

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, December 8, 1966

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. STEWART McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act; and Bill No. 12, an Act to amend The Companies Act.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development & Municipal Affairs) (Cypress) introduced Bill No. 10, an Act to amend The Planning Act.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name and in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Education.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee ready to consider the resolution?

MR. R. A. PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable the Minister would just briefly outline what is in mind.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): . . . if we allow the Chairman to read it first and then the Minister will comply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act by providing: (a) for the increase in the maximum earnings which may be considered to be an average annual income consequent upon which increased compensation may be payable under the Act; and (b) for an increase in the amount that may be paid under the Act for the purpose of furnishing further or better education to the dependent children of a deceased workman. Are you ready to speak to the resolution?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, really as we listen to the resolution, it is self-explanatory. We intend to bring in amendments to the Compensation Act raising the maximum ceiling which will become the average ceiling for compensation purposes, and we intend to amend it also to improve benefits for a dependent youngster to continue his education.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I would have appreciated it if the Honourable Minister would have told us what the increases will be, because I'm sure he has recalled, or everybody in the House here recalls that I had discussed this in the Industrial Relations Committee on more than one occasion, and at that time I had proposed that we increase the present ceiling that we have for the maximum disability. I know at the present time it is far below any of the other provinces in Canada. That's on the compensation which is at the present time 75 percent of their earnings, which is the ceiling at the \$6,000.00. I know many people earn much more than \$6,000 and I feel that they are penalized by having the ceiling established at \$6,000.00.

The (b) section, which says increasing the pension to the children, is as well much below the average from the other provinces in Canada. I would have liked to hear what the present increase is going to be so we can discuss this much more fully.

There is another point that I am disappointed that the Minister has not done anything about, and it is increasing the pension of the widows as well under the Workmen's Compensation, because it seems to me at the present time \$100.00 a month, Mr. Speaker, does not go too far. If the man of the widow is killed in an accident, I think a widow is left in a very distressing position. Suppose, for instance, the husband instead of being killed outright is injured and was receiving an income of \$400.00. At full compensation of 75 percent it would give him an income of \$300.00, but if the man is killed outright the widow is only left with \$100.00, so I

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) feel also that the Minister should have taken this part into consideration as well and increased the widow's allowances too, but I would also like to hear what the increases are, so we can debate this more fully.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Honourable Minister of Labour for his very profound statement as to what this resolution really is about, exactly as we read. We are going to be asked to provide moneys and that is the purpose, of course, of it being a resolution from His Honour, and I think that the Minister should be more broad in his explanation as to what the resolution is about. I know it is the desire on the part of some to stop debate or to have limited debate on resolutions, and normally I ascribe to that thought myself. However, I do think that it would be proper for the Minister of Labour to indicate to us what the new ceiling is going to be. I also would like to have a further explanation insofar as the second part is concerned, as to what is meant by "increase" in the amount to be paid for the furnishing of further or better education to the dependent child of a deceased workman. What about the dependent child of a workman whose parent the breadwinner may not be deceased but is on full compensation? Surely the Minister, Mr. Chairman, has in mind taking care of the dependent children in such circumstances as well, and if this resolution only deals with dependent children of deceased workmen then I respectfully suggest to the Minister that before the Bill is printed that the dependent children of those whose injuries at work have made it impossible for them to continue work, that consideration be given to their children as well; I also would like to suggest at this stage to the Honourable the Minister of Labour - and I presume the Bill is not printed yet, because otherwise the introduction of a resolution would be rather useless - I would suggest that the Minister give consideration to increasing the ceiling of 75 percent as the basis of computing Workmen's Compensation. Surely, Mr. Chairman, penalizing an individual to the degree of 25 percent of his earnings because of an injury in employment is not fair and it's not justified today.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that we are not all recognizable to you immediately and certainly that's a very understandable state of affairs. I am forced to be in the same position as the previous two speakers in having something introduced and then an explanation being given, and then leaving the House and this Committee in the same position as we were when we read this particular matter on the Routine Proceedings paper. In other words, the Minister is saying that he wants to increase the maximum earnings and that he wants to increase the amount which is proposed to be allowed for bettering the education of the children. I think that probably this House would be unanimous that this should be increased, but the fact that will likely be debated is the fact which the Minister chooses even after being asked for an explanation to keep a secret. What is he talking about when he is talking about an increase? The remarks that were made by the Member for Assiniboia indicate that he is left without information on this, and the remarks that have been made by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party indicates that he has no information on this. I would think that the whole House is in the same position, so that the Minister puts a resolution on the floor and puts it in such a manner that it can't possibly be debated. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in particular with regard to paragraph (b) that we in this party have always taken the position that insofar as education is concerned that there should be equal opportunity to all citizens within this province, and that in particular every child in the province be educated so as to reach his maximum potential because in that way he'd be able to make his maximum contribution.

Now that situation is far from being achieved, and with respect to the family of the working man who is entitled to receive compensation and who is deceased, it is almost impossible, even with raising the amount which is available to a dependent child, for the family to hope that their child will be able to complete their higher education. I think that the Minister should be prepared for the fact that we, in this group in any event, will be looking for something which will indicate that the government has a program that where a working man in this province is deceased and therefore his children are handicapped to an almost unlimited degree to be able to get an education, first of all, because if the man was entitled to workmen's compensation he is likely to fall within the lower income levels of our population and is already once handicapped, and then the father being out of the home - and many people who are educated are educated at their parents' expense and are able to get a higher education because their parents are still paying their education, even paying for their food and clothing while they are going to school - this is almost impossible where the chief breadwinner of the house is absent, and a youth of 17 or 18 years of age who would be able to obtain a higher education had not his parent been

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) taken from him as a result of an industrial accident in Manitoba would have been able to get educated even though it be at his parents' expense.

We would look to the government to introduce a program whereby the talented people who are struck by this kind of a catastrophe are not only being given an assist by having a higher allowance, but are also given such aid as would make it possible for them to achieve that higher education.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that part of the difficulty with regard to this resolution arises from the fact that, as some of the speakers have mentioned, it is quite indefinite. I know that most of us find it difficult to keep our familiarity with these Acts in mind and I would think that as far as Clause (a) is concerned that it would be helpful to the Committee and would expedite the work of the Committee if the Honourable the Minister would just review the method by which the average income is now determined - what is the method and what change is proposed?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I understand that workmen's compensation is presently available to all farmers and has been for some three or four years, but while I understand that it's available my guess is there isn't one farmer in 500 that knows that it is available to him - that's my guess - and I think that a great deal more publicity should be given by all means possible to make certain that the farmers know that workmen's compensation is available to them. We had a very sad case, in a way, just in Neepawa here a month or so ago that dragged on for about a year but ended up in court and it cost the poor farmer about \$4,000, and if he'd had compensation for the men it wouldn'd have cost him anything. That's about the way it would have been.

Now I hope, I hope, Mr. Minister, that the increases that you propose by way of the resolution that is before the Committee applies to the farmers as well as to everyone else. While it's true that the farmer's net income is not any higher, his gross income is up substantially and the cost of hiring his help has gone up considerably and is going up every day. So I hope that two things happen: the increases that you plan will be available to farmers; and that this government will undertake to encourage the farmers to participate in workmen's compensation and put on a bit of advertising campaign to make it know to the farmers that it is available to them. We spend a great deal of money in advertising other facets of the government and this is one that should be given more publicity.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, just one or two questions before the Minister replies. Is there any thought of expanding the Act and would the Act or the new Bill that is coming forward, would it be retroactive in any way? Would it cover the present school term and so on? I think these are things that we should probably know or will it only be effective as the new fiscal year of this body?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I should offer an explanation why I didn't go into detail, and that is that I thought that these points were points that would be debated at second reading of the Bill. I have no hesitation in telling you that we are going to move to the highest ceiling in Canada to accommodate our highways industries that are coming into the province and the ceiling is going to be \$6,600.00.

I have no hesitation in telling you that the allowance is going to be increased to \$50.00, which is as high as any province in Canada, for educational allowances for orphans. I am very pleased to do that. It won't be retroactive and I have been informed by the Minister of Agriculture that they are undertaking a PR program to inform the farm community that compensation is available.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister missed just on one particular question that was asked by my colleague the Member for Assiniboia regarding widows. Has he any intention at all of moving in that line?

MR. BAIZLEY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? -- Agreed.

RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Schools Act by providing, among other matters, that the costs of taking a vote on a referendum or the election of a new board of trustees of a division held under section 444C of The Public Schools Act may be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, this is simply a measure, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act which will be before us which provides that the cost of the referendum will be paid out of the Consolidated Fund rather than reverting back on the Divisions, and the necessary moneys to provide for same will be contained in the estimates that will be before us later on. That's really what the purpose of this money resolution

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) is at this time. Under the present legislation the Minister has the power to call the referendum. It's been thought advisable to bring in the amendment to the Act which we passed last year which will provide for the detailed regulations that will be required concerning the conduct of the vote -- the entire cost of this vote to be born out of the Consolidated Revenue.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his explanation and I'm happy to see that the Consolidated Revenue will be bearing the costs of the referendum. I presume he's referring to the one to be held on March 10th as well as the election of trustees which I understand will be held on the 30th of March.

Now if we're going to adopt the cost of that as a provincial responsibility, as I believe we should -- and I want to say as well that I'm in favour of proceeding along this line, that I think from an education standpoint the single division board is in fact a forward step -- but if we're going to do that, Mr. Chairman, then I'm very concerned about what steps my honourable friend the Minister will take to ensure that the facts, the information go out to the public in order to make this referendum a useful exercise.

I spoke yesterday about the question of costs in education and the lack of equality across the province; the problems for a number of our divisions who presently simply cannot meet their obligations. I know that the Minister had a delegation recently from one of the school divisions which is in particular trouble and that he is not in a position, I think, to give them an immediate answer.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it's absolutely essential that the Minister declare very soon to the people of Manitoba what he intends to do from a financial standpoint, because unless he does that and unless there is in fact a very sizeable forward step by the province and something done about equalization, then I very much fear that the money that he's putting in the referendum will not be well spent because I don't think that the referendum will pass. I think that there is a fair agreement that from an education standpoint this is a forward step, but people want to have the full information, and unless they have all the answers given to them before the 10th of March, and well before the 10th of March, there may be some areas in this province who simply will turn down this referendum, not because they don't want better education for their children but because they're afraid of what's going to happen. They well remember the school division vote and they don't want a repetition of this situation once again, so there has to be a very clear-cut statement from the Minister on the cost factors. Surely the Minister is going to do something about equalizing the costs across the province.

Then I think there are further matters that the Minister must look at, and that is where he, for example, is putting into the hands of division boards the responsibility for what is normally termed special schools or schools under The Official Trustee. These are by and large in areas of low assessments where there isn't a sufficient local source of revenue to operate the school in a normal fashion, where it has proved difficult in the past to elect any kind of a board -- for obviously there hasn't been a local board -- they couldn't do that so they ended up in the hands of the Official Trustee.

Now these areas are going to be part and parcel of the ones voting in these divisions and particularly in the case of Turtle River, the one that came to visit him recently. The Minister knows that this is a very serious problem in that area because there are new costs being turned over to the division board as it is. The vote comes along, the people will want to know exactly what this will mean to them. The Minister again in this particular area will have to proceed and give some details, and I suppose every member of this House from the education standpoint is very interested in seeing the whole of the province progress. I'm certainly anxious to see in my school division in my own constituency the very best of education facilities for the children in that area. But, Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible for me, and I suspect for the other members of this House, to go out and conscientiously speak to our constituents in favour of the referendum unless we have the full information ourselves. I cannot see how at this time I could possibly go out to a meeting in my own constituency on this matter of the referendum and conscientiously be able to tell my people that this is what they should do, because they will be asking a whole series of questions which remain totally unanswered by the government at this point.

Now I know the Throne Speech says that the government is going to do certain things, but the government must come out with that policy, Mr. Chairman, very very soon. If it doesn't do so, it will jeopardize this referendum; the referendum will fail, and there's no point in having it and spending the money on it unless the Minister is prepared to take those steps.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, the wording of -- "it being expedient to bring this measure to the Consolidated Fund" concerns the fact that it's bad timing with two departments of the government. On the one hand, the Department of Municipal Affairs has publicized, for the use of school divisions and school districts, the 1967 equalized assessment which in the rural areas and particularly the places that you expect the vote to carry for the single board division, an average increase of 34 percent of assessment. Now this assessment has been established in a very arbitrary manner and it has a lot of confusion set up within these various districts. The R. M. 's of particularly the western part of the province are concerned with the fact that the assessing branch, instead of having the province assessed in total and using the actual assessment as a basis, they have arbitrarily used the figure of 40 percent of market value, and this has increased in some cases as high as 55 to 60 percent of the equalized assessment. And you can realize, Sir, in establishing this in your timing, that March 10th is your vote. Your new levies will be coming out shortly after that as soon as your Board is set up, and instead of having to levy nine or eight or ten mills for your general levy, you are going to go as high as 17 and 18 mills, and so the single board division is going to get this blame, and I think, Sir, that some consideration at this time should be given that if you are going ahead with the vote on this basis that the assessment of the 1967 equalized assessment should revert back to 1966, because on that basis you will save the - particularly the rural farm people - as much on an average in the province as 34 percent, and this will be an average increase in taxes for education and a saving to this government.

Just recently one of your members of the Department of Education spoke before the Department, the Municipal Trustee, or Union of Manitoba Municipalities of which he pointed out that the overall equalized assessment was now increased 12 1/2 percent over last year, which was going to reflect in the municipalities having to pay 12 1/2 percent more money and that the government would have that much reduced, and I think it's advisable that this whole program of this vote be tied in so that the people know what they're voting on, and I can assure you that it won't be satisfactory to proceed on a basis where the larger portion of these divisions in the western part are going to be faced with a 34 percent increase in the general levy of school taxes.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just a word or two on the resolution. First of all, I think that I should state that in our opinion the Government should have shown sufficient gumption and initiative of introducing the larger areas of school administration into the province, and rather going about it backwards to have instituted the larger areas of administration with the opting out clause for those who did not desire following it. In this way, I feel that it would have been far better, we would not have had to go through unnecessary referendums in those areas which apparently may adopt the new larger areas of school administration.

Of course, the stand that I am taking is not unfamiliar in this Legislature because my predecessors in the CCF Party advocated this at two previous governments on many occasions, as I believe the Honourable Member for Lakeside will admit. It's true there is a difference in methodology. Maybe some may consider we would impose conditions upon others, or somebody else first of all.

Another factor, Mr. Chairman, I think that is worthy of note, that by doing it this way by a referendum to come in, those municipalities or school districts which are now providing elementary and secondary education such as the City of Winnipeg, are going to have to subsidize the costs of the referendum because of the fact that they do make contributions. Almost half of the total revenue of the Province of Manitoba comes from in this particular area. And then, too, I think that the Minister has got a real selling job to do. Already I might say in my own Division No. 12, Transcona-Springfield, one of the members of our local council has attacked the holding of the referendum because of the fact that in the City of Transcona they are desirous of having a self-contained school district themselves, where one school board will handle all of the administration of education, both elementary and secondary. And I greatly fear, Mr. Chairman, that unless the Minister states the fact clearly, that many areas who have peculiar situations such as I mentioned for the City of Transcona, are going to defeat the by-law, defeat the referendum, because of the cost factor involved to the larger more populated areas.

I suggest to the Minister this may also be true insofar as, I believe it's the River East Division, that's North Kildonan and North St. Paul and that area there. I may not have the right division name but the general area is there. So I suggest to the Minister that up until now there has been no clear-cut indication from the government as to what the gains are going to be

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) in dollars and cents by the adoption of the larger areas of administration. And I think it's most important that this be done, Mr. Chairman, because I don't believe that there's a member in this House who is not aware of the needs of advancing the cause of education in the Province of Manitoba - maybe irrespective of cost, but the fact remains, however, unfortunately, that in the minds of many the cost factor is the first and the most important factor, and this I suggest, Mr. Chairman, can be the means of defeating the referendum.

So I say to the Minister, I think that you are going about it the wrong way - at least in our opinion it's the wrong way. It would have been less costly insofar as the referendum aspect is concerned to have invoked the larger areas of administration with an opting out provision. We would not have had to have as many referendums, and while the cost may be insignificant in the overall cost of governmental operations it's still nonetheless a cost; it could have been avoided.

Then I say that before the referendum is held, I appeal to the Minister to state clearly and concisely the dollar and cents figure as it will affect each and every school division in the province, and I think this is most necessary.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I believe that the government expects that every member of the House will do everything within his power to sell the principle of the single administration to everyone in the province as we did in 1959, I guess it was - seven years ago. --(Interjection) -- In some divisions or some people helped? Well, there were some people that didn't help too, Mr. Chairman, and what I want to say is this: that I think, after having been in the selling game for 35 years myself, I think the best way to sell anything - and I don't care whether it's Watkins products or selling yourself - the thing to do is tell the people the truth about the product and tell the people what they intend to do and stick to it, but for Pete's sake tell them the truth, and if it's going to cost more money, tell them why it's going to cost more money, and tell them we believe that it'll cost more money but it's worth it, if that's what you believe in. I don't believe in beating around the bush and saying you're going to have a lot better deal at a lot less money, because that's the thing

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the honourable member would as close to the resolution and as brief as possible.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I've got it right as close to me here as I can get it. And we're talking -- my guess is this referendum is going to cost a lot of money but I'm just saying this, and trying to give my honourable friend some good advice, because one of the -- if some of us members did not make a good job of selling the plan last time, seven years ago, it was because not only us fellows didn't understand it but the government didn't understand it, because they went out all over the province and said, "This new jet age plan is going to cost you less money." My honourable friend the Minister, the Attorney-General did that, page 95, and the Honourable the First Minister said it would cost less.

MR. ROBLIN: not.

MR. CAMPBELL: Read it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't expect my honourable friend the First Minister wants me to read this, but Free Press January 31st, 1959: "Roblin reiterates no tax boost planned," speaking over Brandon TV, and he says, "Premier Duff Roblin of Manitoba in a television appearance in Brandon Friday night renewed a pledge made during the last session of the Legislature that implementation of the province's new education legislation can be handled without an increase in taxes."

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend knows perfectly well that that address had nothing to do with local school taxes. Now would he please have the candor to say so. --(Interjection) -- If somebody doesn't tell the facts I'm entitled to get up and remark about it and my honourable friend can shout order until he's red in his face

MR. CAMPBELL: Is the Chairman here the Honourable the First Minister, Mr. Chairman? The Honourable the First Minister interpreting the rules and enforcing them as well? Let's have some order.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm just quoting from the Free Press as usual, and I gave you the date. This is from the -- and if my honourable friends, they're sitting together there now, if they want to take legal action against the Free Press for misquotes they are quite at liberty to do so, but this is what they're saying. And then Hansard is considered to be a fair authority on what the fellows say. A fair authority. And my honourable friend the present Attorney-General isn't. The Minister of Public Utilities. The Provincial Secretary? Well, he

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) has a multiple post. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly. He indicated on more than one occasion that it wasn't going to cost any more, but what I'm saying is this. This is old -- we're threshing old straw, but what I am saying is, don't let's make the mistake again this time. That's all I'm saying. Let's go out this time and tell them the facts; tell them it may cost you more money but it's a better deal and we think you should go for it, and this is what I'm trying to say. --(Interjection) -- Tell them where it's going to come from, that's a good point. Tell them where it's going to come from. Tell them it's not going to come from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan or Ontario, it's coming from our pockets, and whether you shift it from that pocket to that one it makes no odds, it's still coming from us.

MR. RUSSELL J. DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, the member from Elmwood. I think that anyone who reads the papers or pays attention to the statements by the Minister of Education and of the government can see that they obviously do favour these larger school districts under one board, that this actually is their position. They have offered a 10 percent incentive or carrot to divisions who will follow their plan, and now we have a referendum. It seems to me that they are clearly avoiding their responsibilities here. I thought the government's function was to provide leadership, and what I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister of Education is, what will they do if the referendum fails in the rural areas? Will they hold another referendum followed by another and another and another?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the other members discussing this resolution that is before us. I would like to know from the Minister just how many divisions are involved, how many divisions will have a vote on this matter. I think I read in today's paper, this morning's paper, that some people in the Interlake area are not too well satisfied by just imposing it on them; that they would like to have a vote as well.

Then I think, as the Honourable Member for Gladstone says, or Neepawa, that the matter should be decided on its merits and not hang a carrot before the people and offer them inducement grants, especially so after we will be calling on the taxpayers in this province to pay a great deal more in taxes because of the increase in assessment that has been taking place, and that the school districts and divisions will be getting less money in grants. Now we are going to offer them 10 percent of this money back after depriving them of probably 12 or more percent. I think in my own area it would be much more than 12 percent.

Also, I would like to know from the Minister, is he going to engage special help for the purpose of selling this program? Are members going to be called on to participate and so will they be remunerated, and also will they be remunerated whether its pro or con because it's not necessarily taken for granted that everyone will speak in favour of it especially because of some of the facts that are involved, because if this takes place I think Manitoba in five or ten years will be a desolate place with a few larger centres, because in the Division of Rhineland I'm sure there's only one centre that will have an elementary school left. The same will hold true for the Western Division and I'm almost sure that the same will apply to Garden Valley. Now, what the effect of this will be is that real estate in these smaller centres will be devaluated to such a large extent that people will as a consequence face great losses, and I think these are matters that we have to take into consideration as well.

The other matter is the involvement. I think we are losing a great deal from the very people, the trustees of this province and citizens as a whole, who have taken heretofore great interest in education, have done much on behalf of it, and who will now drop on the wayside and will not be called on to work for it.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I would like to briefly comment on this. This resolution calls for the expenditure of our money, and I would say that any money spent on this project would be worthwhile providing that the referendum does go through, and I'm sure that the Minister will vouch for me when I say that I have always been a strong supporter of centralization of educational facilities. I have always supported it very strongly and I'm willing to take my place with the Minister, side by side with him, in an information campaign supporting the principle of the single school district, but I am not willing and ready to participate in a campaign of deception, and I'm not accusing the present Minister of trying to deceive, because I'm thoroughly convinced that in the past during the formation of the school divisions the people have been deceived, because the information given to them did not pan out. It wasn't accurate information.

As has been stated previously by my colleague from Gladstone, the people were definitely told that the cost to them will be decreased, that the taxes will not go up. That did not materialize.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) They were told that, and I remember one of the Ministers speaking at a meeting and that was not even in the campaign meeting, and he said that definitely 50 percent of the cost will be borne by the Department of Education or by the Province. That did not materialize. Our taxes have doubled in some places, in other places they have tripled.

Another information that was given, and I have had with another Minister at the time, and the Minister definitely stated that it isn't the intention of the government to centralize divisions, and at that time I got up and I said, "If it isn't the intention of the government to centralize educational facilities, I don't want to have anything to do with it," because we wouldn't have had an improvement in our education, and I definitely took the stand that if it is not centralization I would have nothing to do with it. But the Minister at that time made a statement that "We are not here to force you." Maybe in a way he was right, because it's up to the board, but the intention was behind it, because that's the only way we could have improved our education in the Province of Manitoba by centralizing education but still the Minister said at the time, "We are not here to ask you to do it - it's up to the board," but the intention was there; that was the principle of it. And again when we come back to this I do not want to deceive the people of Manitoba, and I'll agree with the former speakers - be frank with them. All of us have to be frank. If they ask us if this is going to cost more money - yes it will cost more money, but it is going to be worthwhile. It will cost us more money. It doesn't matter whether it comes from the Province of Manitoba or from the local taxpayer - property tax - it is going to cost the people of Manitoba more money, but it's going to be a better system. Let us be frank, and if the people ask, "Does this mean centralization of elementary education," I would say yes, it does, and I hope it does. I'm not going to beat around the bush and I hope and I believe that the Minister will not beat around the bush and make a statement that it isn't our intention. It is our intention. If it isn't our intention to group into graded schools -- sure, some areas it may not be possible but wherever it is possible it is the intention, my intention, and it should be the intention of the government to see that these people do centralize and help them along and tell them that. That is our intention. We intend to centralize. We intend to put in graded schools. If it's eight classrooms, if that's advisable, make it eight or twelve or ten, but we want to centralize if we want to improve, and I don't want to deceive the people. I'm willing to go all out for it and I have already been doing it, but I would like the people to know the truth.

This statement that I have on this yellow paper, a paragraph on Page 6 where the Minister seems to be - I don't know the intention - to be backing out of it. It says, "It has been stated and attributed to me that the government intends to use," - maybe the government doesn't intend to use - "a new administrative system to impose at least eight-room graded schools." Maybe the government doesn't, but that is the intention of the whole thing - the whole idea. It is the invention because otherwise we don't need it. If we are not going to centralize, why go ahead into it? We want to improve our education, and this kind of a statement I don't go along with it. I would like everyone who goes out on this information campaign to be frank with the people and tell them exactly what is involved. I'm being asked questions now, the same as has been asked by one of my colleagues here. What about the foundation grant? What about the inequality of assessment in different areas? Is the government coming forther with greater grants? As I said before, it still comes from the people but on a wider base. It might make it easier for some people to do it but we have got to know that, and before I go out on an active campaign I would like the Minister to give us full information, maybe not at this time because the campaign isn't starting yet, but in the very near future, to tell us exactly what it involves. Just to say there's a 10 percent increase, of what? I don't think that is sufficient and I would like to say that I agree with this expenditure and it is worthwhile providing we get fruitful results, but if we just spend money and that money doesn't bring the desired effect, I don't want it; and if it is not going to improve our education I'm not for it, because I believe it is possible to improve but let's do it the right way.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my question once again to the intent of the resolution, that is, that the referendums be paid out of the Consolidated Fund, which is the change, I take it, from the present situation. The only effect of this particular change as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is that it results in the moneys which are collected from all of the citizens of this province being used to finance these referendums. Let me make it clear that I as an individual see no objection to having all of the funds that are collected by all of the province used to finance a program which will result in some betterment to the education or other area of our provincial economy, but that's not what is happening with this particular payment. What is

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) happening here is that it's being used to finance a referendum, and then it seems that various members have said that we are all expected to go out and sell this referendum and hope that it succeeds. Well, Mr. Chairman, my short experience has indicated to me that people who are elected to public office make much better legislators than they do salesmen, that this is not the responsibility of this Chamber to go out and sell a program, because I can recall in 1950 the aldermen of the City of Winnipeg, 15 out of 16 who agreed on Plan C decided that they could sell this project, which was eminently reasonable and approved of by everybody who knew anything about power engineering. They said that they would sell this program to the people of the City of Winnipeg, and they didn't sell it. The politicians became engaged in a political war with the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Free Press, as it sometimes does, emerged victorious and Plan C went down to defeat, and what did the City of Winnipeg and Greater Winnipeg have to do? They had to accept their responsibility as elected representatives of the people and enact the very program that was turned down by the people, and it cost them a lot more money.

Now I say, Mr. Chairman, that as a representative of the City of Winnipeg I see no objection to using provincial revenue to finance the betterment of the people of this province, but I don't see why a consolidated fund has to be used and then, in turn, if the thing is defeated and, as Mr. Tanchak says, nothing happens, then all we have done is used city revenues to finance, or 50 percent finance, a referendum in a provincial area which has gone down to defeat, and that's the intent of this resolution.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the far-ranging expressions of opinion that have come forward on this modest resolution to proceed with the province-wide referendum on March 10th, and to pay the cost therefrom from the revenues of the province. May I say that first of all I quite appreciate some of the statements made this afternoon, some of the apprehensions by the honourable members opposite. All I can say is that these have been given the fullest consideration, taken into consideration, and the detailed financing of education will be before us shortly at which time, I think, as it unfolds I trust the honourable members opposite will endorse the kind of program that's anticipated.

What I really want to say, I think I should take this opportunity to say that with respect to the referendum which was decided upon early in September, prior to that time and since then we have been in constant touch of course with the trustees of Manitoba and the Teachers' Society working with them, and we have established a publicity committee with representatives of each organization who are working closely together in Room 48 down in the basement here. We had a meeting for example again this morning. I should tell the members that to date we have established this committee. We are engaging some assistance to bring the message across the province as vigorously as we can.

I think the people of rural Manitoba have said loud and clear to us that they want meetings, they want much information, and I think generally speaking over the province they favour the referendum rather than the imposition from above. I'm convinced that given the proper information and the need for change as we see it - as I call it the collision course of our curriculum revision and so on with the local administrative structure - as we take this opportunity to bring what we know about it before all the people, or what we think we know about it, we think this will serve a double purpose and that is the vigorous educational campaign preceding such a referendum will serve a great deal of good and the people want the information.

We've had seminars involving trustees, teachers and educators. We had an all day seminar here a couple of weeks ago and several of the points that have been discussed in this Chamber were brought forward. Our committee has worked, meetings have been held and are being held almost every night just about this time. The idea was until the 15th or 16 or 18th of September, this low key campaign would go on where we go out to a district and have meetings, get the issue boiling, or get people talking. Our people are going out with kits of material that we have at hand, assembled by our three publicity people. We are then planning -- the strategy is that right after the new year to go on an intensive day-to-day campaign.

Our inspectors have been charged in each division with being in charge of the campaign within their areas. They are working with trustee and teacher representatives within each division to plan the spots where meetings should be held and the very fullest discussion allowed. A brochure has been worked upon and should be ready by the 15th, before we rise here, a brochure that I hope and expect will commend itself to you, bringing forth the reasons as we see it why single district divisions can best serve education today.

I think that this was a decision of our joint committee that we go along at this rate, that

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) we emphasize the principle of single district divisions foremost, that we sell this principle and not mix up boundary changes with the principle of single district divisions at this time. These are more longer range problems in most cases and should be thoroughly researched, which is being done at this time.

However, we must sell the principle of single district division, and of course as the Leader of the NDP said, the cost factor is something that once our budget is out and the details are known of what the government is proposing in educational reform and finance, we can get down to the nuts and bolts in our literature as to exactly what is involved, and this is the way we hope and see and expect this thing to evolve.

MR. PAULLEY: I hope that's out before the referendum at least.

MR. JOHNSON: It'll be out in plenty of time and I expect everyone here to give their full backing to this program as they have expressed it. I understand everyone's in favour. I would have some trepidation with the member for Rhineland. I think I will have to get closer to him in the next few weeks and discuss some of the issues that are worrying him about over-centralization.

I might say now that I'm on my feet that with respect to the quotations that have come up in the last two days concerning the eight-room school, as raised by the Member for Emerson, what I was trying to convey - and it was very clear that there certainly are areas in the Province of Manitoba geographically where it's simply impossible to get an eight-room school - I think we have to say perfectly frankly to the people in these divisions the new boards will be in charge of the rationalization of the total education program within their borders, and certainly the good sense of the trustees concerned is going to prevail I'm sure. But naturally we, where possible, would like to see most adequate consolidation. As you know with the referendum -- I don't want to talk about the referendum not going over in certain areas, I think as our program unfolds before you and as our informational campaign gets into high gear, that it will commend itself to the people of our province. I would certainly hope so.

I don't know insofar -- there's one thing that bothers me in the debate this afternoon, in continually referring to don't be untruthful, that we are trying to get away with something. I campaigned vigorously in the 1959 election throughout the Interlake area, and everywhere I went I certainly - the matter of costs - and I know most of my colleagues to my knowledge at no time said, "You're getting something for nothing." I think the public are quite aware that increased services, better schools, better programs cost money, and this program, gentlemen, is going to cost an awful lot more money but it's going to be the service that our people need to bring more equal opportunities to the boys and girls of the province.

This is a far-ranging debate that has gone forward but I just want in conclusion to say that I would be pleased to probably prepare for the honourable members some of the detail work that has gone on to date so you're aware of what is being done, and we hope, as I say, to have a day to day schedule after the 1st of January which these people are working on at the present time. The financial aspects of this will unfold and I quite appreciate that some members can't make a judgment in total without knowing all those facts. However, at this time and in our brochures to date, we are emphasizing the principle of single district divisions; the educational benefits which will accrue therefrom; and the details of finance we will follow up with the proper material as soon as this comes before you people -- or before this House.

I think, however, that the idea of a referendum, the opportunity for the people to express in a democratic way their wishes in this regard is proper and is the kind that the people of rural Manitoba especially expect. However, we are quite aware of the situation in the Interlake, though we had legislation passed last spring which called for a pilot project which was sort of a package deal following the joint study we had with the ARDA people - the federal people under the ARDA agreement - and the Boundaries Commission is busily engaged there at the present time and should be making a recommendation early in the first month or two in the new year, I would expect.

I think that this is really all I can say at this time. As I say, there will certainly be a complete candor in bringing before the people the nature - or the reasons why the single district division, we think, will serve them best, and the full financial picture disclosed to them in due course. I would ask the patience of the members in that regard until that's before us. However, I want to be most emphatic about the fact that as a member of this government I have never heard any of my colleagues tell the people of Manitoba that more and better service costs less money.

MR. DOERN: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. DOERN: When the referendum has been taken, what would you consider to be a successful result? Fifty percent? Sixty percent? Eighty percent? You obviously expect a majority result in favour of the referendum. Could you tell us what you would consider what your minimum figure would be in regard to what you would consider successful?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, a majority within each division, a simple majority.

MR. MOLGAT: How many divisions do you expect to pass?

MR. JOHNSON: Thirty-three.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in this committee it takes the oddest things to get some people to take part in a debate. I must use the time-honoured phrase, "I had not intended to take part" and it was a peculiar circumstance that brought me to my feet because it was a new member of this House, one who is certainly going to be heard from frequently, I am sure, the Honourable Member for Inkster who is responsible for me being on the floor at the moment.

Let me set the minds of the honourable members at rest though by saying that I do not intend to debate at length the re-organization of the electrical industry in the Province of Manitoba or go into the details of planned fees, but if my honourable friend or anyone else in here would like to discuss that question when we come to the appropriate time in the committee or in the House, I'd be very glad to, but in the meantime let me simply say to my honourable friend from Inkster that the arrangement that was made following the defeat of Plan C was not the same program that was offered under Plan C. It wasn't anything like as good as was offered under Plan C for the City of Winnipeg, so I mention that. But of course, now that I'm on my feet, I want to be helpful to my honourable friend the Minister. I have a high regard for him and I do want to be helpful, because as I have read this resolution carefully, it seems to me that though he makes provision for the cost of taking the vote on a referendum or the election of a new board of trustees of a division, it seems to me that it does not cover this matter that we've spent a lot of time talking about and that is, the carrying of the message to the people.

Now my honourable friend from Rhineland touched on this briefly but is that covered here? Because this is going to be, I think, if there's anything that could be said to have unanimous agreement in the House this afternoon, it would be that this is going to be a major job to see that this program is sold to the people of Manitoba and sold properly and well, because it isn't going to be easy to sell it. And while I know that my honourable friends on that side of the House are justly sensitive when it comes to discussion of the famous vote of 1959, and I see my honourable and dear friend the Minister of Public Utilities looking at me with what I might term a suspicious eye, I must say that because of - will we call them misunderstandings; will we suggest that they're only misinterpretations, though I think they were more because the people felt that they were led to believe that the property taxes in their areas were going to be reduced as a result of the amount of extra money that the government was going to put into the educational system, that it's going to make the job of selling this program more difficult than it would have been because of the results that have happened since. If anybody wants to debate that at greater length I'd be glad, like my honourable friend from Gladstone, to produce evidence to support my contention. This isn't going to be an easy job, and if the honourable members of the government are convinced that it's the right thing to do, then they have a responsibility to see that the best possible job of publicizing and promoting the campaign is done, and so if the resolution doesn't do it now, it should provide for the costs of doing that job well.

Mr. Chairman, let us make no doubt about it; have no doubts about it at all. The point that my honourable friend from Rhineland mentioned has a lot of validity to it, whether the people who take that position are right or wrong, what reason they have for taking it isn't the question. The fact is, in my opinion, that a lot of them look on this question of centralization as something that has a great social and sociological effect and also economic, right in their home community, and it's going to be a job in a lot of the areas to get this program accepted. So I say to my honourable friend the Minister that if he has any doubt about the matter, that he make sure that in the legislation that he brings in, the costs of the advertising and publicity campaign are covered as well, because that is going to need to be a pretty important effort in my opinion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that we don't need the Legislative legislation to pay for the costs of a publicity campaign that will be conducted in connection with this. The Honourable Member for Lakeside raises the question that this may be a hard sell. I acknowledge that, and I think it can't be said too often that all of us here must of course realize

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) more and more that everything about our daily lives today is being affected so greatly by educational advance. Change is upon us so rapidly that concepts are changing almost monthly amongst the educators in Canada. However, in the very matter of opening more doors to our boys and girls we've simply got to impress upon people at the local level that there has to be grouping; there has to be more alternative opportunities made available. To open up more doors we're going to have to have a degree of centralization, and I think they're aware of this in such fields as vocational training, education of the retarded and other special categories, that inter-divisional arrangements will have to be made, and of course we're looking to the grouping of regions at this time.

We find this in Greater Winnipeg itself, where the member divisional boards in our Metropolitan area are discussing and anxious to see regions created within the Metropolitan area where groups of these divisions even in this urban centre can come together to bring on certain programmes, but I've come to the conclusion certainly as the Minister in this Department that there is no question, that we have no alternative at this time in the evolution of the Department of Education but to rationalize the number of boards at the local level to provide for the courses that are now being developed, and I think the former member of this House, my honourable friend knows very well, gave the best example I have heard of when he talked of the new occupational entrance course within the division, pointing out that it was simply impossible to put on a proper course of that kind in a multi-district division where he had to negotiate with a number of boards and so on - one course alone. And I think we're reaching a crisis in the development of our physical plan throughout the rural area. Now is the opportunity to seize upon this and give the leadership, give our divisional trustees as will be established an opportunity to rationalize both elementary and secondary throughout their area with a mind to the development of special services and so on. All this in addition to the many benefits from centralization such as superintendent services, maintenance and what have you.

I would hope that all members would be quite definite in advising their constituents of the benefits of this referendum and what we have and what it stands for, and I would certainly hope that all the information that is possible will be made available to the honourable members and to the people concerned in the very next short while.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief again. There are two questions I would like to ask again: is there any consideration being given for a referendum in certain remote areas either on March 10th or at some future date? Because I understand there are two possibilities. It is possible that the present Boundaries Commission sitting many recommend redistribution or change in the boundaries of some divisions, and this change may include some of the present remote areas. Now if they do not vote on the 10th, how will we dispose of this problem? And there is another possibility, that some of these remote areas - and I have one in my own area, that's Piney Municipality - they do wish, they have always wished to be in a Division. Of course they applied, they made application for remote because they had no alternative; they wanted more benefits; but they would like to be in a Division, and this other possibility is that they may make application to the Department to be included in a certain Division. How would you dispose of that? Would you give them a referendum on the 10th or at some future date?

MR. JOHNSON: I just want to answer the Honourable Member from Emerson, with respect to the remote areas we are looking at this right now within the Department, the possibilities, and I could make a report on that later to the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised by one of the statements of the Minister, when he admitted a few moments ago that we have reached a crisis stage in Education. Those were the terms the Minister used, that we have reached the point of a crisis, and unfortunately I am afraid that is so. I'm certainly prepared in this particular one, the case of the referendum, to assist, but I say to him again, he's going to have to come out with his facts.

Now the Minister says that the advertising campaign will start in January. He says that the financial information will be out soon. When is "soon?" What is the target date for the Government to announce its proposed plan for assistance to education? When will the Minister be able to say what he proposes to do to equalize the costs, what he proposes to do for schools presently or previously under the administration of the Official Trustee? Will he be able to make a statement soon regarding the new assessment? I mentioned it yesterday, the 12-1/2 percent average increase across the province; my colleague the Member for Turtle Mountain mentioned it today, and this is taken from statements by the Minister's Department itself, that we can look forward to a 12-1/2 percent increase in the average local assessment and thereby

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) in the costs at the local level. When can the Minister announce that this will not take place and that the Government is in fact going to take steps to prevent this added load from being put on, because if he doesn't do this very soon some people are likely to make up their minds on this matter in the very near future. So I ask the Minister to tell us now, when will he come out with his positive plans? He admits that there's a crisis in education. Well, let's start working on it right now.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, when I say there's a crisis I mean in all aspects of education, not only here but right across Canada, and I sure wish he could reach his federal colleagues in Ottawa on this point. We go down there and the Premiers of Canada and the Ministers of Education across Canada extend a hand to the Federal Government and say never in the history of Canada has a Federal Government had an opportunity like this to reach out, take the hands of the provinces, give them the fiscal elbow room to carry out the first and top priority of the nation, education. And what do we get? You know, we're still arguing the nuts and bolts. We still don't know what post-secondary education is, by their definition, operating costs and this sort of thing. But what an opportunity for Canada as a whole. What an opportunity for the Federal Government to borrow money if need be, to help the provinces across Canada meet the challenge before us today. Not just in Manitoba, right across this nation. But no! And the Honourable Leader there ignores that portion of the Throne Speech that points out where his colleagues down there want to balance the budget over the next five years and leave the provinces and municipalities in a deficit position across the country. What an opportunity now in the development of this province and Canada for the Federal Government to reach out and assist the provinces to do everything possible for our youth.

Our proposals will be before you soon. As soon as this material is before the House we will then assemble it in such form to bring before the people. In the meantime our brochures and our campaign is being planned to bring all the educational benefits of a single district division to the people. On to that will be grafted the financial implications and financial support when the material has been before the Members here and then put in brochures or whatever method we choose to bring it out. But we have certainly got this in mind, and can't do anything positive on it until it has been enunciated. Crisis? Certainly; there's a crisis in education right across this country and the likes of which were never anticipated - never anticipated before. And to sit in any educational department today is a most challenging position, but I certainly would endorse, Mr. Chairman, that our Leader of the Opposition bring this as forcibly as he can to his counterparts in the Federal scene.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'll be delighted at any time to debate the question of federal aid to the Province of Manitoba. I don't think that this is exactly the resolution under which it should be done. However, I have no objection at all to undertaking it, and let me assure the Minister that I have no position to hold relative to Ottawa, that regardless of who happens to be in office in Ottawa I will stand up for what I think is right for the province of Manitoba. But I'm rather surprised that this Government, of all governments in Canada, and that the Department of Education and Minister of Education of this province, of all provinces in Canada, having had the most dismal record of any province in Canada in accepting Federal aid when offered to them in the field of vocational training, when for years the Federal Government has said to the provinces, "The money is there waiting for you; 75 percent to build the schools, 50 percent to operate them," and this Government's got the worst record of any government in Canada, bar none. And you have the gall to stand up in this House and say that the Federal Government isn't doing for you what it should be doing. Well maybe it isn't. Maybe more needs to be done. I think there is a Federal responsibility in education, but it's not up to this Government to be lecturing Ottawa at this time. This Government should be hanging its head in shame for its dismal record in this particular field. So I say to the Minister, you tend to your own knitting. You do your business for the people of Manitoba. And if this Government had taken its responsibilities in this field, we'd have a better education system in the province of Manitoba now than we've got. And when the Minister said crisis in education, he was referring to the Province of Manitoba. He tried to cover up later and said it was in Canada but he admitted it was here, and it's of the making of this Government. Now the Minister says the information will come soon. Will it come before Christmas? Will it come before this House rises for the recess, or will we have to wait until some time in the New Year when the House reconvenes?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I don't think I should let this outburst of my honourable friend go without some notice being taken on this side of the House. Actually you know, Mr. Chairman,

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) it is difficult to point out to honourable members that the purpose of this particular committee is to have, according to the comment of Beauchesne, a brief discussion of the main principles involved, and that it doesn't degenerate into a general free-for-all, which is what we've had in this last little while. A general free-for-all with every conceivable aspect of matter, whether related or unrelated, from electricity supply to the question of technical schools brought into the particular argument. Well, my honourable friends make statements on the other side, and they can hardly expect people on this side to sit and listen to it all without some kind of reaction to some of the misinterpretations, some of the twisted reaching, and some of the malaprop logic that we hear from gentlemen on the other side. We go right back, for example, to the Honourable Member for Gladstone — and you know I'm really reluctant to mention his name because I am as positive as I stand here that this will probably promote another round of comments from all concerned — but he starts out by quoting me with reference to something that happened in 1959 and makes the reference to the wrong subject. Well, that's been going on on the other side for a long time. They take statements that are made from time to time by people on this side, and apply their own interpretation to what they have meant.

Now the last thing I want to do is pretend to this Chamber that we are gifted on this side with either complete accuracy in everything we say in the sense that we know everything and can disclose everything. We have to admit that statements that are made are made in the light of facts as we know them at a certain time, with the best of good faith, and I think members on the other side of the House will accept that. And I'm also going to admit, because it is an obvious fact of life, that it's very easy to be able to look back and see where certain events led to other events which were completely unanticipated at the time. But that does not destroy, in my opinion, the right of those who make statements on good faith and on the best knowledge they have available at the moment to receive credence and credibility. We've been told about candor. I'll have something to say about candor before these few days are over because I expect to take part in that main debate. But one has to watch when one makes accusations that other people are not completely candid because in the course of any particular argument it is difficult to put all the facts on the table, as some gentlemen in the House are going to find out when we have an opportunity to discuss what they have said in the last day or so. But I really think it is unfortunate that there should be charges here that people are not being candid, are being untruthful, because the conclusion that the listener draws is that this is some deliberate effort to disguise the facts or to prevent the hearer from getting the fullest possible picture of what's going to happen under a certain circumstance such as this vote and these single district divisions. I regret that.

I don't say that the government spokesmen always are able accurately to tell exactly what's going to happen in the future. Obviously we're not. Sometimes we're a long way off the target but I do suggest that we gave whatever information was available in an effort to be honest and candid with the people to whom we were talking. I think we have a right to expect that members of the House will accept that kind of an approach, because if we don't do that, it's either you or I calling one or another unreliable or deliberately — and this is the implication — deliberately misrepresenting the facts or the information we had or failing to disclose the information that was pertinent, that people ought to have. We mustn't do that. Let us resist the temptation. I've been on the other side and I've done it myself so I'm not saying that I'm any better than anybody else, but let us resist the temptation to follow that line of talk and of conduct because it won't do anybody any good and it won't do the people of this province any good. We on our part will resolve to do our best to give a complete presentation of the facts as we know them at any particular time. We will do our best to give an honest forecast of what those facts portend for the people to whom we present them; but we must acknowledge the fact that they can only be our best judgment under the circumstances and I think it should be accepted by members of this House and accepted by members of the public that we are honestly trying to do this particular job. When we get finished, six years after the event, if any of us are here at that time, we'll be able to reproach one another with the fact that certain things didn't turn out exactly as we expected they would do, and that's bound to be the case, but I hope it will not lead to recriminations of a kind which destroys the mutual confidence that should exist between us and destroys the confidence of the public in public men. Public men cannot set themselves up as paragons or complete pillars or models of accuracy. They cannot foretell the future any better than anybody else. If they have any specialized knowledge at their disposal they can give an intelligent forecast. Let us hope that we do not go beyond stating that what we do is an intelligent

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) forecast or what we say is an intelligent forecast of the facts that are available.

Now when I got up this afternoon I must frankly say I had intended to deal with some of the remarks that have been made about the educational program of this province. I'm going to pay some attention to my own strictures and refrain from doing that because I do not feel that it will enhance the debate or the degree of gathering of opinion that we've reached on the particular resolution which really doesn't deal with the general educational policy of the government. I'll have another opportunity to do it.

But my purpose in standing up today is merely to deal with this fact that some members have left me with the impression that they are trying to impute - they may not mean this, and perhaps I should not read too much into what they say - they left me with the impression they were trying to impute to some of us some insincerity, some failure to be as candid as we could under the circumstances, some failure to tell all we knew that was relevant to the issue. Well, being human, I've no doubt those charges apply to some extent but I would be very unhappy if that kind of an approach was followed to any further degree or any considerable degree in this House because it will only disturb the honest exchange of opinion which we have. I think it is wrong to even impute those kind of things and it will not enhance the reputation of the Legislature, the parliamentary process of the people that sit here. If we are guilty of complete and absolute misrepresentation that certainly must be exposed, that must be exposed, whoever does it, and we take the consequences for it. But I'm here to say that with respect to the last issue that we voted on in respect to education, that we did it in good faith with all the candor and honesty that we could assemble at that time and with the knowledge that we could not accurately or adequately predict the future. So I just make an appeal to the committee Sir, to keep this approach to our affairs in mind, because I think if we do, we'll do a better job for the public than would otherwise be the case.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the words of the First Minister but I don't think that this sermon should take us away from what we started in discussing. It's very plain. We are asking that all the facts be known to us and the people of Manitoba as soon as possible. Now is this wrong? This is what we started in saying -- we didn't bring anything up on the question of the Federal Government and so on. We are asked to do a job and apparently, the First Minister admits himself that maybe people misunderstood in the past, we are asked to be ready with a referendum and we are asking that the people be given all the facts. God knows that we probably will have some more misinterpretation and so on. We always get that as the First Minister said, but at least let's start knowing what we have to sell. This is what the Member from Emerson said; this is what my leader said and this is what the Member from Gladstone said. We are asking, we want to know and we've never received an answer to this question. We'd like to know if we'll have this before Christmas or before the first of the year or when we will receive this. All we're told is - the Minister got up and told us they were having meetings and that they were discussing - everybody had their own kit, they were ready to go; but what are they running around with a kit if they don't know what they have to sell? This is what we want to know. We just want an honest answer. If we have this information we'll stop talking about the past. But I don't think it's fair for the First Minister to come in and try to get us away from what we're discussing today. We're discussing, we want the information. We haven't got this answer. Will we be given information?

Now maybe we have reason to doubt this - not to doubt, reason to demand this. Not so long ago we were sitting in this room and all kinds of committees were being set up and we knew then that these committees would be dead before they had a chance to do anything at all. Call them political tricks, call them what you want. I don't want to start an accusation either, but we are asking and I don't think this should be turned around to use against the members of this side who are doing their work because this is what we're here for. We are demanding that you give us this information, then we will help you. Every single one of us here has offered to help you, but we've got to know what we have to sell.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I can answer my honourable friend very quickly and very easily. This information is naturally part of the budget speech. It must surely have been apparent to honourable gentlemen that that's what it is, it can't be anything else, because it's all combined with the budgetary arrangements we are making, the tax proposals we have -- and we've got some, let me tell you -- and all that goes with it.

Now we are hoping that we will reconvene on the 15th day of January. I cannot promise

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) that, but that is our hope, and on that day the estimates will be laid before the House and on that day or very shortly afterwards the budgetary statement, complete with a statement about this particular matter, will be before the Legislature. Now we expect that will fit in quite nicely with the timing of the campaign that my honourable friend is arranging here -- and I must say that perhaps we could have cut a lot of the talk short if it had dawned upon me that people didn't realize that this was part of the budgetary arrangements and that obviously the budget and the estimates would have to come down on the day we reconvened, if we're to follow our usual custom, which we do. So I'm happy to make that explanation and I hope that it clears the air.

MR. MOLGAT. Mr. Chairman, I think that goes a long way to answering what I was wanting to get because I think this is part and parcel of satisfying the people certainly in my area as to how they should vote and I'm anxious that we have the information soon because I know they will be discussing this because they know now that a vote is going to be held and decisions will be made by some of them without having the full facts.

Now is it necessary, however, insofar as the assistance that will be given, is it necessary to wait for the budget to do that? Is it not possible for the Minister of Education to announce how he will be assisting these divisions and what steps he will be taking for the financial aid and the budget can follow later.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm afraid my honourable friend wants candor; another gentleman asks what it's going to cost; I think it's got to be all part of the one package. We considered this and I think it's quite obvious that it must be part of the one package.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a concern I have that I didn't bring out before in regards to what I consider the division of assessment. I've just worked it out here -- the increased equalized assessment within the province is \$200 million of which the rural areas are carrying 50 percent of that, so you see the burden of responsibility is coming out of the bigger areas to the smaller area. It's quite a large share and I hope in the consideration of the statements come down that this will be taken into consideration, because this is a big burden.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend keeps encouraging me to talk, I'll have given the budget speech before the Provincial Treasurer. All I can say is that there is going to be what, in my opinion, is a radical reform in the whole of this field. Members may expect to see, I trust, all or almost all the problems that concern them, particularly with the matter of assessment, to have been fully considered in this new change that is to come in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report same.

IN SESSION

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. BAIZLEY introduced Bill No. 6 an Act to Amend the Workman's Compensation Act.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 4 an Act to Amend the Public Schools Act No. 1.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I table the annual report of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation for the year April 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966; and in addition, the annual report of the Civil Service Superannuation Fund. This is the 27th annual report for the nine months ended December 31, 1965. Of this latter report 57 copies will shortly be made available, one for each member of the legislature.

MR. DESJARDINS: Monsieur le Président, il me semble qu'il n'est que convenable de féliciter un des nôtres qui vient encore de nous faire honneur. Nous nous réjouissons avec Monsieur Gilles Guyot de St. Boniface, autrefois échevin de la ville Cathédrale qui vient de recevoir le Canadian Drama Award pour services qu'il a rendu à l'expansion du théâtre amateur.

Mr. Speaker it is with great pleasure that I join many of the friends of Mr. Gilles Guyot of St. Boniface in congratulating him for having won the Canadian Drama Award given in recognition of outstanding contribution to Canadian Theatre. Mr. Guyot has been active in the theatre for the past 30 years or so. He has been an actor, director and technical director with the Circle Moliere those many years. He has directed many plays and has met with great success at the National Festival of Dramatic Arts. Presently he is training a young technician

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) to replace him. He is known as one of the best comedians in Canada and therefore I am very pleased to congratulate Circle Moliere and Mr. Gilles Guyot.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day may I address a question to the Minister of Health, with reference to compulsory prayers for student nurses at the Childrens Hospital in Winnipeg. Can the Minister inform the House whether morning prayers and attendance at morning prayers for student nurses is regarded as a necessary or compulsory part of nurses training - of the training curriculum? This question actually is in three parts. If it is a compulsory part, on whose authority has attendance at prayers been made compulsory on students; and further, on whose authority have morning prayers been incorporated into the nurses training curriculum? Does the Minister of Health deem that attendance at morning prayers need be a component part of a nurses training? Now if I may elaborate on this, just . . . (Interjection) that is the question.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this question. Morning prayers are not a requirement of the Department of Health in the nursing curriculum. At the Childrens Hospital apparently for awhile it was a custom in the calendar to notify the parents of the girls who were going in for nursing training at the Childrens Hospital that morning prayers would be said. At the request of the student body itself, the morning prayers were then changed to be prayers once a week where there was a small ceremony with a chaplain present. The student body then asked if that could be changed back to what it is at the present time, with a requirement for morning prayers, but I understand now that the requirement has been removed and that a notice will be on the board over there, notifying the students that this requirement will not be required any longer.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that in answer to the question from the Honourable Member from Portage who asked about the Grace Hospital, there was a news release which happened to be released last night, apparently I suppose in conjunction at the same time he asked the question, and it gives the information that he asked. With respect to the water seeping into the basement there had been some difficulty but the difficulty I have been advised by the architects has been overcome.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable Member, the Minister of Agriculture. Is the government considering to include the St. Peters and Libau areas in any forthcoming ARDA project? May I add that this can be taken as notice.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): I accept your question. I will take it as notice.

MR. RUSSELL J. DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney General. I received a very serious complaint last night dealing with an alleged breach of the law by the Canadian Pacific Railway in my constituency at Gateway and Chalmers where there was a 35 minute train delay and it seems to have endangered the lives of several people. One person concerned who was delayed by this train has a heart condition and this is the reason for the notice that was given to me. Also a group of children were seen at the train and one of them crawled beneath it; and in addition to this, it inconvenienced many other people.

Can I assure the people concerned that the Attorney General will look into this matter and consider prosecution?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for having given me notice of his intention to ask this question. The answer to the question is yes.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Highways and Water Control. Has the government been able to establish policy in the flood problem surrounding Lake Winnipeg. When can we expect a statement of policy?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no and when the policy is ready to be announced, it will be announced.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with - and I guess it's about time they were proceeded with - but I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce in consideration of the fact the Friendly Family Farms, the triple F farms, has changed ownership, has the government recovered its loan of nearly \$1 million in full, without loss to the taxpayer?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights):
Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary. What positive measures has the government taken to educate the public in regard to changes in the Highway Traffic Act, particularly the elimination of the 15 mph speed limit through school and playground zones?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I answer this question as Minister of Public Utilities. An extensive program was undertaken in conjunction with the implementation of the new Highway Traffic Act by advertisements, billboards, radio, press, both daily and weekly. In connection with the school zones, special advertisements were placed and a special meeting was arranged with school superintendents, school principals and traffic officials. I was not at the meeting; I am informed that it was largely attended and very successful.

MR DOERN: May I ask a supplementary question?

(Interjection) . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, but may I intervene to say that I think my honourable friend from Elmwood was asking a supplementary question, in which case you might permit him to proceed, if you will.

MR. DOERN: I'm sorry I used the wrong terminology but didn't realize it. (Interjection) I did say it. In view of the fact that there seems to be some confusion on the part of the public, certainly people that I have spoken to are confused by this new law, would it not be a good thing to provide some specific examples as a guide? It seems to me it is very unclear.

MR. McLEAN: I don't know whether that's a question or not. I think the law is quite clear. I don't know what examples we could provide other than the advertising which has already been done and presumably will continue.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions that I would like to direct to the Minister concerned. I think it might concern the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Provincial Secretary. Have the reports of the commissions, that is on the Totogan Farms and also the one on the Portage la Prairie enquiry which was supposed to be conducted by the Municipal Board, have these reports been tabled; and if so, could I have a copy of each?

MRS. FORBES: In replying to the last, I will see that you have a copy of the Portage la Prairie enquiry. I do not have the information on the first question.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend and neighbour the Minister of Highways. Does the government still take the position that the members of this House are not entitled to information regarding traffic counts on the highways?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the government takes the attitude that it did before, that the specific traffic counts in the way they have sometimes been requested are not provided but in general areas maps will be provided again the same as last year.

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . question then. We can look forward to receiving a map shortly?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it will be shortly. It will likely be after the new year sometime because they won't be compiled until - I think it's December 31st date if I recall that they do their compiling after that.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't get an answer to the first part of my question in connection with the Totogan Farms Commission. Is there a report available?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to that, we will have to check our records to see whether or not copies were distributed I am totally unclear on the point. If my honourable friend has not received a copy I will certainly see that he does.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I think you are well aware that the good town of Thompson lies considerably north of Winnipeg, but I didn't realize that Santa Clause was so close. I am happy to inform the members and I'm sure they will agree with me in congratulating United Steelworkers of America and the International Nickel Company in that they have come to an agreement on their wage negotiations for the three years following. They had a vote last night - there were approximately 1,045 for and 395 against with about 21 spoiled votes. The basic increases in this wage negotiation will bring the present rates from \$2.26-1/2 to \$2.52 in December 1st of this year; \$2.61 in March, 1968, and \$2.73 in March, 1969. The Trades and Miners will also receive an equivalent increase on a special formula. But this is wonderful news for the town of Thompson and I'm sure the whole of Manitoba will benefit through this wage agreement which was drawn up and signed ahead of their deadline.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have one further question I would like to address to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. Has application been made to Ottawa to have the additional increase of the Honourable Ministers' salaries or any part thereof declared tax free, and if so, was the reply favourable?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, while the question was not addressed to me, I do have some information on the subject. I have made enquiry and had conversation with the Honourable Mr. Benson in Ottawa as to the conditions that do apply to the sums paid to not only Ministers but to the members of the Legislature as well and ascertained the provisions of the income tax act in this respect. Nothing in the form of a formal application, as my honourable friend says, has been made by the government.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Does the government intend to introduce an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act which will make it legal for motorists to carry the Centennial licence plates on the front of their cars?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, that legislation already exists.

..... continued on the next page

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member of St. Vital for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech on the opening of the Session, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wondered for a while this afternoon whether the holding of a referendum was going to prevent me from taking part in the debate this afternoon. I'm glad, however, that there are a few moments remaining this afternoon so that I might be able to make a statement or two to the House, and I think thereby assuring that this Thursday will be the first evening sitting of the present Legislature. I might say quite frankly that I had thought that we might have postponed the contribution, if indeed it is a contribution, this afternoon, but I realize the rules of the House being that it would have been considered a day in any case, so I thought that possibly we could continue the further edification of the government by making a few remarks this afternoon.

May I first of all, Mr. Speaker, extend to you my sincere congratulations on your appointment as Speaker of this Assembly, and I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for me to say to you that you don't look quite as handsome as the former Speaker but this is one of the failings of the male sex, that while they can replace to some degree a position, they certainly can't replace beauty, but I do wish you every success in your new venture.

May I also congratulate the government on its re-election, despite the fact that we used our efforts to see that such would not be the case. I also extend to the new members in this Assembly every good wish. It is an honour and a pleasure and a privilege for anyone in the Province of Manitoba to be elected by the constituents to serve in this Assembly, and in extending congratulations to the new members, I am not unmindful of the contribution which was made by former members of this House. I note that the Honourable Minister of Industry is holding the seat that was formerly occupied by a very good friend of mine, Maitland Steinkopf. He is still doing good service to the Province of Manitoba and to the nation in his capacity in the Centennial organization, and if the new Minister of Industry and Commerce is a patch on the former member from River Heights, then he will be filling very large shoes.

A couple of my own colleagues are not here, the former member for Seven Oaks and the former member for Elmwood, and I'm sure that those who sat in the House with them will appreciate the contributions that they made. The Leader of the Opposition the other day referred to the former member for Ethelbert Plains, Mike Hryhorczuk. He, over many a long period of time, did render invaluable service; and others, Mr. Speaker, who are not here are the former member for St. Matthews and indeed even the former member for Wellington. Although I was most happy that a colleague of mine took his place, I must say however that I am going to miss the admonitions of the former member from Wellington, particularly in regard to differences in basic philosophies between him and myself.

And too, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Honour. They are going to be, I am sure, valuable additions to this House.

May I first of all, Mr. Speaker, undertake a review of the election. I think it is pretty good and pretty well that we should look over what transpired since the dissolution of the last House and to give some consideration to events that have just passed not so long ago. I say, Mr. Speaker, that despite our claim that the election was unnecessary, because we still had two years to go with the previous Legislature, we have come to the conclusion that the Premier knew better than we, that the Tory administration was on the way out then, as indeed it is on the way out now. I am convinced that if the election had run for another two weeks, the government would not have had a majority in this House. I am sure now the advisors to the government knew that under the policies being followed by the Premier, the comparative position of Manitoba would worsen in relation to other provinces. I confess, Mr. Speaker, we did not give the Premier full marks for being politically astute. I do so now. However, I regret that our province will not be any better served than it was before the election. As the result of the election, we have a government that only represents 40 percent of the electors of the province. It is true of course that this is a majority insofar as numbers in the House are concerned, but it is nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, an indication of the lack of confidence by the voters in the Conservatives. They lost five seats.

What of the Liberals? A gain of one seat but a loss in total voting strength, an indication that their policies were rejected. The lone Socred that is with us is still here and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a personal tribute to him. The only party to really gain was the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....party I have the honour to lead. Our gain was not what we had hoped for or expected. Our increase to eleven members, an increase of nine percent in popular vote to almost one voter in four, fell short of our predictions.

We are confident that the gains we made are but the forerunner of better conditions in store for Manitoba due to more acceptance of our program, and I want to warn the government to listen to our program as it is placed before this House by my colleagues. I warn the government and the official opposition, we are sick and tired of the ineffective and fruitless policies advocated by both Conservatives and Liberals here and at Ottawa. I warn this House that we intend to fulfill our responsibility to the electorate of our province without asking for or giving any quarter.

Mr. Speaker, I give you what I sincerely believe to be, irrespective of number, the most capable and qualified group in this House. As my new members become familiar with the procedures of the Legislature and take part in the debate, I feel sure, Sir, that you will agree with this contention. And just to introduce, if I may, my members briefly, Mr. Speaker, may I first of all refer of course to my deputy and colleague from St. John's, a very capable qualified lawyer, a former member of Metro, a former School Trustee in the City of Winnipeg; the honourable member for Inkster - a lawyer, a former Metro councillor, a man who has earned himself a great reputation in the community. We have our old stand-by, Len Harris, who was a miner of course in Wales, as is well known, and now works in the packinghouse industry in the province; our honourable member for Brokenhead - a market gardener, a former director of the Farmers Union, a man who has taken a ver interested and active part in the Vegetable Growers Association of the province; the honourable member for Elmwood - a school teacher of note and a historian; the honourable member for Seven Oaks - a small businessman, school board member, councillor, deputy mayor of that great community of West Kildonan; the honourable member for Kildonan - a stationary engineer, a director on the Industrial Development Board of Metro Winnipeg, a life member of the Royal Canadian Legion and a member of the local committee of the National Employment Service; the honourable member for Wellington - a Minister by profession of the Unitarian Church, a school teacher prior to that, also sat on the Winnipeg School Board and is on the Municipal Hospital Commission at the present time; then my farmer colleague from Ethelbert Plains, secretary-treasurer of one of the school boards in his location from 1957 to the present time, trustee on the Gilbert Plains Hospital Board, director of the Pool Elevators and many other positions as well; the honourable member from Burrows, who is a graduate in law and a former School Trustee. These, Mr. Speaker, are the members that I have to offer to join with me in the deliberations in this House, and I think an appraisal of their qualifications will give reason for my happiness in having such capable representatives with us in this House.

And what were the issues of the election? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there were at least five. The failure of the government to develop our human and material resources; the failure of the government to develop adequate industrial expansion; failure to attend to the security and well-being of Manitoba; failure of the government to create and provide harmonious labour management relations; failure of the government to introduce a readjustment in the inequitable tax structure in the Province of Manitoba. Sixty percent of the voters said the government had failed. They were right. However, the luck of the draw gave the government another chance and it has a majority. It's limited, true, but nonetheless a majority. If this government fails to propose methods to correct its past failures, it will fail and it will fall.

But of more concern, Mr. Speaker, than the falling of the government will be the continuation of the decline in the economy of Manitoba. The third report of the Economic Council of Canada indicates the relative position of Manitoba by comparison with other provinces is not improving. The latest report available on personal income shows a downward trend in comparable income of taxpayers in the greater Winnipeg area. I note in the speech of my friend the Leader of the Opposition yesterday he referred to those figures and I will not repeat them this afternoon.

We find in a recent issue of Trade and Commerce further illustrations of the backward trend in Manitoba. We find that by comparison with September, 1965, our September, 1966 population was down by 2000; Saskatchewan was up by 3000, Alberta up by 13,000 and British Columbia up by 73,000.

The consumer price index places Winnipeg as paying the highest prices for commodities in the west, particularly in food and personal care and housing, with the exception as far as

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....housing is concerned, with Vancouver.

Weekly wages are lower in Manitoba than any other western province. Here you have, Mr. Speaker, the higher cost as far as the consumer price index is concerned here in our province with the lowest average wage of the three western provinces. On average our weekly wage is about \$3, 00 less than in Saskatchewan, \$9.00 less than in Alberta, and about \$23.00 less than in British Columbia. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, we are not going ahead in Manitoba? Is it any wonder that our population trend is downward? These are cold facts. As a Manitoban, I'd hate to have to admit this is the situation in Manitoba, but it is so, and I am saying it in order to try and awaken the government into action to change the situation.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the government has been too long chasing after rainbows without realizing the dark clouds that are prevailing around us. Those dark clouds, I suggest, are the creation of this government. This government has long been wont to refer to commissions and agencies matters of vital concern which should be a direct concern of Cabinet. I might say that as far as commissions and agencies are concerned in Manitoba, quite frequently we have resolutions or proposals to abolish the Senate at Ottawa. Well, I say here in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, if you want to be on a comparable place with the Senate in Ottawa, all you have to do is be a defeated candidate of the Conservative Party and you'll be elevated to the Senate, namely, some commission here in the Province of Manitoba.

It is true that the Premier and some of his Cabinet Ministers are conducting excursions into other areas to sell Manitoba. I wish them well. However, I am sure that if the approach to our problems were more realistic than at present, the job of selling Manitoba would be less difficult.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to sell our province with its low minimum wage. We have --(Interjection)-- it is true, and I defy the Honourable the Minister of Labour to dispute the fact that we have tried to sell Manitoba with a low minimum wage, and I ask my honourable friend, why then, if this is not the case, has the First Minister and your Cabinet asked the Minimum Wage Board to be reconvened the next day after the last increase to \$1.00 became effective of our minimum wage. If this isn't any indication of what I say is true, then I say that the Honourable the Minister of Labour had better meet with me at my office and I'll try and indoctrinate him into better plans for the province.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to sell our province with the lack of adequate health care. We have tried to advance our province by giving away our natural resources without fair return to our taxpayers. We have tried to sell our province with its antiquated system of taxation which is unrealistic and inequitable. We have tried to sell our province using balderdash and unimaginative attractions as our weapon. These methods have failed. What is one of the latest, Mr. Speaker? "Manitoba '66 - An Industrial Breakthrough." This is a new gimmick of a new Minister in the Department of Industry and Commerce, and I would suggest that the honourable member was indoctrinated very very thoroughly by the former Minister because the same guff is going on. Here we are statistically and in all of our reports that we get from the National Economic Council, and other trade publications say that we are not holding our own, and here now the very costly piece of propoganda, "Manitoba Industrial Breakthrough."

Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe it's darn near time that we did have an industrial breakthrough. I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that if he thinks that he is going to do it by just talking it, he's got a lot to learn. I say, Mr. Speaker, that these methods have failed. It is a time for a reassessment in our approach, not only to sell Manitoba outside but to improve it inside as well. It is time to make this province a better place in which to live; a better place in which to stay; and a better place to come to.

Mr. Speaker, it will serve no purpose for the Minister of Industry or the Premier to bring new people to our province unless we can hold them. The begging for financial assistance outside the province will be of no avail unless the use of the finances will improve the lot of Manitoba. Let's stop kidding ourselves. Let us increase our minimum wage to a realistic amount so that our workers can have some benefits from their toil. Why hasn't this government got the gumption to set a minimum wage of \$1.50 by itself without referral. The government has the power to accept, reject, increase or decrease the recommendations of the Minimum Wage Board, but ach no! I don't know whether it was because of the pilgrim from Thompson being here or not that motivated the government into action in respect of minimum wage. I don't know how come that motivation, but I do say to the Minister of Labour that he has the power, the Cabinet has the power, without reference, to bring about an increase in the minimum wage.

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

Let us insist, Mr. Speaker, upon the Federal Government proceeding with its promise of just a year ago to institute a national health plan. Don't let the Federal Government get off the hook, I say to this government and to this House. In saying this, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that it's because of the anemic attitude of the government of Manitoba to a health scheme, that to some degree laid the ground work for Mitchell Sharpe and the sharp-shooters down at Ottawa to bring about the postponement of the promised medicare scheme for July 1st, 1967. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the economy of the country is healthy enough to allow Trans Canada Pipelines to serve American interests before Canadian interests at great cost to Canada, at a lack of sovereignty of Canada, surely the economy of Canada is healthy enough to provide for the health of its own. Manitoba with a system of universal health care would be easier to sell outside and more attractive and humane to our citizens.

Let us improve our labour laws so that harmonious labour-management relations are enhanced. A contented labour force is imperative if we are to advance. There are those, Mr. Speaker, who are of the opinion that legislation is necessary to prevent labour from using its right to strike in labour disputes. I want to warn the Minister of Labour not to attempt such measures as was enacted in the Liberal province of Saskatchewan to the west of us recently in respect to strikes. No one likes strikes except those engaged in one of the most recent strikes in Canada, and, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to the Air Canada strike, I'm not referring to the railway strike, but I am referring, Sir, to the strike of the Moneylenders. These persons and corporations simply would not loan money for the building of homes at the stated rates under NHA so they went on strike by withholding their dollars. It did not matter that thousands of Canadians were in need of housing. The government at Ottawa did not say as they did to the railway worker - "Return to work under compulsory arbitration." The Liberals of Sharpe and Winters gave the financiers another pound of flesh which meant another millstone around the neck of the home purchaser. And I predict that if the increase in interest rate to 7 1/4 percent is not sufficient, the moneylenders will sit back on their haunches until the government in Ottawa says, "Well boys, 8 percent will do now." I say that if this isn't enough of a raise to increase loan capital, increase in interest rates will follow. What is the result of this increase? Approximately five to seven dollars a month to the homeowner and purchaser. Despite the high prices of houses, this is going to add additional six or seven hundred dollars to the total cost over a short period of time. On one hand it's quite all right for moneylenders to strike but not workers. One has to adhere to compulsory governmental arbitration or regulations; the other wins their point because they are the friends of government.

I say, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba should re-appraise its position with respect of aid to industrial development. At the last session of the Legislature the government was given power to use public funds for industrial expansion.

What consideration has the government given to using the power it obtained last time to build the factories needed to give gainful employment to our school graduates. Mr. Speaker, I say let us revise our educational system so that every boy and girl in Manitoba has opportunity for full use of their talents without financial restrictions upon them. We quite frequently hear of the effort that is being put into our educational facilities of the province. However, it appears that our efforts are considerably less than what is being done in many jurisdictions.

The September issue of "School Administration" indicates that our provincial effort is disappointingly low by comparison with other jurisdictions. I quote from figures of a study made by Dr. Andrews and S. M. Hobson of the Ontario Institute of Studies and Education and relate to the year 1962, and while it is appreciated that additional efforts are being made in Manitoba since 1962, I suggest the same would be true of the comparative jurisdictions referred to in the study. According to these studies Manitoba ranked 35th out of 60 in effort, effort representing the expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance expressed as a percentage of personal income per capita. It is also interesting to note that of the 60-odd jurisdictions referred to, Manitoba ranks 50th as well out of the 60 as far as income per capita was concerned. The expenditure per pupil in Manitoba again was near the bottom of the totem pole, ranking 47th out of the 60.

This government has vainly sought for additional sources of revenue. It in my opinion has overlooked one of the greatest sources of revenue, namely, the higher and more complete education of our young men and women who through their abilities would be earning more and thereby making a greater contribution to the tax base of the province. It is a well known fact

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). that the greater number of years spent in educational institutes, the greater return to the economy in dollars and cents measured in personal income. If this government is really desirous of increasing its revenue in the province, then I suggest there is no better way than to making all of our facilities in regard to education available at low cost to the individual concerned. In other words, I repeat what I have said previously from this corner, that there should be no barrier to higher education other than the inability to absorb knowledge.

Let us give to our agricultural industry the incentives required to bring about stability in income to our farmers and also to give them a fair share of the national affluence. It may be argued that due to export wheat markets and due to the favourable crops we have had in the past two or three years that the income of the farmers is more satisfactory at the present time than it was in the past. However, there are indications that this may not continue and I suggest that if this government is what it presumes to be at times, a friend of the farmer, it should take greater efforts and the rural dweller be well advised in concert with this government to have Ottawa fulfill its promise of a year or so ago and bring into effect a two-price system for wheat immediately. The price for farm commodities, I repeat once again, should be based on the cost of production.

I note with interest too in another field, in what is generally considered agriculture, that references were made in the Throne Speech to consideration of the McIvor Commission Report on the fishing industry. This is long overdue, but I say to this government that it has been aware of this unsatisfactory condition for a long time and it did nothing about it, and if it is going to give just lip service to improving the lot of our fishing industry, then I say in this they are continuing the failure to give proper leadership to the fishing industry as well.

These are matter, I suggest, of prime concern to Manitoba, not only as they affect us today but tomorrow as well, and unless this Assembly tackles them we are not going to be standing still in Manitoba, we are going to be going further back.

Now let us give a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to a more detailed consideration of the Speech read by His Honour on opening day. Mention is made of the increase in per capita income in the province. I do not know where the First Minister got his figures from, indicating an increase. The comparative increase in Manitoba, and while I must -- it's correct, there was an increase in Manitoba, but the comparative increase in Manitoba was less than it was anywhere else in Canada.

Now my honourable friend tells me that he's going to get around to it and I'm sure the people of Manitoba are anxiously awaiting our honourable friend getting around to it. It's almost similar to the discussion that took place this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, with the Honourable the Minister of Education when we were asking him to tell the complete story or lay the complete story before this Assembly insofar as dollars and cents. Now the Honourable the First Minister tells me that he's going to get around to it. Well, I sincerely trust that he does. He's already got around to it once, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to say that my honourable friend deliberately misled us in the Throne Speech. It could well be that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics are the ones that misled us in the figures that they gave us, or it could be that my honourable friend is going to pull up some more balderdashish figures from the Department of Industry and Commerce that'll dispute, because we've had these figures before. You know, Mr. Speaker, in the past we've heard about a factory being built about 12 times in succession and we always find out it's the same darn old factory, just repeated year after year. However, my honourable friend the First Minister is going to indicate to us where he got his figures. --(Interjection)--Yes, I'm learning caution from you my friend too.

I do not know what the basis is for this statement, Mr. Speaker, and while it is true local incomes have been on the rise, it is also true that our relative position was worsened. According to the Tribune news serve article published on November 25th, the position of the City of Winnipeg income taxpayer tumbled from 34th to 49th place in the list of Canadian cities having the highest average income. It deals with the difference between 1963 and 1964. The average nationally between 1963 and 1964 rose by some \$199 to an average income of \$4,749.00. Winnipeg's average was \$155 below the average level for 1964 compared with \$103 below the level in 1963, so how can the government justify their statement that our per capita personal income is increasing at the same rate as the nation as a whole.

This government likes to repeat continuously the fact that unemployment in Manitoba is at a minimum. I do not dispute that statement. However, I do not agree with what I am sure is the government's contention that this relatively low percentage of unemployment is

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) due to a thriving community but rather, as I said in the offset of my remarks, to a lowering of the total population in Manitoba.

On Page 2 of the Throne Speech mention is made of the development in the national resource industry in our province, and to use the phraseology of the government, this is cause for special satisfaction. One appreciates that activity is taking place in our natural resource area. Kettle Rapids construction has been begun; new mines are being found. It is particularly interesting to note the other day of increased investment by International Nickel near Thompson. Could I suggest to the government that if the net return to the taxpayer of Manitoba is not going to be greater than we are now receiving in proportion from our natural resource development, the net benefit to Manitobans will not be very great if the same ratio prevails.

The next section of the Throne Speech deals with the question of education, the costs of education. I will not dwell further on this at the present time because my colleagues I'm sure will be making many contributions in the debate on education. It is sufficient for me to say, however, by reference to a referendum of what is known as a single district division, this is what we had advocated many years before.

I note with interest too a reference in the Throne Speech to the use of French as a language of instruction. This is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that the basic principle behind the introduction of French as a teaching language should be directed towards national unity and national understanding; and I say, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, that if the motivation behind the change in our statutes in respect of the language is to create ethnical gaps, then it will serve no good purpose at all. I say in the national interest it is as well for us to have French as a universal language with English, but if the objective is just within certain communities and certain areas to the exclusion of others, we will be doing an injustice to Canada.

I note that the Speech refers to the Report of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future that we received in 1963. This was a very good report at that time, but I would like to hear more from the government as to what they mean when they state that good progress has been made in achieving the high goals set out by the report. The very fact that the government tends to re-convene the committee to re-assess and restate these highest goals and to re-emphasize the effort required of the private sector, gives lie to the statement that good progress has been made, because in that report it was documented year by year the progress that we should be making in Manitoba and it hasn't been fulfilled. We haven't progressed, as Mr. McMillan and his committee suggested back in 1962.

If the situation wasn't so serious it would be almost laughable to read of the government's concern about the effect of increases in the cost of living to the people of Manitoba. For at least the last three sessions of this Legislature members of our group drew this to the attention of the government without them taking any action in substance at all, and now the Honourable the Attorney-General made an announcement yesterday that, in concert with other jurisdictions, we'll share the costs of a commission. You had the opportunity in the past without taking any proper steps and I suggest that we will not receive much benefit from the new tri-provincial effort.

It is noted in the rest of the Throne Speech that there is reference to many items concerning this House, such as housing and renewal, legislation uniform time. We await in anticipation to see what the government has in these areas and save our comments for later. Sufficient for me to say once again that the Tory Government must back up their words with action, that the Tory Government must back up their words with action and that action must be in the interest of all of the people of Manitoba before it receives our support.

Threaded throughout the Throne Speech is a condemnation of the federal jurisdiction for not providing more money to the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, while I hold no brief for the federal authority, as we read the document, the Government of Manitoba is prepared to lay at the doorstep of the federal authority reasons for its shortcomings. It is agreed that if we could have more money from Ottawa our responsibility at home as far as tax revenues are concerned would be less. I am convinced that many measures might be taken insofar as federal finance is concerned to reduce the net cost to the taxpayers of Canada and as a result would be increasing revenues to Manitoba.

I refer to one, the huge cost in the field of National Defence is an area which could be explored at the federal level so as to make more money available for people at home. The question of tax evasions through advertising gimmicks, etc., could be investigated at the federal level, making more revenues available to the provinces. There are many areas in

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....which criticism could be directed to the federal level whereby if the situation was improved more money would be available to Manitoba. But the fact is, however, that notwithstanding the failures of Ottawa, this government here in Manitoba has failed to guide the destiny of our province so that more monies would be available for public use in our province. While I do not disagree with criticisms directed to Ottawa, I say that part of our trouble rests with this government.

I want to warn this government not to use Ottawa as an excuse for curtailing needed programs in the Province of Manitoba. I want to warn the government that we will not stand for the lessening of our endeavours to increase the number of beds available in our hospitals or to curtail new construction. We will not tolerate this government curtailing efforts in the field of mental health and mental retardation. Manitoba sorely needs new facilities for those who are unfortunately retarded, both young and old. Manitoba needs more qualified personnel in the field of medicine, and this can only be done through the provision of new resources in this field. Manitoba needs a medicare scheme available in our province to all, regardless of their ability to pay. Manitoba needs to develop its resources, both material and human, to assure the advancement of our province, and this government should not cry on the petticoats of Ottawa.

Speculation is right at the present time that it is the intention of the government to impose a sales tax in Manitoba. Here again I warn the government to be wary of its actions. We want to know, before any consideration is given to a sales tax, what investigations the government has made into new sources of revenue other than the sales tax. We want to know what investigations the government has made into increasing revenue from our present tax sources. We trust that the Provincial Treasurer, although he is new at the job, will be able to give to this House an indication as to investigations into tax revenue sources before too long.

In regards to the question of a sales tax, may I say that I am convinced that the First Minister had conditioned his friends to the imposition of a sales tax. I also say to my friend the First Minister and to the new Provincial Treasurer we don't trust you in imposing a sales tax. There are many who feel that a sales tax is a reasonably fair source of revenue these days, particularly because other jurisdictions have adopted this method of raising revenues, but I don't trust this government to impose a sales tax. Many may feel that if a sales tax is imposed on luxuries or near luxuries it is not a bad thing, but this government, Mr. Speaker, has already shown that it cannot be trusted regarding imposing a sales tax.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because when the government imposed its sales tax - or its utility tax as it is called - it did so without the regard of the ability of the persons to pay such a tax. The old age pensioner, those on fixed income had to pay the utility tax irrespective of what their income may be. It might well be that if and when this government introduces its sales tax that it would not apply to food stuffs, children's clothes, detergents, but I say I don't trust you. I don't think this House should trust the government in any sales tax because it would be so easy for them to change the basis upon which a sales tax is raised in Manitoba.

On this happy note, Mr. Speaker, I draw my remarks at this time to a conclusion. Members of my group will in due course be adding their contribution to the debates of this House. Sufficient for me to say that I have no greater admiration for the government than I had prior to June 23rd, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, in saying this I am not referring to the personal individuals - I love them all. They're good fellows but they're up the wrong garden path, and I hope that before this session is over we may get them on to a more flowery path for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that Manitoba is stuck with this government for the next two or three years and it will be my duty -- yes, I wouldn't be surprised -- the Honourable Attorney-General puts up his five fingers and I wouldn't be a darn bit surprised, Mr. Speaker, if this government over there doesn't duplicate what the former Liberal did back in 58, go their full term knowing darn fine they won't be back anyway. -- (Interjection)-- That's right, that's right. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, it will be my duty and my obligation, together with my colleagues, to endeavour to persuade this government that its policies must change if Manitoba is to take its place under the sun and if it's going to be a progressive component of this Dominion of ours.

Next year Canada celebrates its centennial and we join pride in this our native land. In 1970, three years later, Manitoba also celebrates its hundredth birthday. Mr. Speaker, three years is but a short period in the life of nations and of provinces. I plead with this government to take such steps as are necessary to ensure that in 1970 Manitoba is not behind the rest

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) of the provinces in this great domain of ours.

Now, as is normal, Mr. Speaker, for me as Leader of this group, I intend now to propose an amendment to the Throne Speech introduced by the Leader of the Official Opposition. Before I do so, Mr. Speaker, I must refer briefly to his amendment because it contained no real criticism in our opinion of the policies of the Government of Manitoba. It makes no reference at all to the question of resource development in the Province of Manitoba; it makes no reference at all to the needs of a proper Medicare system for the people of Manitoba - and of course I guess on that subject they'd better be quiet; it makes no mention of the needs of improving the lot of our welfare recipients in the Province of Manitoba; it makes no reference to the plight of the Indian and the Metis; and it makes no reference at all to the need of industrial development in the Province of Manitoba. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, because of the omissions of the official opposition to offer real criticism of the government, I have the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of amending the amendment as follows: That the amendment be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "has" in the second line, and adding the following: "failed to meet the needs of the people in dealing with the economic, social and educational problems facing Manitoba."

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member of the New Democratic Party, I didn't get your seconder.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: I just wish to raise a point of order here. I admit I'm not clear on this and I wonder if I could raise the point and then perhaps you could take it under consideration while we continued with - perhaps this same debate. But it seems to me that a sub-amendment ought really to amend the terms of the amendment and not cancel it and replace it by something entirely new. Now that's my point; it's awfully simple. I only raise it and ask that you might consider it and give us a ruling on it after you've done that. I may be quite mistaken, but I'd like the point clarified.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the First Minister, may I refer you to the Journals of 1955 wherein the present leader of the House proposed substantially the same resolution in exactly the same manner.

MR. ROBLIN: It's just possible I was wrong on that occasion.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest then that the precedent has been established that even though you were wrong, you were right.

MR. ROBLIN: Well if Mr. Speaker would be so kind as to look at it, he might also call it 5:30 and we can return at 8 o'clock to continue this interesting discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare it now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair until 8 p.m.