



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



INDEX

Monday afternoon, July 27, 1959

Report of Committee, Law Amendments (Mr. Lyon)..... 1297

Introduction of Bills:

Bill 80, re Central Gas Co. (Mr. Carroll) 1297
Bill 98, re Liquor Control Act (Mr. Lyon) 1297
Bill 99, re Gaols Act (Mr. Lyon)..... 1297
Bill 97, re Brandon Charter (Mr. Lissaman) Mr. Ridley 1297

Statement, re School Division Voting, Mr. McLean..... 1297

Questions 1298

Bill 74, re Distribution of Gas (Mr. Carroll): Mr. Paulley..... 1298
Discussion of Point of Order 1303
Mr. Stanes 1304

Bill 88, re Fire Prevention (Mr. Thompson) 2nd Reading..... 1304

Bill 14, re Public Schools Act (Mr. McLean) 2nd Reading 1304

Committee of Supply

Department of Labour, Administration 1307
Employment Standards Division..... 1310
Labour Relations Division 1310

Report of Committee of Supply..... 1312
Res. 6, Federal Provincial Conference, Division 1312
Res. 21, Education (Administration), Discussion and Division 1316
Res. 22, Education Grants, Discussion and Division 1317
Res 23, Teacher Training, Discussion and Division 1317
Res 25, Agriculture (Administration) Discussion and Division..... 1318

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, July 27th, 1959

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: The Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their fourth report: Your Committee has considered Bills No. 6, an Act respecting Social Security for Residents of Manitoba; No. 56, an Act to amend the Manitoba Teachers' Society Act; No. 76, an Act to incorporate The Urban School Trustees' Association of Manitoba; No. 82, an Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act; and beg to report the same without amendment. Your Committee has also considered Bills No. 23, an Act to amend the Child Welfare Act; No. 24, an Act respecting Housing Accommodation for Elderly Persons; No. 42, an Act to amend the Municipal Act (1); No. 51, an Act to establish a Municipal Board; No. 63, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate "Manitoba Health Service"; No. 83, an Act to amend the Pipe Line Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Minister of Health and Public Welfare that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 80, an Act to amend The Winnipeg and Central Gas Company Act and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 98, an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act and that the same be received and read a first time.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 99, an Act to amend The Gaols Act and that the same now be received and read a first time.

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

MR. M. E. RIDLEY (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member from Brandon, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member from Hamiota that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 97, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter (2) and that the same now be received and read a first time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. MCLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): From time to time, questions have been asked in the House concerning votes in the four parts of the province where the school division plan was rejected. I would like to make a statement to the House at this time concerning the policy of the government with respect to such votes. The government is prepared to provide a second vote in the proposed school divisions in the four parts of Manitoba where they were rejected on February 27th, 1959, subject to the following alternative proposals. Proposal A - that we receive a petition signed by not less than 25% of the resident electors in the proposed division on the basis of the names on the voters' list prepared for February 27th, 1959, that is, of course, the provision on arrangement that we had stated some time ago or, Proposal B - which is new, that we receive a petition signed by not less than 10% of the

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . resident electors in the proposed division on the basis of the names on the voters' list prepared for February 27th, 1959, and that we receive resolutions requesting a vote from not less than 75% of the local school boards within the proposed school division. That second means a combination, that is, there must be both, but the proposals are alternate and if the foregoing conditions are met in any or all of the four proposed divisions the government is prepared to hold a vote on a date to be selected by the government, but not later than December 15th, 1959. I may say for the information of the House that a petition signed by considerably in excess of 25% of the resident electors from the proposed school division of Hanover will, I understand, be delivered to me this afternoon by representatives from the school districts in that proposed division, this afternoon after the close of the House, and I believe that plans are underway in at least one other of the proposed divisions for a similar petition.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): of the House, may I direct a question to the First Minister. Recently the Prime Minister made a statement re decentralization of the government. My question is whether it affects this province - if yes, what is being done about it?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, I can give my honourable friend some information on that score, it was touched on lightly the other night when the House was in committee and I can say that the Government of Canada has made it clear to us that they do intend to decentralize the administration of the country in the case of an emergency, and that they will be taking some steps to apply that decentralization principle to the Province of Manitoba, as I understand they will to other provinces in Canada. Representatives of the Federal Government have visited with us and have given us an outline of their plan which they are now in the process of implementing. Apropos that perhaps I could go a little farther and say that this government is doing the same thing. When we came into office we found that there had been no plan made for the carrying on of the government of this province in the case of this centre being put out of action, so we convened a meeting of the deputy ministers to devise a plan whereby the administration of the province could be transferred to another site and carried on from there and those plans are being worked out in co-operation with the plans of the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for the Day. Adjourned debate of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities for second reading of Bill No. 74. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate in connection with Bill No. 74, which in effect is a Bill to grant an exclusive franchise for the distribution of natural gas in the Greater Winnipeg area, to the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company, I do so because I think, Sir, that this is one of the more important Bills that has been before this legislature for a number of years. I think, Sir, the principle evolved in the bill is one with which we of this Legislature should be very, very wary. In Manitoba in the past, other bills of a similar nature to this, have been debated at great length. I recall particularly a bill which was before this Legislature in the late '20's or early '30's, which gave to a private corporation, franchises on the Winnipeg River for the production of hydro electrical energy. At that time members of this Legislature pointed out without success to the government of that day, that a grave injustice was being done to the people of Manitoba and it was not until about 1952 or 1953 that the full implication of the passage of the bill granting an exclusive franchise in respect of Seven Sisters had to be reconsidered by this Legislature. And I suggest, Sir, that while it is perfectly true that in respect of this particular bill we are not giving away any of the natural resources of the Province of Manitoba, we are allowing a private company to have the exclusive franchise of the distribution of one of the products that the Great Creator has bestowed upon the Dominion of Canada, namely natural gas. And I would say, Sir, that according to the best information that I am able to get, that the supply or source of this energy is not inexhaustible. As one reads the Borden Report in connection with natural gas, one cannot but come to a conclusion that at the present time the life span of the resources in respect of natural gas could well terminate within the life span of most of us here present this afternoon. Now, Sir, we well know that in the Greater Winnipeg area, that ever since consideration was given to the extension of pipelines from Alberta into this area by way of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines, that the question of who should be in charge of the distribution of this natural resource has caused many debates and much apprehension. I don't think, Sir, that any company in recent years has been under such a

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . close scrutiny as has been this company. I don't think that our municipalities have been concerned with a greater problem affecting them all, in recent years as this problem. As a result the municipalities requested the former government to set up a commission to investigate the whole aspect of the distribution of natural gas in the Greater Winnipeg area. But before doing that, this company individually approached most of the municipalities in Greater Winnipeg and obtained from them consent to lay pipelines in most of the municipalities. Under the provisions of the Act incorporating the Winnipeg and Central Gas, nowhere can I find that any of these consents amounted to a franchise given by the municipalities to the Winnipeg and Central. There was much dismay among the municipalities, and two other companies attempted to provide to the municipalities similar services at a lower cost. But when the question of the supply of natural gas was encountered, they found that the hands of the municipalities, in effect, were tied, not because of the consents which were given by the municipalities but because the Winnipeg and Central Gas had changed -- come to an agreement with the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines whereby they, the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company, had, what was termed, a franchise to be the sole company which was enabled to receive the gas from the pipeline. And I think, Sir, that in this the government was negligent, because as I read legislation, that while under the Act incorporating the Winnipeg and Central, consents were able to be approved or taken from the municipalities, these were not binding until approved by the Utility Board, which was not done.

Certainly under our Municipal Act, no municipality was in a position of granting an exclusive franchise for the distribution of natural gas up until the present, and under the present suggested Act, that will be given irrespective of whether the municipalities want it or not - that franchise will be given under the proposed legislation to the Winnipeg and Central Gas.

Because of the uncertain base on which this company was founded, and because of the methods that they used in obtaining these consents, knowing full well that as an ace in the hole, they had this exclusive franchise with Trans Canada, this all caused a great amount of unrest among our municipalities, and as I said, a commission was set up to investigate the whole matter. Now then, Sir, that commission investigated this whole matter with a considerable degree of thoroughness, and I want to quote a few excerpts from the Gas Commission report, because I think, Sir, that while the Bill itself before us starts out by saying something to the effect, that whereas the commission has recommended certain things in respect of the distribution of gas, that this Bill is now before us, that there are other points within the Commission report to the contrary of the Bill before us today. I cannot understand as I study the Commission's report, how in just its few final paragraphs of its report, the Commission made the recommendations that it did, and it seems to me that in proposing this legislation, the government of today has not given due study to all of the factors in the Commission's report itself, and has just jumped at one or two of the recommendations.

I might say at the outset - I am quoting from page 5 and I referred to it briefly a moment ago - in connection with the granting of the franchise, or obtaining of the franchise, that when this company was granted incorporation under our laws of the Province of Manitoba and taking over the old assets or corporation of the Winnipeg Central Gas Company, the report says that the Company's franchise was in the City of Winnipeg, did not require the approval of the Municipal and Public Utility Board, nor could the terms of the franchise be altered by the city since By-Law 543 was itself part of an Act of the Manitoba legislation. Then the report goes on to say that at the outset of its operations, Winnipeg and Central Gas did not have any agreement giving consent to distribute gas in any other municipality in the Greater Winnipeg area. However, the company under its act of incorporation was empowered to enter into agreement with other municipalities for consent to use the streets and lanes for the distribution of gas without further approval from the Municipal and Public Utility Board. In this respect the company's position was different from that of other gas distributors, whose franchises or agreements to use the streets and lanes were subject to the approval of the Board.

I am sure, Sir, that what is meant by this is simply this, that insofar as the use of the streets and lanes was concerned, the approval of the Utility Board did not have to be obtained in respect of Winnipeg and Central Gas, whereas the other companies would have had to receive that approval. It has been interpreted in some quarters that this gave the franchise within the municipality to Winnipeg and Central for the sole distribution of it, and I say that that is not

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) correct. And I say this too, incidental to that point, Mr. Chairman - Mr. Speaker, that if it had not been for the endeavours of the other two companies who attempted to render service to the municipalities, and who, in effect, set up opposition to the Winnipeg and Central, that the whole matter may have been cut and dried long before.

So I say, Sir, that right from the outset we were in difficulties in respect of this company. The municipalities were not satisfied. The other companies were not able, apparently legally, to proceed because of the ace in the hole of the franchise from Trans Canada, which ensured a 20-year supply of natural gas for the whole area, including Winnipeg. And during the course of the past few months, municipal councils were upset. We have in our assembly today one of those gentlemen, who serving his municipality as an alderman - the Honourable Member for Assiniboia - pointed out quite conclusively, I think, his opinion of the public relations of the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company; and I will just quote, from page 19 of the report of the commission on gas. Alderman George Johnson of the Council of the City of St. James, at a hearing before the Board stated, and I quote: "I think all on this Council know that with regard to public relations the attitude of the Winnipeg and Central Gas from the start was very dogmatic, and did not tend to create an amiable relationship between any of the proposed municipal and we, on more than one occasion, were told in no uncertain tones, 'This is it, take it. You can't do any better. You can't get it anywhere else.' And we proceeded to find out if there was something else we could do about it, and we feel we have done something about it."

Now then, Sir, only because of the press of competition, this matter in respect of rates, was drawn to the fore. We find that on July 15th of last year, Mr. Osler, speaking on behalf of the Company, said that this particular company could not live on a 90-cent rate. I might say, that the Utility Board in the first instance, as I recall, had agreed to a company rate of \$1.12 and after protests, the Board changed that down to approximately \$1.03 per 1,000 cubic feet, and a suggestion was made that not more than 90 cents should be the rate, and this very same company, who by this legislation will be granted a franchise for the next 25 years said that it could not operate on a 90-cent rate. The whole financial structure of the company came under review, and it was found lacking in many instances. And while it is true, Mr. Speaker, that under the recommendations of the Commission, that certain commitments were to be taken -- or given by the company as to its being able to fulfill the recommendations of the Commission, I think I can say truly, as far as we of the general public are concerned and we on this side of the House are concerned, we have seen no evidence other than the words of the gentlemen opposite as to what these firm commitments actually entail. And while I do not suggest by that, that there has been anything hidden, or while I do not suggest any ulterior motive, I think we should be informed fully of the commitments which have been made and the proposals of the company which were the basis of the government producing this legislation.

Another point, Sir, which I wish to touch on briefly is this, that in respect of the supply of gas, the Winnipeg and Central Gas have a contract, we understand, with Trans Canada to supply 46,400 M. C. F.'s of gas as a demand load, but if the gas distribution system expands to the degree anticipated, the chief engineer of Winnipeg and Central Gas said that the demand in 1962 would be 62,000 M. C. F.'s. We do not know -- we have no evidence -- in anything we are able to find whereby this demand load will be obtainable from Trans Canada Pipe Lines. We do not know what the price of this extra load will be, and I hope that the Minister, when he is considering this Bill, will be able to inform this House what steps Winnipeg and Central have taken to obtain further quantities of gas from Trans Canada, and at what price. Because just the other day we read a report that with the expansion taking place in Eastern Canada now, the capacity of the line -- Trans Canada Line -- will soon reach its maximum.

Now then, getting back to the consideration of the Commission itself, on page 55 the Commission reports that after considering various methods of distribution of this very important utility, the area of discussion was reduced to three possibilities: First, gas distribution over the whole Greater Winnipeg area by one privately owned utility; second, similar distribution by a municipally owned utility, and third, such distribution of a provincially owned utility. Then the report, on page 55, goes on to say -- I think this is very, very important -- "The Commission places considerable emphasis on the need for careful and effective regulation if the single utility is privately owned." This emphasizes -- emphasis direct attention to the monopolistic aspects of public utility, and these will now be examined briefly. And I am at a loss to understand,

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . to find out that in this whole report of the Commission on Gas Distribution, that almost on every page you find references to the necessity of having a board or a commission hot on the heels of a privately owned utility; nearly every page in the whole commission report makes mention of the fact, considerable emphasis on the need for careful, effective regulation if the single utility is privately owned. Throughout the whole report, in essence, the Commission is telling us, and telling the government, that if we have a privately owned utility we have to set up a body - a regulatory body - who is armed to the teeth to watch them very, very carefully and very, very closely. And I suggest, in all deference to their final recommendation on this, that had the Commission carried through their thoughts to their final recommendation, they could not have done otherwise than recommend a publicly owned utility for the distribution of gas.

Page 56 of the Commission's report says, "Frequently a monopolist may, if he wishes, charge a relatively high price for his product and sell a restricted amount of it, or he may charge a lower price and sell more." I can find nothing in either the new Public Utilities Act or in this Act to give direction to the privately owned utility to ensure broad distribution at a lower price.

Page 57, "It would seem that if the public interest is defined as serving the largest possible number of consumers at the lowest possible rate, then the private monopoly must not be given an initial or final control over the rate. A rate should be set low enough to encourage the wide use of the product, so that utility has the maximum incentive to expand its output and service to consumers to the point at which it will achieve necessary profits at the price set for its product. An essential prerequisite is that the company to which the franchise is given is soundly and adequately financed and competently managed." In respect of Winnipeg and Central Gas, the management of that utility, or that corporation, as I understand it, has been changed considerably over the last two or three years. And while there has been a new board of directors set up we have not yet had any evidence that they are going to be any better or any different than the directors who have been controlling this affair over the past few years.

Now then, on page 58 of the report, the Commission went into the question of public vs. private ownership. At the top of the page it says that here the Commission holds no doctrinaire position; the purpose of this section is merely to suggest some of the relevant implications of both forms of ownership. It goes on to say that public ownership appears to possess certain undoubted advantages. It is likely that the large amount of capital required for a gas utility could be obtained at lower cost through some form of government issue than by private utility seeking such capital in the market. This is largely the result of the high credit rating of reputable government. It goes on to say, however, "It must be not lost sight of, however, that the credit of a municipality or even a higher government is far from unlimited." And then for the next two pages, in my opinion the report seems to favour the setting up of a publicly owned utility. At the bottom of page 9, it says, "The privately owned utility also possesses certain advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of finance, especially as it affects public interests. It is not unusual for natural gas distributing utilities to suffer losses during the first few years of their operation."

Then, on page 60, we find these very pertinent facts, "The publicly owned utility should have no other purpose than to serve the largest possible number of consumers at the lowest possible economic cost. If this objective is accepted and efficiently pursued by the management on behalf of the public, it is possible to dispense with any other form of regulation or control, other than that which is inherent in our democratic form of government." Undoubtedly this has its advantages; and what have we got before us? - that after the Commission having said that in respect of a publicly owned utility, not only have we got this Bill, spelled out -- with impositions, as some may call them -- but we also have the new Public Utility Act which sets out other certain aspects, and here is the commission that is reporting on this telling us in no uncertain terms that the publicly owned utility should have no other purpose than to serve the largest possible number of consumers at the lowest possible economic cost. And what is the alternative to that? The inference definitely is there, that the privately owned company is the reverse.

They go on to mention something to the effect of efficient management, "It can be stated in general that private enterprises provide incentive for managerial inventiveness and efficiency. However, there are exceptions to this, and it is possible to point to publicly owned enterprises

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . which are managed more efficiently than some private ones." Again the tenor in their report indicates favourable consideration for public ownership of the distribution of gas.

So I say, Sir, that having all of that, that's been said, and while it seems that the general thought throughout the pages right up to page 62, seems to me to indicate that this should be a publicly owned utility. While the Commission said that they had no doctrinaire position in respect of this, it is not until after they have said all of that, we come to page 62 and the Commission recommends that the necessary franchises be approved through the powers possessed by The Municipal and Public Utilities Board, to a single utility for the distribution of natural gas throughout the Greater Winnipeg area. And then they went on to say, that this single utility should be the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company itself or a single utility created by a voluntary arrangement between Winnipeg and Central Gas and the Great Northern Utilities Limited to distribute natural gas through the Greater Winnipeg area, provided that they undertake to set up a schedule of rates involving the average cost of gas of not more than 90 cents a 1,000 cubic feet.

Now then, Sir, I say that the Commission backtracked; and after having used arguments, stated a case, it seems to me, to indicate a publicly owned utility - it backtracked and recommended what they did. I think they were right in their first part of their report. I think that they were wrong in the last part. I think that our bill is wrong that is before us because it gives the municipalities no opportunity in the future until at the expiration of 1983, of taking over this utility.

I think it is wrong, I think it is contrary to the desires of the municipalities in Greater Winnipeg. Now I would just like briefly, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some of the remarks of the municipalities of Greater Winnipeg, and in each of them, St. James we find in their report that they were opposed to the Winnipeg and Central Gas being granted a sole franchise. They say that the resident ratepayers of the City of St. James were unanimously in favour of the terms of the contract with the Great Northern Utilities and no one appeared before the St. James Council to oppose it.

St. Vital likewise wanted to get into the picture and did not suggest a complete franchise in respect of Winnipeg and Central.

Fort Garry raised objections. We would like to point out and emphasize that we had no alternative but the one chosen unless we were prepared to submit to the rates authorized for Winnipeg and Central Gas Company which we thought out of line with that service.

In the municipality particularly of West Kildonan came out point blankly and said that what we desire is the municipally owned utility in the Greater Winnipeg area. Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all of the municipalities with a possible exception or two, were in favour of a publicly owned utility for the distribution of gas.

Now my friend, the Honourable the Minister of Utilities, said the other day on page 1235 of Hansard, that he's doing the municipalities a favour in respect of the terms of the franchise. He says that the previous arrangement granted to the Winnipeg and Central Gas this franchise in perpetuity. I say such is not the case -- it was not the case. They did not have solid franchises in the municipalities and even if they had I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it couldn't have been in perpetuity in any case because according to the Borden Commission report on page 139 the only length of the contract the Trans Canada Pipe Lines itself has with the Petroleum Natural Gas Conservation Board of the province of Alberta is for 27 years dating from May 14, 1954 and it is with Trans Canada the Winnipeg and Central had their contract. So how could it have been in perpetuity? So, Mr. Speaker, we of our group oppose the passing of this Bill granting to private industry or a private organization the whole of the distribution of natural gas in the Greater Winnipeg area, as did forward looking individuals in this Legislature back in the '28's, '29's and '30's in respect to the development of Seven Sisters. We think, Sir, that consideration should have been given to the establishment of a provincially owned distribution system for the whole province which would have been the best method. Failing that, that the distribution of this very essential fuel should have been in the Greater Winnipeg area on a municipally owned basis. Therefore, Sir, I move an amendment to read as follows, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows: That Bill No. 74 be not now read a second time but be read 12 months hence.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member of the CCF stated

(Mr. Stanes, cont'd.) that several municipalities did not want the distribution of natural gas in the Greater Winnipeg area

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the motion that he has moved is not debatable.

MR. STANES: I beg your pardon.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you I beg your pardon.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's debatable. It's not a motion to adjourn a debate, it's a motion deferring the reading of the bill. I'm not sure now. You may be correct, Mr. Speaker, I'm not arguing the point but I thought it was debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to be fair with the Honourable the Leader of the CCF party and I will allow the honourable member to speak if he wishes to.

MR. ROBLIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just looking very briefly on page 14 of our own rules I wonder if perhaps you're not correct. Unless it could be brought in under (a) the debatable motions are every motion standing on the order of proceedings for the day, which certainly would not include this one. Receiving of reports of standing and select committees, concurrency in a report, previous question, second readings, third readings, adjournments for matters of urgent public importance, adoption in Committee of the Whole of various resolutions, appointment of committees, reference to committee of a report, suspension of the rules, and any other such motion made upon routine proceedings as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment of conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangements of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of a day for its sitting days or the times of its meetings or adjournments. All other motions including adjournment motions shall be decided without debate or amendment.

I don't know whether that throws any light at all on the situation because I know these are complicated but I just give that for what it's worth.

MR. PAULLEY: May I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister touched on it when he mentioned that every motion for the second reading of the bill is debatable and all in effect that I am doing, we're still going to read the bill for second reading, only instead of that, we're not doing it now we're doing it some other time. I think it's debatable.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't agree with you.

MR. W. C. MILLER (Rhineland): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, any motion on second reading is debatable. I am quite sure the First Minister must realize that. It's been the practice in this House to debate hoist motions of every description.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that this is not an amendment to the question to read a bill a second time, it's a new motion, and it is a superseding motion. It supersedes the question and it is in the same category as a motion to adjourn. Now I'm quite willing to do what the House wants me to do in this question, but my thinking on the matter is that it's not debatable at the moment and our own rules more or less bears this out.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to further complicate the matter but I think if you'll consult the records of the past, you will find that when a six month hoist or other hoist motion has been moved, that it invariably has been subject for debate. That perhaps does not make it right. It could be that the procedure had been wrong before, but it always seemed to me that in a case of this kind that the people who have reason to believe that there is a good argument for not deferring the reading of this bill for, in this case, 12 months, should have an opportunity to state their arguments, and I think that's why we have always had the debate on the six month hoist amendment. After all this is an amendment that the honourable member has moved.

MR. SPEAKER: I disagree with the Leader of the Opposition in stating that this is an amendment. It is not an amendment. It is a new motion. I can agree with him in remembering that in other sessions of the Legislature, motions of this type have been debated. With the strict interpretations of the rules, I believe that it is not entirely correct. But I have no objection, as the House has in the past debated these motions, and I know from my own experience in the House that that has been the case, but it has been I believe, a wrong practice and I would think possibly the Honourable Member for St. James should make his speech on this motion and we will take it under review at a later date and find out exactly what the ruling is. We have rulings on both sides here and I think in fairness to the members and to the member for St. James that possibly we will allow him to make his speech. Go ahead.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that a number of municipalities who did oppose at the time of the discussions of supply and distribution of gas in the metropolitan area by the Winnipeg and Central, did so primarily, I feel, out of the poor public relationships at that time between the company and the municipalities. Also I think, a secondary factor in there was the question of price. Naturally every municipality, feeling they were negotiating the distribution of the gas for the individual homeowners in their municipality, wanted to get the best possible buy. And I think they were the grounds not necessarily the grounds that have been mentioned, but they wish to have public ownership. I think quite a number of people, I think myself, Mr. Speaker, would have liked to have some form of competitive spirit within the distribution of natural gas in the Winnipeg area in order to assure, as we thought at that time, of a competitive price. But we were informed by those who know better than ourselves good reasons why this system would tend to increase the price and not lower the price.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of the state ownership, I would just like to say a word and I would like to dispel that ideas that have been painted by distribution of natural gas by a publicly owned corporation have been compared with that of power at the time of our electrification of rural Manitoba. This is totally untrue as at the time when the electrification of rural Manitoba was brought about there was no source of power. Also, I would like to point out the tremendous difference in cost between transporting of natural gas and that of electric power. I think it's indicative in the Winnipeg area that the big majority of people who have linked in with the natural gas have been those either of new housing developments, or those of older homes where the furnaces are in need of repairing. Therefore, I think it's safe to assume that if there was a form of public ownership in the distribution of gas in this province we would have scattered people because of their individual circumstances wishing to take advantage of that natural gas. The distribution cost would be fantastic. In addition of course to those costs there would be some form of settlement with not the Winnipeg and Central but as now the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company who incidentally has changed quite considerably and should not be compared with the old company. There would be settlement there, both as to their installation and equipment they have and also their arrangements with the pipeline. It's quite easy to see also, Mr. Speaker, the political implication. I just wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that one cannot compare the distribution of gas in the province today with the rural electrification of this province at the time it was done in -- I forget the date right now. There is no comparison whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion will stand until next session of the Legislature. Second reading of Bill No. 88. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Bill No. 88, an Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act be now read a second time.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, there was a query in this connection when the bill was before the Committee of the Whole as to the amount realized on the former rate of levy. That amount was \$35,880.93 for the fiscal year just closed. The amount that we estimate for the current fiscal year is \$42,620. That estimates the need which we feel is required for this fund in the current fiscal year.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1), be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Speaker, there are -- this bill deals with a number of matters under The Public Schools Act. The first portion relates to school areas and makes new provisions as to the powers and jurisdiction of local school districts and local school boards. For some time in the actual operation of school areas there has been a conflict between local school districts and local school boards and the area boards as to their relative jurisdictions and we are attempting by this Act to draw out in more specific terms the authority of each in order that there may be no misunderstandings. Briefly the bill provides that the local school board shall have the right to select the teacher. Now when the legislation for school areas was first enacted,

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) provisions were put in to insure that under certain circumstances, under most circumstances, the local school board did have the selection of its teachers but it didn't say that in just those words and what we propose by this bill is to say specifically that the local school district shall select the teacher for the elementary school. In addition the local board may help recommend the transfer of the teacher or the termination of the contract of the teacher. It also provides the local school board shall engage their own caretaker. That may seem like a rather small item, but it has given rise to some misunderstanding as to who was authorized to engage caretakers for the local district.

Also the selection of a school site. That is a school site that is to be used for elementary school purposes. The bill provides that that task and that responsibility is to be solely the responsibility of the local school district and the local school board.

A further provision that the local board may make repairs to schools that is to the school under their jurisdiction and purchase equipment up to certain amounts that are specified in the act and under certain conditions. I should say to the House that there is just a minor amendment that we will propose in committee here to make the meaning quite clear as to what we have in mind. It provides also for the appointment of secretary-treasurer of a local school district and the fixing of his remuneration. Holding meeting in the local school district of the electors of the local district. Arranging for extra services for the district and also provisions under which the local school board may require that their school be closed or alternatively that it may be opened within the ambit of provisions that are set out in the act. All of these are authority and powers granted to local school districts and local school boards within a school area.

Then going on from there, the counterpart, the authority and jurisdiction of the area board and it is made to -- the bill proposes that the board of a school area have the full jurisdiction over all secondary schools, secondary school buildings, and secondary school education within the school area. This, I think, for the most part they already have, but again it has not been spelled out perhaps as clearly as it should and this brings the jurisdiction of the area board with respect to secondary education into the same position as the jurisdiction of a division board with respect to secondary education in a school division. It provides that the area board shall have the sole responsibility for the finances of the area, the preparation of the necessary budgets, money by-laws, the entering into contracts with the teachers, and the negotiations leading to the establishment of salaries. The bill provides further that the area board may close a local school which does not have proper enrolment as set out in the School Act - proper enrolment in order to earn grants. A new provision provides that the area board shall provide transportation for both secondary students and elementary students and again this is completely in line with the principles established by the act with respect to school divisions. Now I would just say to the House here that there is again a minor amendment that we shall propose in committee to bring the wording and make the intent of the amendment quite clear. There is an important provision which provides for the elimination of what are called the groups in a school area. The legislation for school areas provides that for taxation and budget purposes the area shall be divided into groups. One group consists of a town -- schools which are incorporated in towns, another for schools in villages or unincorporated villages, and the third group for schools in rural municipalities what are generally referred to as rural schools. The bill proposes that those distinctions be eliminated and that for purpose of taxation and school finance that the area operate as a unit. This will in a sense make them comparable to a school division which has that principle inherent in it although it goes some distance further because the principle of taxation as a unit applies not only with respect to the support of secondary schools but also to all of the taxation required for the purpose of elementary schools. Then, as arose when we were discussing this in committee, a further provision in the bill provides that grants to school areas shall be the same as the grant made to school divisions and a section that provides for the making or regulations and that regulations that pertain to these grants shall be applicable to school areas as they are to school divisions.

Just to answer a question which I am certain will occur to the members of the House as to why this should be done, the answer is that first of all that school areas are given special grants now 20% over and above the regular grants, and in order to reduce the number of different types of grants that we have, this will bring a very great uniformity so far as the government and the Department of Education is concerned, but more particularly the fact that school

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . areas provide the same services and have the same responsibilities as school divisions. Namely, they have the same responsibility of providing high school education to all the students in the area, without charge to any student irrespective of where he or she may live. They have as a principle of school finance, the sharing of school costs over the area or as it is at the moment until this bill is passed over sections of the area and they do in fact, although they have never received grants for it, they do in fact provide transportation particularly to the high school students so that they have the obligations and they provide the services which school divisions do and on that basis are entitled to grants on the same basis.

Now just before leaving this particular part of the bill, I should point this out, that if this bill receives the endorsement of the House we will then have in effect four principal administrative units, if one may use that term insofar as our schools are concerned. First of all we will have the individual school districts which operate entirely on their own. That applies to the four parts of the province where they did not form school divisions and where each school district operates as a unit in the provision of elementary education and in many instances high school education as well.

Then, secondly, we will have school divisions in which the divisions will be responsible for high school education and the local school boards responsible for elementary education. Then we will have school areas in which the school area will be responsible for high school education as in the case of the school divisions, the local school districts will continue to exist with the authority that I have indicated so far, but with a common financial policy that applies to that area and provides for both the financing of the elementary as well as the high school education. And then finally we will have the single district school division such as in the case of municipal school district of St. Vital, the Consolidated school district of Seven Oaks, the Consolidated school district of Kelsey up at The Pas, and the larger school districts such as Winnipeg, ST. Boniface and Fort Garry, and St. James. That will give us as I say four general types of administration and they work in quite well with one another particularly the last three, so long as the geographic size, the number of teachers, the number of pupils, the assessment meets the general requirements as suggested in the Interim Report of the Royal Commission and as stipulated in the legislation which applied to school divisions.

Coming then to the next portion of the Act there are sections in the Act providing for the purchase, covering the provisions for the purchase of used text books and the payment for them. Actually what has happened so far is that the local school districts and the school divisions have themselves purchased the texts from the students, or did purchase them in June and the sections of the bill that are before the House now will authorize the payment, repayment to those school districts and school divisions for the purchases which they have made and another provision is -- makes provision for, or authorizes the school districts or school divisions or school areas to join and pay fees to the Urban School Trustees' Association of Manitoba; there are certain conditions which are attached to the fees, they must be approved and the detail of that is in the bill and we can discuss it in committee. There are also provisions which make the collective bargaining provisions of the act applicable to school divisions; that was an item which was overlooked when we introduced the legislation last fall. The next part of the Act we have already discussed in a very brief manner on one or two occasions. It provides for the establishment of a Board of Reference, and this Board of Reference will operate in two situations, first in the case where it is desired that a school district be transferred from one division to another, a Board of Reference will be established to deal with that application. Applications may be made by the board of a local school district, by the municipal council, or by ten or more resident electors of a school district and the application as I have indicated will be for a transfer of the district from one division to another. The Board of Reference will hear such application, will hear those interested, which would include of course, the school divisions concerned as well as any other district that might be affected by the transfer if it is made by individual citizens. They are authorized, or will be authorized to hold a vote of the persons in the district that have asked for the transfer, and to make a decision. That decision is not necessarily final, because provision is made, that any person affected by the decision may appeal to the Country Court Judge and in that case the provisions of the Act, which applied to other appeals to a County Court Judge will apply. The Board of Reference will have another duty because there are in the Act provisions that permit the board of a school division to alter the ward boundaries within a

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . division or to alter the number of trustees, division trustees, provided, of course, that they don't go below five and don't go over nine. Now in certain instances it is thought that citizens may wish to have such a change made and may make application to a division board for such a change, but that the division board will not be prepared to make the change and we have made provision for an appeal from the refusal of a division board, or their decision if they've dealt with it and made a decision and appeal to the Board of Reference and in that instance the Board of Reference will act as it were as an appeal from the decision of the division board itself. Only with respect to those two matters and any decisions made by the Board of Reference on such a matter will be final for a period of three years, so as to prevent frequent appeals being made. The Board of Reference for both these purposes will be established by Order-in-Council, and the bill makes provision for that and also makes provision for the designation of the municipal board as the Board of Reference and in which case it would have the authority and powers of a Board of Reference under the Act. Provision is made for the Board of Reference on any application that is received to fix a date for a hearing to give written notice and publish that notice in the proper newspapers and also, where a change is made and this particularly applies to a change of a school district from one division to another, to make an adjustment of assets and liabilities as between the divisions concerned. Finally the bill makes provision for certain matters concerning budgets and estimates for the year 1959 these provisions apply only to the year 1959, because of the fact that it was not known until February 27th, what divisions would be established and so this provides that for the year 1959 a school district, which is not in a school division is required to submit its requirements to the municipality not later than April 15th, a school district which is in a division is required to send along its budget to the school division not later than April 15th, and the school division is required to send both its and the local school districts budgets to the municipality not later than May 15th. Actually this is only now approving what in effect has already been done because those times have passed and is applicable only to the year 1959. With 1960 we shall revert to the regular time as set out in the Act, which is March 1st, and which will be applicable in all cases with respect to school budgets. I should say just in closing, that there are one or two other matters dealing with the School Act, which through inadvertance we omitted in this bill and which will come before us in a second bill which has already received first reading, which is somewhat shorter than the present, and I just mention it now to indicate that there will be other some further matters in the later bill.

MR. W. C. MILLER (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews took the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 13 Labour, 1 Administration

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. Johns): When the committee rose I was saying a few words on this. I find since I spoke last Wednesday that my facts were not quite correct in as far as Kelsey is concerned, I learned since Wednesday that from another union organizer that not only are they working 180 hours in a two week period at Kelsey, but according to one representative his people are working in the two week period 195 hours at straight time. Now at Churchill Mr. Chairman a large amount of the work, which is being done comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the provisions of the Fair Wage Act don't apply there, but the Federal Government has itself I am given to understand evolved a system whereby for five days a week men work straight time for eight hours a day and on Saturday they work straight time for four hours a day, but over that 44 hours they are paid at overtime rates. I'm told, however, that there's a good deal -- it's extremely likely that the town site will be moved and if that should be done that the people who work on the moving of the buildings to a new site, would be exempted as are all other workers at Churchill from the provisions of the Fair Wage Act and they could therefore work the same hours as they are working at Kelsey, which is 12

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . to 14 hours a day or more, seven days a week at straight time.

Now at Thompson Mr. Chairman we heard during the first session -- in the special session in 1958 when I raised this question that we were told by the then member from Churchill that the men were willing, they wanted to work these long hours and inferred that they didn't mind working at straight time. Now it's interesting Mr. Chairman that as far as the operation of International Nickel is concerned, from the beginning of this year, I think it was January 3rd, I'm speaking from memory, of 1959, when the new agreement went into effect between the Building Trade Unions and the International Nickel Company the standard work week is nine hours a day six days a week in other words 54 hours a week. I don't think that's particularly good, but that's the agreement which they reached. Over and above that, if the men work more than nine hours in any one day and if they work Sundays, they are given overtime pay at time and a half, or I think, double time for Sunday. Now this applies to the Inco project itself, but as far as the large number of workers who work in the town site, for example those workers who are working building the homes, I'm given to understand that there are no provisions for overtime that they work 12 to 14 hours a day seven days a week at straight time. Indeed, I'm told that in the construction of houses by one of the companies, that the men when they are hired are told and its a condition of employment that they will work 14 days and it will only be on the 15th day in other words every 15 days they get one day off. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in my opinion, conditions in the north country where these big companies are operating ought to be no different than they are to the contractors in any other part of the province. I'm told that in recent hearings before the Fair Wage Board that one of the contractors, I think from Neepawa said that they would be willing to live up to not only to the zone B provision, but that they would be willing to live up to the zone A provision providing there was an amendment that projects under a certain value, say, I think he suggested \$100,000, should be exempted from the provisions of the zone A regulation. Mr. Chairman, I submit, that in my opinion there is no reason why these large companies should be permitted to work employees the long hours and the continuous work day after day without a day off, which they are doing without the payment of overtime rates which are now the obligation and responsibility of employers in every other part of the province. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister would make an announcement that the government is giving consideration to an early change in these regulations.

MR. A. E. CORBETT (Swan River): Did you ever work on any construction project in the newer areas? Were you ever up in them? Did you ever work in them? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 (a) Salaries

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Min. of Labour) (Virden): Mr. Chairman, I think we have had occasion to discuss previously the question of the employment at Kelsey. I have here a complete list of all the wages and the hours worked at that site. We asked one of our departmental inspectors to go to Kelsey and obtain the information on the wages and hours in that area and he was in the north country obtaining data for the survey on wages and hours, which is produced annually by the Department of Labour. Normally, any of the information contained in this survey is not published by -- that is respecting an individual workman. We obtain the data purely for the purpose of a general picture of the wages and hours in the province. However, in connection with the question raised respecting the Kelsey construction I had arranged an interview with Mr. McNamara who was one of the contractors there at Kelsey, that is I believe he is the main contractor on that site and I had an interview with him with respect to the whole issue, wages, hours, conditions of employment and so on. And he said that I could use if I wished any of the data, which we obtained through our inspector. It is quite true that the men in that area are working longer than normal hours, there's no question about that, in fact the head of that firm Mr. McNamara was surprised himself at the length of hours they were working and from his standpoint he thought that it was uneconomical that men some men should work the hours that were contained in this report. We have a cement truck driver, for example at 191 1/2 hours for a half a month -- for a period of half a month and we have a machinist 172 1/2 for 15 days or half a month and a fitter for 199 hours, for half a month. I'm picking the larger ones I have none marked, I'm just selecting these at random. We have a carpenter who worked 198 1/2 hours from June 1st to June 15th, 1959, and a drill helper who worked 180 hours and so on. Here's one, a drag operator who worked 218 hours in that 15 day period, a labourer pusher who worked 195 hours. Now, of course, there are other employees who worked less,

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) . . . the cement workers I understand worked long hours in a given period because they had to work at the cement while that cement construction is underway and it involved long periods of hours at one setting, at one operation. But the figures I have are rather surprising that on the average, the average weekly hours worked by construction trades employed by McNamara, Brown and Root at Kelsey, total hours total employees 381 average weekly hours 57.18 average daily hours 9.52. The hours vary very much, a great deal, according to the trade or occupation of the individual employee, but some of them are long, there's no question about that. Those that I have quoted appear to be too long.

Now the wages, a drag operator is \$2.10 an hour, there's a furnace man at \$1.50 an hour, a filler at \$2.15 an hour, labourer — here's a carpenter at \$2.15 per hour, another carpenter at \$2.15, a labourer at \$1.20, another labourer at \$1.20, a boiler inspector at \$1.80, a diesel operator \$1.60, another carpenter at \$2.15, labour foreman \$2.15, oiler \$1.30, electrician \$2.20, train operator \$2.10. Some of these wages compare favourably with the zone (A) rates of Winnipeg and some compare favourably with the zone (B) rates, which apply, of course, in Manitoba in towns of 2,000 population or over. Now on this matter of extending the Fair Wage laws to all of the province we are unable to agree with that at the present time, I do not feel that it would be practical to extend Fair Wage Rates all over the province, there are areas such as Greater Winnipeg where the cost of living is presumed to be higher, certainly the housing is much higher and the rates are designed to suit the area, and I think the Fair Wage Board, which only this Spring approved of the rates and hours for the various zones have found this to be correct. We are not expanding zone (A) or zone (B) all across the province. Now with respect to the northern area, with respect to the Kelsey area, I feel as the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities stated one evening recently, that the men who are in that area wish to work long hours. They want to be employed while they're more transient; they're transient workers and it is not their desire to stay there and spend a considerable part of their time in recreation and leisure. They go there to work and they want to work I am told, these hours and we have had no complaints. Our department, to my knowledge at the moment has had no complaints from anyone working in the Kelsey area. The only complaints we have had have been from the union representatives who are not working in the area, but of course who no doubt represent individuals who are, but we have had no one come to us and complain, that has been a worker in any trade in the Kelsey area. Now as I say they appear to be quite satisfied with the general picture, I consulted and discussed this issue with Mr. McNamara, the chief contractor there, and he was of the opinion that if overtime rates were imposed there would be no overtime. He felt that the rates they were paying were sufficiently high and that if they were forced to pay overtime that they would just work the normal hours, which were imposed upon them, that is if it were nine hours at straight pay they would only work nine hours a day. If it was ten hours they would work ten hours. He said that they would not be able to pay overtime and that's the way he put it. And, of course he has the contract — it's a signed, sealed contract, and he is not intending to pay overtime if we enforce a certain limit of hours there in Kelsey.

He is I might say quite agreeable to, and of course we have impressed this upon the contractor in that area, that there should be a definite permission to enter the area and if the labourer, if the trade union organizers wish to organize the men and obtain a contract, there's nothing to stop that. There's nothing to stop that, and I asked him to contact his foreman in Kelsey and clear the air with respect to entry and it is confirmed that there is no doubt that there can be entry there by air, the only question, there is a certain restriction of movement in the area for safety reasons. They have a security officer at the dock and I did suggest that a security officer sounded rather harsh and strict and he agreed that perhaps he should employ a guide, it's a softer term than a security officer. And he is agreeable to employing a guide in order that no one who goes in there union organizer or anyone else, would not enter upon an area where the men are working where a great weight of concrete is moving through the air above or where there are high tension wires and so on, they are very strict about safety in the area, and visitors who go in are guided around in order that they will not go somewhere where they might be severely injured. This guide of course would show any individual through the area, but as far as union organization is concerned any organizer is free to enter there and to see him, not in the restricted area, of course, or not in working hours, but outside the restricted

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) . . . area there is certainly free contact with anyone. Now if any union obtains in the normal fashion a certain number of men in order that they can apply for certification, there's nothing to prevent that and certainly the contractor there assured me as he of course could not do otherwise, if a certain number of men if the majority desire to be certified bargainers then he will meet that union or any union or number of unions that prove that they represent the men in the area. At the present time the contractors are not prepared to meet the union organizers they say, because they have no evidence that any union represents any particular trade in that area, but once they apply for certification and establish their right, then of course the employers in the normal way will be obliged to bargain with the union or any unions, and they can then by bargaining, establish whatever rates they agree to in that area, but as far as extending the zones Mr. Chairman we are not prepared to extend zone (A) or zone (B) any further than it is at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Administration (a) passed, (b) passed, resolution 86 passed, Item 2 (a) passed, (b) passed, (c) passed, resolution 87 passed, Item 3 on Employment Standards Division (a)

MR. ORLIKOW: What is the work of this divisions? Very briefly --

MR. THOMPSON: You were asking the work of the Employment Standards Division?

A MEMBER: Yes, I

MR. THOMPSON: It covers quite a general field; the inspection on wages; on safety; minimum wages and the general field of employment. This division took over the work of the -- at least we have the Employment Standards Act which now includes the operations of the Minimum Wage and some of the other divisions which were formerly under separate enactments. We have added five to the staff of this division to cover wage inspectors and safety inspectors. We have opened -- we are opening a new office at The Pas for the northern area, which will include an inspector from this division, and there will be two -- four additional -- three additional inspectors centred in the Winnipeg office. Those are the general items covered by Employment Standards -- respecting wages, safety and general employment conditions in industry.

MR. GRAY: Is the department looking after the safety outside of the city as well -- I mean, in the city as well?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. GRAY: Isn't there any duplication between you and the city authorities?

MR. THOMPSON: No, we are concerned with safety in the city of course as well.

(Interjection) I beg your pardon?

MR. GRAY: Safety of machinery; or safety of fire -- fire hazards?

MR. THOMPSON: Both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) Passed. (c) Passed. Resolution 88 passed. Item 4. (a) Passed. (b) Passed. (c) Passed. (d) Passed. Resolution 89 passed. Item 5. (a) Passed.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the CCF asking questions with respect to whether the difficulties being encountered by some employees in the process of organization, asked whether the Minister felt the Labour Relations Act gave all the protection necessary. It probably should be answered under -- I don't know if the Minister gave a reply, and he could probably give us some information under the Labour Relations division. The problem usually arises before the union is certified and has its agreement. After it has its agreement, usually the grievance section of the agreement covers dismissals, but before that it often happens the employees claim they are dismissed because of union activities and they have no protection, and the Act, in their opinion is pretty weak. I wonder if the Minister has -- I don't think he answered before; I wonder if he could say anything now on this question.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe the machinery is here in the Act to deal with these problems. Now I think the question arose over a recent case of a glass company -- is that the one you are referring to? (Interjection) That case was heard this morning. I haven't received a report on it at the moment, but the Labour Board this morning had an extensive hearing which lasted a considerable time on that issue. I think we have the machinery to deal with these cases -- the Act is clear on the issue, and my honourable friends have not recommended any particular change. We see, at the moment, no need of any change to provide the necessary provisions for that purpose. I see no need of a change in the legislation. I think the legislation is already here which meets the need.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I might make a comment on that. I agree with the Minister that we didn't make any concrete proposals to him. Possibly before we deal with this question at the next regular session we'll have a very close scrutiny of it, because the Minister made reference to the case that I raised in the House in reference to a glass company. I am very happy to say I just received information a few moments ago that the case was heard and it appears as though the arrangements made are quite satisfactory, and restitution has been made -- or will be made, in respect of the case that I raised specifically. But the point was that while that particular case has been resolved, it still doesn't eliminate the possibilities of others. I think, in general, there can be quite a broad interpretation of those sections of the Act. However, Mr. Chairman, in order to facilitate the work of the Committee we'll not proceed with it at this time, but I think I could say to the Minister, that before the next session we'll reread the sections over, and see if we can come up with any concrete suggestions to the Minister that may make it so that these cases are not so likely to rise in the Labour Relations division.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I should point out that there can be a breach of any law no matter what we adopt here -- it can be broken. Now if it was broken in this case, as you suggest, there is a remedy in the legislation as it stands, and we can't certainly control every act of every individual. We can make laws which provide a remedy, and as I see it at the moment, the remedy is in the law.

MR. PAULLEY: The point really that I was making, Mr. Chairman -- I agree with the Minister that anybody can break a law, but if I recall correctly these particular sections are sort of -- shall I say -- broad in some respects, or not spelled out specifically enough, that gives rise to these problems as to an employee not knowing what might be considered under the law as intimidation, and it's more of the interpretation of it, it's true. But I do agree with the Minister that even if that were done there could be breakages of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) Passed. (b) Passed. (c) Passed. (d) 1. Passed, 2. -- (e) Passed. Resolution 90 passed.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, with reference to (e), is the contemplated winter employment very similar to what you had in effect this past winter?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, that matter has not yet been finally determined. We have been in contact with the federal authorities and we are told that they have the issue under study. They are considering whether to extend the winter employment program into the coming winter or not, and they have not yet come to a decision on the issue. We have been considering whether or not we should meet the program. There has been certainly a great improvement in employment conditions in Manitoba and in Canada. Now, our position is that we would like first to know what the Federal -- what federal action will be taken, because as you can judge from the results of the past winter's Winter Employment program the Federal authorities made a very substantial contribution, and we are interested -- before we make a decision for Manitoba -- we are interested in knowing what position they are taking with regard to the winter of 1950 - 60. At the present time, they have not come to a decision, but as I say, they have the matter under consideration, and we have it under consideration, and we hope it will not be too late in the summer before a decision is made whether to extend a similar program into the coming winter.

MR. HAWRYLUK:that, Sir, is that the amount slated for the coming winter of '59-60?

MR. THOMPSON: No, we have not included -- this is the amount to cover the past winter. We have not included an amount. Our expenditure, if there is one, will be governed a great deal by the Federal decision, and we have not included any item in the estimates at the present time.

MR. HAWRYLUK: In other words, Sir, that the fact that when this session closes, it will be left entirely to the discretion of this government to decide, if and when you hear from Ottawa. Is that it?

MR. THOMPSON:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 90 passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman,have you an item standing in Agriculture?

MR. ROBLIN: There is nothing standing that I'm aware of. Has my honourable friend got one that's not clear?

MR. CAMPBELL: I have the large item on page 8, No. 26, marked 'Stand', and my impression was that there was an agreement by the Minister that that should stand so that the Honourable the First Minister would have an opportunity to report on crop insurance (discussions) when he came back from the East, and, I don't know whether there were other matters mentioned, but crop insurance was one that we thought might be discussed at that time.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the matter of crop insurance was reviewed when I was down east. Since that time the House will be aware of the federal legislation that covers that item, and I may say that there is a notice in the Votes and Proceedings today that we will be bringing in a Bill to cover our present intentions in respect to that matter, and I would probably think that the Bill will deal with all the points that might be at issue, and will provide ample opportunity for discussion of that particular matter. If there is anything further my honourable friend would like me to mention, I'll be glad to try and do so.

MR. CAMPBELL: As a matter of fact, I noticed that the notice was given in the Votes and Proceedings of the Bill that will be coming forward, and perhaps, under those circumstances, it would be just as well to defer consideration of the subject matter until the Bill comes before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

MR. ROBLIN: In that case, I think there is nothing else outstanding, so I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rise and report, call in the Speaker.

The Committee of Supply have adopted certain resolutions, have directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

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

MR. CLERK: Resolutions, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4(a), 5, were read and concurred in. 6. Resolved to be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,750.00 for Executive Council Federal-Provincial conference.

MR. CAMPBELL: I wish to move seconded by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland that while concurring in Resolution No. 6, this House regrets that the government has failed to obtain from the Government of Canada any guarantee of an improvement in Manitoba's payment under the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreement.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, with regard to this amendment, I'm afraid I shall have to depart from the usual custom by taking a very short time to say something in support of it, and I base my remarks to some extent on the copy that the Honourable the First Minister has given to me, being a submission by him to the committee of Ministers meeting on July 6th in Ottawa.

I am presuming in discussing this presentation, that there were other presentations which occurred in camera, but so far as the public record is concerned this is the only one that we have before us. And so I think it may fairly be taken, Mr. Speaker, that this presentation as presented by the Honourable the First Minister at that Committee of Ministers is a statement of Manitoba's case, and on consideration of it, which I have given a good bit of time to since I received this copy of the submission, I am inclined to think that the statement here is an accurate one. Apparently the Government has failed to obtain from the Government of Canada any guarantee of an improvement in Manitoba's payments under the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreement. I have carefully considered a statement that the Honourable the First Minister made to this House when he returned from Ottawa, and then have had the advantage of reading this submission later on. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that having in mind the fact that the Federal Government is one that had promised before the election to make sweeping changes in the federal-provincial financial arrangements, then had repromised similar -- had made similar promises when the second election came along, then had had a conference following the first election -- promised a further conference soon after, and eventually convened not the conference in the accepted sense of the word,

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . as we had understood it before, but rather a committee of provincial treasurers. I must say that I think Manitoba has reason to be highly disappointed over the results to date. And I must say further that those of us who are used to the vigorous language and emphatic style that the Honourable the First Minister employs when he speaks in this House, couldn't help but be struck by the very, almost apologetic attitude that he struck at Ottawa. I don't intend to comment on the statement in great detail but the last paragraph on the first page, the Minister says, "It is obvious that the Dominion Government has not forgotten the needs of the provinces, and that it was willing to convene the conference of November 1957, to reopen the agreements devised by the previous administration." Well, it would certainly need to be willing. After all it had said it was going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the prominent members of the party, as they were at that time -- now the Government at Ottawa -- had gone across the length and breadth of this province promising great advantages to the provinces and to the municipalities, if they were returned to office. And yet we find the First Minister of this province saying that they had not forgotten the needs of the provinces and that they were willing to convene a conference. Then later on he is almost apologetic when he says that "it was hoped that a full examination of the present arrangements could take place then". Well there is no reason why there couldn't have been a full examination take place there. We were -- I was present at that conference; we pleaded with the Federal Government to continue for more than the two days that had been arranged at that time. They were unable to continue longer than that time. They told us that instead of being prepared to give any of the benefits that had been so loudly proclaimed before the election, that they had simply called us down to get our ideas on the subject -- that after they received our ideas they were going to give consideration to them. Then the statement of the First Minister goes on to say, "However, due to what we understand to have been the heavy Federal timetable, it did not prove possible to reconvene the conference in order to deal with the very real inadequacies remaining in the arrangements after the interim relief granted in 1958." But the inadequacies should have been dealt with when we were there in '57 -- let alone the reconvening of the conference.

Mr. Speaker, for one who like the First Minister is so able to present an argument as he can do, I couldn't escape the impression that this was a very toned down sort of a demand on the Federal Government.

The Honourable the First Minister has told us on more than one occasion in this House that he will not be in any way at all embarrassed or influenced by the fact that the Federal Government is of the same political persuasion as the government in Manitoba, and that he will argue just as strenuously for the rights of Manitoba as he would regardless of who formed the government there. But when we read page 2 of this brief, we find the very mild suggestions that the Honourable the First Minister has made. They do not appear to me to warrant the interpretation that he gave to this House of having demanded an interim adjustment, and this province having been the only one that had made that demand.

Well, I don't intend to go through this brief in detail, Mr. Speaker, but I think there is only one thing in it that has not been previously presented to the Government, and I am not sure of the value of that particular thing. As I read it, I notice nothing new, if indeed that is new, but the suggestion of tax free bonds for approved provincial and municipal financing. While it's true the Honourable the First Minister has quietly suggested that there should be some interim adjustment, I think that the nature of the interim adjustment that he suggests is exactly the same as the one that the previous administration had recommended back two years ago.

I notice on page 5 an interesting statement, near the end of the first paragraph on page 5, "Immediate steps should be taken to encourage further savings, to alleviate a growing shortage of capital funds and to lower effectively the interest rates being encountered by provincial and local financing authorities." It's a fine statement of principle, I think, Mr. Speaker, but I would just like to ask the Honourable the First Minister, how does he expect that to be done when governments both federal and provincial are giving the lead they are, so far as encouraging further savings, or getting capital funds in anything but ever increasing amounts?

I note that the First Minister refers to the fact that Manitoba's requirements as a province are pressing, and he deals with several of the matters that are of great concern in this province. He thinks that Manitoba already indicated its requirements for consideration by the continuing

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . committee, such items as a review of arrangement for Dominion-Provincial developmental investment in the fields of flood control, conservation, highways, as well as other capital undertakings. He says that the Agricultural Paper will make mention of farm credit legislation, crop insurance and the full complex of difficulties facing the agricultural section of the economy, as a result of rising production and operating costs in a period of increasing cost price squeeze. Then he comes to the statement that we are gratified by the Federal authorities' approach to these problems as evidenced in the Agricultural Bills introduced in recent weeks.

If my honourable friend is gratified by the Crop Insurance legislation that has been introduced in recent weeks, I think that he belongs to a very small minority in the Province of Manitoba.

However, the real burden of the presentations there was not to deal with these particular matters but with regard to the situation on the tax sharing agreement between the Government of Canada and Manitoba. And it looks to us so far as the present circumstances are concerned, and viewed in the light of the experience of the last few years -- the last two years -- as though just no progress has been made. Now we, of course, can't tell that nothing is going to happen as a result of the conference that was held, and the one that will be planned later on after the committee -- Continuing Committee -- do their work. But, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what I've said on other occasions, that the Committee of Ministers simply cannot take the place of the full conference such as had been held in former years. I know that it is the custom of the federal ministers at Ottawa to pretend that the provinces were faced with a take it or leave it attitude when they dealt with the previous administration. I say as one who was there for several of the conferences under the previous administration and one conference of the present administration that the take it or leave it attitude certainly applied to the present government much more than to the former, and I'm afraid that my honourable friend, the First Minister has found that to be the case because we have no reason to believe at all so far as I know, unless he can give us some further information than he has communicated to us up to date -- no reason at all to believe that the suggestion that he made about either an interim adjustment or the arrangement for the longer term have done anything but fall on barren ground. Now we will hope of course that when the continuing committee has done its work that there will be some advantages accrue to Manitoba but up to date the record I think has been a very, very unoptimistic one. Gives us little hope to assume there will be an improvement in the near future. The brief of the First Minister suggests that this continuing committee work and the studies that they will make and the action that the federal government will take as a result of those discussions will be a long time in maturing. In the meantime the province of Manitoba goes without these great advantages that had been promised to us, so that my complaint so far as the First Minister is concerned, is that I believe he did not use the undoubted ability which he possesses to present Manitoba's claim in the way that it could have been presented, that he did not use the influence which he quite properly possesses with the federal government in order to remind them of the just claims of Manitoba and of the promises that the government themselves had made. So, Mr. Speaker, we feel that it's only proper that an amendment of this kind should be moved.

MR. ROBLIN: I would say a brief word Mr. Speaker, we don't usually have much of a debate on concurrence but in view of the statement made by my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, I think I should say a word or two. If everything that he has said is correct and if he had correctly interpreted what has gone on in the field of Dominion fiscal relations in the past two years, he might properly have addressed this resolution of non confidence to himself, because we should not forget, Sir, that he led the delegation of the province of Manitoba to the conference of December 1957 which he found so unsatisfactory, and it seems to me that we might say that he failed to use his undoubted talents in stating a case for Manitoba at that time. However the situation is that the facts as he presented them to the committee this afternoon, or to the House, Sir, are simply inaccurate. He left the impression with me that nothing had happened since the present federal administration came into office, to improve the financial position of the province of Manitoba, and he was critical of this administration that we had been silent or ineffective while this situation pertained.

I have heard my honourable friend on many occasions says how little he thought of the 3% increase in personal income tax that was awarded at that time and I have never heard him

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . say that it was valuable to the province of Manitoba. Perhaps he thinks it isn't, but I can tell him Sir, that I hope to give figures later on tonight or this week in which I will indicate just how valuable to the province of Manitoba that concession is and it is worth millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, to this province. I think that fact should be taken into consideration when considering our relations with the federal government. There is a closely related item as well which has failed to receive much attention from the gentleman opposite and that is in connection with the other arrangements we have with Ottawa in respect of cost sharing that are in addition to our tax rental arrangements and which were the subject of discussion at the meeting held last July 6th of which he complained. Later on, I'm not going to do it now, but later I'm going to give the House at the proper time, the information as to just the extent of the changes that have taken place in cost sharing arrangements between Ottawa and Manitoba insofar as they affect the welfare of this province and they're to be valued, Sir, at many millions of dollars. It may surprise some members to see how high the figure is. So I think in discussing this matter credit ought to be given in respect of those two points to somebody. Certainly not to this government in any overwhelming way — we didn't increase it 3% as far as the personal corporation tax is concerned, we are entitled to no credit for that. We are entitled to some credit for some of the renegotiations and improvements in our cost sharing arrangements, because we had a part in that. And while I don't believe that it's any part of my duty to stand here to defend another administration, I do think that in ordinary justice recognition should be given to those improvements that have been made.

Now having said that, I want to, in an extent say that I made it clear to the federal administration when they first thought of this conference many months ago in March or February that Manitoba would not be satisfied with a conference that did not have plenipotentiary powers, That we would not be satisfied with a conference that didn't have the power to decide. And although my honourable friend doesn't like some of the language that I've used, I want to tell him that it was just as emphatic as any other that was used there and there were people of all political stripes. "I must say very frankly" -- I said "that the government of Manitoba believes the frequency of submissions and studies made by this province over the past decade and submitted again to the conference first convened by the present government of Canada in the fall of 1957, gave the full argument for immediate increases in tax sharing payments. Now we await decisions on these matters." I think that's pretty plain language, perfectly clear what I'm after, more cash, more money, and now.

That was the policy of the administration at that meeting. You go on to read the final paragraph in it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out from the Honourable, the First Minister that if my copy is correct of the submission, the wording is the frequent studies and submissions made by "the" provinces over the past decade -- not "this" province.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sorry, I'll accept that correction, but I think my honourable friend had some pretty good advisors which I was glad to inherit on this particular matter, and our argument was much the same as that made by previous administrations of Manitoba. No attempt to disguise that. No claims that we thought of anything very new or startling, although we do think that our idea for tax free provincial and municipal bonds for what's called social capital is a good idea, and would be very helpful in the financing problems we face and then again in the latter part of this document, I repeated our stand. The first order of business should be to agree on such interim adjustments in the tax sharing arrangements. We can then set the date for the resumption of the full conference as originally suggested by the Prime Minister some eight months ago. And further on here we urged deliberate speed not haste. However we cannot see the need for delay in reaching interim decisions on some items particularly those involving essential interim adjustments in our fiscal arrangements. So that while I'm sorry if my language doesn't please my honourable friend, it seemed to us at the time when those words were spoken that they were just as emphatic, I'd say more emphatic than the propositions presented by other provinces, that in spite of what my honourable friend says, we were the only province to speak in those particular terms asking for an immediate increase now, and then a consideration of these other matters and we did the best we could to present the case for the province of Manitoba. Now, we didn't get any money and I want to say frankly that not getting any money disappoints the government very much. We went there to get money. We didn't

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . get it. We say we did the best we could to get it and we will keep on working to do the best we can because we do feel that a broader sharing of these tax revenues between the provinces and the dominion is essential to get a proper fiscal relationship between the two partners of this confederation.

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

MR. ROBLIN: What did you say, Sir? Mr. Speaker, how did you call the amendment, please? Because if you indicated I was in favour of anything the Leader of the Opposition said, it's a little bit exaggerated.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion reads while concurring in the resolution No. 6, this House regrets the government has failed to obtain from the government of Canada any guarantee in the improvement of Manitoba's payment under the Dominion taxation agreement. Do we have the ayes and nays or another vote?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was recorded and the result was as follows:--

YEAS, Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Weir, Willis.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 19. Nays 31.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

Resolutions No. 7, 8, 8 (a), 8 (b), 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, were all read and passed.

Resolution No. 21 resolved that it be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$733,965 for education administration.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon that while concurring in Resolution No. 21, this House regrets that in spite of its many promises the government has failed to, firstly increase grants to school boards unconditionally by 50%. Secondly, provide equal opportunities for all the children of Manitoba. Thirdly, reduce the tax load on the municipal tax payers, fourthly, provide merit rating for all school teachers.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before the question is put on this resolution, and I do agree that it is to a considerable degree a severe condemnation of the government, but insofar as our group is concerned, we cannot support this resolution as it stands in its present form, particularly in respect of item no. 4 dealing with merit rating for all school teachers, because the matter is still under consideration with the Royal Commission, it's also, as we understand it under consideration with the Teachers' Society, and also the local school boards, and we think that it would be improper for us to support this type of a resolution dealing with a matter of such importance to the teaching profession and also to the general aspects of all education in Manitoba at this particular time, so therefore we are going to oppose this particular amendment and we have a resolution of non-concurrence on a subsequent one which achieves our aim.

Mr. Speaker presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost. Call in the members.

A standing vote recorded and the result was as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Weir, Willis, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yes 9. Nays 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 22. Resolved that it be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$22, 441, 950 for education. Education grants.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that while concurring in Resolution No. 22 this House regrets that the government has failed to assume a fair share of the cost of education and has left too large a portion to be borne by the municipal taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost. Call in the members.

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Shewman, Smellie, Stanier, Strickland, Thompson, Weir, Willis.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 19. Nays 32.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 23 was all that be granted Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$624, 935 for education Teachers' Training.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye that while concurring in Resolution No. 23 this House regrets that the government while promising not to increase taxes, has proceeded to make very substantial increases in the fees chargeable to students at Teachers' College and Technical Institutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll just be a minute. The government not so long ago promised greatly increased expenditures for education and at the same time the same government promised not to increase taxation in 1959. A number of government supporters were elected on the basis of this promise an impression was created among the electorate or among the electors that increased services could be obtained without taxation. I do not agree with that. Something for nothing. Now the government immediately upon election, turns around and does increase taxation by increasing fees chargeable to students that enter Teachers' College and Technical Institute. Of course my honourable friends across the way may say that this is not taxation, but I claim that it is. Any monies that the government takes or levies upon any individual is certainly a taxation. I claim that the government has broken faith with their electors, the government has broken another of its many promises, election promises therefore this House regrets that the government is increasing taxation by means of these increased fees.

MR. ROBLIN: I deny my honourable friend's interpretation of fees and taxation we'll have a fuller debate on it no doubt later on.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost. Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is motioned that while concurring in Resolution No. 23 this House regrets that while promising not to increase taxes have proceeded to make a very substantial increase in the fees chargeable to students at the Teachers' College and the Technical Institute.

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Weir, Willis.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 19. Nays 32.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 24. Resolved that be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,779,680. for education, student instruction. 25. Resolved that be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$63,375. for agriculture and administration.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan that while concurring in Resolution 25 this House regrets the failure of the government to implement the recommendation of the Indian and Metis report.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make my own position clear in this matter. It's a subject in which I'm very much interested I was involved with the honourable member for St. Boniface at that time when this report was first undertaken. I've read the report and I'm very much interested in what it does recommend, but in all fairness to the government I do not feel that they have had time since the report has been turned into them to proceed according to what this motion requests. I therefore do not propose to support this motion, but next year will be looking forward to definite works on behalf of the government in this matter.

MR. ORLIKOW: Not going to make a long speech. Had the government indicated any progress in this matter we would not have moved this today, but we have had a number of questions and the answers have been, to say the least, very slim in their

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it's not often that I come to the defence of the government, but I think on this occasion that I agree completely with what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has said that the report is voluminous, the measures recommended or discussed are quite voluminous and I would think that under the circumstances that it would be unfair to expect the government to have taken positive action in the time that has elapsed since its receipt.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman I'm not a bit surprised to hear that from my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition. In the past many reports of commissions have been tabled to his government and have laid on the doorstep of some minister's officer for indefinite periods. As my colleague from St. Johns has pointed out we appreciated too, to some degree at least the relatively short period this report has been before the government, but also we are of the opinion that some of the main recommendations in the report at least the House could have been informed that they were under active consideration which were not and the main purpose of this resolution is to draw to the attention of the government in this manner that we are anxiously awaiting developments in this report.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I should say a word too Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be left out of this round-robin. I don't think this motion of censure should lie at our door, the report has only been received a short time ago. The recommendations it calls for demand something before you take action and that is a thorough consideration of the procedure to be followed in implementing any part of this report and that certainly couldn't have been done when fighting a general election and conducting two sessions of the House. It certainly couldn't be done. To say that we have done nothing, or given no indication of our sympathy in this matter is not correct. We stated publically, this appeared in the press that the government did intend to implement portions of this report, and did intend to action upon it. And as proof of our intentions in the matter I can inform the House of a fact which I'm sure the Leaders -- the gentlemen opposite already know, and that is that we have hired the man that wrote the report to help us in discussing the policy that should be followed. We have already started him on some of the problems, immediate practical problems that any such change or improvement would have to face in one particular part of this province comes to my mind at the moment so while I'm in favour of clear-cut decisions on these matters as soon as practical; in my view it has not been possible to take action in the public interest in this matter in the way that some of my friends seem to indicate they expect.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): There were two sentences which I would like to say on this, but in view of the time I would like to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: 5:30 and I leave the Chair.