

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 14, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committee

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 23 Grade 5 students from the Robert H. Smith School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Trow. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. There are some 60 Grade 11 students from the Garden City School under the direction of Mr. Solar. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I would like to make an announcement to the House at this time. We all know that the taxpayers of Manitoba have put a considerable amount of money into agricultural research in the form of Capital Grants for buildings and facilities and also annually we vote a very substantial sum for current research programs. It's nice to have a harvest once in a while, having sown so much seed, and today I can announce that there has been a further development in the breeding of rapeseed at the university. A new variety has been licensed by the Government of Canada and a limited amount of this new variety of rapeseed will be made available to farmers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta through the Soils and Crops Branch of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Conservation. The name of the new variety is "Target." That's a pretty good designation in this day and age of moon-shots, etc.

Target was developed by Professor B. R. Stephenson of the Plant Science Department of the University of Manitoba by individual plant selections from the variety "Tanka." You will recall two or three years ago I made an announcement in the House with respect to Tanka and we had a sample that we passed around. Well this is a further selection from the variety Tanka. Selection was based on seed size, yield of seed, earliness and other agronomic characteristics. Target has substantially outyielded other varieties such as Tanka, Nugget and Golden. In addition, both the oil content of the seed and the protein content of the meal are higher than the other varieties mentioned. The increased protein content is an important consideration to seed manufacturers and this is particularly true of a large part of the product that is going into the export market. Another important point is that Target flowers four days earlier than Golden, Nugget or Tanka, and matures up to three days earlier than these varieties. It is expected that Target will replace Tanka as well as the other varieties.

Foundation seed of the new variety is being distributed through the Soils and Crops Branch, Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Conservation, 702 Norquay Building, Winnipeg 1, Manitoba. Cost of the seed is \$1.00 per pound. The seed will be sold in 50 pound lots with a maximum of 200 lbs. for each applicant. Cheques or money orders should be made payable to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, Province of Manitoba. The seed available for distribution is some 7,000 lbs. of foundation, sufficient breeder seed for at least four growers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta growers as they may require it. The suggested foundation seed distribution in Manitoba - 4,000 lbs, Saskatchewan - 2,000 lbs, Alberta - 1,000 lbs. The distribution is on a first-come basis by the Soils and Crops Branch.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture relative to his statement, Madam Speaker. I missed whether he said anything about the oil content of the seed. I noticed the protein content. What does it mean so far as oil content?

MR. HUTTON: The oil content - the yield in oil is higher than any of the varieties we have had to date.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the Red River didn't freeze certainly through certain sections of Winnipeg until very late this year - it was into January - and with the heavy snow cover it is likely the ice is quite thin, is there any consideration being given to opening up the channel so that the river can flow more freely and start flowing very soon and so reduce the flood danger?

MR. HUTTON: No. In view of the fact that the ice skin on the river is relatively light compared with other years, we don't anticipate any problem in respect to the ice-back.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, would there not be an advantage though to have it flow very early if it is thin? Could we not do something to get it clear now, or in the fairly new future, and thereby take away more of the water earlier?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, this is an argument that I can't pursue with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. My information is that we are fortunate, in view of all the unfavourable data that we have been gathering, we are fortunate in this respect, that we have a thinner layer of ice than before and we don't anticipate that aspect of the flooding problem to be too important.

MR. MARK SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a further question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Up in the north we were able to encourage the break-up of lakes up to ten days in advance of the normal break-up by putting either ashes or any black earth on the ice surface, and I was wondering if there has been anybody that has made this suggestion and has this been tried, because in view of the fact that it does encourage the break-up some ten to fourteen days in advance, is there any reason why this should not be tried? I understand it's not too expensive. Has the Honourable Minister given any consideration to this?

MR. HUTTON: Yes, I have discussed the use of either salt or charcoal with the engineers with respect to this problem but there is no decision that we have reached in respect to it, and as I say, this year the ice factor is not the important factor. Under some conditions it could be very useful, but from the information that we have, it would appear that this is a very minor factor in the problem we have to face.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Another question, Madam Speaker. I would imagine that the run-off would be a very important factor, to get it as early as possible, therefore could the Honourable Minister tell us as to the reason of the engineers' feeling that this is rather unimportant in view of the light skin of ice on the rivers. What is their reason for saying this is unimportant, because I do feel that a great deal of importance should be attached to this.

MR. HUTTON: The ice will be gone out of the river by the time that the flood peak arrives here. This is why it isn't a significant factor in identifying the dimensions of our problem. By the time the southern water, which is our real problem, gets here, the channel will be clear, and especially this year with the thin layer of ice that we have.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, a further question on that. Does that mean then that the Honourable Minister is suggesting that as far as the local run-off is concerned, it will all be taken care of before the flood waters arrive in Winnipeg? Is this correct?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I did not say that all the local run-off will have taken place. All the local run-off is not going to be affected by the ice in the rivers. It will take warm conditions to melt the snow and the ice in the country-side in our part of the watershed and get it into the rivers. That same kind of weather that will convert the snow to water and get it running will convert the ice in the river to water. Now to say that all of our water will be gone before the southern water hits us - no one can make that prediction. We should hope that this should happen, but the fact is that it's when we get weather conditions that bring about a simultaneous or a coincidence of circumstances, this is when you get a flood problem.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Is it true that the Monoca A. G. is a subsidiary of a U.S. space firm? And if so, could he tell us the name of this firm?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): There's no information I can give my honourable friend on that subject.

HON. MAITLAND STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table a Return to an Address for Papers, No. 3, under date of February 23 on motion of Mr. Peters - or Mr. Paulley, the Honourable Member for Radisson. And also, a Return to an Order of the House No. 11 on a motion of the Honourable Member from Radisson; a Return to an Order of the House No. 12 on a motion of the Honourable Member from Radisson; and a Return to an Order of the House No. 13 on the motion of the Honourable Member from Radisson.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Throne Speech contained references to The Vacations with Pay Act and The Workmen's Compensation Act. I wonder if my honourable friend can indicate how quickly

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . the House will be in possession of legislation dealing with these two matters?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): I can only tell my honourable friend - shortly, Madam Speaker. I expect them from the printers any day.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I would like to address two questions to the Honourable Minister of Education. Is the Honourable Minister aware that with respect to the Fannystelle School problem that he has, that the Defehr family are sending their children 11 miles to another school at a cost of \$49.00 a month plus transportation? The second question is, is he going to enforce The Public School Act at the Fannystelle School?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I have an inquiry being conducted. I enquired over the weekend and I was advised that I would have it tomorrow or the next day.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, members of my group have spoken on a number of occasions on this Order for Return and similar orders where the government is refusing to give what we consider to be perfectly legitimate information that the members of this House are entitled to have. Some of my colleagues have shown that members on the opposite side apparently have been able to get the information because they have used it in the course of debates, proving or disproving certain statements that have been made or certain proposals that were made by ourselves by way of resolutions, particularly with regard to No. 1 Highway between here and Portage la Prairie.

It appears that the government has also given this information to other bodies. We do not as yet have the reply insofar as our questions for an Order for Return in regard to correspondence with the . . . . . corporations. I understand that a number of the municipal corporations have obtained this information and it's perfectly proper that they should. Any municipal corporation through which a highway goes or where there's a particular road or bridge problem should be entitled to have this information.

Surely then, Madam Speaker, so should the members of this House. What can possibly be secret in information that the government gathers about the number of vehicles that are using certain roads? What could possibly make this a purely internal matter for the government? Why has this position been taken by this government, because it is a fact, Madam Speaker, that in previous days when there was another government on the far side, that information was given to the members of the House, and I have here with me the types of document that was at that time given to members of the House regardless of what side they sat on. This is a report - Diagramatic Traffic Flow Map, Department of Public Works, Highways Branch, 1956. There it was, Madam Speaker, outlining the traffic on every one of the highways of the province, giving the relative importance by the thickness of the black line, giving it in addition by a numerical figure, giving the average over a certain period of time. For the City of Winnipeg, because of the largest flows of traffic in the immediate vicinity, there was a special blow-up map showing exactly that section.

Now why, Madam Speaker, if this was valid information in 1956, given to members of this House, why should it now become a great secret? Why should members of the House be denied this information? There could only be one conclusion, Madam Speaker, for the insistence of the government, and that is that they are not following this one factor insofar as their road construction. Why else do they want to hide this information? I'm not suggesting that traffic flows are the only consideration in highway construction; obviously there are others in this question of giving service to various parts of the province. Quite obviously if there is no highway at all, you can't have a traffic count, and therefore if you based it strictly on traffic counts, isolated areas would not be obtaining any highway construction. My group are not saying that this should be the only criteria, but surely, Madam Speaker, it is one of the criteria. It is one of the criteria that the members are entitled to have.

Let me point out again to the government a resolution that was presented to this House by one of my members some four years ago. It was a resolution that No. 1 Highway between here and Portage la Prairie, one that is known as the death strip in Manitoba, should have been built into a separated grade with four lanes. The government voted against it. If my memory serves

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . me right, we brought it in a second year. We were unable, Madam Speaker, to get the figures. We couldn't prove how many cars went over that highway; we couldn't stand in this House and say, "There's the traffic flow on that highway by comparison to others where you have proceeded to double lanes or where you are proceeding with improvements on highways very close to one another." It would have been in the advantage to the people of Manitoba had we had that information, because we could have made our case that much clearer. The information that we had was, unfortunately, the number of people who died and were injured on that strip of highway. Those were the statistics that we had to depend on to make our case. The government voted against that resolution - voted against it. Undoubtedly they had the information, but they wouldn't give it to us.

Then what happens? Lo and behold, a very few months later, the government announces a crash program to build a highway to Portage la Prairie, a crash program that they had voted against on two previous occasions when the program should have been started. How many people died in the interval? Wouldn't it have been better if the government had accepted this in the first place? Wouldn't it have been better if the members of this House had in fact this information, so that the Minister couldn't say, "It isn't necessary to build that highway." Manitoba would have been better off had the government not taken the position that it took in this regard.

I say to the government now, this is information that we are entitled to have; it is information that would be of value to the House and of value to the people of Manitoba; and when they deny these figures, they can leave only one conclusion in the minds of the public and that is that they are deliberately hiding these figures, that they are hiding them - for what purpose. The only other conclusion is that they are hiding them because they are not following this as an index to highway construction. They have other indices that they prefer to follow, and this one, which is part of a sound program, they refuse to divulge to us.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: All traffic counts taken on Provincial Road No. 242, between P. T. H. No. 1 and P. T. H. No. 2 for the years 1964 and 1965.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Winney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17; nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that a humble address do go to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for a Return showing all correspondence between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the Canadian National Railways relative to the establishment of an integrated forest industry announced by the Government on March 8, 1966. (2) Copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the National Harbors Board relative to the above. (3) Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province of Manitoba relative to the above and showing in particular requests for: (a) financial aid in road construction, (b) financial aid in forest inventory, and (c) reduced freight rates.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam, subject to the usual reservations, we'd be glad to accept the question.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and (a) North American Wild Life Foundation for the years, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965, (b) Ducks Unlimited (Canada) for the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965, and (c) Ducks Unlimited (USA) for the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the House and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that this Address was accepted last year - last session - and I believe there was quite a length of time to answer the Address last year. Can the Minister or the First Minister give us assurance that this order will be answered this session?

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

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

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The number of automobiles, trucks, and other vehicles owned by the government or any Crown Corporation as of July 1st, 1958, and as of December 31st, 1965. (2) The number of operators of the said vehicles. (3) Policy of the government in respect to purchasing vehicles and length of time they are used before being replaced. (4) What restrictions are placed on the use of government vehicles when used by a government employee for his private use. (5) Is it permissible for members of employees' families to use the government car. If so, under what circumstances. (6) Number of vehicles rented by the government or any Crown Corporation or Agency for the year ending December 31st, 1965, and total cost of same.

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

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the details of all land and building -- Pardon me, I guess I have the wrong one, I've got two or three in there. Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) The number of loans made in 1965 by the Manitoba Development Fund in excess of \$1 million. (b) The number of loans in excess of  $\frac{1}{2}$  million. (c) The number of loans in excess of \$100,000. (d) The number of loans in excess of \$25,000. (e) The number of loans under \$25,000. (f) The number of loans under \$10,000.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I'd be very glad to provide the information. I'll request the Manitoba Development Fund to provide it right away.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) What flood-fighting material and amounts or numbers of each of the following: A. Sand, gravel, clay; B. Sandbags; C. Tools and equipment; D. Dynamite; E. Boats; and F. Other equipment; have been stockpiled at Portage la Prairie, Oakville, Elie, Morris, St. Jean and Greater Winnipeg, (a) as of March 1st, 1966 and (b) as of March 7th, 1966.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, insofar as this is question that refers to provincial materials, we'll be glad to accept the question. Of course we can accept no responsibility for getting the answers in respect to municipal or private stockpiling.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Copies of all agreements between Monoca, A. G. St. Moritz and the Government of the Province of Manitoba relative to the development of an integrated forest industry in Northern Manitoba as announced by the government March 8, 1966. (2) Copies of all agreements between any municipality,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . organized or unorganized, or local government district, and Monoca, A.G. relative to the above.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, only one question arises and that is whether we have in our possession the agreement between the municipalities and the company. Insofar as we have them we'll provide it.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Estimated costs of road construction required for the development of an integrated forest industry as referred to in the announcement by the government on March 8, 1966. (2) Estimated costs of forest surveys and forest inventories to be undertaken by the government in Northern Manitoba referred to in above mentioned announcement. (3) Estimated increased costs for fire protection in areas referred to above.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Stumpage charges now being levied on cutters in the various areas of Manitoba. (2) Costs of fire protection, if any, borne by any timber operators or pulp mills in Manitoba at present. (3) How are costs of access roads in present timber areas paid for.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Copies of all correspondence between Monoca A.G. and/or Churchill Forest Industries (Man.) and each of the following departments of government: (1) Mines and Natural Resources. (2) Municipal Affairs. (3) Industry and Commerce. (4) Education. (5) Highways.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: Copies of all agreements between Manitoba Hydro and Churchill Forest Industries (Man.) Limited relative to power supplies for an integrated forest industry in Northern Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that this matter be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1.) Copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the Manitoba Development Fund relative to Monoca A.G. Moritz and/or Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) regarding construction of an integrated forest industry in Manitoba. (2) Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Industry and Commerce and his Deputy Minister regarding the above.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, insofar as the questions may be answered under the statute and do not refer to privileged matters, we accept the order.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Dates of meetings held between representatives of Monoca, A. G. St. Moritz and representatives of Manitoba at The Pas, Thompson, Churchill, Winnipeg and New York regarding the development of an integrated forest industry in Manitoba. (2) The names of representatives for Manitoba at each of the above mentioned meetings. (3) The names of Manitoba representatives other than the Premier who attended meetings in Zurich, Switzerland with the President of Monoca A. G. (4) Copy of letter of commitment by company dated March 6, 1966.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we accept the motion subject to the question of privilege and also subject to the protection of the anonymity of members of the Civil Service.

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

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Whether land has been acquired for an overpass at the junction of No. 1 Trans-Canada Highway west, and the Perimeter Highway. (2) What the size and legal description of the land is. (3) From whom each parcel was purchased. (4) When it was purchased. (5) The amount paid for each parcel. (6) Whether all the land required has been purchased.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, I'll be happy to accept the order subject to matters that are still under negotiation.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The total amount of Provincial Highway Contracts awarded to Stratton Engineering for work in the area of the Perimeter Highway and the Trans-Canada Highway East. (2) The date on which the contract was awarded. (3) The dates on which this work was to commence and to be completed. (4) The penalties, if any, for non-completion. (5) Whether the penalties were applied. (6) The amounts paid to Stratton Engineering or to others on their behalf and the dates on which they were paid. (7) The amounts of holdbacks retained by the Manitoba Government and the dates the holdbacks were made. (8) The disposition of these holdbacks showing the name of those to whom they were paid and the dates on which they were paid.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for a Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the details of all land and building appraisals made by, or on behalf of, the Government of Manitoba, of the properties known as the Bain Estate, since 1960, showing in particular: (1) The date on which the appraisals were made. (2) By whom the appraisals were made. (3) The qualifications of the appraisers at the time the appraisals were made. (4) Whether in all cases, the appraisers were accredited appraisers. (5) What the basis of payment was (fee, per diem, or what). (6) How much was paid for the work. (7) The description of the property appraised. (8) What appraisal values were indicated for the various parcels of land and buildings appraised.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, the government is glad to accept this order subject to any privileged items or if there should be any items still under negotiation.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement in this regard. I'd like to point out that this was an Order that was moved last year on the 22nd of March and it was accepted by the government. The House sat then until the 11th day of May and undoubtedly a good deal of the information between the 22nd of March and the 11th of May must have been accumulated. There was a further point, Madam Speaker, that when the House rose, or shortly

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . before it rose, we asked at that time what the disposition was going to be of any outstanding orders, and at that time on a statement by yourself, you were to take this matter under consideration. The House rose before we had any report from you.

At subsequent meetings of the Statutory Orders and Regulations Committee, my colleague the Honourable Member for Lakeside and myself brought up the matter of these outstanding Addresses for Papers and Orders for Return. I pointed out that the Ottawa procedure as laid down in Beausheune was that the Returns did not lapse. They were not given to the parties or to the House members in between Sessions, but they were tabled at the next following Session. The members of the government at that time suggested that this should be looked into and there was some correspondence between the Clerk of the House and Ottawa in this regard. The first letter was inconclusive and the second letter clearly indicated that Ottawa followed that practise.

In view of this, the fact that these Orders and some of the others that have been moved today by my colleagues were on the Order Paper last year, that undoubtedly the government proceeded then to get the information and to get the authorization where Addresses for Papers were involving other people. The fact that, until the House sat this year, there had been no indication that these papers or these returns should not be submitted at this Session, I trust that the government really has all of the information now complete, because there has been ample time. So I would hope that we would be able to get the answers to these particular circumstances within a very few days.

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

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House showing: (1) Details of all land and building appraisals made by or on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, of properties in the Arts Centre area and in the redevelopment area south of the CPR line and east of Main Street, showing in particular: (a) the date on which the appraisals were made; (b) by whom the appraisals were made; (c) the qualifications of the appraisers at the time the appraisals were made; (d) whether in all cases the appraisers were accredited appraisers; (e) what the basis of payment was (fee, per diem, or what); (f) how much was paid for the work; (g) the description of the property appraised; and (h) what appraisal values were indicated for the various parcels of land and buildings appraised. (2) Whether any appraisals are presently being carried on, and (a) by whom the appraisals are being made; (b) what the basis of payment is (fee, per diem, or what); and (c) how much is being paid for the work.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, we will accept this Order except for matters that are privileged or presently under negotiation.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to make the very brief observation that the same applies to this Order as to the previous one I passed. It was accepted on the 22nd of March, 1965.

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

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the details of all land and building appraisals made by, or on behalf of, the Government of Manitoba, of the properties in the area of the Oak Lake Project and Pipestone Creek, showing in particular: (a) the date on which the appraisals were made; (b) by whom the appraisals were made; (c) the qualifications of the appraisers at the time the appraisals were made; (d) whether in all cases, the appraisers were accredited appraisers; (e) what the basis of payment was (fee, per diem, or what); (f) how much was paid for the work; (g) the description of the property appraised; and (h) what appraisal values were indicated for the various parcels of land and buildings appraised.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, this Order can be accepted subject to reservation for any items that may be privileged or under negotiation.

MR. SHOEMAKER: What my honourable leader said in respect to the two previous Orders for Return also applies to this one. I find on checking the journals that this Order went in exactly



(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . the way that it is today on April 30th, 1965, so that is nearly 10 months ago and it is to be hoped that we can have this information before the election. I suspect that some of the Orders will be withheld because of the election, but I sincerely hope that inasmuch as this one has been in for 10 months, that we can expect to have it shortly.

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

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Maps indicating the proposed boundaries of the Birds Hill Park. (2) Maps showing the land owned by the Manitoba Government at April 1, 1960, at April 1, 1962, as well as at April 1, 1964, within these boundaries. (3) Maps showing the land owned by the Municipalities at April 1, 1960, at April 1, 1962, as well as April 1, 1964, within these boundaries.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I would also like to give the information that this was asked last year and was passed on May 1st, 1965.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to have this item stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 20. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 20, an Act to amend the Public Libraries Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, there are in essence two things provided for in this Bill. One has to do with the matter of the quorum of a Board of the Library, and the second having to do with the date on which the estimated expenditures of the Library are to be submitted, and members will note that the proposal is to alter the date from the 30th of November to the 15th of January. This change is made at the request of the Library Association. They have found it somewhat difficult to anticipate their requirements as far in advance as the 30th of November because it relates to the next following year and it is considered advisable to alter it in the way that is provided for in the Bill, the proposed expenditures of course that are submitted by the 15th of January as provided for in the proposed amendment relating to the year which will have commenced on the 1st of January.

The more substantive matter is that respecting the formation of Library Federations and I would like to say a word or two about it. One of the problems as the programs of municipal and regional libraries have developed throughout the province has been the problem of having a sufficiently large number of people within the boundaries of a municipal library or a regional library to warrant the expenditures for books and professional services that would make for the best library services, and in this matter there has been a difference of opinion between the - if I may use the expression - professional librarians who understand the kind of service that they would like to provide, and the very real service that is provided by the municipal and regional libraries even though they may be small in terms of population and in terms of income, and there has been a good deal of debate about what ought to be done concerning this situation. It seemed unwise to alter the legislation that would make it a requirement to have a public library that, for example the population ought not to be not less than 25,000, because that would rule out in many instances, for all practical purposes, the formation of a library service and also prevent people who are now under our present arrangements receiving library services, prevent them from having them, and I think that we may say that the municipal and regional libraries are performing a most worthwhile service for their people, particularly the regional libraries.

So, Madam Speaker, we have designed what we think will meet these two situations, by proposing by this legislation the formation of what might be called a Library Federation, and very briefly, it's simply a plan, design, to enable municipal and regional libraries, if they wish to do so, to enter into an agreement whereby they will form a Library Federation, which Library Federation will perform such functions for their individual member libraries as they may decide and as may be agreed to from time to time by the members of the Board of the

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . Federation. It is not possible of course to foresee all of the functions that might be performed by such a federation, although one may suggest as illustrations, some of the functions that could well be performed.

For example, a federation might employ one professional librarian who would give professional advice and assistance to all of these member libraries within the federation. That would be service which might not be possible for the individual libraries themselves, but which would be quite feasible if supported by a number of libraries who had entered into a federation. The same is true with respect to the ordering of books. Certain books might be ordered by the Federation for and on behalf of their member libraries, and the processing, or cataloguing as I believe it is called, of the books might be performed for and on behalf of the member libraries but by the Library Federation, and other functions may be visualized. For example, another illustration is the possibility that a federation might, for example, purchase a bookmobile which would service a number of member libraries. That will indicate in a general way some of the things that might be done by a Library Federation on behalf of its member libraries.

It will be noted that the formation of a federation is a purely voluntary matter and will be initiated by the Boards of Libraries - either municipal library or regional library - but in each instance will require the approval of the municipal councils who are represented in the respective libraries. This has been done because it will always be remembered that our public libraries are based in relation to our municipalities. They are formed by petitions in local municipalities or groups of local municipalities and there are votes taken of the people in the municipal corporation, and each municipality within a library is represented on the board of that library by one of its own elected members being a member of the Library Board. So it is quite clear in the legislation that while the idea of joining a federation or forming a federation may be initiated by the Library Board itself - Library Board - they do require the approval of their respective municipal councils in order to proceed with the idea.

Assuming that a federation is formed, it will be on the basis of an agreement between those librarians that have joined the federation and that agreement will be enforced for a term of five years. It may be renewed at the expiration of five years if that is the desire, or may discontinue with that if they desire it as well. The federation will be managed by members who are elected or appointed by their respective boards to the Federation Board, and again it will be noted that one of the members from each of the member libraries must be a person from one of the municipal councils concerned, thus maintaining that working relationship which is part and parcel of the present Public Libraries Act. The work of the federation would be financed by contributions that would be made to the federation by the member libraries in accordance with the terms of their agreement, and that will be their own decision in that regard.

It will be noted that -- and one of the important things to remember is that the individual member libraries continue their separate corporate existence and there is no interference in any way with them in that regard. The bill of course contains the necessary provisions for the management of the work of the federation.

Madam Speaker, we believe we present this as an important extension of our library services. We are hopeful that it will meet the wishes of this House and also that it will meet the approval of a number of the libraries in the province who will see fit to join a federation under the arrangements set out in this bill, because we are confident that it offers a useful means of strengthening and expanding the work of library services generally throughout the province and also of the individual member libraries because of the expanded services they will be able to provide their own people; and it is on that basis that I recommend the measure to the House.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, just a few comments on the bill. I think it's a good one. I think it will have a great value in the future as we go along. Just last year two local libraries were established in our area. There was one at Winkler and one at Morden, and I can see where this federation can be of great value by the interchange of books. That will mean that less books will have to be purchased - or not duplication of the same books - so that in that respect it will be of great value as I see it. I also noted that there is no number of local libraries required in order to form a federation, so that this is left up to the individual member libraries.

Just one question, under 33 (e), it says "furnish books." I should like to get a definition from the Minister what he means by furnishing. Will the federation be able to order any books of its own or is that completely left to the member libraries to order these? I think we've had a good example through our film councils that form a federation of this type and we're able to

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . exchange films which are being shown at the various schools in our area and in this way could be interchanged, so likewise they will be able to interchange books at the local level. I think this bill is a commendable one and should have a good future.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 41, an Act to amend The Election Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I do not anticipate the same reception for this bill as for the last. As members will recall, the Committee on Privileges and Elections that was appointed at the first session in 1964 and reconfirmed or reappointed at the summer session of 1964, met during the year 1964 and early 1965, and the report of the committee was presented to the Legislature on February 23, 1965 and reported in Votes and Proceedings of that date. The bill, subject to two matters, the bill which is presently before the members follows that report. Now inasmuch as the report has been before the members since -- it was brought before the members on the 23rd of February last year and contained a large number of individual items, I shall not spend much time speaking about the bill except to try and illustrate some of the things which this bill in principle and policy endeavours to provide.

I think that it would be fair to say that in many matters the report and the bill is designed to bring The Manitoba Elections Act more in line with the provisions of the Federal Elections Act and there will be a number of instances that members will observe where this is the case, not to say that the provisions are identical in all respects but a number of the proposals have the effect of bringing our own Elections Act into line with the provisions of the Federal Elections Act. There are a number of what might be called I suppose technical improvements and clarifications, wording - perhaps somewhat better grammar in one or two instances - and I give an illustration. For example, the provision of a form for the acknowledgment of nomination papers, which is a technical item, is provided for. There is a good deal of simplification and improvement, both of documents and forms, and members in this connection will note for example a more simplified proclamation and a different form of ballot, the ballot following the form which is presently in use under the Federal Elections Act.

There have been removed a number of provisions which the committee considered were unnecessary. For example, the obligation which presently exists that people have to act as Returning Officers according to the terms of the Act, presumably whether they wish to or not. Well, the committee felt that that was an unnecessary provision and so the bill proposes that it be removed.

I would think that the principal matters, the most substance of matters in the bill have to do with the improvements with the provisions which will result in improvement respecting enumeration, and voters' lists and voting, and there are a number of measures all related to this general aspect, all designed to ensure better enumeration, better voters' lists, and provisions which more easily provide for voting on election day or at the advance polls which precede election day.

The provisions of the bill are, in effect, the results of the consideration given by the members of the committee, all of whom have had considerable experience in political affairs and in elections, to that general proposition. I of course would not present any of the changes in this general sphere as being a final answer. I suppose one could guarantee that somebody's name will be left off the voters' list or that errors of that sort will exist even under changes that are made here, and there will be other improvements of that nature no doubt made in the years that lie ahead. But in any event, there are a number of sections all designed for this purpose.

I should direct members' attention to two matters, one which is a matter that was mentioned in the report and one which is a matter which is not mentioned in the report. In the report there was a recommendation by the committee that the voting hours be altered from eight to -- that polls be open on election day from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and members will note that there is no proposal in this bill with that respect. As I alerted the members when presenting the report, that was an item on which perhaps there was some doubt with respect to legislation, and I can just say quite frankly that it was not considered advisable to propose any change in the voting hours, but I do direct the attention of the members to the fact that in that respect the legislation does not conform with the report that was presented to the House.

One other matter is in the legislation, and that is with respect to the provision of liquor after the close of polls on election day. This is an item, Madam Speaker, which was discussed

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . by the committee briefly, although no recommendation was made. This provision is in the bill respecting The Election Act and is a companion measure to a measure which we shall be presenting to the House for their consideration in respect of The Liquor Act itself, and if the provision in The Liquor Act were to receive favourable approval, it requires this companion provision in The Elections Act. It is there for that purpose and briefly is to allow the operation of the normal liquor licenses and/or permits after the close of the polls on election day. These are the two matters as I say in which, in a sense, the bill somewhat departs from the provisions of the report of the committee.

Madam Speaker, I believe that this bill is designed to improve the election machinery in the Province of Manitoba and I recommend it to the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the bill because I intend to support its going to the committee stage. We may have some further observations to make on specific sections at that time and some amendments to move. In general, we agreed with a good deal of the work that the committee did last year. We put forward some other suggestions that the committee did not accept and I'm sorry that that is the case.

We approached the committee's work last year with two general principles. One, that wherever possible, the provincial legislation on elections should be similar to the federal legislation, and wherever possible as well, the municipal should follow the same course. It is our feeling that there is a good deal of confusion in the minds of the public with regards to hours at which the polls open, hours at which they close, regulations on such things as advanced polls, who may vote and who may not vote, and that this standardization of our acts at every level would facilitate the second principle which concerned us, and that was to encourage the largest number possible to vote. We felt that simplification of the Act and standardization of the Act would achieve in many respects that second objective, that is encouraging the number who vote. It is indeed pathetic when you think of the battles that went on in past days to get the right to vote and run our own affairs, and then you look at the numbers who turn out to vote in present day elections.

There were a number of matters which we felt should have been added to the report of the committee which would have improved in particular the making up of the list of electors itself. It has been my experience that if there are difficulties with the list, the list is not complete and accurate, that this discourages many people from coming to vote on election day. It was for this reason that we recommended last year that there should be two enumerators used in the urban voting division under the provincial Act in the same way as is done under the federal Act.

The reason for that, Madam Speaker, is because with one enumerator only, which is the present practice, chosen normally by the party in power, that one enumerator can easily - and I'm saying this quite sincerely - not by any deliberate attempt at all but by pure accident - because it's one person working - could quite easily miss a street or miss a side of a street, or miss an apartment block. This was the case in 1962 when in certain of the city ridings complete apartment blocks had been missed by the enumerator. Well if there were two enumerators, which is the practice under the federal Act, one named by the party in power or the candidate - or I should say the member from the constituency - the party represented by that member and the other named by the other party who came second in the last election, I think this sets up the situation where there is a genuine attempt, because there's a dual party representation of making sure that everyone gets on the voters' list, and this is I think the place in which we must begin, that every name who is entitled to vote definitely gets on the list.

So these are the sort of suggestions that we made in the committee last year, Madam Speaker, and a number of these were not accepted by the government, which I regret, because it is most important in my mind to facilitate in every way that we can, consistent with having proper elections, to facilitate voting by people.

In addition of course there was some other factors of a different nature that we brought up and which we will be discussing later on during the session by way of other resolutions, and I'm referring to voting at age 18, which we felt should have been part of the committee's report but which was refused at that time and it is not part of the amendment now. We are bringing it in by way of resolution. But all in all, Madam Speaker, I believe that the Act represents a forward step in improving our Act and improving the techniques by which we are going to make up our lists. I think we could go further but we are prepared to accept what there is here for the time being and let it go to committee.

I'm a little perplexed by Section 98 of the Act and I hope you'll excuse me while I select

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . one section, Madam Speaker - I realize that I should be dealing with the Act in general principles but I think that this does come down to the principles - because that section says that with the exception of Section 58 - and that section will be on a day fixed by proclamation - that one section, on a day fixed by proclamation, but the remainder of the Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal Assent.

Now why is there a division between these sections of the Act. Section 58 of the Act I take it is the one that the Minister referred to which establishes the question of liquor outlets being open on that day. It would seem to me, and this is by very casual reading, that the balance of this Act may not be put into effect for some time. Now does that mean that the next election which has been heralded for the fairly near future according to my honourable friends at their meeting last week, does this mean that this Act will not be applicable to that great event which I look forward to, or does it mean only that one section will be applicable at that time. I'd be interested to hear from the Minister exactly what the intentions are in this regard.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned -- adjourned unless the Honourable Member from Rhineland wishes to speak.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 50. The Honourable the Minister for Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I request the indulgence of the House to allow this item to stand.

MR. BAIZLEY presented Bill No. 53, an Act to amend the Labour Relations Act (1), for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, there are three important changes proposed by the amendments to this bill. Firstly, we are introducing a new method of dealing with cases where it is alleged that either an employer or the union has interfered with the right of a worker to join an organization of his choice, and under the amendment the Manitoba Labour Board will be authorized to hear such complaints, to issue cease and desist orders, and to order reinstatement of the employee in his employment. Secondly, we've come along to a much maligned subsection (3) of Section 21, which is the strike vote being conducted by the Manitoba Labour Board. We would ask you to support the repealing of that and we are making provisions that the strike vote shall be by secret ballot. The third important change is that we are attempting to encourage the parties to select mediators -- where the parties will agree to a mediator, the cost of the mediation will be paid for out of public funds, and we feel that this is a help in labour-management relations.

Now there are a couple of other minor changes which are for clarification. One is arbitration procedures for the settlement of disputes arising out of collective agreements and these are continued in effect during the period when an agreement has expired and a new agreement has not been concluded, or until a point in negotiations where the parties have the right to strike or to walk out legally.

Another change is prohibited acts by unions and employers. This is clarified and it also gives the employers the right to freely express their views and particularly their views about union organization at the time that unions are in the process of organizing - freedom of speech.

Madam Speaker, I would commend these amendments of The Labour Relations Act to the members of the House.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I wish to advise the members of the House that we will be supporting the bill but I do wish at this time to advise the Minister that I will be proposing an amendment in respect to the secret strike vote. I know the Minister has gone half-way what the Woods Committee recommended, but he did not go all the way. I'm glad to see that the government is following the Woods Committee recommendations on unfair labour practices; and, Madam Speaker, these are the very recommendations which we proposed to this House last year, because if you refer to Hansard, Page 1432, this is what we said the government should be doing in respect to The Labour Relations Act, which now becomes a prohibited act.

We did say that "Jurisdiction over enforcement of Labour Relations Act should be placed under the Labour Relations Board" -- I'm quoting from Hansard, Page 1432, Madam Speaker -- "The Labour Board to set up a procedure similar to that of Ontario where upon receipt of a

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . complaint under The Labour Relations Act, it immediately sends officers to investigate, to attempt to resolve any dispute. This provision is especially significant in relation to allegations of unfair labour practices. (3) If the complaint is not resolved, the Labour Board to hold hearings and to make a determination, the Board to have the power to make a cease and desist order to reinstate an employee and order compensation for loss of earnings." We said, "These provisions are in line with what already is in force in many of the other provinces in Ontario, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan," and I said I hoped our Honourable Minister would give some consideration to these points. That was part of our resolution as far as certification procedures were concerned.

I believe this is good legislation. The key to these provisions is the idea that unfair labour practices be dealt with and if possible be resolved by a field officer, the Labour Relations Board only interfering only where it is necessary. I also said last year that officers should be of highest calibre and should have training, and at that time we also recommended that the government maybe set up an industrial relations department at the university or the Institute of Technology to train people for this type of work.

I would like to refer at this time to the Woods Committee on Page 6, and that's Appendix C, "Joint Recommendations on Unfair Labour Practices," and I would like to just read a few sentences out of it. It says, "Legislation similar to that examined in Ontario is also in effect in British Columbia, Quebec, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia. Sufficient time has not been available to examine the results in these provinces, but experience in Ontario seems to reflect favourably on these procedures. It is true that approximately 150 cases a year on the average are filed with the Ontario Board, and it is not unreasonable to assume that Manitoba will not have more than 20 or so cases to be filed." Well, this is the point where I would like to disagree to the Minister. I would at least like to make a recommendation because, in my opinion, I feel there will be more cases in Manitoba largely because employers do not fully recognize the need of trade unions in Manitoba and the second point is because many of our shops are quite small. The reason I make this point, I feel that the government maybe should be giving some consideration to strengthening our Board, perhaps maybe making three of the members on it permanent as a permanent staff, so that they'll be able to be more full-time and to deal on it and be on the job at all times. That's one of the points that this bill deals with, this Labour Relations Act.

The second point that I would like to make some remarks about is the secret strike vote. We did have a resolution on this for the last two or three years and at that time we did say that the secret strike vote was not necessary; it was insulting to the trade unions and it should have been repealed. Now the Woods Committee, if we turn to Page 4 in that section, the Woods Committee - it says right in the book, a new section - "A strike vote taken by a trade union shall be by ballots cast in such a manner that a person expressing his choice cannot be identified with the choice expressed." Notice the two most important ingredients in this section, Firstly, it says, "taken by a union"; and the second point, "secret". This is what the Woods Committee recommended.

What is in the Bill? In the Bill there's no mention - it says, "Every strike vote taken shall be by written ballots cast in such manner that the person voting cannot be identified with the ballot he cast." It doesn't say how this strike is supposed to be taken, by whom, where, by Government or Union. There's no reference in this bill as to who is going to take the strike vote, which is not the same as the Woods Committee recommended.

There's another section that I would like to also point out. It's point 4, which concerns me and I think this is the biggest thing that I think this bill is going to give us problems, and that is the voting constituency in every strike vote is the bargaining unit represented by the bargaining agent. We all know that in most collective agreements there is no "closed shop." This means that not all of the employees in a plant or shop are union people.

Now picture the situation where a union bargaining on behalf of employees, with the employer looking only to its membership for guidance, reaches a point where it wants a formal opinion on whether to hold a strike or not. The union executive wants formal authority to call a strike. The executive decides to strike, that the strike is advisable. Ordinarily you would expect only the union members to vote on this issue, but Section 21 (4) makes the voting constituency of all employees in the shop or plant whether they are union members or not. I think this is going to cause quite a problem, because picture the vote being taken by a union, no doubt in a union hall or in a labour centre, can you see non-union men coming in to vote? If they do come, you can feel the atmosphere. Any experienced labour man will tell you that you are inviting trouble, and personally I don't think it is going to work. So I'm going to propose an

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . amendment to this section that it should be the union taking the strike vote and it should be the union members alone.

But I would like to quote from - which I think is really expressed quite well by Dudley Magnus, whom I personally feel is probably one of the most expert labour reporters in Manitoba, and this is what he had to say on the recent article in the Woods Committee suggestions -- and this is what he had to say and I think he makes a good point. "If amendments are passed as is through the House this Session that there will not be a union vote in Manitoba but as at present an employee vote, the great difference of course will be that the union will conduct an employee vote where and when it pleases, not the government. There may be some difficulties here because the non-union worker, a likely 'nay' in the strike vote, won't be too welcome at a strike vote meeting of the union members in the Labour Temple or Union Centre. Furthermore, the average non-union men or women will not be over-anxious to attend a union meeting. Union meetings are often held with a warden at the door who first wants to know who it is who enters. 'I'm not in a union, but I have come to vote', might be received with mixed feelings by many union members and this is going to cause trouble."

Now he goes further to say, "I asked R. J. Bud Henderson, President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and a member of the Woods Committee about the situation. He said he didn't like it at all, that the idea was to do away with the present section. This is a step forward, and we propose now to go further for improvement." And I think he makes a really good point.

Madam Speaker, this brings another point to my mind. I'm glad that the government has followed some of the recommendations of the Woods Committee, but we have been making these recommendations to this House for many years. What about the points that the Woods Committee and the management and labour do not agree on? I wonder if this government is going to show any leadership in this point and take any action. It's easy to say, well we'll fill this out to the labour management and let him study it and bring recommendations, we're going to do what they say, but there's many areas where I am sure they do not agree on. This government should show some action on what their policies are. We did. At least our group has said what we felt about the strike vote, what we should do in certification matters, and I am glad to see that the government has taken our recommendations into consideration, but I do serve notice that I will be making an amendment on the point that I mentioned, where the strike vote to be taken should be taken by unions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 57. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, could we have the indulgence of the House to allow this to stand.

..... continued on next page

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

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

MR. EVANS: The Honourable Member for Hamiota, Madam Speaker, will take the Chair.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 (a) Passed --

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Education had some other replies we were waiting for before we leave the salaries. It seems to me . . . .

MR. JOHNSON: I think I gave a rather complete reply to the honourable member concerning the extent of the French and Français upon introduction to the system. I think one of the other questions he asked was "Are private schools as good as public schools?" As you know, a child must either be in attendance at a public school or otherwise enrolled in, under the School Attendance Act, a private school, and the inspection really - the departments involvement is simply to the extent as to whether or no they give the equivalent in education or a minimum standard of education as compared with the public schools. The information I received from the department is many are very excellent, others much like many public schools, vary. I imagine it's the staff and -- I am sure there are certain public schools that wouldn't measure up to certain private, and vice versa. But generally, it is felt they give a satisfactory standard of education.

The reference to the appeal against - refusal of a Board to agree with another Board for instruction. As you know the individual school boards can determine within their own areas those courses which they will offer in their schools, and I believe they are looking at certain amendments of the Act re inter-divisional and inter-district co-operation or sharing of services, etcetera. But this again is something which -- in their own jurisdiction local boards are the authority within their district as to those matters.

There are certain amendments coming forward with respect to, for example with the introduction of regional vocational high schools where several divisions and districts would have to share one vocational centre, because we would have to have enough students from -- it would take about 3 to 5 divisions in order to produce or to fill a 500 classroom count vocational centre, so further amendments re inter-divisional matters will be coming before us in the legislation.

I was trying to recall further questions the Member from St. Boniface asked. If he would jolt my memory when I sit down I would be happy to try and answer further. I tried to look over most of the questions and generally, I think I referred to a good many of them.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for the added information, answers that he just finished giving us. He had mentioned something about television and I had agreed that there was an awful lot that had been done in television, but I made a comment or suggestion that we should look immediately in the proposal that a T.V. station for the field of education should be started, be promoted at the University grounds, and the Minister didn't see fit to comment on that, but that will be fine. I still think that this is something that should be done.

Now I'm not too satisfied with the answer that I just received re the appeal to the Minister. I know what's going on now. This is why I mention it. I think that in this case the people should have an appeal. There's been a few cases where people were not satisfied with what was done by the Local School Board, and as this is only permissive legislation, as we understand, it seems to me that in certain cases, we are going to have this equality of opportunity for all, I think that in certain cases - I'm not suggesting that things should be done automatically, I'm just suggesting that the Government should, if they're responsible for the administration of education, and certainly this is the case, I think that the Government should have a final say. We should be able to lodge an appeal with the Minister, and this is what I was suggesting. Of course the Government is free to accept this or reject it. There's something -- a note that I had taken when the Minister was talking about television. I think he said that the Province which had more to say would get the grease. I think he meant by that, that whoever had a little



(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... more pull. I think that in this case -- and I'm not blaming him for this, because he has done an awful lot in this field since he's there, but the former Minister didn't ask for any grease at all. I think that the main thing -- that whoever got in line first, because it's either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick that received value over \$1 million dollars before any other provinces took advantage of this. This is quite a while ago that we had suggested that. But this is water under the bridge anyway.

There is something that I feel that's very important, and I would like, this is something that can't be done from one day to the other, and I don't expect -- or in a question of days I should say, -- I don't expect the Minister to give me any commitment at this time, but I would like him to take this under advisement and think of this very seriously. A few weeks ago under the Estimates of the Attorney-General, I made a few comments, few remarks, about lawyers and so on, and I did say at the time that a lot of the things that could be remedied could be done if the people knew a little more about things. Well, at the present time we have courses on pretty well everything and we're talking about others on training the students in certain places to drive, which is very good. Certain places -- oh, there's all kinds of things, certain things that are used to develop the mind and so on of the students, certain things that they might not use too much in a way, but still it seems these courses are good.

I would like the Minister to think very seriously of introducing another course and this could be done. I think that if we showed the lead in this, I think that in no time the people all across Canada -- if it's not done. I don't think it is done anywhere -- would follow our lead. Now, I think that sometimes somewhere there should be a course where the people will know just the fundamentals of how to manage their homes. What I mean by that is what happens in ordinary life that the ordinary people don't know a thing about. Some course that will have to do with the common thing in law for instance. How many people know what a mortgage is, or the different types of insurances; or a bond or an option. I think that this would be very important, that we should have a course -- I don't know exactly the administrators -- the educators could tell you this -- but I would like the people that know more about it than I do to study this very seriously, and when a young person gets -- and preferably in one of the -- not wait till they're in university and so on, cause a lot of people don't go to university, don't attend university. But I think that most of the young people getting married should know all about a mortgage, should know all about a bond, should know all about leases. Believe me there's an awful lot of people that don't know about that -- and some of us here in this House I am sure. If we knew a little bit more about that, and if we knew our rights and if we knew what to expect from the law I think it would be very interesting. I've discussed this after my remarks as you can well understand -- I received a few remarks from other people also -- and I've discussed this with a lot of lawyers and it seems that after awhile I'd lose them or they'd lose me because their intelligence is, at least in this respect, is above the ordinary people. They're trained in this business of law and automatically they think they know the answer, but the ordinary people don't know these things, and I think it would be a very good thing if we would have a course. I don't care if it's one period a week, it wouldn't be wasted, where we can discuss insurances, the type of insurances, because every single person should have that -- a bit of the income tax, the tax structures in our country, and -- well as I said, the mortgage or the payments, whatever you do, what to expect from a lawyer. I think the Minister knows what I mean, and I would like him to think about this and maybe next year, I hope, come in with a recommendation.

Now there's another point, Mr. Chairman, that I'm not going to be too long on. It's this question that I brought in about this teaching of French. I was hoping that the Minister would make some statement because once we leave these estimates we won't come back on this, not for this year. It seems we do this every year. It's true that the Leader of the NDP has asked for some questions on this Windsor Park affair, but these are only questions and the only chance we'll have would be to ask questions before the Orders of the Day. I would like to -- well, first of all, I would like to know, I would like the government to be able to let the public in on this. Did the St. Boniface School Board break the law or did they stay within the law, in all this episode? Because you don't just close your eyes now. There's been a lot of things said, there's been a lot of adverse publicity, and I would like to know if this is the case.

Now, I would like to remind you -- as I said before that things like this we shouldn't play too much politics on this. I think that we started this whole thing wrong in 1963, and I would like to go back a little bit. In 1963 in this House I suggested this following resolution, Mr. Chairman, and I quote from Page 305 of March 15, 1963, three years ago tomorrow, and the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... motion was this: "I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that whereas Canada is a bilingual country, the true extent of which has not been adequately recognized in the past, and whereas Canada will be celebrating its Centenary in July of 1967 and every effort should be made to recapture the spirit and basic concept of our confederacy, and the best method of so doing would be by promoting and encouraging bilingualism in this province; and whereas provision has been made in our Public Schools Act for the optional teaching of French starting from Grade 4; and whereas psychologists maintain that the best time to teach a child any language is up to the age of ten years; therefore be it resolved that provision be made in our Public Schools Act for the optional teaching of French from Grade 1".

Well, Mr. Chairman, this wasn't too controversial I thought and as I said at the time I certainly was not advocating that French should be forced on anybody, but I felt that at least we should make the teaching of French available here in a bilingual country for those who were interested in it, and I felt that the number was ever growing. This is some of the things I said at the time, and I said "Today in French I praised the First Minister," and I'm quoting now from the speech of that date, "for his interest in the French language; for his willingness to speak French; for his lack of prejudice. I have congratulated him for being perfectly bilingual. I meant it and I have not had a change of heart since." This was in 1963. "This man has probably done more for our cause by his example than most of us here. This I recognize, but because of his statement and because of the timing of his statement, I must explain the reason for me bringing this motion. I must assure you Madam that I am more interested in the result than in the credit here. I do not deny that the Honourable the First Minister has always been in favour of the principle spelled out in this motion, and I must also admit that all the members of the Liberal caucus were in accord with me when I presented this motion"-- and this is a point that I wanted to bring out. "In fact I haven't heard a single member of this House object to it. Of course I haven't been speaking to all of them. I would not like to see us argue childishly to see who deserves credit here. I don't think that this is a motion where we should indulge in this kind of debate but rather we should demonstrate a good example to the rest of the people of Manitoba by presenting a solid front. The four party leaders in the federal campaign recognized the value of bilingualism to our country. The Honourable First Minister indicated many times that he does. Mr. Campbell did the same thing when he instituted the optional French from Grade 4 and saying this was just the first step. Yes, all of us are in favour I am sure, but the fact is that at the present optional teaching of French from Grade 1 is not allowed and this motion would rectify this wrong."

Well, if you remember, Mr. Chairman, after this is something that -- oh, I remember after that there was a speech from the Member from Brokenhead at the time, Mr. Schreyer, and he certainly favoured everything that was said, no partisan politics in here, and he finished by saying, therefore -- there had been an amendment by the Honourable Member from Rhineland who withdrew it later on, and this is what he referred to, but he said: "Therefore I" -- and this is Hansard, Page 805 the same year -- "I suggest that we pass the resolution in the form that the Member for St. Boniface has proposed it, I could not bring myself to vote against the amendment if I thought that as result of that the entire thing would be defeated. So I suppose we shall support it if there is no other alternative, but I simply point out that we would be much happier with the original motion." He was speaking for his Party again. Well, to our surprise the -- as I said the other night, there was an amendment brought in by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, and he started by saying that "I should like to compliment the honourable member on the broadminded and non-partisan way in which he approached the very important subject of teaching of French in the schools of Manitoba, which I was very flattered; but then he says: "The desire of the Honourable Member of St. Boniface to get things started is fully appreciated and I believe understood. It would however, not be proper for the Department of Education or School Boards to announce their intention before plans to operate the change are completed." And then what I referred to as a wishy-washy amendment, and I'm not going to read all the "Whereases" because it's the usual thing, but the important thing in the motion was "Now therefore be it resolved that this House approves the action taken by the Minister of Education and recommends that the Department of Education continue, in co-operation with the Advisory Board, consideration of extending the teaching of French in the Manitoba school system."

Well, do we realize what this means, or what this meant? There were three parties anyway that were ready to go ahead with optional teaching of French from Grade 1. This had

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... been done gradually from Grade 9 and Grade 4 and so on -- it was Grade 1. And then at the time, I think that the government was wrong -- again it was the former Minister of Education -- I think it was wrong, because all this motion did -- and nobody was going to be stuck with this, there wasn't going to be any politics, because two parties were absolutely in favour of this. Now this was asking the members of this House to approve something. It was something that would be included in the Act, the Public Schools Act, the optional teaching of French from Grade 1. Well, for some reason or other, the government at the time did not see fit to accept this responsibility. This is what I said then and this is what I repeat. So it brought all this -- swung all the responsibility on the shoulders of an Advisory Board. Well, let's see what happened then. Well it was obvious that something would come in, I thought, and I wasn't disappointed in this fact although what came in did not please me. It was on July 4th that -- I have here from the Tribune that: "Français now optional from Grade 1." It was the Advisory Board. And right on the first line it was, "Beginning in Grade 1 for those whose mother tongue is French" that was the key thing. Now the government brought this in. This was an announcement by the then Minister of Education who is now the Attorney-General, speaking in Brandon, and this is what he did -- there's quite a bit of the declaration here, but I can read the thing that I'm mostly interested in. It says that, "In conformity with the resolution of the Advisory Board the government is now embarking upon a new program in the teaching of French for the pupil whose mother tongue is French; the new course to be known as Français has been approved and will commence in September 1963."

You see this is the point. I'm not suggesting that the government wanted trouble at the time, or anything like that. I think that they meant well, but it was a mistake that was recognized at the time. It was a mistake and in the Tribune of the next day they had different comments. Mr. Andrew Robertson, Chairman of the Winnipeg School Board praised the new course as long overdue and promised to fight to make it available to all students -- but not just to those with French descent. And the same thing, Emerson Arnett the general secretary of the Manitoba Teachers said: "I regret that the course will be limited to students of French descent," he said. "I don't see the reasoning in that at all. I can't see why it should just be started in Grade 1 this Fall."

Well, when I saw this in the newspaper, Mr. Chairman, the government had done something, something recommended supposedly by an Advisory Board. Well, I can understand an Advisory Board bringing in certain administration problems and certain things like this. We're not expert on that. But the principle, the principle -- I had asked in 1963 that we recognize the principle, and this was our responsibility here in this House, nobody else. This was our responsibility. This wasn't done. So in July of that same year this is what we were faced with.

Well, Mr. Chairman, just to indicate that what I said last Friday was not politics or anything like that, I'll read a letter that I wrote to the Premier on the date of July 16, 1963, immediately when this announcement had been made by the then Minister of Education. "Dear Mr. Roblin: Since 1959 when I was first elected as a representative for St. Boniface to the provincial legislature, I have many opportunities to hear you enunciate your views on bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and in particular in Manitoba. During the last Session I was disappointed when the government saw fit to amend my motion, a motion that if passed, would have recognized the principle of bilingualism and also one which would have provided the law makers of this province with an opportunity to show leadership and recognize the principle of the two official languages of our country in the true spirit of confederation. The amendment brought in by a government member left the responsibility of acting on the principle with the advisory board, for there was no doubt in mind at the time that before the next full term your government would legalize the teaching of French in Grade 1. The statement made by the Honourable Minister of Education on July 4, 1963 surprised and disappointed me for the following reasons: (1) French can now legally be taught in Grade 1 only to students whose mother tongue is French -- no provision is made for non-French students who want to learn French. (2) No mention was made of improved teacher training to develop qualified French teachers. (3) The delay in legalizing French teaching in Grade 2 and 3 is unnecessary. (4) No steps are being taken to make French a teaching language. In view of the great importance of the question, Mr. Premier, I wish to present the following recommendations for your consideration: (1) The immediate official recognition of the principle of optional teaching of French to all Manitobans in all Grades. This would leave each individual School Board free to make its own decision. In order to make this first recommendation possible, the government

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... should immediately take the necessary steps to train qualified French teachers. (2) May I bring to your attention the fact that the St. Boniface College would be in a good position to carry out this program for the Manitoba Teachers College or as part of the Manitoba Teachers College. This could be done without complication since the St. Boniface College is already affiliated with the University of Manitoba. (3) In view of the fact that, at the present, the Department of Education stated that it is not in a position to offer further French courses to those whose mother tongue is not French and also because a special program is being prepared for the French speaking student, it would be a good occasion, a very big step forward if the government were to declare French a teaching language for certain subjects such as History and Geography. This of course, for the time being, would be restricted to children whose mother tongue is French, and would be optional. I've taken the liberty of forwarding this recommendation to you because I feel that the subject is of such great importance and should not suffer because of partisan politics. "

This is what has transpired, Mr. Chairman, starting with this resolution. Its the first one that I heard dealing with the French language since my election to the House in 1959. I think it was a mistake then, and I think that the government should recognize this. It's not a question that I want to crow. This is not the thing at all. Or play politics. I think that maybe the government meant well - the then Minister of Education meant well. But we can see that this has not worked. It has not worked because the people of Manitoba don't like the idea of a course just offered to a certain group. Now, I will say -- I'm not certainly, as I said I'm not going to play politics and try to stay on both sides of this business.

I think that the word segregation has got an awful lot of mileage in this province. When I say that I favour some of the - that I'm concerned about some of the points brought out by the Citizens Committee, I feel that they should not - those that meant it, those that were sincere - that they should have a chance, an occasion to learn French also, that everybody - it shouldn't be just a certain group. I agree with this. If these people are sincere. Now, as I say, segregation -- you can push these things too far. If you want to forget about all -- I say it is impossible not to segregate at all. And if you're going to bring segregation, this is just a way then, all right the majority will rule, absolutely. And this is the best -- this is the only way. You could have no rights for minorities of any kind, if this is the case.

Now, you have segregation, this might be far fetched, but you have segregation now in University. You have the students studying law on one side and medical students on another side. Well this is all right. You have segregation of worship, or you have no liberty of worshipping. You have certain segregation. The point - I think its bad to earmark only a group can do this, but if a group wants to take advantage of some liberty of some right, to worship for instance or to study law or to study French, or to study something else, I don't believe that this is discrimination. And I don't think that the government -- I will say this in all sincerity. I'm sure that the government did not intend to segregate these people at the time - the students. But I think that the government was wrong because it did not approve the principle here in this House. I think that the government was wrong although they were advised at the time that we needed French teachers. The government did very very little to do anything about it. What I say now and what I said in '63 is still the thing to do - to try and get the Minister to give me some figures. There is some retraining, but I don't think that is enough and this is one of the reasons why I'm so interested in the TV -- the use of television in education. I think that if we're going to have that and if we're going to have -- I don't believe that French should be forced down anybody's throat, I'll repeat this again, -- but I think we should have the teachers - qualified teachers, and we'll have to develop them. We're not doing enough in this field and we started too late and I think that the only way - then we'll be able to offer it to those that want it. I think this is the word - I agree if we talk about segregation that only a certain group of people can have this. That I believe is the kind of segregation we don't want. Now it will take a while before we qualify this -- but these things won't be done from one day to the other.

I have another Bill in front of the House and I had it last year and it is a pretty well a companion bill. Last year when I brought in this Bill, I felt that, in my innocence I guess, that there wouldn't be anything wrong, politically it wasn't going to hurt anybody to at least approve the second reading of this bill. I couldn't see what else we could do; we could vote for or against a principle in second reading. I could understand in committee the government coming in and say, well, we'll make a start. But the principle would be approved; the principle of really bilingualism, of getting a chance. Then of course it might take ten years to come into effect because you have to - you can't do it in a - it's - got to be done in an ordinary way. And it's possible the government said

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . all right this is fine we approve the principle and then this would be behind - we wouldn't spend all the time fighting on these things and we wouldn't get all this adverse publicity. The government might say all right we can't do anything else we're going to start now maybe on social studies. This is what I want with this bill. This is not to embarrass anybody. Neither in '63, neither in '65 or neither this year. I just want us to show -- to give leadership and to show a little bit of the class of the people that we should have here in Manitoba and to show that we're sincere; that we don't just read the paper and talk about separatism and that we are going to be the biggest separatists of them all. That we are looking not only as Manitobans but we are acting as Canadians. And this was recognized; and this is one of the reasons why I'm shocked when I see some of the members of the cabinet, and especially the First Minister, who make these flowing speeches, these wonderful speeches somewhere else and will not take the responsibility that he has right in this province or in this House - to enter the debate.

As I said, maybe these things are a little difficult, but we've got to face them. So my purpose today is not to embarrass anybody, I think that we have to look at the mistakes we've made. And I'm not accusing the government. I'm accusing the government in '63 of not having done anything about it because it was brought in by somebody else, - that I'm accusing. But the government must remember, and I've quoted this many times and I'm ready to do it again, that in 1958, starting in 1958, the First Minister said, after the next election. Well that was in '59, but he had spoke in '58 that he wanted to see the day when every single person in Manitoba would speak French and English. And he said that in '59, shortly before the - and in '62 again that we would have French teaching in - and it was only in '63 that I brought in the first resolution and I tried to bring it in in a most non-partisan way that I knew how to do. This is all I'm doing again this year. I'm ready - and I think we should forget all this.

I think that the Minister of Education -- the only reason why I brought in this today -- I mentioned a few things on Friday and I thought that the Minister would make some statement. And he has to make some statement. We can't let the estimates of this department go by and all these things without any statement. I think the people of Manitoba are entitled to know if the School Board of Winnipeg have been acting in good faith - of St. Boniface I should say. They didn't say - it wasn't their idea to say that teaching of Français is only for those whose mother tongue is French. It wasn't those people at all. This is the instruction they got, and I think that this is why I said before that the Minister of Education has to stand up and say, we decided that, the government take responsibility, and if he feels they were wrong, well we were wrong. But don't blame the school board. Then you wouldn't have all this adverse publicity that we're having and all these fights - and boy I can promise you a lot of trouble if this keeps up at the next election of the school board. It will be a question of French against English. And we're trying to unite this country, not to divide it. So I think that the Minister in all sincerity, without any embarrassment, I think he should make this comment. And I think that as soon as possible, I would suggest anyway, that the government would replace this term for those whose mother tongue is French and give everybody, who are qualified mind you. I think there should be an entrance exam, but everybody. This is what I wanted in '63 and this is what I want now. Because if I go in my little corner and even if I speak beautiful French, it's only part of it. I want the people to understand, to have a chance to speak French, to realize that we're not that bad, we're just the same kind of citizen as anybody else; and that we love Canada the same as everybody else.

You can see the people from Quebec coming here, and I was talking to one not too long ago, and all he had been taught was to hate the English people. It wasn't just the English people, it was "le maudit anglais" (the damn Englishman). And when he was here a couple of years he realized how ridiculous that was. Because he had a chance to see. This is what I'm asking, that we give a chance to the English-speaking people to see what the French people are. And look at this exchange of students that we're having now. This is one of the greatest things - for Confederation; this is the greatest project that we've had with the . . . . Christian and Jews doing now, the exchanging of these students. I haven't heard one complaint. They all think it's terrific. The Attorney-General himself who was the Minister of Education a few years back lived in Quebec, and he came back and he thought it was terrific also. He was all enthused about this. Why do we have to fight over things like that? Why do we have to play politics over things like that? Is that anything to do? Who wants national unity? Just the Liberals? Just the NDP? Just the Conservatives? I don't think so. I don't think there's any need to be embarrassed on a thing like this. I think that we should get together. I hope that this bill that's

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... going to come - I hope that this time it's really thought of and the government, the Minister of Education will see that there's no trap, nothing set for the election. The French people here in Manitoba do not control one single seat and I in St. Boniface included, in any provincial election, provincial House. If anything this is going to go - where I'm trying to play politics here, I'm hurting myself and I'm hurting my party.

I'm just making a plea for national unity and I think on this thing that the Minister should tell us now or sometime in the House, all right the government will recognize that this is not what they wanted at all, they're going to change this, and it will not be French for those whose mother tongue is French anymore. It'll take a while. In principle it won't be, maybe in practice it will be for a while, but at least the principle will be accepted. In practice it will be because until we get more French teachers it'll have to be and until these other people start learning some French they won't be qualified to take this French. So it's not going to change that much for those people that are sincere. Those that are just looking for a way to use the word segregation or anything else, they won't be satisfied. Let's not make bones about that; they will complain. But I don't think that we're going to just study the delinquent or the people that are trying to tear this country apart. I think it is time we looked at the other people what make a true Canadian tick.

I think this is the important thing and I would therefore then Mr. Chairman, ask the Minister to make a statement absolving the -- which I think anyway should be done unless there's certain things I don't know -- but absolving the School Board of St. Boniface of any wrongdoing at all. They followed what they thought is the law as set out by the government. Certainly it wasn't the idea - I know enough of those people, and I know that they don't think that French should be only for those whose mother tongue is French alone. Then the government -- I don't know, I think should be done immediately, in this Session.

Now if the Government wants - if they feel that this is not working - a lot of other things have been changed because they didn't work. It's not admitting defeat or admitting anything wrong for a government or a Minister to say, "Well, this is not working too well, let's try something else." I don't think that he'd be hurt politically in this at all. If the government and the Minister feel this way, I think he should announce that from now on this will be taken out of there "for those whose mother tongue is French," and it will be for those who can qualify to take this course and for those who are willing and would like to have this education. This is all I can say on this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some more comments on the Minister's salary. There are a few questions that were not answered the other time when I spoke, and also because of the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund coming under the Resolution of the Minister's Salary, and I have certain questions on that one as well.

On the previous occasion when I spoke, I asked several questions in connection with the TRAF, or the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund changes, whether there were any changes in coverage; whether there were the same privileges of withdrawing; and whether or not requests had been received from teachers to stack the Canada Pension Plan onto this Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund. And also, the question of what happens to the funds being held by the present Retirement Allowances Fund now that it is integrated. Does the Canada Pension Plan have any authority as far as investment is concerned? Will there be any interference on their part? What portion of the funds that are being paid go to the Canada Pension Plan and will not be retained by the Retirement Allowances Fund? Just how is this integration going to affect the plan? Are any of the funds going to be removed from this section?

Then I also note from the Financial Statement as contained in the Department's report on Page 158, that there are a terrific amount of withdrawals. I notice here that the statement says that there are \$610,324 that were withdrawn from the Fund. This represents well over 20 percent, I think around 22 percent. What is the reason for this? Is this because of the female teachers leaving the profession, or what's the cause of this, because I think this is almost an abnormal amount to be withdrawn from a plan.

Then I also noted that our Account B is almost depleted after you pay for half the cost of the pensions in a given year. Last year half of that cost amounted to \$677,501, so all that was left in Account B was \$89,696. Supposing this account will be overdrawn next year. How is it replenished or how is it accounted for?

I notice also on the following page a list of the various stocks and Government Bonds being held by the fund but there is no yield given, that is in percentage of interest. I think

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... this would be of interest to the committee to know what the different bonds do yield, because we know from other funds, where the investments were made in earlier years, that the return is much smaller. I also note from the report that the average yield runs around five percent which is, I think, a fair return. These were some of the questions I had in connection with the Retirement Allowances Fund.

I asked the Minister the other day how the team of school inspectors - how it was working out and what were the benefits that accrued from having team inspection of schools, and whether this was going to be extended this year. Also in connection with that, we have a very short report in the departmental report on the General Course, which is very brief. Is this one reason why we have team inspections, that we brought in the General Course and that we wanted a better evaluation? Just a little more information on the subject I think would be valuable to the committee.

Then in one of the - was it in Highlights or was it in the other report that we got - there was mention made of a possible two-year teacher training course. Could the Minister give us a little more information on that, because it seems to me that this could act as a deterrent in teachers entering the profession if they have to go through a two-year training course before they are licensed to teach. This would also naturally mean the cost of teachers' salaries would be higher because the cost of training would naturally have to be reflected in the salaries paid to the teachers. What is the intention? Is it to have the two years in two consecutive years, all in one, or would there be an intermediate period whereby they would gain some experience and then later on continue for another year of teacher training.

One further question I have is in connection with bursaries. In other years we have been told that a considerable number of bursaries were not spoken for and were left over. I haven't checked the report too closely on this for this last year, but I have people coming to me and telling me that they have applied for bursaries and have been refused. Is this the case? Can we not accommodate all people that do apply, or what percentage of the people that do apply are refused a bursary? I think this is something that should be looked into because one of the people that approached me on it had passed his high school and he was teaching. He is attending university now and he intended to write a thesis and he wished to have some money to spend in order to do some research work. He had applied for a bursary and had not been able to get the necessary funds.

I would also ask the Minister whether we could probably have a display of the new textbooks that are being issued. Probably these could be displayed in the Library and members could, at their leisure, go and have a look at them. I think this would be worthwhile, and this could probably be arranged.

These were a few of the items that I thought I would ask the Minister because we are still on the Minister's Salary and especially since the Retirement Fund Allowances are covered by the first motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I could hardly be accused of holding up the Minister's Salary because I have not made one comment to date on the Department of Education, but I would just like to know whether or not I missed the Minister's reply to a certain challenge that was made by the Honourable Member for Emerson. I thought I heard him recommend that as regards to Phase No. II, that it would be to the advantage of everyone in the Province of Manitoba if a province-wide referendum was held rather than to allow the various divisions to proceed with a referendum as provided for in Bill 39.

Now I know that I have spoken to many trustees and many school teachers who have said that the Bill 39 is completely unworkable. Now I don't know whether it is quite that bad, but my guess is that up to now just nobody - nobody has complied with the necessary provisions to provide for a referendum. I don't think that one vote has been held in the province yet.

The Minister, I think, said that a pilot project would be carried out in the Interlake to see how a school division would work that embraced elementary education and secondary education. Now surely we have had one division, if you want to call it that, in the province that has had 20 years' experience in this regard, and I refer once again to the Dauphin-Ochre area, and you will recall, Mr. Chairman, because I think that you spent the same number of years in this House that I did, of a very interesting discussion that I had with the present Attorney-General and the former Minister of Education on this whole subject. Because if you go back to 1959 when the province was voting on the recommendations of the Royal Commission and providing for the setting up of the various school divisions, the Dauphin-Ochre area were allowed to delay or postpone their vote to November - I think it was - whereas the rest

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... of the Province voted in February, I believe, and then during the campaign in Dauphin which was carried out about October and probably the first part of November, the then Minister of Education and the member that represents that area went out and advised his own people to vote against his school division plan because he said that what they presently had and what they had since 1946 was really in effect a lot better plan than the school division plan. Mr. Chairman, I see my honourable friend the Attorney-General's ears are now picking up, and I hope that he will not interject this time as he did six or seven years ago because I'm satisfied that in the interval that he has at long last conceded that it was a better plan than the one that we presently have. I agree that it is a better plan, but seven years ago he denied it. He denied that it was and he denied having said a lot of things that he said out on the hustings prior to the referendum up there.

Now I asked as long as seven or eight years ago, when could the rest of the province expect to receive the same consideration that the Dauphin-Ochre had enjoyed for 20 years? It looks to me as if my honourable friend the Minister of Education is now providing for the same consideration for the rest of the province when he introduced Bill 39 a year ago, and then when we received the second phase program here the other day. So I think that this is a step in the right direction but it's 20 years late, it seems to me, because it is exactly 20 years since the Dauphin-Ochre area was implemented.

I don't often read from the Dauphin Herald because I don't get it, but I just happen to have a copy of the Dauphin Herald in press Wednesday, January 26. The editorial is quite interesting on this very subject and it's headed, "By the Way. By the way, we read with interest the news report about the historic meeting of the executive of the Provincial Teacher and Trustee Organizations to consider joint action on current problems facing Manitoba's public school system. The two resolutions they unanimously adopted call on the Provincial Government to do two things which few people in Dauphin-Ochre area system would quarrel with, to take steps aimed at bringing both elementary and secondary education under the authority of the Division Boards which would then administer what we have known for nearly twenty years as the Area System, and to substantially increase the province's financial support for the public school education," and so on, and there's a whole editorial on it. So this just points up what we have been saying most of the time, that here is an area that has enjoyed for twenty years a system of education that we are now going to bring about, and of course -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and a few other places. Now twenty years ago - twenty years ago, surely this government was not in power, and surely twenty years ago the government of that day had some foresight in the field of education.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is one other question that I'm still waiting for some comments on. Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Honourable Leader of the NDP and I are both speaking to the Minister, or whether he's listening to him and not me. -- (Interjection) -- Well, whatever suits the occasion. I see you are yawning there but I don't often sleep and stand up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter to which I have not yet received an intelligent reply, either at the last session or this session, because I have said that I rather endorse a lot of the statements and comments and recommendations that a fellow by the name of Bobby Bend made and continues to make on so many occasions, and I know that my honourable friend knows of which I speak. But what the whole theme of a lot of Bobby Bend's messages seem to be, "What in the world is the point of a fellow having to have first year university if he wants to be a barber for the rest of his life," for instance, he says. "If he can cut hair and if he can change a dollar bill, well surely he doesn't need all of this high falutin education." Well, I still haven't received an answer from my honourable friend as to whether or not he endorses some of Mr. Bend's ideas.

I noticed, Mr. Chairman, that an ad that is currently in some of the papers put out by the Department of Education, Vocational Branch, Special Training Opportunity, it states that applicants must have - this is for certain courses - applicants must be 17 years of age and have completed Grade 11, or the consent of the principal. Now I wonder what does that mean? It says that you must have (a) have completed Grade 12; or (b) the consent of the principal. Now this suggests that maybe if he had Grade 9 and could pass another examination that he might qualify for admittance to MIT. I don't know. I could send it over to my honourable friend if he would like to have a look at it.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I will have some more comments to make when we get down to school tax rebates and other items that are most interesting I see, but there's one other one



(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... that I might ask at the moment. You will recall, Mr. Minister, that I said of a meeting that I attended at Neepawa on January 28, that one of the speakers - I think it was from the Department of Education but it may not have been, he may have been a school teacher that made this comment - but anyway someone made the comment that 50 percent of the children that are presently attending our elementary schools will be called on to fill jobs that are not yet created, and I think I saw my honourable friend the Minister nod his head in the affirmative on that one when I was speaking a month ago on this subject.

Now I asked the question then and I ask it of the Minister now, whose job is it to determine and to assess what the job requirements are for the future and then to train the people and our children and students accordingly. I am not certain whether this little booklet that each and every member has on his desk, or should have there, came from the Department of Education or not. It's called the "The Educational Research," and it's enclosed with a letter from the Canadian Council for Research in Education. Perhaps the Minister can tell me when he replies whether or not this was published under the authority of the Department of Education, and if it was not, then what is he doing about the recommendations that are presented in it, because it looks to me as if there are some pretty valuable recommendations and comments in it. So, Mr. Chairman, I will look forward to receiving some comments from my honourable friend on some of these questions.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I think I should treat these in reverse order of their presentation. I think that the honourable member who has just spoken, with all respect, I don't think he really understands Bill 39 or what was attempted last year. Bill 39 follows the Dauphin-Ochre plan only as applied to divisions. Within the Dauphin-Ochre area the individual municipalities, by a percentage of the electors, voted in the Dauphin-Ochre plan. Within divisions, Bill 39 made it possible for a division to vote in a similar type of plan.

One year ago, at the joint trustee meetings of the two organizations which I attended, one organization at that time voted about 147 to 135 for the idea of a divisional fiscal control being taken over and districts left with certain duties as outlined in Michener. In other words, that short time ago there wasn't a very wide consensus even amongst many of our divisions and trustee and districts in the province that they would favour the kind of plan that a legislation like for instance is being proposed this year. For 20 years it's true that the Dauphin-Ochre has been in operation and has been successful and the people are happy with it, but I don't have to rehearse the old hat that the amount of leadership that his group gave to the pushing of the Dauphin-Ochre area type of scheme in their time. It was on the books, it was permissive legislation, but there was no hard sell at any time. That's what led to the divisional vote of 1959, and we are now approaching this year, and I don't want to go back in history for ever, but I sort of felt he was talking out of both sides there and giving Bill 39 a rough treatment and yet falling back and saying the Dauphin-Ochre plan is still the best.

I think now on the books you will have both plans. You will have the Bill 39 method of bringing about fiscal control and you will have the several methods. What we're doing in Phase II actually is opening the Act right up, getting away from the all or none principle that has existed in the past, and the legislation that'll be before you will provide for several methods by which fiscal control may be vested in the divisional board. Individual districts will be able to come in, and when a certain number are in, 50 percent, a referendum will be held. All this, the Trustees Association of this province agree, and the teachers feel as we do, that there must be an active educational campaign to precede a referendum. I am convinced that in certain areas of the province where large consolidations have been effected in the last few years, that the trustees of these districts may not be just ready for fiscal control at this point. I think we have to have a vigorous campaign.

The government is taking pretty wide leadership in transferring all official trustee districts to divisional boards; in transferring closed districts to divisional boards; permitting districts to come in by a petition of 20 percent of the present electors. Any one board can give up its control under those circumstances. The procedure will be set up and when 50 percent are in, as I say, you can have a referendum - when two-thirds are in - and then over and above all that, if in any one division, such as Beautiful Plains, 20 percent of the resident electors want to give up all fiscal and all control to the central authority, they may do so. We think in many cases we will have to move into divisions with a comprehensive educational campaign to acquaint the people with the implications of Phase II which involves the creation of Technical Vocational outlets for the boys and girls to further extend equality of opportunity.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... This is the whole point of the exercise.

The Interlake is being treated as a pilot project to see what happens when you mandatorily put commissions in to a district, map out the elementary consolidations and determine the sites of primary and secondary schools within an area, and see if this is acceptable and works. I think we're going to go very rapidly forward. However, I don't underestimate the problems. This is no easy task. I take up the challenge on behalf of my colleagues. We think we must do this at this time.

I think the member must realize that also this is evolution as I have said in my statements earlier. We are not saying everything in the past is bad. I think the Manitoba Educational system has grown by evolution. It's almost at the stage of coming to a revolution, and almost a revolution is necessary in local administrative matters for the administration of small schools, and I think everyone is becoming cognizant of this. I think the people are in the mood they're in today because for twenty years the people of this province that have been in the department have been going out to meetings across this province. I don't think that this is -- I think that the position is clear in that regard.

The honourable member wonders what I -- the remarks of the gentleman he mentioned re why is it a kid needs Grade 11 to cut hair. Because this is 1966, the second half of the 20th century. That chap has to live with his neighbours; he has to live in a modern society; he has to be adaptable to the future. Surely to goodness it's the responsibility and duty of this department to take every mother's son as far along the academic trail as we can. Surely to goodness the whole purpose of the curriculum explosion in the last while that I have been recounting for several days has been to provide alternative outlets for boys and girls. I don't think it's enough for a barber to be able to count on one hand. Maybe that's all he'll be able to do, but surely to God we've got the responsibility of doing our best to bring every child to the maximum of his achievement.

Certainly it's an idealist's goal, but it's one that we have pursued in this province, and I hope we will continue to pursue in the future. I think we must realize that we in this province, educationally as elsewhere, have been traditionalists in the past. I think we have conducted an excellent stream for the child who had the ability to follow a purely academic course on to university. I think we are recognizing today that we must find these multiple outlets, that we mustn't make it too easy for a kid to drop out of school. We must make the whole purpose of this curriculum business, and this is in response to world-wide development. We must do our best to maintain the interest of the boy or girl and carry him as far along the trail as we can. This is our job. This is the job of the Department of Education. This is what we spend all our time doing. This is why we need more and more guidance and so on.

There's a lot of truth in some of the things the gentleman says and I'm not discounting them for one moment. I think to bring emphasis and to be provocative in this area is a good thing, but let's keep our balance and our goals in mind. The honourable gentleman from Neepawa wondered about job assessment, when we don't know today what the people are going to be working at five, six, seven years from now. Again I say to him, this is precisely why we must take every child into a course that he would succeed at and give him alternative outlets; namely, to bring him as far along as we can so that he will be adaptable to these new jobs for re-training as they open up in the future.

Certainly in job assessment, this type of work is done by the Department of Labour in Ottawa; it's done by the departments here in government. We have innumerable advisory committees at the provincial and local levels. We have committees in connection with each school. We have a committee in connection with each trade, and these men are practical men who are in the field doing this work every day and these are the men who are advising of new techniques and what have you. For example, at the moment we have an in-service training program I think there are seven or eight in it, who are on the job, training with a particular upholstery firm learning - the member from Radisson would know something about this, I don't - about new techniques, training in particular techniques that is progressive and so on.

We're going by -- this information is disseminated across Canada. Our boys who walked out of our technology last year - our first class graduated two years ago. One of the boys wrote me the other day, he is making over \$800 a month in Toronto in some factory or other.

I might point out in assessing jobs, we are in constant touch with industry, and I have a particularly interesting note here from the Aluminum Company of Canada who were writing to our officials in the Manitoba Institute of Technology, stating how pleased they were to receive a man who had taken pre-employment training with us in some basic skills. He was

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... six months at the MIT, went to this company who trained him for a particular process in their plant, and they were writing to us and telling us how well prepared they thought he was. He also asked in Canadian Council for Research and Education - I believe that pamphlet comes from the - is a publication of the Canadian Council who are supported by the Canadian Educational Association and the various Departments of Education across Canada, in some degree. I think there is a small amount in my estimates which supports this proportionately with other provinces across the country, and research in this area is constantly going forward of course.

All our people are attending all the major meetings in Canada in Manpower Development. We are quite mindful of this. As a matter of fact the Ministers of Education across Canada will be meeting in June in Montreal, to meet with the leaders of industry and members of the Economic Research Council to find out -- we feel in education that we've got to go more to industry and tell industry of the programs and policies that we have to train people for them and to find out what their needs are, and every department in government is going into the act. And education feels it has a continuing role in the development of our courses and so on. There is constant liaison I can assure the honourable members in the House between industry -- between practical people in the field, and both at the local, provincial and national levels.

With respect to the member for Rhineland, there is one question I would like to look up and give him the information as concerning a specific item in the Annual Report; but with respect to legislation there will be I believe, certain amendments to the T. R. A. F. Act to further bring it into line with The Civil Service Act, with respect to the - when benefits are paid under the Civil Service Act. I think after 35 years a person gets 70 percent of his best salary over the previous 10 years, and this is being brought into concert and will be brought forward soon.

With respect to the integration of the Teachers' Plan, they sent us a brief which we discussed with them, and as you know we have constantly tried to keep the Manitoba Teachers' Pension Plan into concert with the - or into alignment with the Civil Service Plan, and both the Teachers and Manitoba Employees Association agreed to the integrated plan. This particular matter will cost the Province of Manitoba, with respect to this particular matter, around \$580,000, which is in the estimates this year. This is the \$60.00 formerly paid by trustees and trustees will now pay their 1.8 percent of the teachers' contribution, the employer and employee - the teachers still pay their 6 percent, 1.8 percent goes to the companies - the Canada Pension Plan contribution, and actually works to their advantage. It's an advantage plan over the present one, and adjustments were made to make it fair and the teachers agreed with the adjustments we made. The details I haven't got before me. I'm not sure just what this withdrawal he has mentioned here is about - I'll check on that. I wasn't aware of anything of this nature.

School inspections: The team inspection experiment which we tried in five divisions in the south-west corner last year, has worked admirably. Actually the inspectors within each division are responsible for elementary inspections, but insofar as secondary education is concerned they go in as a unit into each school and following which their recommendations are made to a senior inspector who can give a more - to try and get away as much as he can from any subjective inspection. The senior inspector of the group files a report, a copy of which goes to the trustees of the division concerned, or the school board concerned, and one copy to file. This is being extended throughout the rest of Manitoba this year, and Winnipeg has had team inspections but we are extending this plan, it is going to go right across the province in the coming year.

The general course: I don't know what more information I can give the honourable member. The course if in full implementation insofar as text, syllabi, and what have you, is concerned. It's a first class course. I hope he gets out and sells it with the rest of us. I think every member of this House must realize it is one of the alternative courses which we must have in our system. It will be the basis of our technical or vocational high school academic program. It's being considered, as I said, by the university. In that connection, I should mention that in addition to an articulation committee between the department and the university people, who have been meeting over the past year since we last sat, we have brought in -- bringing in professional people, or teachers, from the high schools of the province who are teaching these various courses and who can assist our central committee in explaining the problems to the university people, and in bringing about the kind of integrated high school program that we are aiming for. I think as the university accepts the general

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... course in certain areas, that we will see more and more outlets open up, and I am just as anxious as the honourable member to see this happen. I think it's a first-class course, and I think our teachers will come to accept it more and more. Every teacher I have spoken to who is teaching this course, thinks it's excellent. The kids like it. The kids are seeking - and it's like anything else that's new - this status business. And this is the sort of thing we've got to at least fight with one voice.

The two-year teacher training program: We have given this problem - much discussion is going on. Our Teacher Education Committee made up of member representatives of the Teachers Society, trustees and others, as I announced some time ago, is working with the university. Of course they're on this committee, and we have asked them to determine how we can best phase in a two-year program. I don't know - I hope I misunderstood the honourable member - sure we may have to pay a little more for a better trained teacher, but that's the point of the exercise. That's what the whole business of education is all about. To get the best people and I think quite frankly, that - we had some apprehension in transferring Teachers' College to the university - we wouldn't get the enrolment in the first year. This has not been the case. Where they have gone for the two-year teacher training program in other provinces, it has not resulted in less applications, but my information is, it's ended in more.

And it would be hopeful that the Education Committee can so arrange the two-year program, that people get a year or two towards their degree; probably one year towards their degree and one year of their professional training. After another year, or two summer schools, they might be able to get a Bachelor of Pedagogy. And then if they go back and take a full year, they'll get their Bachelor's Degree. We hope to make it as flexible and integrate it as much as we possibly can. I would hope my honourable friend would support the two-year teacher training program as an absolutely necessary step. The Social Credit Party of Alberta and B. C. have had this for some time and they are quite pleased with it, and we are certainly going to have to pick up a hiatus as we move into it in filling our teaching needs. I don't think Ontario is headed in this way, but I am certain that we are going to have to move into it and I have asked the Committee to give me recommendations in that regard.

I've got some more here but I'd better .....

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.