

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, February 3, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I wonder if I might direct the attention of the members to the gallery. We have 100 students of Grade 8 standing from the Norberry School under the direction of Mr. Dewar, Mrs. Cummer and Miss Lebit. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. On behalf of all of the Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Second Reading of Public Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's) presented Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this bill in exactly the same form was presented last year and the idea occurred to me as a result of two specific happenings. One was a number of discussions that were held at the committee on consumer protection and consumer credit matters of this Legislature where this specific problem was raised a few times and discussions were held on it; and the other occasion was a more personal matter where I was involved as a member of an arbitration board dealing with a discharge of a person who was discharged because a garnisheeing order had been issued, I think for the second or third time in some period of time, and his employer discharged him.

What disturbed me very much was that the Arbitration Board majority decision was to the effect that garnisheeing orders, matters of this type were within management's prerogative and therefore the Chairman of the Board ruled that management had the right, and then went on to say that he was critical of management for having asserted that right, that he felt it was too great a punishment, and because this matter was protected by a collective agreement the Chairman of the Board then ordered that the man should be reinstated with a certain amount of loss of pay and of seniority, both of which I thought was ridiculous, because here was a man who was obviously having financial troubles, and compounding his financial troubles was the punishment resulting from his financial problems, and the punishment was that he took a loss of several months' pay.

But I brought it in last year and it came in later in the session, namely, because it didn't occur to me to bring it in in this fashion until after the meetings of the Consumer Credit Committee had continued for some time, and as a result it stayed on the Order Paper and came to the attention of this Legislature seven days before we prorogued. It was brought up before us at midnight, or so I assume, because the House adjourned immediately after the vote on this bill at 12:05 a.m., and bearing in mind the lateness of the hour and the lateness in the session itself, I noted that last year all the debate that took place is reported on pages 2047 and 2048 of last year's Hansard. I note that I spoke briefly, I think I spoke not longer than I have already spoken; and then one of the members of the Legislature for the Liberal Party spoke very briefly, asking a question or two; then the Honourable Minister of Labour spoke, also very briefly, and what he said, although brief as it was, seemed to have aroused me where I spoke at some greater length; and then the vote was called and the vote revealed that the members of the Official Opposition and the members of the New Democratic Party voted in favour of the bill and the government voted against it.

I can only assume that the vote took place as it did because it was late in the year and the government caucus probably didn't have time to go into this adequately, and I suspect that the Honourable the Minister of Labour didn't have time either to review it carefully because I will not embarrass him by repeating what he said then. Should he still feel the way he did then, no doubt he will say so, but I do feel that it did not get proper consideration last year and for that reason I brought it in verbatim into this year's proposed bills.

I want to stress that this, to my mind, is not a question of labour-management problems, labour-relations at all. I believe it is a matter that deals in the question of consumer protection and it deals with the question of a person who has fallen so far behind with his debt retirement plans as to have a judgment against him and people after him for payments of money, and if and when we get the Orderly Payment of Debts machinery lined up, now that we again have the legal authority to have an Orderly Payment of Debts office in Manitoba, that this problem will not be as acute. Nevertheless, there are occasions where it would still be applicable, but in the last number of years it has been a very serious threat to a person who had a judgment against him to be told that if he doesn't pay in accordance with the manner in which the claimant

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) wishes him to pay, and unless he goes through the machinery of getting a Judge's order - and as I say I hope that problem will be eased - then there is a threat that a garnisheeing order will be issued against his salary, and knowing his relations with his employer, he may either feel secure that his employer will be understanding of the problem or he will know that it might be policy in that plant that there would be automatic dismissal. I am not raising this in a speculative manner because the fact is that there are certain employers that do have a policy saying one garnisheeing order and out you go; some have a policy saying two garnisheeing orders and you go out after the second; but indeed, whatever the policy is that affects garnisheeing orders, it could have very serious ramifications - well, very serious dangers to the employee.

Now I recognize that most employers are considerate. Most employers when this situation occurs call in the employee and even plan with him an orderly arrangement whereby he can pay his debts, and will very often get in touch with the creditor or his solicitor and usually things are worked out pretty well. But there are occasions when, as I say, there is maybe policy, and you know once you have policy it is very difficult to be flexible; or indeed you might have an arbitrary employer who doesn't care very much and doesn't have enough feeling to worry about his employee and then he just says: "Out you go, it's too much trouble; it's too much bookkeeping trouble." And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the law provides that an employer who deals with a garnisheeing order has the right to take \$5.00 out of the employee's salary to compensate him for this bookkeeping to which he is put and I know of no employer that has ever taken advantage of the law, but nevertheless if there is an employer who wants to, the law is there to permit him to take care of the bookkeeping involved.

I think though that there should be some indication of the feeling of this Legislature on this question of garnishment orders, and the way the bill is worked, the principle behind it is that there shall not be a justification to discharge a person because of the service of the garnisheeing order. I think I have indicated that the danger to the individual is great. If he is discharged, well that's something like capital punishment, he's finished - he's out. Under the law there is no way by which he can appeal for reconsideration unless he gets down on his knees before his employer because it is a unilateral act, unless of course there is a collective agreement which may provide for a grievance procedure in the event of any punishment and indeed in the event of a discharge, but even when there is a collective agreement, I believe that there ought to be an indication of the displeasure of the representatives of the people to leaving to management the right to discharge on a garnisheeing order being issued. I point out to you that a garnisheeing order has no relationship and in no way affects the man's ability to work. The way in which he does his work is in no way affected by whether or not he has been served with a garnisheeing order. Of course if he is afraid of a garnisheeing order, then his work could be affected; if he is afraid of being discharged, then his work ability could be affected.

Those of you who are familiar with the change made in The Labour Relations Act last year will recall that Section 6 (a) was brought into The Labour Relations Act giving the board the power and the responsibility of investigating or enquiring into complaints that are made because of discharge, discrimination, or any other form of intimidation against any person because of something that is done contrary to the Act. The section actually reads: that, "The board may authorize a person to enquire into a complaint that the employment has been discontinued, contrary to this Act as to his employment, opportunity for employment, etc." The idea is that a person who is discharged has the right to appeal to The Labour Relations Board which then has the right to and must, after consideration, appoint a field officer to investigate and then can hold a hearing in an attempt to resolve the problem. But that deals only with the charges of intimidation or coercion or the other improper acts which are defined in The Labour Relations Act, and all that this bill before you has in mind is to give the opportunity to a person who has been discharged for reason only of a garnisheeing order, to give him the right to appeal or apply to the board - the Labour Relations Board, so that it may consider whether or not there is justification. The proposed Act reads clearly, that the cause of discharge must be limited solely to the question of a garnisheeing order. The employer may have other reasons; he has the right of course to deal with his employee for these other reasons; but if his only reason is a garnisheeing order, then I suggest that it is much fairer that the jurisdiction be given to the Labour Board so that it may enquire into and deal with the problem.

Now when we debate a bill, we debate it on second reading as to principle only, and I appeal to this House to accept this bill in principle. There have been various suggestions made,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) last year as indeed this year, that there could be certain changes made to the bill in relation to some of the specifics therein. I invite discussion of that in committee once the principle is accepted, and I certainly hope that the members of this House will recognize that the problem is there; it is a serious problem, although it is not widespread; and that it deserves consideration both in principle and then in detail in the committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the principle of this bill. I appreciate the fact that there may be certain suggestions made in committee respecting the wording of the bill itself, but nevertheless I support the principle that a man should not be discharged simply on account of the fact that one or more garnisheeing order has been served upon him or his employer.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this matter in order that I might look into the state of the legislation that my honourable friend has reference to in his resolution, and I would refer him and other interested members of the House to today's Votes and Proceedings where he will notice that there are two bills of which notice is given. First, the one in today's Votes and Proceedings, an Act to amend The Judgments Act; and secondly, an Act to amend The Law of Property Act. In yesterday's Votes and Proceedings he will notice that there were two notices of motion given, one respecting a bill on the attachment of debts and the second one to amend The Executions Act, and I can tell him that there will be a further piece or pieces of legislation that I require to give effect to the recommendations of the committee which reported back to this Legislature last session on the items in question. And so, therefore, this is one of those happy occasions when I can tell my honourable friend that what he is seeking to have the House do is already done.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: In closing debate, Mr. Speaker, I assume there is no point really to debate this further. I'm pleased that the Attorney-General has found it possible to get this legislation before us. I assume that the resolution will be supported and we'll be seeing the results very soon.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Russell and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, may we have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HILLHOUSE: In the absence of the Honourable Leader, would you allow this matter to stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable the Minister of Highways.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. George, I wonder if I might be allowed to have this stand this afternoon please.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, may I have this matter stand? If somebody else wishes to speak, they may do so.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could take a moment or two to speak on this resolution and its amendment. It is a topic, Sir, that has come up before this Legislature on more than one occasion since I entered it in 1949 -- it's a resolution instead of a topic. It's been very very vital and I think to me it's important. I have always supported it and I'm going to try and point out in about five minutes why I believe this

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd.) should be supported. We would suppose, or should surmise that in 1967 with a budget of some \$119 million being directed towards education alone, that over the last period of years the average young boy or girl from 18 or 21 certainly has a better education. In 1949, the total current government estimates were some \$34 million.

I could go farther back afield with regard to why I think the young men and women today of this age should have the right to vote because they are intelligent; they are well educated; and they know far more about politics and the current affairs than certainly I knew when I was 18 or 21. I know that my father with a Grade 4 education made quite a success in business and I with a Grade 11 education am not quite like one of the poor farmers my friend mentioned this morning, but today I have a lad at 20 who has three years university. This young man knows more about current affairs, the good and bad points about the Liberal and the Conservative Party - I steered him clear, I thought perhaps he shouldn't worry too much about the honourable gentleman on my left - but he knows so much about politics that at 19 years of age he got me elected to this Legislature - believe it or not - along with his sister who was 17 years of age. These young people - and I don't profess that my children are any smarter than anybody elses - but I know what they have done and this is why I use their names.

I think that we should stand up and support this resolution and the amendment. I have no objection, although it gets a little difficult to really tell the Federal Government what they should do. Basically, we're representing Manitoba and in this we have the opportunity. It says, "Whereas young people at the ages of 18 and 21 are considered mature enough to participate in economic, social and athletic life of our country" -- Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is right and that this coming summer in the City of Winnipeg where we have the Pan-American games we will see perhaps some of the smartest, most brilliant young people in the world here.

It says, "Whereas it is in the interest of good government that young people between the ages of 18 and 21 participate in the political life of our country, " -- I was just using an example where these young people have participated in the political life of Manitoba to the effect that this honourable member is in fact in the Legislature. Now this is true all across the country; the young people of today are going to be the men and women of tomorrow. I would suggest that when I first entered the Legislature nearly twenty years ago, it was very uncommon to see the galleries filled up with children. It happened occasionally but nowhere near the way it is being taken advantage of today. I'm sure that by the time the present government get around to instigating this law, if they do - it may take a little while yet - but I'm sure that if and when they do, it is the right thing to do.

It is common knowledge that -- as a young man I was a flier in the last war, although even when I went overseas I was 21. You sit around in an Air Force mess at night and look around, 75 percent of these people that were flying these aeroplanes and fighting and serving the country were certainly under 21. I had a crew of seven men, three Englishmen and three Canadians. At 21 I was the oldest, and believe me I'm not going to say that I was the bravest - I'm not so sure of that. These young fellows would go out and fight for their country, and if they were man enough to do this, surely to goodness they're man enough to stand up and put an X against the man of their choice.

Now they may make mistakes; who doesn't. I for one made a mistake the first vote I ever made. I can never forgive myself for it was a drastic mistake. I was 21 years of age, flying a big aeroplane in England and I didn't know anything about politics. The then Prime Minister of Canada, MacKenzie King, kept me standing in the sunshine at Brandon playing a saxophone for two hours waiting for him to come. He was there for two minutes. When he got there two hours late, he was gone. I was mad; I didn't like MacKenzie King, so consequently I supposed I didn't like the Party he represented. So when I got overseas I happened to be with a group of fellows, who I'll have to admit were supporting my friends to the left, so I have got to admit, Mr. Speaker, and I publicly will admit that I did vote CCF at one time.

Now when I came back from the war, a farmer came into my office one day and I said what can I do for you? "Jim," he said, "what do you think about politics?" I said I never thought about politics in my life, why? "Well," he said, "some of us would like you to stand for nomination," Well, I said - and he happened to be a Conservative - I said there were not enough Conservatives in this constituency to elect George Drew when he was running; secondly, our business is too big to play around with politics. Certainly my dad lost some of the best customers he ever had when he helped elect the late Senator M. No, thank you, I'm not interested in politics. However, he was a good salesman and finally I entered the Legislature

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd.) as an independent and my education began. Quite frankly, it isn't completed yet, I'm sure of that.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this resolution I honestly feel that it's worthy of a great deal of consideration. I would ask the Premier of the province, whose ultimate responsibility this will be, if he is not ready - and perhaps he is ready to support this resolution - that I think that he knows that it's going to come; it must come. I know that a lot of the older people, particularly in my constituency, told about my way of supporting this resolution. They think that it is not right. At the same time I didn't always think the way my father did; I know my son doesn't always think the way I did; but this doesn't necessarily say that it is not right. I think that in 20 years from now, 75 percent of the members of the various Legislatures of Canada will be under the age of 40 years of age and, Mr. Speaker, if they don't start between 18 and 21 they're not going to be ready by that time. A young person can become 21 the day after the election and the next election he's 25. What opportunity has he -- why does he want to get interested in politics, because by the time he's 25 in this day and age he's married and raising a family and he hasn't got time to think about politics. So with those few brief words, I would support this resolution; I believe it's right and I hope it passes. Thank you.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I was rather taken by the member's speech from Birtle-Russell and I think most of us agree with him that possibly we should reconsider the voting age of our people today, but I was amused as I sat and listened to him. The first time he had the opportunity to vote, he says that he couldn't really make up his mind and he voted CCF, but after he came back and became a little more mature, he realized himself the problem that he was getting into and he bailed himself out very quickly. So I just wonder whether he should be so fast in supporting voting under the age of 21 because he's certainly come a long way since he reached his 21st birthday.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, while he is not in his seat, he did move its adjournment. Are you ready for the question. Or at least a

A MEMBER: He asked for it to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. HARRIS: In the absence of the member, I beg leave to have this matter stand. It's in the name of Mr. Green.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Could I have this matter stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead; the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur in amendment thereto - standing in my name. I would like to inform the House that I have given careful consideration to the contents of the amendment to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead as put forward by the Honourable Member for Arthur. May I say that in view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Arthur does not appear in his resolution to contemplate any special expenditure of monies I consider the amendment relevant and therefore in order.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Chairman, I -- the amendment is in order now? Should it be voted on?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. VIELFAURE: I'd like to say a few words on the amendment, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment of the Honourable Member for Arthur because I think it is a more appropriate way of approaching the situation of farm machinery testing instead of going into it directly as was formerly suggested by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I think this resolution which asks for a study first is a much better way of approaching this situation. I have here a brief that was presented by the Deputy Minister of Saskatchewan to the Annual Conference of Provincial Ministers and Deputies of Agriculture held in British Columbia on July 10 to 15, 1966, and while I don't intend to read all the brief, it is indeed interesting to read some parts of it which was actually a report on the reason why the program was discontinued in Saskatchewan, and it has here the pros and cons plus many other explanations, and I will just read a couple of paragraphs illustrating both the pros and cons of the machinery testing

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) program in Saskatchewan. Some of the pro arguments are here, and I'm quoting: "Pro arguments generally tended to be: (a) Farmers need more impartial assessment of machines to guide them in their purchases. (b) Impartial testing and publication of results will cause the manufacturers to make needed corrections in machine design and construction resulting in better machinery. (c) Such an agency can assist small manufacturers in design and construction. (d) It offered a service to manufacturers in testing new machines; and (e) Research information on operation and functional performance assisted farmers in their operation."

Now the con arguments ran like this: " (a) Such an agency could only be a duplication of the extensive efforts of manufacturers in the design and testing of machinery; and (b) the farmer himself must be the best judge of machinery and inadequacies or weaknesses will quickly be corrected through competition between manufacturers. (c) Machinery companies tended to not submit doubtful machines for testing and often only submitted their older models." Now here is another important one in my opinion: " (d) One of the major implements, the farm tractor, has never been tested; and (e) The reports were too complicated and technical for many farmers to use.

So these, Mr. Speaker, are some of the pro and con arguments that were mentioned at the convention and which actually give us an idea of what the reasons were for discontinuing the practice.

Now in my opinion another very important factor is the fact that in the presentation it also says that the cost of operating this program, not including office space, heat, light and furnishings, was between \$150,000 and \$170,000 a year, which I would imagine could very well run into the \$200,000 amount if you figured space, heat, light and all that. So the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I say that I think the amendment is a better way of approaching this, is that from what we have seen here I think it was a rather high price for the benefits of the testing program.

I also have here some of the projects that were taken on during 1965 and one sees that the reports themselves are fairly complicated and they just don't come out in black and white saying that, for example, a 20-10 John Deere Tractor is no good and that a Case tractor is good or so on. This is fairly complicated. For example, I'll just read one and I'm just picking any one here. A new machine called a Fl. . . alt Weeder was supplied by Cockshutt Farm Equipment for an evaluation of its potential as a tillage machine. Observations were made and a report submitted. So this gives an idea of what a farmer can get from this, and in my opinion many of these reports that were read by practical farmers -- and certainly the Honourable Member for Brokenhead illustrated this himself by saying that he was one who was receiving the reports and at the same time saying that he had purchased a machine that had not been tested and that he was fairly satisfied that the company had lived up to its expectations. So, I'm not trying to run the program down, but what I'm trying to say here, Mr. Speaker, is that we want to be very careful in my opinion if we go into such a program and make sure that the benefits will warrant the cost, and also that there is a real need for such a program.

Also, I must say that I was indeed pleased to see that the second "whereas" in my honourable friend from Brokenhead's resolution will not be part of the new amendment. I feel very strongly on the second "whereas" where it says that "the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan has bowed to vested interests by abandoning this service," not so much because it's addressed to the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan - this has little bearing - but I don't think this is the kind of "whereas" that we should see on our Order Papers here. I'm certainly not an authority on parliaments or on legislatures but in my opinion members of this House will not bow to vested interests be they NDPs, Liberals or Conservatives. I don't agree with that statement, and to make a blank statement that the Government of Saskatchewan has bowed to vested interests, I certainly don't agree with. I think this is creating a wrong impression on government and I am pleased to see that the amendment will take this part out.

Now I am in full support of the resolution which said that a Special Committee of the House be established to inquire not only in the testing of machinery but the price of machinery and also other matters related and including the farm testing program. I think it should be studied but that we're not ready to jump into this and establish a program immediately, because, let's face it, Mr. Speaker, we have just been handed a vast bill of \$354 million here and we want to make very sure that the money that we have to pay is going to bring results to the Province of Manitoba. Our taxes are certainly high enough now that we want to make sure that any additional money we spend is warranted, and especially beneficial to the farmers of this province.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few remarks in connection with the amendment that is before us on the resolution to establish a committee, and I certainly favour the amendment that is before us. I think it is advisable to first establish a committee and to seek out priorities as to what should be done. If we're going to set up a testing machinery, certainly we should give some thought to it as to what types of machinery we are going to test, which should come first, and it will definitely involve considerable monies because we know from the consumer reports which has a similar program and that have done a lot of testing in other areas - not necessarily the machinery but appliances and so forth - and they've done considerable and, in my opinion, valuable work. And if we can do something of that type in this province I think it would be of benefit to the people of this province and I am sure that the farmers would appreciate if they knew beforehand what the government or the agency, whatever we are going to set up, would recommend. So I feel there is merit in setting up this committee and see what recommendations will come forth.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, first of all, perhaps, before I get into the amendment itself, I probably want to make a remark here to get the Honourable Member for Arthur straight insofar as my profession is concerned. I must extend to him my sincere and warmest thanks for elevating me out of the poverty-stricken industry of farming even though it was only for a few moments. I am a farmer by profession and by birth, and I'll probably continue to be so if we could persuade the government here to implement some price program which will enable us to exist in that profession.

Getting down to the amendment here, Mr. Speaker, I have no particular quarrel with the amendment except I have some reservation after this special committee, when it would be of course established and perhaps -- I fail to see why this wasn't referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture instead. However, not having too much experience in this parliamentary procedure maybe this will work out quite satisfactory and the implementation of this farm testing program will not be too far away.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Honourable Member for Arthur some of the summaries and conclusions which were supplied to farmers by this testing program conducted in the Province of Saskatchewan, and if I might have the indulgence of the House, I probably will just read a few sections here and there to give them an idea how beneficial this program was, not only to the farmers of Saskatchewan but to the farmers of Manitoba and Alberta also who were on the subscription list to this pamphlet, and I can only say from personal experience, and the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell will verify this - he's not in his seat now - that back in '58 and '59 I also was a salesman for a machine company and it was just at that time that this program was being brought in to Saskatchewan, and I must say that the farmers at that time certainly appreciated this program and the farmers elsewhere in Manitoba as well.

Getting back to some of the recommendations made in these pamphlets which were available for distribution to the general public at large, the function on this pamphlet deals incidentally with a disk - it's a Manitoba-made disk. "The functional performance of a" - I won't mention names - "disk was very good in a wide variety of soil conditions in Saskatchewan during the 1963 season. The durability of this disk was fair to good. The failure of the land and the rear wheel control valve crank and other failures lowered its performance in regard to durability. Although a number of disk blades were broken, the durability in severe stony conditions was good. The size of tractor required to adequately operate this disk at a depth of three inches at four and a half miles an hour under most conditions would be approximately 50 horsepower."

Now I'll just stop here and suggest to the honourable members here, and particularly my farmer friends, where else could you get this type of information in a company-sponsored pamphlet? This was an independent body who were impartial in their recommendations and this of course was sincerely appreciated by the farmers.

I might just go on and point out some of the recommendations that this program had to recommend back to the manufacturer. "It is recommended that the manufacturer consider: (1) Modifying the land and rear wheel control bell crank to prevent this deformation; improving the welding of the plate of the hydraulic anchor bar; modifying the hydraulic bell crank to prevent the holes from wearing; modifying the hydraulic bell crank pin at assembly points to prevent them from wearing;" and so on.

And then this might be very interesting to note too, is what the manufacturer had to state in reply to that. With regard to recommendation No. (1), this bell crank has been redesigned

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd.) and all disk owners advised it will be replaced gratis. (2) The hydraulic anchor bar has been redesigned and all owners advised it will be replaced gratis. (3) The hydraulic bell crank has been redesigned and all owners advised it will be replaced gratis. So I think perhaps I will not read on any further. I have illustrated my point, but this vital information was not only beneficial to the dealer, to the farmer, but also to the manufacturer.

It was beneficial to the farmer, because having had this type of information he could make a very good assessment insofar as what he could get most for his machinery dollar, and as the honourable member has outlined the other day, that farm machinery is only second insofar as capital expenditure is concerned on the farm, only second to land itself, and with that type of investment I think it is of the utmost importance that the farmers of this province have a very good idea what they are getting for their machinery dollar. Insofar as the dealer is concerned, it saves the dealer a lot of grievances. All these little things were rectified before the machine got out in the field, and in a lot of cases had eliminated hard feelings between the dealer and the farmer himself. And I must add at this time that the manufacturer was also in a position to benefit because by rectifying these situations early in the game his name was maintained in the field and his sales did not result in a loss as a result of that.

I must also say that this information was also available on many of the display counters of implement dealers, also at the ag reps offices, and if I may add here, some of the implement dealers used these pamphlets in their sales kit when they went out on farm calls. Naturally, and needless to say, the implement dealer didn't use it if it was to his disadvantage but in most cases it wasn't, and of course if it was to his disadvantage it was all the sooner that the manufacturer was aware of the fact then and did everything in his power to rectify the situation. So far as the cost of this program is concerned, sure it will cost us \$150,000 if we undertake it alone for a year. Maybe as my honourable colleague from Brokenhead had suggested here two weeks ago, maybe we could get together with the other two prairie provinces and have this as a joint effort. However, I don't think that cost should be the deterring factor. If we can spend money for topnotch engineers to go and survey the forests of Northern Manitoba and trip on the fallen trees as the Honourable Member for Churchill has said, and provide maps and so forth for our foreign friends, maybe it is just as justifiable to have this expenditure go toward the farming industry and help the farmers to make a realistic assessment before they buy any expensive farm implements.

When this station was first announced that it would be discontinued in the Province of Saskatchewan, I think that my honourable friend from Carillon would be interested to know that the farmers of Saskatchewan called it a very dark day insofar as the farm machinery was concerned, and I think that a lot of our implement dealers who were subscribers to this pamphlet and a lot of our farmers in Manitoba and Alberta were also in sympathy with the farmers of Saskatchewan, and I only hope that by having this matter referred to the special committee that this would not be just an avenue whereby this would be set aside indefinitely. However, it would be my intention to see this carried out and implemented as soon as possible so the farmers of this province could have this benefit without any further delay.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. HARRIS: I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. HARRIS: I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand due to the circumstances that has happened to the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon, I'm sorry.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. HARRIS: I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. HARRIS: I again beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member of Logan. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the member from St. Vital and the member from Churchill, I was convinced that the resolution as submitted by the member from Logan was a ridiculous and an unnecessary one, and I also thought it smacked of Socialism. Then I had afterthoughts. I don't really know what a day nursery school is, I thought to myself, and I'm reasonably sure that I should have a look into this and maybe check a day nursery school and get a few particulars, and I'm pretty sure that if other people had done the same they would have a different outlook.

First of all, for the information of the member from Churchill, day nursery schools do not include babies with diapers. The definition of a day nursery school is a child from 2 to 6 years of age. Also, it does not include children, as he said, of 25 years of age.

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

MR. DAWSON: When I am finished, thank you.

MR. LYON: All right. I just wondered if you knew of any children of two who didn't have diapers.

MR. DAWSON: I'll make a note of that and ask

MR. LYON: I'll bring you evidence if you want.

MR. DAWSON: Well, I'd say that other arrangements are made for children under two that are welfare cases. The Family Planning look after these and they are usually put into a foster home, so while we are discussing day nurseries we will not consider children that are in diapers.

At present there are four day nursery schools that are licensed in the city of Winnipeg. There are others mind you of the type described by the member from St. Vital, but these cannot meet the high standards so they are not licensed by the city. Now the license restrictions are pretty tough. There must be one trained adult for every eight children in a day nursery school. There can be no overcrowding and they must have medical facilities available and there are some other regulations which I did not get. The reason for the strict licensing law is because a child between two and six must have love and trained care to mold his character for public school or elementary school. This is because it loses the love of its mother for ten hours a day at least. Trained people who recognize any of the medical symptoms that could cause problems later on when the child enters public school or elementary school.

Now in a recent survey that was made of the working mothers by the Community Welfare Planning Council here in the City of Winnipeg, it was found that there were 4,000 children that required day nursery care and some were being inadequately cared for. I would ask the members in this House, those who employ people in their places of business, etc., how many of you have married women working for you and how many of these women could take advantage of this situation rather than putting them into private homes where they cannot be adequately cared for.

Now in the four licensed homes that are in the City of Winnipeg, there are only 165 children being cared for - and I did say the survey showed there were 4,000 wanting this type of care - so you can see that there is a need. And I should mention at this time that the four in the City of Winnipeg are second to none in Canada. Now Ontario have pioneered this program since 1945. They have had day nurseries in Toronto. There are 15 of these day nurseries in the City of Toronto alone and the deficit budget is financed by - the municipality pays 50 percent and the Provincial Government pays the other 50 percent. There are many of these day nursery homes in the other cities, towns and villages in Ontario.

Now many people believe that there is a need in the City of Winnipeg, because four years ago the school boards of Laura Secord School and David Livingstone School launched a pilot project in their own schools and they started a day nursery for children four years of age and up to six. I believe there is also - I know there is a course for day nursery attendants at the MIT now. I also believe that the people on the other side of the House cannot fail to support this resolution; they can't fail to vote for the resolution in view of the fact that for the last three years the Provincial Government have been paying 67 percent of the cost of these four licensed day nursery schools in the City of Winnipeg and have been covering this under The Social Allowances Act.

I guess we all remember that some years ago we were told - it's many years ago now -

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.) that kindergartens could not work in schools, that children were too small at the age of five to be taken away, but we found that kindergartens worked and they worked very well.

Another vital reason why we should give these sole support mothers an opportunity to have good day nursery care for their children is the fact that we can keep them off of city relief or social allowance. Many of these women are willing to go to work if there is a place for their child to be looked after, and I was told by social welfare people, many times they have to put these women on social welfare even though she is willing to go to work because they cannot find adequate care for her child. Now I am sure that if this woman could get adequate care for her child when the child is two years of age, she would work and she would continue working probably for the rest of her life or until her family were old enough to get out on their own, whereas what we have in many many cases is the fact that the woman cannot find adequate care for her child so she stays at home and collects social allowances and she likes it so much after a few years that she stays on it for the rest of her life. So I believe, and I think many of the people on this side of the House believe that this is a good sound resolution and we plan on supporting it. Thank you.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity in a cursory fashion to read the submission made by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce to the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons which he was kind enough to distribute yesterday, and I needn't remind him of course of what he said in relation to the garment industry which according to him faces a very unique labour shortage situation.

I would like him to direct himself to the debate, and indeed the resolution we are now dealing with, and consider whether there isn't an assistance provided in this resolution to meet this problem, because he has been having trouble apparently with the Federal Government in attempting to get changes in the Federal Government's regulations on immigration. He has been complaining, with justification, that there is a real hardship in supplying the workers that he needs for this industry in particular amongst others. He mentions the fact that because of declining immigration, more attractive alternative employment and the lack of new young entrants resulting from a reduction in domestic sewing interest, because of other factors, the labour supply has not kept pace with demand.

Frankly, I don't quite understand what he means by reduction in domestic sewing interest, but if what he means is that the newer young people are less interested or less equipped or capable of sewing in their homes, then this is a problem which I presume he ought to refer to the Minister of Education and his technical schooling in the public schools. But if his need is skilled sewing machine operators, and assuming he is right in saying it's the new young entrants that are missing, then I would suggest he look very carefully at this resolution and calculate what opportunities there would be for him and for this industry to make it more possible for married women, or mothers who have children that they can't leave without care, to have the opportunity of leaving their children in the care of public day nurseries which do have the facilities and which would be able to look after the children and leave with the mothers a feeling of confidence that their children are well looked after.

I would think, reading the brief as I say as I did in a cursory manner, and reading the resolution, and knowing the Honourable the Minister for Industry and Commerce and how quick he is in being able to see the opportunities afforded to him, that if he cannot convince the members of his caucus to go along with the resolution, at least he himself will be at the forefront of seeing to it that these opportunities are made available so that his program, and indeed the progress of the industrial aspects of Manitoba, will be strengthened by the proposition proposed to him now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, since the resolution is before us and no doubt we will be called on to vote either way, for or against, I thought I should probably make a few comments and make some of my views known.

I think the request that is made in this resolution is a socialistic service that they ask for, and while I don't quarrel with the fact that there might be need in some quarters for such service, I feel that interested parties in this matter should take the initiative and organize clubs of many kinds to provide this service. Why must we continually call on the government to provide the services of this type? I don't think it is the duty of the government in this case to provide such a service. Maybe I'm old-fashioned, but I still believe that the mother should be

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) and remain in her home and not take part in as many affairs as is presently done. I think we have the necessary machinery, the various legislations that if the breadwinner, the father or the breadwinner of the household, if there's not sufficient income that we can give assistance, so that I think too often it is not a matter actually of need of the particular parent but that they probably want to indulge in certain things so that they require a larger income, and this is the avenue they choose, this is the way they go about it to get that, and as a result we find these requests being made.

Certainly if we look to the communal farms or even what we have in this land of ours, the Hutterites, certainly this is what they have, and there the older ladies look after the children and the younger ladies do the work. So maybe if our mothers and the people that are requesting this, if they formed this kind of club our older ladies could perform a useful service and we wouldn't have the problem such as they are requesting here.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, unless anyone else wishes to speak I would like to adjourn this debate, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get the seconder's name.

MR. DOERN: Wellington.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): In the absence of the Member for Burrows, I beg leave of the House to have the matter stand today.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, The Honourable the Minister of Health.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, firstly what I have to say on the resolution is going to be something anticlimatic because we debated this matter to some extent at any rate when the estimates of the Department of Health were being considered, but I would like to refer to some of the matters that the resolution mentions, and of course in its first "whereas" it refers to the fact of the report coming down. And then again in the next "whereas" it refers to the terms of reference and then it comes down to a "whereas" which says that the Provincial Government did very little if anything to follow the recommendations of the report, and it follows on with a comment about a serious shortage of hospital personnel and it makes reference to hospital beds that are not in use because of a shortage of nurses and then it comes down to its resolution.

As I mentioned to the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface the other day, I was sorry that I couldn't go along with the resolution that he had, and in order to give the reasons why, I will have to resort to some quotes from the Willard Commission itself, quotes which I think are important to the consideration of the House when we are debating this particular matter.

As he points out in his resolution, the Willard Commission did report to the government in June of 1963, but I think it's noteworthy to note, Mr. Speaker, that if the Willard Report had pointed out a serious shortage of nurses and if the Willard Report had suggested immediate remedies, and if these could have been implemented within a matter of days, that we would have felt the effect - particularly with respect to registered nurses - we would have been feeling the effects of it in the fall of 1966, because it does, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, take three years to graduate a registered nurse.

In fact, if you wish to study the Willard Report very objectively, it did not view the supply of registered nurses with any alarm, and on Pages 69 and 70 of the report there is this statement - and you'll forgive me if I have to quote rather voluminously from the report - but this is from the Willard Report on Page 69 and 70: "The Survey Board does not consider that the over-all supply of nurses at the present time warrants sharp increases. While there are shortages due to mal-distribution, in general, the situation at the present time is not unfavourable. A substantial increase in the output of nurses in any province could lead to a higher than usual movement of nurses out of the province. While some Manitoba residents receive their education in other provinces and vice versa, a greatly expanded output could mean that Manitoba would end up by paying an unduly high share of the cost of educating nurses. In allocating resources for educational purposes in the health field, it is important to take into consideration the supply of other health personnel which in some cases is much less satisfactory than the supply of nursing personnel." And further, "This involves more than allocation of financial resources. It also includes effective use of human resources to ensure that the proportion of students available for future employment in the health field will be channelled into the different health careers in accordance with the relative demands."

And then the report goes on in another section and it says this: "The Survey Board recommends that for the present there be no further construction of nurses' residence facilities to accommodate increased numbers of nurses." It's interesting to note that the Survey Board at that time did not concur with the concept of a centralized school of nursing which has been brought forward by the committee on the supply of nurses which was set up under the Minister of Health.

On Page 72 of the report with respect to registered nurses, the report comments: "The Survey Board concludes that there are many advantages to retain pre-clinical instruction in the existing hospital schools pending further study of the situation." The Survey Board at that time saw no reason for any fundamental changes except to recommend continuing study of the situation.

Now the study was initiated, Mr. Speaker, immediately after receipt of the report, and after a number of efforts by different groups, it culminated in the report of the Minister of Health's Committee on the Supply of Nurses. The considerations that this committee had, the studies that it had available to them were the studies of the Willard Report itself; it had the considerations that were undertaken and the results that came down from the Royal Commission on Health Services; and then it had also for consideration for study, a study that came down by Dr. Scatliff under the Manitoba Hospital Commission. They presented a brief to the Manitoba Hospital Commission in the summer of 1965 after study of over a period of a couple of years, and these reports have all been studied as was recommended by the Willard Commission and

(MR. WITNEY cont'd) have come up now with this report of 71 recommendations for registered nurses and other health personnel.

It's interesting to note that from the cursory perusal of this report - and I haven't had the opportunity as yet to study it from the point of view of detail and to study the recommendations from the point of view of the ramifications both financial and otherwise - that at the time the Willard Report was commenting there was the concept of nurses being trained in a hospital environment, and over the period of years that concept has changed until now we have essentially, as I read the Committee on the Supply of Nurses, as making a change and recommending that the orientation of the training of nurses be in an educational environment.

With respect to this report itself, I think it's interesting to see what it had to say about the Survey Board report, because on Page 33 of this report on the Supply of Nurses are these comments: "The Survey Board, confirmed in this view by the various hospital schools of nursing" - and that is the view that I quoted just a moment ago up on Page 72 - "The Survey Board, confirmed in this view by the various hospital schools of nursing, anticipated that the additional nurses required could be obtained by a moderate increase in the annual output of the seven schools of nursing, to provide approximately 450 graduates annually by 1964 and thereafter to 1967." It should be noted that at the time the existing schools of nursing believed that they could increase their enrollment to the extent required. Now this report points out that this did not happen and, as a result, the nurses supply situation today is not as favourable - is not as favourable as the Survey Board expected it to be.

Now it's interesting to note when we talk about "not as favourable" that this report here shows an increase of approximately 10% in the number of registered nurses employed in the hospitals in Manitoba from the end of 1963 to the end of 1965, even though there was no increase in the number of days of patient care during the period, and I have no doubt that the honourable member for St. Boniface will have some comments to make about that. Thus the increase in the registered nurses was applied exclusively towards the improvement of the services provided, and I believe that it's interesting to note that in 1963 up to the present time there has been an increase of 10 percent in the supply of registered nurses that we have, and when you're considering this question of the supply of registered nurses - and here I'm afraid I must repeat myself to a certain extent from the estimates - this Committee on the Supply of Nurses said this: It said, "At the outset the committee was confronted with the most difficult aspect of the study, to define authentically the alleged deficiency in the number of nurses." The many reports compiled by other agencies in Canada and in the United States of America, as well as information from other parts of the world, were studied by the committee but failed to provide any conclusive answers.

And then a little later on in this report, which culminated all of the studies which were recommended by the second volume of the Willard report of June of 1963, are these comments which I think are of interest on Page 25: "Announcements of the temporary closing of hospital wards due to lack of nurses, concerned hospital administrators worrying in public, newspapers on the scent of a sensational subject with popular appeal, all tend to leave the impression of a rapidly deteriorating situation in the supply of nurses. This is, of course, not the case. Although the reliability of available statistics is open to question, indications are that in Manitoba and in Canada as a whole there are now twice as many registered nurses in relation to population as there were 20 years ago".

This report then goes along a little later on to recommend that we have about a 415 nurse shortage in the province. The Canadian Association of Registered Nurses points out that we have somewhere in the neighborhood of 4,500 and I pointed out the other night that that is approximately 10 percent, and that on the most recent information that I have been able to get, it appears that as of April 1, 1967 a recent survey of all the hospitals in Manitoba indicated that the hospitals estimated requirements for additional nurses as at April 1, 1967 at only 375. This report points out that there is an intermittent swinging of the supply of nurses over the period of years, and up on my desk I have several books about that high indicating the whole numbers of reports that have been made going away back into the 1920's on this particular subject about the supply of nurses.

But the resolution also goes on and it speaks that we did not do very much apparently about not only the shortage of nurses but about the shortage of hospital personnel, and we have in the hospital personnel various categories. We not only have the registered nurses but we also have the licensed practical nurses; we have the physiotherapists and the occupational therapists;

(MR. WITNEY cont'd).... we have lab and x-ray people; and I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, again in some facts that I have here, where there has been action taken and that in fact the statements that the Provincial Government did very little, if anything, has no validity in fact.

The Survey Board acknowledged that the importance of practical nurses was something that we should have more of, and right again from this commentary on the supply of nurses, from the report, is this succinct adding up of what we have done, and on Page 116 it says: "In its Annual Report for 1965, the Department of Health records 1,553 active licensed practical nurses in Manitoba. The comparable figure reported by the Manitoba Hospital Survey Board for 1961 was 1,075. There has, therefore, been an increase of almost 50 percent in four years. The Manitoba Hospital Survey Board made a painstaking assessment of the requirements for licensed practical nurses. In every respect the Survey Board's goals seem to have been exceeded. For 1965 the Board anticipated the employment of 806 licensed practical nurses in hospitals; the actual figure for 1966 is estimated at 900 effective full-time licensed practical nurses' staff in hospitals.

"The Survey Board at the time estimated that in order to meet the demand, the Central School at the Manitoba Institute of Technology and the School conducted by the Sisters of Charity together, would have to graduate 553 licensed practical nurses in the years 1961 to 1965 inclusive. In fact, 789 students completed the one-year course during this period. The Survey Board calculated an attrition rate of eight percent annually. A cursory examination indicates that this rate seems not to have been reached; in fact the attrition rate appears to have remained at six percent, the rate which the Survey Board calculated for 1960 and earlier."

And as I pointed out to the Honourable Member from Rhineland - and it's drawn to the attention of those who wish to read this report - that we have now three classes in the Manitoba Technical Institute of 100 each, and that by the end of 1967 we will be graduating from that one facility 300 licensed practical nurses annually. When we look at the statement that the Provincial Government did very little, if anything, in 1964, in that school over there in Brooklands we were graduating 75; in 1965, a little later, we were graduating 150; and now in 1967 we are going to be graduating 300. Now I can't really subscribe to that as being little action in other health personnel.

Let's take a look -- and I might also add that with the output from the school over at St. Boniface that we will be graduating about 350 licensed practical nurses, and again, one of the recommendations I like here is the ways and means of taking licensed practical nurses to give them an opportunity to move up into the registered or the diploma nurse - that category.

But let's take another health personnel - the medical laboratory technicians and the X-ray technicians. The Survey Board recommended the establishment of a central school for the didactic portion of the technician training. The Survey Board report was submitted in June of 1963 and the first class in a central school was enrolled in the fall of 1963, same year, at the Manitoba Institute of Technology. The current enrollment is 105 students in the nine month Laboratory Technicians Course and 33 students in the four month X-ray Technicians Course, and this latter figure should be doubled for the year because there are two classes enrolled in each year in the X-ray course. And, Mr. Speaker, we have done exactly in this area what the Survey Board recommended.

The Survey Board recommended a training program which would permit an annual enrollment of some 100 laboratory technology students to meet the demand and to take care of drop-outs and failures, and the objective has been met. I think perhaps we should pay attention to the fact that here in Manitoba - and I may be mistaken about this - that we have the combined laboratory and X-ray students being trained by Manitoba, and if I'm not wrong, we are the only province that does it, and we have, if I recall correctly, there are some 40 of those at the present time.

I'd like to look at some figures which have been drawn to my attention about the staff in the hospitals. The laboratory staff in the hospitals have been adequate enough to have permitted the increases in the volume of laboratory services provided to patients from approximately five million units in 1963 to approximately six million units in 1965. And then again in the laboratory and X-ray units operated by the province, from 1963 to 1965 there was an increase of 40.4 percent in X-rays to in-patients and 60.1 percent in X-rays for out-patients, while lab work for in-patients and out-patients increased by 44.5 percent and 48.4 percent respectively in the laboratory and X-ray units.

Now these are statistics, Mr. Speaker, and they may be rather boring to the House, but

(MR. WITNEY cont'd.) they are statistics which point out that in order to provide for those increases in services we have provided for the personnel who could do the services. And again referring back to the comment that the Provincial Government did very little, if anything, I find it difficult for it to stand up.

Therapists - I mentioned a little earlier about therapists. The Survey Board reported that in 1961 there were a total of 53 therapists employed in Manitoba, 41 physiotherapists and 12 occupational therapists. The Survey Board made no recommendation as to the total number of therapists required, but in July of 1966 there are 135 therapists employed by hospitals. The Survey Board suggested that there might be a need for 140; in July of 1966 there is 135. We started the School of Physiotherapy in the Rehabilitation Hospital during - I don't know whether it was during the period between the Survey Board report, the second report and now - but at any rate it has been started during the term of this government and it has been producing physiotherapists and occupational therapists and it has been doing so to the envy of some of the other provinces.

The Survey Board reported in other health personnel - it mentions dieticians, medical record librarians, and medical social workers, and the report shows that from 1955 to 1961 the number of dieticians employed in public general hospitals actually dropped. The total employed in Manitoba in 1961 was 38; in 1966 in the Manitoba hospitals they employed 45 dieticians, and five were employed in other health centres. Medical social workers - the Survey Board had this statement. It said: "In general, the Survey Board expects a growing demand for social workers in hospitals where they need to more than double the current number of positions during the next decade." Medical social workers have increased from 16 full-time and one part-time in 1961 to 31 full-time and three part-time in 1966. So, Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to carry on with the -- or at least to concur with the statements that are made in this resolution, those statements that are critical of the government.

Then we come down to the statement which says that "Whereas many beds in Manitoba hospitals are not in use because of the shortage of nurses." Right at the moment, and before coming into the House this afternoon I had the figures checked for me. There are two hospitals that have had beds closed - just one now - because of a shortage of personnel according to the hospital officials - just one. But you can go to Dauphin, to Flin Flon, to The Pas, to Brandon, to Morden, to Steinbach, to Gimli, and there are no beds closed because of a shortage of personnel. You can come to Metropolitan Winnipeg and you can go to the Grace, you can go to the Concordia, you can go to Children's, you can go to St. Boniface, but there are no beds closed because of the shortage of personnel. You could have gone to the municipal and you could have gone and found that they had beds closed there, about 26 beds for a period of about 15 months, but they have all been re-opened since last November because they got the staff.

So that leaves one hospital, the Winnipeg General, and the Winnipeg General has 61 beds closed at the present time, but when you say that the Winnipeg General has 61 beds closed at the present time you must also recognize that during this past period the Winnipeg General Hospital has opened a 172 bed wing which had to be staffed, and it has also opened up a new intensive care wing which had to be staffed, and in intensive care wings, that's where you do use a maximum number of health personnel. So when you look at 61 beds closed you must compare that in relation to the 172 beds, new beds that have been opened, the renovation and the staff that has been required for the new intensive care wing.

Then we come down to the matter of doctors. I believe that there's really no need to repeat the comments that I made during the estimates upon this particular matter. I think that the statements that were made there are quite clear with respect to doctors. I find a strange anomaly. We have the comment that we have a shortage of beds and that we have a shortage of doctors. It's the doctors who put people in beds and if there was a shortage of doctors there wouldn't be as many people going into the beds, so there must be doctors in order to put people into the hospital to create the shortage of beds. I can see the Honourable Member for St. Boniface doesn't agree with the reasoning but nevertheless it's there for his attention.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that I need to belabour the House any more with this matter, simply to say to you that in my humble opinion and from the facts that I have presented to you, that the comment that "Whereas the Provincial Government did very little" is not a correct statement or comment; That "Whereas there exists in Manitoba a serious shortage of hospital personnel" that that's not a factual statement. We do have shortage of personnel in some areas but I just pointed out to you that it's not as bad as the word "serious" connotes,

(MR. WITNEY cont'd.) and I've also taken to task this question, the statement that was made "Whereas there are many beds in Manitoba hospitals not in use because of the shortage of nurses."

Now, on that basis I cannot regret, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asks us to do. I believe that the government has done very well in this matter; that the government has been alive to the needs of personnel in the health field, and that in those areas and some that I haven't covered, the government has taken action; and I suppose that I need only conclude my statement to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to vote against the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would move adjournment of this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconder?

MR. PETURSSON: Seconded by the Member for Logan.

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

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that

WHEREAS many citizens of the Province have expressed concern over the lack of vocational school facilities; and

WHEREAS the government has stated that ten new vocational schools will be built in Manitoba; and

WHEREAS at least one Town Council has appointed a Committee of Council to prepare a brief to present to the Government of Manitoba and the Minister of Education to make certain that one of the ten promised vocational and/or technical schools be built in its area; and

WHEREAS at least forty percent of the students now attending elementary and high schools are likely to enroll in vocational and technical school training; and

WHEREAS these students wishing to attend technical and/or vocational schools are now obliged to attend same in Brandon or Winnipeg thus imposing a great financial strain on some parents and prohibiting others from attending by reason of limited means; and

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has been paying 75 percent of the capital construction costs of such schools as well as a share of other costs; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has in the past failed to take full advantage of such generosity; and

WHEREAS it is estimated that approximately 40 percent of all Manitoba students would attend such vocational training schools, provided they were conveniently and strategically located; and

WHEREAS it is necessary and essential for proper planning that all School Divisions in Manitoba be immediately informed of the intended location of such new schools and that the choice of such location be on the basis of the greatest need;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba immediately remove from the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission the right to determine the location of such new vocational training schools, and without delay, and solely on the basis of the greatest need, determine and announce to the people of Manitoba, such new locations.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the last speaker that spoke immediately prior to myself, the Honourable Minister of Health, made much of the fact that some of the content and wording of the resolution was not factual and was more or less a lot of garbage. I have particularly

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman is speaking to the contents of the motion, or the principle of the motion, when he's referring to something to do with health as garbage. I wondered if he would keep to the principle of the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It wasn't my intention to define "garbage" but the Honourable Speaker has said there's no room for it in health and I agree with him. There is no room for garbage in the Department of Health. It should all be removed.

Now to get back to my speech. I, in drafting this resolution was most particular to make certain that I stuck completely to the facts and I intend to proceed in the order that they appear on the Order Paper, that is, starting right off with the first "whereas" and continuing down.

Now the first one is "Whereas many citizens of the province have expressed concern over the lack of vocational school facilities." Many persons, Mr. Speaker? Not only have many persons expressed grave concern over the lack, but the government has themselves expressed grave concern over the lack. The Throne Speech of a year ago says that in addition to these measures - he's referring to other ones by ministers -- no - "My Ministers recognize" - here we are: "My Ministers recognize that the automated society in which we are rapidly moving places unprecedented stresses on the young people of our province. A new youth and manpower agency will be established" - and so on. Now the government themselves recognize that there is a grave lack of vocational and technical schools in the province.

Earlier today the Honourable Member for St. John's referred to the brief that was just presented to the House yesterday, I believe, by the Minister of Industry and Commerce - his submission to the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Immigration on January 31st. And the entire brief that was presented by the Minister deals with this problem, and what does it say? It says in fact that we do not have enough trained and skilled -- and they go on and say "unskilled labour force in this province to assure a province the growth that it

(M R. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... is entitled to." As a matter of fact, on Page 4 of that brief it says, "Canada's second century holds challenges that are more exciting than her first. Man-power policy will play a key role in meeting these challenges and attaining our economic objectives." True, it will; and what the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce is saying is, we haven't sufficient in numbers here now, therefore lower the bars; let in an influx of immigrants to fill this vacuum.

Now, I don't think that I need to dwell any further on the first "whereas" because the government themselves have pointed this out on so many occasions and are in fact pointing it out during the school meetings that are presently being held throughout the Province of Manitoba in respect to the referendum. This is being repeated and will be repeated from now until after the referendum is held.

The second one is: "Whereas the government has stated that ten new vocational schools will be built in Manitoba."

Now you will notice that I didn't say they were all going to be built this year, although the government at election time inferred that they likely would be, immediately after the election, and in their propoganda that was passed around at election time and used in every constituency, including my own, they placed great stress on this - my honourable friends are all familiar with this 10-page document I think it was - no it's only four pages, eight pages. That's not quite up to their regular amount of propoganda but, nevertheless, in this famous document they told us they were going to build a number: "School finance in education, special grants to allow retarded and handicapped children the benefit of public school system's regional and vocational schools with residential accommodation to be constructed throughout Manitoba." Throughout Manitoba. That's what they said here. And they haven't denied yet that they weren't going to do it. They promised it, and the reason they occupy the position they do today is because of the promises that they made, and it's certainly up to we in the Opposition and the people of this province to hold them to their promises.

Now in my own constituency - and my guess is that in about 57 constituencies, every candidate for the party that occupies the benches over there likely promised one for their constituency - now they likely did, but probably they didn't in the city, so there was likely about 33 promised or thereabouts, vocational and technical schools, and they certainly promised one in Gladstone constituency. There's no getting away from that. I've got the proof here if they would like to see that. They don't say they'll promise, they say they will. "1. Obtain adequate medical and dental facilities." That was No. 1. "2. Resolve school problems to the benefit of all our children. 3. Establish vocational school facilities." And so on.

I had quite a time finding where my honourable friend the Minister of Education said that there would in fact be 10. I'll admit he was fairly careful. I found it though.--(Interjection)-- Up to 10. Yes, that's right. "Dr. Johnson said," and this is from the Winnipeg Free Press, Friday September 30th, and reported in the school trustee magazine - "Dr. Johnson said he didn't see an immediate rush by division boards to construct new high schools." I agree with him. As long as we know where they're going to build the other ones first. "The Boundaries Commission was now studying possible sites for eight to ten . . ." - eight to ten it says here, not up to 10; eight to ten - "regional vocational schools throughout Manitoba, and Boards were likely to make temporary arrangements until the vocational school sites had been chosen so facilities wouldn't overlap." Now that is sound and logical advice so long as the people of the province know soon and now where the location of the schools are going to be so that they won't over-build. I agree with my honourable friend. That's sound advice.

They're still promising the ten schools, and I don't think I'm telling any stories out of school, Mr. Speaker, if I let you know what they're saying at some of the referendum meetings that are presently being held. For instance, what they're saying in Neepawa. I'm not letting anything out of school when I say that because it's reported in the Neepawa Press, and incidentally I haven't read one at this session of the Legislature. But I want to read briefly from one of January 27th last, and that's pretty current isn't it? This one --(Interjection)-- Am I still the reporter? If my honourable friend is referring to a column that I write in the Neepawa Press I still write a column there. This one, it says: "Single district school division most efficient system, says Bobby Bend." My honourable friend will be glad to know that he made that statement I'm sure. And then the article is written up by a fellow that signs himself AFM and you certainly know who that is and he isn't very favourable to my side of politics. A. F. M. - I might as well tell you, it's A. F. McKenzie who was a former editor of the Neepawa Press, and here's what he had to say. He's reporting what the school inspector said and it's in

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)....quotation marks so I guess he said it: "Ten vocational schools which have been promised for Manitoba will be available for single divisions. It would seem quite apparent that the new plan would be more favourable to the taxpayer, the pupil and the teacher." So once again they are talking about the ten promised schools and they're talking about it, not at election time, but right now - a week ago. So surely, Mr. Speaker, I have convinced my honourable friends that they promised it and I'll get on to Item No. 3 of the resolution if I can find it. Here we are.

"Whereas at least one Town Council has appointed a Committee of Council to prepare a brief to present to the Government of Manitoba and the Minister of Education to make certain that one of the ten promised vocational or technical schools be built in its area." Now that is an understatement if ever there was one. Because Neepawa is presently preparing one, my guess is that so is every other town, so I don't need to elaborate on that because that is a statement of fact, so we'll get right on to the next one.

"Whereas at least forty percent of the students now attending elementary and high schools are likely to enroll in vocational and technical school training." That is a statement that my honourable friend has made on many occasions, and I think the former Minister of Education made comments in this regard, and I think it's a fact that nobody wants to argue against it. As a matter of fact, when we were dealing with the Department of Education estimates a year ago the Minister of Education went even further, and he said - I think this is correct - he said that 50 percent of the students that are presently attending elementary school will be called upon to fill positions that are not yet created." Now that is a fact and I'm certain that my honourable friend will agree that he made that ... and it's still a fact. Therefore what he was pointing out was that in this whole field of automation it is advancing so rapidly that it's nearly next to impossible to keep up to it, and that there will be whole new fields developed and that we must be prepared in this last half of the 20th century to make certain that there are students there prepared to accept these new positions.

Now they are - I believe that this is one of the points that is mentioned in this new document - and I am not letting any secrets out of school when I present this, am I Mr. Minister? There's some fine pictures here of you - this hasn't been distributed to the House yet, but it is one that is being distributed at the meetings, and there's several pictures of my honourable friend and they're good pictures. He has a very fatherly look on the outside there and there are several pictures, one on every page nearly. And it's a good well-prepared document, and I am only going to read one paragraph. I know he would like me to read the whole thing, but I'm only going to read one paragraph. "Now we want to change the single district divisions that will make possible, for instance, the co-ordination of technical courses at both the elementary and secondary levels with the new regional technical vocational schools to be built in strategic locations for interdivisional use by many rural Manitoba children." Isn't that exactly what I'm saying in my resolution? So that is what we're asking for, so I've convinced my honourable friends on that one and I'm halfway through my resolution now. How is my time, Mr. Speaker? Am I halfway through it as well?

"Whereas the Government of Canada has been paying 75 percent of the capital construction costs of such schools as well as a share of other costs." Now I don't have to dwell on that, I'm sure, because that is a fact. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I missed the other one immediately prior to that: "Whereas these students wishing to attend technical and/or vocational schools are now obliged to attend same in Brandon or Winnipeg thus imposing a great financial strain on some parents and prohibiting others from attending by reason of limited means." That's a fact. That is a fact, and that's one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that they intend to now build ten more throughout the province, in order to give an equal opportunity to every child in the Province of Manitoba. You have to do these kind of things. You can't have a child from Makinak going to Brandon to attend a technical or vocational school there and say to him he has exactly the same opportunity at the same cost as the fellow that's living immediately across from the vocational school in Brandon, for instance, and so this is what I'm saying here.

And "Whereas the Government of Manitoba has in the past failed to take full advantage of such generosity;" that's the generosity of the Federal Government when they have paid 75 percent of the cost. I see my honourable friend the leader of the New Democratic Party - that's what he likes to be called - questioning some of my facts here. --(Interjection)-- Well, if somebody said to you, "I'll pay 75 percent of a new hat and you go and buy one," you'd probably go and buy one. --(Interjection)-- That's fine and dandy.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)..

Now, my point is this, Mr. Speaker, that other provinces have taken full advantage, or nearly full advantage of the generosity that I refer to in the resolution, and here are the figures, and surely my honourable friend the Minister is familiar with this magazine. It's called Technical and Vocational Education in Canada - Issue No. 8, Spring 1966, in which it outlines under the heading "Building for Them All" the federal contribution to vocational technical schools. Building and equipment expenditures for the four western provinces was \$210,981,563 and the total spent by provinces were: Manitoba \$14 million, nearly \$15 million; Saskatchewan \$24 million; Alberta \$101 million, and British Columbia nearly \$71 million. Where's Manitoba? Down at \$14 million. Well why, why is that? Out of a total of \$210 million that was offered to the provinces by the federal government, Manitoba only spent \$14 million, and so this is what I'm saying in my resolution. They have failed to take full advantage of the generosity of the Federal Government in this regard. And incidentally, --(Interjection)--well, we might as well take advantage of it as give it to Alberta or Saskatchewan or British Columbia.

I don't know whether this is something new or not, different and apart from what I've already been discussing, but on October 26, 1966 - not too long ago; four or five months ago - there was another offer made apparently by Ottawa. This article, Free Press of October 26th, says: "\$275 million due provinces in school aid." I wonder if my honourable friend when he's replying to this will tell us more about that. It says the money is to be used in construction of buildings for technical and vocational training. What part of the \$275 million are we going to get in Manitoba and what part are we going to use in this current year? A new deal, according to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, "Whereas it is necessary and essential for proper planning that all school divisions in Manitoba be immediately informed of the intended location of such new schools and the choice of such new location be based on the basis of the greatest need." I didn't say build one in Neepawa or Gladstone or Arden or Riding Mountain or Makinak. What I am saying is, let us take it out of the realm of politics and place the locations on the greatest need. Mr. Speaker, the school division board at Neepawa apparently has been warned on two occasions - as indeed I have already indicated - by the Minister of Education to don't proceed on any kind of a building program now; wait and see where these vocational schools are going to be, because it will affect your building plans. And that's a logical and sensible kind of a statement to make. And an article here in the Neepawa Press as a result of this, October 14th last, says: "Unknown factors delay division board building program. Deputy Education Minister B. Scott Bateman has been quoted as saying the proposed vocational schools would siphon off 40 percent of the high school population in rural areas." Now isn't this what I am saying in my resolution? So what he's saying is that 40 percent -- that it is quite possible that the proposed vocational schools would siphon off 40 percent of the high school population in the rural areas, and so don't be in a big rush to build those new classrooms, because if we build a vocational school there and it siphons off 40 percent you won't need it. That's what they're saying right here.

Now on November 11th last: "The trustees advised to delay collegiate building program. A regional vocational school would also affect enrollment at the collegiate since it is predicted that such a school could attract as much as 40 percent of the present high school population. Locations of the proposed schools have not yet been announced and until they are, trustees are reluctant to make any firm decisions to go into an expensive building program." Quite understandable. Quite understandable that they wouldn't, and I want to congratulate my honourable friend for recognizing this fact, but with school enrollment increasing at the rate that my honourable friends say that it is - and certainly take credit for it on so many occasions - and all of the boards are faced with crowded classrooms and want a building program - they want to go ahead with a building program - what position does it place them in when my honourable friend and the entire department say, "Don't do anything yet. Hold up all of your plans until we tell you where the vocational and technical schools are going to be built because they are going to siphon off a lot of your students"?

"The Provincial Government owes the citizens of this province some clarification on its plans in the field of education," an editorial says here. "At this moment educational authorities at the division and local levels are in a quandary because of a lack of information from higher up," and they go on and say this is the quandary they're in: they don't know what to do about a building program until they know where the location of these schools are going to be.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)....

And so, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that they should take from out of the hands of the Boundaries Commission this one area of location and announce now where the ten promised schools will likely be. You can look at a map of Manitoba or you can look at a map of Saskatchewan or any place else and pretty well determine the areas that the people congregate to - that is, the shopping areas of a big area. You can tell that. In fact, the Department of Industry and Commerce has already done it on several occasions and my guess is that it wouldn't be such a massive job to do. If there are 33 divisions that vote yes - and I know my honourable friend thinks they will - probably they will, and he's going to have ten schools for 33 divisions, then that means in simple arithmetic there'll be one technical or vocational school at least for every three divisions.

Now in a telephone call today - they phoned me, I didn't phone them - but I was informed by this person who phoned me that one of the members of this Boundaries Commission that was set up has already predicted that there would be no vocational school in the Gladstone or Ste. Rose constituencies by reason of the way the people voted there on June last. (Interjection) Well, that's what he said, and he said, "I've got three witnesses to this statement." Well then, it is not an independent Boundaries Commission if there's one single person on it that is prejudiced in this manner. And what I'm saying is that the location in the active part of my resolution, I'm saying in effect, "Let's take it out of politics altogether." (Interjection) Well, let's take it out of politics. How many people on the makeup -- I haven't completely studied this, the personnel of the Boundaries Commission, but my guess is that there are several defeated candidates and one thing and another on there; I know of two or three. Well this is no place for them. And it isn't going to be such a major job to announce now where these schools are going to be and I have repeatedly said, the divisions boards will then know what to do for their building program. Right? They'll know. They're asked now to hold up your plans until we announce where they're going to be, because it's going to affect the enrollment. Naturally it's going to affect the enrollment but it has been suggested by several press reports that it could be five years before this Boundaries Commission reports. Well if it's going to be five years in telling us where the vocational schools are going to be, what do you do for the next five years?

An editorial in the Free Press, August 25th, under the heading of "The Boundaries Commission", and apparently the chairman says the job will take from three to five years. "The Commission members for some reason seem to think that their job should take them anywhere from three to five years with initial studies." That just covers the initial studies - just getting started, and then it will take several years at least, it says. Well, what do the school boards do in the meantime in planning any kind of a building program?

Well surely, Mr. Speaker, with what I have said and with the help I've got from my honourable friend the Minister of Education on his promises and the different information that is being circulated around through the divisions presently, everyone will agree with me and I can rest assured that I will have a unanimous vote in support of the resolution that is before us. Thank you very kindly.

MR. SPEAKER. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, being a new member of this House I was quite interested in the last speaker's remarks, and frankly I am somewhat perturbed at hearing some of the charges that he so lightly threw around. I hold no brief for the members of the Boundaries Commission as individuals, I don't know most of them; I know some of them. The fact that they may or may not be defeated candidates in my opinion doesn't make them any less worthy or knowledgeable or honourable than members of this House, including the member who just spoke. I think it demeans, not only an attempt to demean the members of the Commission, I think it demeans us as individuals and as elected representatives if we have to listen to this type of charge by innuendo without any supporting evidence, and I urge the member who made this charge that if he has any evidence at all, he has a duty and an obligation, to if not name this man publicly, to see the Minister and lay this information before him, because if this is the case then this Boundaries Commission personnel or the appointees to it should certainly not be entrusted with this job. I'm not prepared to say, however, that I for one moment give any credence to this statement.

With regard to the other points made by the honourable member, he presents a very interesting case. He proceeds to outline a number of "whereases"; each of these is based pretty well on policies established by the government, supported by I think all sides of the House

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . . . insofar as the needs for vocational training is concerned, I'll agree with him to this extent, that I think Manitoba lags far behind other provinces in every way; that this should have been done not in 1967 but should have been done in 1963 when this same monies by the Federal Government was available. However it's done, and the question is now, how do we go about upgrading our technical vocational facilities in Manitoba as quickly as possible, as fairly as possible, as effectively as possible, so that all shall benefit? And I can't for the world of me accept a proposition which says that it shall be done on the basis of the greatest need by - and the suggestion is - taking it out of the hands of an independent body and putting it into the hands of a group within this House, I assume. Who's to determine the greatest need? I suggest the greatest need is throughout Manitoba. I don't think there's any one area that needs it more than another. The Honourable Member for Rhineland says he feels that they do. He is therefore determining, on his own information, what he feels is the need and I suggest we are better off to study this on the basis of a board which will be able to view the subject from every side, not just from the elected representative's point of view.

He suggests in the final analysis that it be taken out of the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission without delay and announce to the people of Manitoba the new locations. And I suggest to the honourable member that if the government knew today where the best locations should be they would not have turned this matter over to the Boundaries Commission. I think if they had the answer that they would not have done so. I don't believe that although they may be behind in this policy or program of theirs, that they are simply dragging their feet for the sake of dragging their feet, that if they haven't taken advantage of federal money it's because they felt that they had other problems that they had to contend with first. Perhaps the single district division had to be created first. They could have done that perhaps three years ago but they haven't, and as I say, we have to contend with what we are dealing with now. But to suggest that we take it out of the Commission's hands who are studying this and who can study it with an impassioned manner from a more objective manner than can individual members of this House, is to, I say, put it back into the public arena, to make it a political football in the true sense of the word. Everybody will claim greatest need; everyone will claim that their area somehow is entitled more than others. And there are problems here which I think perhaps aren't recognized by all. The federal grant structure to the best of my knowledge - and I admit I'm no expert on this at all - has certain qualifications. I think it's the optimum school or the minimum, I think it is, that they will give a grant to is one that will hold 500 students. Now you just cannot plunk a school with 500 students in any area and say, "I think it should go here." I think it has to be determined, as I say, by a commission who will study the matter and study it in depth.

I would like to caution the government to this extent, that they don't delay on this by allowing the Boundaries Commission to sit on it indefinitely, nor necessarily to wait until the complete study is made. If the Boundaries Commission decides that in southern Manitoba there shall be one school or two or three or what have you, that rather than wait until all of Manitoba is covered and the full picture is developed, that as the needs are made known to them they announce their program, because there's no question; you cannot build 10 schools in one year. You're not going to build them in two years or three years, and I suggest that the sooner we get some of this information the sooner we can get to build them, so there can be a progressive development of building within Manitoba.

I simply rose, Mr. Speaker, to state that I could not support the contention or the arguments put forth by the honourable member and would vote against this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that this debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk:

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

WHEREAS, under our Parliamentary System, the Speaker of the House occupies a position of paramount importance; and

WHEREAS the Speaker is responsible for the interpretation and enforcement of the Rules of the House; and

WHEREAS these rules, developed over the centuries, are intended primarily for the protection of the rights of minorities in the House, while at the same time facilitating the work of the session; and

WHEREAS it is essential that the Speaker, in the discharge of the duties of that high office, should be completely independent, nonpartisan and impartial; and

WHEREAS the United Kingdom Parliament has, through a period of more than 125 years, demonstrated that this independence, nonpartisanship and impartiality, as well as greater knowledge of the rules are secured to the fullest extent through its tradition of continuity in the Speaker's tenure of office; and

WHEREAS the experience of the United Kingdom Parliament proves that the respect which properly belongs to the position of Speaker of the House is enhanced by this tradition of tenure, extending through new Parliaments and changes of government; and

WHEREAS this tradition is now so firmly established in the United Kingdom Parliament that no Speaker has failed to be re-elected in the past one hundred years, if he wished to continue in office; and

WHEREAS in the 1st Session of 1958 this House enacted legislation similar to that with which the United Kingdom Parliament initiated its adoption of the principle of a continuing term for the Speaker; and

WHEREAS it is apparent that the best interests of the public and the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba would be served by the adoption of this principle,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House declare itself in favour of the principle and practice of the Speaker of the House being continued in office through successive Legislatures and Governments following his election after consultation and agreement among all parties in the Assembly; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to consider the most appropriate and effective method of implementing this principle and practice and report its recommendations thereon to the 2nd Session of the 28th Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would think that if there is any resolution that could be properly said to be self-explanatory that perhaps this one would come pretty close to meeting that condition, and for that reason I shall not find it necessary to speak at as great length as I have on some other occasions.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that we could agree that the first two or three or four "whereases" can be taken for granted. I would think there would be no difference of opinion with regard to the correctness of those statements. Some might think that when this resolution mentions that "whereas it is essential that the Speaker, in the discharge of the duties of that high office, should be completely independent, nonpartisan and impartial," that there was a certain redundancy or repetition in using those terms. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that all of them are necessary and that each has a meaning that is important here. I would define "independence" in this connection as free, not subject to control by others; I define "non-partisan" as not adhering to a Party or group or faction, and I would define "impartial" as not favouring one more than another, or treating all alike. I think that most people would agree with those definitions and that they are proper and necessary qualifications for the high office of Speaker.

The next "whereas" paragraph, I would think is not open to any question, and certainly is agreed to by the authorities that I have consulted on this matter. I think the same would go for the next paragraph, and I think the one which says, "Whereas this tradition is now so firmly established in the United Kingdom Parliament that no Speaker has failed to be re-elected in the past one hundred years, if he wished to continue in office," is worthy of comment. That I am told is a fact, and of course election in that sense does not mean election in the constituency but rather elected by the members of parliament, so I believe it is also true that while the Speaker's election has been contested on some occasions, one or two, that he has never been defeated, and that in spite of the fact that he has refused to campaign as a partisan.

(M.R. CAMPBELL cont'd)....

The next paragraph is a matter of history: "Whereas in the 1st Session of 1958 this House enacted legislation similar to that with which the United Kingdom Parliament initiated its adoption of the principle of a continuing term for the Speaker." We put in two pieces of legislation whereas the United Kingdom had established this tradition by only one. We put in the same one that the United Kingdom had used to begin or initiate this tradition. That simple amendment at that time, way back now, 140 years approximately in the United Kingdom, was simply to remove from the annual estimates the Speaker's salary and place it instead in legislation, by that simple method of pointing out or emphasizing the difference between Mr. Speaker's position and that of the other members of the House, and with that very simple beginning the tradition has grown to where it is now completely accepted and acceptable to parliament itself and to the public.

But we went further than that, Mr. Speaker, because at that time I had been holding some consultations with the people from the university and others who were quite interested in this subject and knowledgeable in it as well, and they had recommended some further proposals and one of them we adopted. That was that in addition to putting the Speaker's payment or salary into legislation rather than being annually voted, that a difference be made in the salary, and that it also be taken out of the annual estimates and be provided by legislation, so that legislation provided for the Speaker's salary and expenses to be double that of the private member of the Legislative Assembly. And I recall always with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that one of those bills was seconded - both moved by myself as Leader of the House at that time - and seconded, one of them, by the then Leader of the Opposition who is now the First Minister of the province, and the other was seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party as I believe they were called at that time, who is not with us at present. And we had hoped, at least I had hoped that this would be a beginning of the adoption of the same principle and that we could move along to getting this method, practice, principle enshrined in the Province of Manitoba. That has not been done and there have even been some differences of opinion expressed in this Chamber as to the degree of consultation that has been held at the time of the choice of the Speakers since that time, but I still feel, Mr. Speaker, that there is a general agreement in this House that there should be a move made in this direction, and so I am not trying to be doctrinaire in suggesting this proposal to the House; I'm not trying to urge that it be done at once; I'm not going to deal - unless I should be encouraged to - with any post mortems over what happened before; but I think we should look at it as the proper thing to do from now on, and so I suggest that the principle be adopted by the House and then that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to consider it a most appropriate and effective method of implementing this principle and practice; and that committee when it would consider the principle and practice could, providing the House adopted the principle, could deal with each and every facet that it decided to consider.

One of those would probably be this matter of a special constituency for the Speaker. I have no firm views on that matter. I must confess that I have always been rather intrigued by the suggestion that a special constituency could be erected for Mr. Speaker and that would remove the -- or one of the objections that is sometimes applied, sometimes mentioned as a difficulty in having a permanent Speaker, namely, that his constituencies are, if he's going to be as nonpartisan and independent as is suggested, that his constituents would be practically disenfranchised. Personally I don't regard that as serious a difficulty as some others do, but if it is so held, then the committee could certainly consider any of the various proposals for a special constituency; a special constituency, if they wished, whose members, whose electors should be such people and only those who are elected as members of the Legislative Assembly.

So there has been a lot of attention paid to this subject in recent years, Mr. Speaker, a good bit of it since the time that it was discussed in this House when this legislation was passed. I think it's appropriate that we should now consider it fully and if the principle is agreed to by the House that we should ask this committee to deal with the duties.

I'm not going to go so far into the background or history of this question as my honourable friend the Member for Brokenhead did in the agricultural situation earlier on today, but perhaps it would be worthwhile to mention just in passing a few of what I would consider to be high points in the tradition that attaches to Mr. Speaker's position. I think everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that in the early days the term was applied to the Chairman of the House because he was in fact the person who spoke for the Commons, and in the early days of that particular evolution of the parliamentary process it was by no means an enviable position to be in, because

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). . . quite frequently, in fact in the early days usually, the Commons were making suggestions to or demands upon the sovereign which the sovereign frequently found very unpopular, and the one who was chosen to be the spokesman of the Commons of that day had a mighty difficult position to undertake, and it was usually handed on, so the historians tell us, it was usually given to somebody who showed both the initiative and the capabilities in debating these different questions and supporting the point of view that was generally agreed to, to be the spokesman, and because he was a person of initiative and conviction he soon became recognized as a mighty important person in the parliamentary process, and the sovereigns of the day were not slow to recognize that position either, and they started pretty early in the game to try and see to it that they got him on their side of the questions rather than on the Commons side, and after awhile, though he had started out as completely independent to the extent that he was expressing the Commons view, it came through the evolution of the process that after awhile he was rather won over to the King's side and he began to be to some extent the spokesman of the sovereign's interests in the House. And this was one of the things that the Commons had to fight against. They had to fight first to get a good spokesman for their position vis-a-vis the Crown, then they had to counteract through the years this tendency of the sovereign to win the Speaker away from the Commons and make him the King's man.

We find in the time of King James I the Speaker apologizing by letter to the King for failing to advance the interests of the Crown as differentiated from the interests of the Commons. A few years prior to that, Mr. Speaker, at the time of Queen Elizabeth I, Peter Wentworth, M. P. actually died in the Tower for protesting, among other things, against the manipulation of the House by Mr. Speaker on behalf of the sovereign, and it took many many years and much struggle to once again reverse the process and again get Mr. Speaker back into the position of where he was once again and indeed the actual spokesman of the Commons, which I'm glad to say he continues to be in these times.

Now there have been volumes written on this and they express the history and the views much better than I would be able to do even if I were prepared to take the time to try and cover it, but jumping up to the quite recent past, Mr. Speaker, it is known that just a couple of years ago the House of Commons established a select committee to consider this matter and they asked Professor Dennis Smith, who is the assistant professor of politics at Trent University, to make a study of what is referred to as the prestige, authority and independence of the speakership, and rather than me taking any time on this matter, I would refer the honourable members to the October 1966 edition of the *Parliamentarian*, which as you know we receive as members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and there you can read an excellent resume of Professor Smith's report on this matter. I have not found out what has been done in Ottawa. I would expect from the absence of any information as to what action has been taken on the report, I would expect that little or nothing has been done because this article is in the October 1966 issue and it conveys no information on that regard.

But I would like to read just a very short section or two from this report, put in much better words than I could put it. Here's what Professor Smith says in his report: "That the Speaker, once elected to the Chair, should normally be re-elected without opposition at the commencement of each parliament for as long as he possesses the confidence of the House and is willing to serve, and that the party leaders should commit themselves in advance to this custom, naturally re-election to the Chair being contingent upon re-election to the House. Some means should be devised to ensure the Speaker's return unopposed in his constituency, even by creating, if necessary, a special constituency of Parliament Hill where the electors would be the members of the House of Commons." I commend this article, which is an excellent one in my opinion, to the honourable members and will not read anything further from it at the present time.

But earlier than this issue of the *Parliamentarian*, Mr. Speaker, we have in the same Journal, in April 1966, an article entitled "The Impartiality of the Speaker" by the Rt. Hon. H. . . . King, Ph.D., M. P., who is the Speaker of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, and that one also I would certainly refer to members who are interested in this question. I would like to just quote a brief reference in that one as well. This is also a fairly lengthy article by the present Speaker of the House of Commons and it is headed "The Impartiality of the Speaker," and on Page 128 there's a heading "Sole allegiance to the House" and this is Mr. Speaker himself speaking: "And so through the centuries, all ties, financial and personal, between first the Crown, then the government, have been eroded and now none remains. The Speaker has one allegiance only, to the House of Commons and to each of its members individually.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....As the latest Speaker said at his election in 1965" - (you will realize, Mr. Speaker, he is here quoting himself) - "as the latest Speaker said at his election in 1965, he is ' a Speaker who would show fear or favour to nobody, king or baron, Tory, Socialist or Liberal, front-bencher or backbencher, because he is the servant of only one master, and that master is the freely elected House of Commons.' " And it is from this article that I extracted one of the "Whereas" paragraphs of the resolution because the next sentence is: "It is significant that no Speaker has failed to be re-elected in the past 100 years, if he wished to continue in office."

To return to Professor Dennis Smith's report on the Canadian Speakership, I shall read no more but I have copied down one of his quotes where, after dealing with the fact that the Speaker should divest himself of all party considerations, Professor Smith makes this comment which struck me as being quite arresting. Professor Smith says: "To have perfect confidence, the House must know that its Speaker has nothing to lose by doing right and nothing to gain by doing wrong." And he is making the point there that if Mr. Speaker does not divest himself of his party associations and affiliations, that he will always be subject, as Professor Smith suggests, that he is subject in Ottawa these times to the view, at least with some of the members, that he is likely to show favouritism. So he uses this striking phrase, "Nothing to lose by doing right and nothing to gain by doing wrong." I make without any comment, Mr. Speaker, only the fact that where the tradition is so pronounced in the United Kingdom that party affiliations are completely unknown after the Speaker begins to occupy that position. I mention that the last two Speakers of this House have gone immediately from that position to a position in the Cabinet.

Professor Smith quotes former Prime Ministers Macdonald, Laurier, Meighan and King as all being in favour of the establishment of a permanency in the tenure of office of Mr. Speaker. It does seem rather interesting to speculate upon the fact that if all of them were interested and approved of that principle that we don't yet have it adopted at Ottawa, but I suppose these things take time. He mentions Macdonald, Laurier, Meighan and King; I have had the privilege of knowing personally the latter two of those Prime Ministers. I have known personally every Prime Minister since that, and I would be willing to state, although I haven't tried to dig up quotations to prove the point, but I believe it would be correct to say that every one of their successors have also endorsed this principle. And though Professor Smith has missed from that list the Rt. Hon. R. L. Borden, some reading that I have done in connection with Mr. Borden's point of view on this would indicate that his inclusion would still make it unanimous.

And so I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should proceed to deal definitely with this matter now at this time, by adopting the principle as the resolution suggests, then referring to what seems to me to be the appropriate committee, the job of dealing with the details of how to implement that principle and practice, and that committee would not be inhibited in any way. It could have the fullest discussion and consider all alternatives. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a forward step in the Province of Manitoba. I know that all members of the House share with me the wish to see that the prestige, the authority of Mr. Speaker is upheld in every way, and I believe that if we should move along toward establishment of a permanent, continuing tenure of office, that we would be doing much to enhance that respect and prestige, and then that we would have thereby the greatest single principle on which we could proceed to make some other, in my opinion, needed reforms in our procedural matters here in the House. I think that having established this first principle, particularly after we got it into practice, that we could then be able to do as they have done in the United Kingdom for many years and depart entirely from the appeals from Mr. Speaker's rulings, and we could have certain other reforms that I think would be very useful. But I believe this first step to be basic to many others that would come.

So. Mr. Speaker, hoping that some others in the Chamber will take an interest in this matter and will add their suggestions to the ones that are contained here, I presented to the House something that is well worthy of consideration, that I believe is in the public interest and in the interest of the House itself.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we should first of all thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for his introduction to this very fascinating resolution. Those of us who happened to be in the House back in 1958 will well recall the presentation that was made at that time by the honourable gentleman and also I reaffirm what he said that at that particular time there were two resolutions, one seconded by the then Leader of the Opposition and the other by the Leader of our predecessor in our political life, the then Leader of the CCF Party. So there's no question of doubt of the fact that the honourable gentleman is correct when he states that at that particular time these resolutions were introduced. And also, Mr. Speaker, I think that you would join with me that since that time we've had a couple or more arguments in this House as to whether or not the position now occupied by you should have been occupied by somebody else, and surely this was also the situation in respect of your predecessor. On opening day on at least a couple of occasions we had some argument as to whether or not the proposals of the Honourable the First Minister back in the Liberal regime should not have in fact become law, because at that time it was so ordained.

And I appreciate very much the study that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside has given to this problem. Frankly Mr. Speaker, as I recall in my short life in this Assembly, and then as I take a look at the preambles to the resolution proposed by my friend, certain questions arise in my mind as to the accuracy of the statements therein contained, and when I say "as to the accuracy," I do not impute any motives to my honourable friend at all.

First of all, in the first portion of the preamble we're talking about our parliamentary system, the Speaker of the House occupies a position of paramount importance. I don't think anyone in this House will dispute the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the position that you now occupy is of paramount importance.

And then my honourable friend in the third "whereas" says that these rules have been developed over the centuries. Now I'm not quite sure what my honourable friend means when he talks about over the centuries, because he's dealing with our parliamentary system. I presume that it's in Canada and we're going to celebrate our first Centenary in a few weeks from now. I imagine what my honourable friend suggests is the parliamentary system of Iceland who have had a sort of a democratic government for a thousand years or so, but of course it isn't our parliamentary system; it was theirs. Then of course a little further on my honourable friend mentioned 125 years in the British parliamentary system, which certainly isn't centuries but just a few years beyond a century.

But I'm most intrigued, Mr. Chairman, in the preamble in my honourable friend's resolution when he talks about the protection and the rights of minorities in the House. I think in this House we've had more arguments about the protection of the rights of minorities than in any other House across the length and breadth of our great Dominion. We have fought in this particular House for the protection or the rights of minorities ever since there was an Independent Labour Party, a CCF Party, and now the New Democratic Party. It was only really until the rules of the House were revised last year that the rights of the minority in this particular House was protected to the degree that at least we had equality of opportunity for the Leader of that Party, whoever he or she may have been, to be on a relative equal basis. If the rights of the minority had been established as suggested by my honourable friend in this resolution, we wouldn't have had the arguments that we've had over the years in order to establish the rights of minority Parties. I agree, my honourable friend the Member from Rhineland, who is the loner of a political Party in the House, just a moment ago interjected and suggested maybe he's excluded of this, but I'm talking of minority which has support in this House, minority that at least can have a mover and a seconder to any resolution that is proposed, and I am sure that my honourable friend the member for Rhineland, a Social Creditor - I do not mean this in any way derogatory of his political Party - but I say that he has protection even more so as the result of the fight and endeavours of the Party that I happen to lead at the present time has fought, and I think now has won, in this House, Mr. Speaker. And I agree with my honourable friend the member for Lakeside, that the Speaker should be completely independent, nonpartisan and impartial.

What does this in effect actually mean? My honourable friend the member who introduced this resolution in his discourse said that he should be beyond the ambit of political considerations. How ideal this would be, Mr. Speaker. Why don't we, instead of adopting the suggestion of my honourable friend, come to the conclusion in this House that the person who is charged with the responsibility of the conduct in the routine matters within this House should be a civil servant divorced from politics? Why shouldn't your position, Mr. Speaker, be occupied by a

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) a person who, once having been agreed upon by the Assembly, be charged with the responsibility of adherence to the rules of the House similarly, may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Comptroller-General of the Province of Manitoba when removal can only be done by a two-thirds majority of the complete members of the House? Would this not, Mr. Speaker, be a suggestion that might lead to a more impartiality of the person who is the humble servant of we members of the Legislature? And I suggest that - and I'm not going to pose incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the resolved part of the resolution that the Committee on Elections and Privileges might take under consideration this proposition. It might be well worth looking at, Mr. Speaker, that instead of having a hassle here at the first gathering after an election, that we have a hassle that we don't have an independent Speaker because he happens to be the nominee of the next Government of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party, the Government of Manitoba, that we don't have a hassle at opening day. Let us in the meantime possibly elect or select by unanimous opinion, if such is possible, of a civil servant to occupy the position of Speaker, because my honourable friend in his presentation here -- or suggest that maybe the leaders of the parties - and now we have three parties recognized in this House - shall select by a majority vote the person to occupy the position of Speaker of this Assembly.

First of all I question very much whether a proposition between the Honourable the First Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party, who would be charged with this responsibility, could choose a person who would be independent, impartial and nonpartisan. But if we could perchance, let's do it. They attempted to do it down in Ottawa and a very good friend of mine and a friend I am sure of everybody in this House, one MP Stanley Knowles it was suggested at one time should be the Speaker of the House of Commons. How far that proposition got we're all aware of the fact that my friend Stanley figured that he had other tasks and other obligations in the parliamentary system of Canada at that particular time.

Then my honourable friend goes on to say a greater knowledge of the rules are secured to the fullest extent through the tradition of continuity in the Speaker's tenure of office. I suggest that in this particular ambit that the thing is not so much the security of tenure in the continuity in the Speaker's tenure of office but having a well-qualified Clerk of the Assembly who from time to time puts Mr. Speaker in possession of the rules of the House, which change incidentally, Speaker by Speaker. We can read May's and Beauschesne and the rest of the Speakers that have held that particular office, and they change. We've even had them changed in this House on a number of occasions.

Then my honourable friend goes on to say in his preamble that this tradition has been so firmly established in the United Kingdom parliament that no Speaker has failed to be re-elected in the past 100 years. I don't think this statement, Mr. Speaker, is accurate, if one considers the fact that Speakers outside of being Speakers at the time being have been defeated in election to the House of Commons in the Old Country. It is, I think, a correct statement to make, that those Speakers who are not opposed and defeated in Parliamentary elections, when they return to the Mother of Parliaments were placed back in the position of Speaker of the House, got back their positions, I think that it is a truism, however, that certain Speakers of the British House of Commons have been defeated in election and were replaced.

I note now it's 5:30, Mr. Speaker. The time is finished. I'll only be about two minutes, unless the honourable gentlemen of the House wish to -- I have a few more things I would say on this resolution - possibly we could adjourn the House and I could continue at a later date.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.