



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 35 2:30 p.m. Tuesday, March 20, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 p.m. Tuesday, March 20th, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Virden) introduced Bill No. 76, an Act to amend the Limitation of Actions Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Welfare)(Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name.

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

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting a program of fitness and amateur sport and to provide, among other things, for making of payments from the Consolidated Fund for: (a) grants for the purpose of promoting, encouraging, and developing the fitness of, and the engaging in amateur sport by, the people of Manitoba; (b) the training of personnel who will assist in achieving the objects of the legislation; (c) the payment of the expenses of members of an advisory council to be established; and (d) the payment of the remuneration of staff required to carry on the program above mentioned.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman, this resolution will be a bill to complement the Federal Bill C131 which is the bill setting up the fitness and amateur sport program in Canada. As the resolution states, there are several purposes to the bill which will require the expenditures of money and, generally, it will parallel very closely the federal bill.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, the Minister presumably has been in discussion with the federal government on this subject. The federal bill was passed some time ago. I wonder if when we come along to the discussion of the provincial bill whether he could supply us with copies of the federal bill at the same time so that we can make comparison of the two. Also, if possible, what arrangements have been made with other provinces, and whether the Province of Manitoba will be roughly in line with the other provinces or whether there'll be some major differences between the legislation we are passing and those passed in other jurisdictions. A specific question I would like to ask him now is when the consultations were held with the federal government on this subject were all the provinces called in together or was the discussion made province by province.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, in connection with this resolution, I think I recall seeing a news item in last evening's paper, I believe it was, to the effect, if memory serves me right, that at the present time the federal authorities either cannot or will not go ahead with their contribution in respect of this program that they have for physical fitness. I wonder if the Minister has any comment or saw that particular news item. It seems to me that there were some difficulties encountered--whether they were financial because, of course, we all appreciate and realize the fact that the federal government is in financial difficulties--I don't know if that was the reason for the newspaper comment or not, but it did seem to me that it was an indication that at least there would be some considerable delay with portions if not all of the program as announced originally in Ottawa. I wonder if the Minister could inform us.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll endeavour to have copies of that Bill ready for second reading. I believe the second reading will be Thursday next so I may not be able to get enough copies by that time but I will endeavour to do that.

There was a federal-provincial meeting called by Mr. Monteith at which all provincial Ministers charged with the responsibility by their several legislatures for this program met and discussed the federal program and the recommendations that had been made by the first meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sport in Montreal early this winter. There was also a meeting of the Deputy Ministers and the technical personnel involved in these programs in the several provinces at the same time. And I think I can report that there was substantial agreement reached on the programs that would be followed and should be followed as a result of the federal bill.

With regard to the question by the Leader of the NDP--he's probably aware that the \$5 million appropriation each year is a statutory amount and that if it is not expended in the course of the fiscal year the amount lapses. Now because not all of the provinces have been able to arrive at agreements or at programs which were agreeable to the federal government or which complemented the federal government legislation by the end of '61-'62, not all of this \$5 million will be, I understand, spent. However, we hope that by next year the programs and the agreements will be sufficiently far advanced that we will be able to see that all of that \$5 million is spent in the coming year.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, following on the Minister's remarks, are we given to understand then this is another one of those deals to which all of the provinces must become participants in order that the funds may be used; or is it possible that Manitoba alone can take advantage of the provision of the funds at the federal level?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman, the timing of the original bill is what determines it. It's my memory that it was passed last fall and there just hasn't been time to organize all the programs--yes, 25th September, 1961--there just hasn't been time to organize the programs that were envisaged under the bill in the intervening time in order to get the money committed to the proper source of programs. But it doesn't follow at all that this is a conditional program that everybody has to share in it. Each province will presumably have their own program and will be making separate agreements with Ottawa for the projects as they see fit. A great variety of provinces--a great number of the provinces, at least, are presently carrying on physical education programs in their Department of Education and they will be augmenting their physical education programs with the federal program, whereas other provinces will be doing it in another way as we will be doing it here. So it doesn't necessarily follow that because one province doesn't have a program that somebody else won't be able to share in the results of the federal appropriation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate to us what will be the sharing basis? Is it 50/50 or what basis is it on; and what is the anticipated expenditure by the Government of Manitoba?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: The anticipated expenditure by the government is indicated in the estimates. I believe the amount is \$100,000 by the province. We hope to receive \$200,000 from the federal government, but we're not sure of that figure as yet. That was the best estimate that we could arrive at, at the time that we were setting out our program. The federal government will be distributing some of this \$5 million to national organizations and for national purposes and the balance will be going to provincial organizations and through the provincial organizations to local organizations. It is impossible at this time to say just what the breakdown will be. I don't think this has been yet decided; and, of course, the exact split between national and provincial programs will vary from year to year depending on what international activities are going on. For instance, in the year that there's an Olympic Games on presumably the federal government will take a substantial portion of this money to augment Canada's representation in the Olympic Games; whereas in another year when there are no international events going on presumably there will be more money available at the provincial level. These matters are still under study by the National Advisory Committee and by the continuing committee of Deputy Ministers that will be set up to advise the federal government on the exact disposition of the money. I might say, however, that the government at Ottawa has indicated that the whole \$5 million will be available for purposes of fitness and amateur sport in that all the administration entailed will be

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.) . . . . . carried out of the votes of the Department of Health and Welfare.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, do I understand the Minister correctly to say that he's proposing the Bill to the House without having a fixed financial arrangement with Ottawa?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: We have very good assurance from Ottawa that there will be substantial amounts of money available to all the provinces. The exact amount of money is not yet available because Ottawa has not yet made up its own mind. However, we do know how much we are prepared to spend on our part, and the size of our program will, of course, depend on the exact arrangements that are made.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated in his opening comments that this was to complement the federal legislation. Now if that is the case, should he not have a fixed commitment from Ottawa; should they not make up their minds? If they passed the Bill last September are they not in a position yet to have their minds made up as to what they want to do, so that the province can proceed and know where it's going?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well I can assure the Honourable Member from Elmwood that it isn't window dressing, that there are some very concrete programs being envisaged under this bill. It's unfortunate that we hadn't had a continuing effort following the original national bill of this kind that, I believe, was passed in '43 or something of that nature and that Manitoba has not had a program in this field through all the years. However, while we're not sure of how much Ottawa is putting forward, we are quite sure of the course that we intend to follow; and we're quite sure that we intend to spend a substantial amount of money, and that we feel this will be a good program and will bear good fruit in the field of fitness and amateur sports.

MR. MOLGAT: It is correct then, that the federal government don't know what they're doing in this field yet?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well I don't think there's any point in commenting on remarks like that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, I would just ask whether he has analyzed the possibilities of having this program cover the whole of the Province of Manitoba including the smaller towns and villages. Our experience of the past has been that physical fitness programs were put into operation in some of the cities and larger towns but nothing has been done whatsoever in the smaller towns and villages, and I would hope that the Minister would consider the necessity of extending any future programs to every small town and village in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: . . . . . member that this program will reach into every nook and cranny of the Province of Manitoba. We will look after all the people of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . understand then, Mr. Chairman, that the Province of Manitoba will go ahead with a physical fitness program irrespective of what the sharing basis is with Ottawa; unlike a former administration in this province that was 50/50 with an administration at Ottawa and because of the withdrawal of Ottawa, physical fitness collapsed in the Province of Manitoba. Am I correct in stating that what you have in mind that irrespective of this being a shared program, this will fill the gap in the life of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: The Honourable Leader of the NDP has made a very good statement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one short thing and that is that I hope that the people who are making the plans for this don't equate physical fitness with amateur sport and that's all. There's too many people in this province like myself who like to watch other people play games; we like to go and watch--10,000 people sit and watch a football game. It's good recreation but it's not much assistance to physical fitness, and I hope that we're going to have a good deal more physical fitness and less sport that we've had in other programs in the past.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that the government plans to spend a substantial amount of money. I notice in the estimates that he's allocated \$100,000. Is this the substantial figure or is there another figure?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well I guess we're going to argue about the meaning of the word "substantial", Mr. Chairman. We think that \$100,000 in the initial stages of this program is a substantial amount of money.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing over the word substantial. He didn't say \$100,000. I'm asking him if that's the amount he's going to spend.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I was going to comment on that same point but my comment was a bit different, because as I read the estimates, the amount is \$300,000 and--yes, the amount is \$300,000 to be spent of which my honourable friend expects or hopes to get \$200,000 back from the federal government. Is that not correct?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: That's the way it--

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right. So this is not \$100,000, this is a \$300,000 program, and I certainly agree that even in these days of high spending, that that's a substantial amount all right. The point that I was going to ask the honourable minister is--I know that the detail of this should be given on second reading rather than now--but the difference is that here we can discuss it in a little more informal manner. I think that, along the lines that have already been suggested, it would be a good idea if the Minister gave us some indication of the proposals that are envisaged to spend an amount of \$300,000. It seems to me that means a tremendous amount of organization. I note that there is authority being taken to set up an advisory committee, and of course to have paid staff, training staff and all that sort of thing. I'm sure that that's necessary.

I was interested in the fact that we're not yet sure as to the amount that the federal government is going to contribute, which brings me to the point that was mentioned by the Honourable the Leader of the NDP because he managed to drag in by the scruff of the neck, the old story about the fact that we folk decided that when the federal government withdrew its support that we would terminate the program as well. I suggest to my honourable friends that they will find, too, that in these shared programs that they need to look at them pretty carefully, and we couldn't get a better evidence of it than right now because the Minister, putting in a very substantial sum, is still not sure how much the federal government is going to take part in this. And I can tell you as one who has gone through this kind of a program on a much smaller scale than is envisaged now, that it is a problem if you get a real big set-up and then find that the other partner decides to not continue with it--and you get that kind of thing between governments very often.

Now as far as my honourable friend, the Leader of the NDP, of course, and his group, well that doesn't matter the amount of money that you spend doesn't matter--just go ahead. I prefer to emphasize the DP part because that's what they're going to be pretty soon--displaced from here and in the country in general--(interjection)--One of the best ways of them making sure that that happy event is going to happen is to keep on with these irresponsible statements indicating that it doesn't matter at all whether the other partner stays with the arrangement or not--just go ahead and pick up his share of the tab, too, and pay it all.--(interjection)--Well there are a lot of people that I would mind more if you compared me with than Lester Pearson. Maybe some of you will be sounding like Hazen Argue. It would be very smart of you if you did.

My whole point is that this is a \$300,000 program, not a \$100,000 program, and I think with a program of that size that we will await with a good deal of interest just what the government has set up in order to use that large amount of money to good advantage.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was quite interested in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. My point to the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, however, was not dealing with the whole of the \$300,000, and the Member for Lakeside has properly mentioned that figure because it is in the estimates--anticipated from Ottawa authority \$200,000.

The point that I raised was, that irrespective of sharing from Ottawa, is the Province of Manitoba going ahead with a program, at least of the magnitude as envisioned in the estimates and for which the government is asking us in this House to provide the necessary monies? My answer from the Minister as I understand it, was "yes." Then, Mr. Chairman, having had the opportunity of being in the House at the time of the collapse of the physical fitness program in the province, I naturally made reference to it because I don't want to see any similar collapse here in the Province of Manitoba as it set us years behind the times, such as the collapse that we had under the former administration. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I was quite interested in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside in reference to shared programs between the federal authorities and the respective provinces, and I would refer him to the statements of his federal leader, a very honourable gentleman by the name of Lester Pearson, who has announced, or at least he did announce in Quebec--that may have been peculiar that the announcement

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . . was made in Quebec--that if, and when--goodness forbid--that he and his party form the next government in Canada, then all of the shared programs as we know them today will be wiped off of the slate entirely. What position would that leave--

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: When I'm finished. What position would that leave us here in the Province of Manitoba in respect of half or more of the programs that we have? So I suggest to my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, that when he gets a little touchy as he does sometimes because I make reference to such incidence as happened during the time that he was the Premier of Manitoba, that it's already forecast as far as his party is concerned in the federal arena that the withdrawal will be in respect of all of the shared programs that we have at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this is hardly germane to the discussion at hand but my honourable friend has brought up once again, the statements that the Honourable Lester Pearson, our Federal Leader made in this regard. He discussed this once before in the House; he's made the statement here again and I want to refute completely what the Leader of the NDP has said. If he wishes to quote Mr. Pearson, I would suggest that he get the full quote. I'd suggest that he quotes correctly what was said--(interjection)--To correct him at this stage, I would like to say that Mr. Pearson first referred the shared programs at a meeting here in Winnipeg--at a meeting, in fact, where we were honouring my colleague, my previous leader, the Member for Lakeside. Mr. Pearson at that time said specifically here, that the liberal party would be in favour of having the provinces free to come out, or to come into shared programs; that if they chose to leave a shared program they would not by that reason lose financially, but that they would be free to participate or not to participate. His subsequent statements in Quebec City was exactly the same statement as he made here. If my honourable friend would check, he will find that to be absolutely correct. There was at no time any suggestion that the liberal party was going to put shared programs on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. It was clearly understood that it was the very reverse. The provinces would be free to come in, or not to come in. If they chose not to come in they would be getting a financial contribution equal to those who did go into the program, and they were free to do what they wanted with it.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . Mr. Chairman, if I may just pursue this point for a moment. My honourable friend the leader of the liberal party suggests to me that I should get a hold of the official documents and text of the speech of the Right Honourable Lester Pearson in Quebec. I suggest that I used exactly the same source for my information as he was using yesterday when he was talking about the question of the Portage diversion--namely, the reports that we receive from time to time through the media of the press--and I suggest, Mr. Chairman and members of this assembly, that the press are not always wrong. The point that my honourable friend has mentioned as to the proposition of Mr. Pearson--the provinces could accept or reject--doesn't really hold water.

Actually an analysis of the proposition of that Right Honourable gentleman simply means that the poorer provinces will get less revenue in order to do the job they are doing now than they do under the present shared program, and argue as he might, Mr. Chairman, a review of the statements that were made by the leader of the federal liberal party are still the same statements that I have made in this House.

MR. MOLGAT: I won't debate the matter at length now--there'll be time on another occasion. All I can say is my honourable friend is once again completely wrong and misquoting.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that Mr. Pearson wouldn't want me to be interpreting his statements for him and I'm equally certain that he would be even less willing to have my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party doing it so I don't imagine it's necessary for us to continue--

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Mr. Chairman, my interpretation would be the more correct--

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I would doubt that even Mr. Pearson would agree with that. But this really hasn't a great deal of bearing on the present discussion except that I come back to the same point that these shared programs, regardless of what the nature of them, regardless of what governments are in power, because as the Honourable the Leader will remember it was a government friendly to us politically that was in power at the time that that particular program was dropped. If my honourable friend thinks it's a case of knifing then that's a very good

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . . description of it, but the fact is that that happens between governments. I can give you many examples through the years of where programs have been entered into, undoubtedly in good faith on both sides, but later on one or the other of them decided to drop out. And it doesn't make very much difference if its the provincial government that drops out because the federal government can carry on without much trouble at all if they decide to do so, but if it's the federal partner paying the major share of the cost and with the resources that they have at their disposal, that drops out and leaves the provincial government with the program on its hands, what happens? And when my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party is asking the Honourable the Minister now--Do you intend to carry on with a \$100,000 program--that just shows the depth of his understanding of this matter because once again this is not a \$100,000 program. This is a \$300,000 program, and when my honourable friend gets it built up to a \$300,000 program, if the federal government should decide to not continue it at all --what do you do? Do you cut it back to a \$100,000 program, or do you keep on with a \$300,000 program? And that's the point that many governments before this one have come to and have had to face.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks. First of all, last fall I had a discussion with one of the members of a commission that sat and brought in a report on recreation and fitness and he at that time thought that this was long overdue and that action should be taken. I am quite happy to see that something is being done about it now. I would like to know just what part local societies will be playing in this matter. Just what is going to be given to these societies in the way of funds--is it going to be on capital items or is it on operations? Then I also feel that the Member for Lakeside has a point there when he says that we should watch ourselves on these cost-sharing programs. This should definitely be considered that we not be caught holding the bag. I think I'll have some supplementary questions after--

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, members will recall that last year the Department of Industry and Commerce set up a program of leadership training in the field of recreation and amateur sports and this program will carry on--will supplement and augment that program--it will augment it tremendously. With regard to the details I think we can probably leave those to second reading and consideration in the committee stage. Generally speaking, they are set out in (a), (b), (c) and (d) of the resolution. I would say that our emphasis, we feel, should be placed upon (b) and as far as grants permit--as far as money permits--(a). The items set out in (c) and (d) will be more or less continuing expenses, and the programs envisaged under (a) and (b) will be the ones that will fluctuate with the amounts of money available from other levels. But the Member from Lakeside is quite correct, the total program, we hope, this year will be \$300,000 and we hope that Ottawa will, when they complete negotiations and when the National Advisory Committee has had further meetings, that they will come up with a figure approximately that. But in any event, we hope to expend the full \$100,000 in the coming year for the purposes as set out.

MR. FROESE: What proportion do you feel will be spent on grants and how much on staff?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Those details I think, Mr. Chairman, could be more properly be left to the committee stage. It would be not right of me I don't think to make an estimate of that situation now and the members will see why when they see the bill in detail.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): . . . . . I don't think it would be wise to put ourselves in a position where later on the members on this side of the House could be accused by the Minister of putting words in his mouth, and I would like to have something clear here. When the Honourable Leader of the NDP spoke--and of course used the time of the committee to do a little bit of campaigning for he and his Member from St. John's--the Honourable Minister stood up rapidly and smartly behind him and told him that he had made a real good statement. Well, this is what I want to know. Is this going to be a \$300,000 program or a \$100,000 program regardless of what the federal government will do?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: If the honourable member will consult the estimate book he will see that the total program is \$300,000, of which recoveries are estimated from the federal government, of \$200,000--the provincial appropriation is \$100,000. Now if that doesn't mean what I say it means why then the thing is open to doubt, but we expect to spend the full \$100,000 of our appropriation and we don't expect we will receive more than \$200,000 from the federal



(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.) . . . . . government, and if we do receive that much we will certainly spend it, because their appropriation, as I pointed out earlier is a statutory appropriation. Now I know you're going to get up and say: What happens if we don't get \$200,000 from the federal government--and, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that that's an eventuality we will have to face when it arises.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I rise but not to say that. Now I have my answer that \$100,000 will be spent. In other words, that they won't go it alone--and I don't think the Minister should be so much in a hurry to get behind the Leader of the NDP--In other words, if the money doesn't come from Ottawa that won't be spent. Now that money might be voted, but we see that this year the federal government voted \$5 million and I don't think they've spent half a million so far. And that seems to be the same thing again. The time that it takes this government to decide, I don't think they'll spend that \$100,000. I wonder what's going to happen to that.

And there's another question that I would like to know. Apparently it's starting here that it is expedient--although we've been talking about this for four or five sessions now and we're told that we're out of order, or some other ridiculous reason like that--nothing is done, but all of a sudden now that Ottawa is in the act, well then we're all set and this of great importance.

Now I'd like to know a little bit of this--the payments of the expenses of members in the Advisory Council to be established. I think that this is very important because if its a proper Advisory Council it might be all right. I wonder how many members would be on that and what they will be looking for when they'll be establishing and looking for those people to go on this Advisory Board. I think that is a very good point to know.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Secretary)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I do think that we should confine ourselves as far as possible within the rules of debate. Now it's clearly established that when a motion is introduced on first reading, that the member or the Minister introducing the bill shall give the general purport of the bill--not by any means to discuss the details of it. In committee the same rule applies, although a little freer debate occurs because an individual member can speak more often than once and there's a little more informality. I do think it would be wise for the House to confine itself, as reasonably well as it can, within the rules of debate.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, pardon my ignorance. I thought I was discussing the bill and it is rather quite a mix-up that the Leader of the House doesn't get up when Rip Van Winkle here talks about everything else, and is in the past, and talks about everything else but this--now I'm quoting (c) and I can't get any information. I don't know why we're in Committee of the Whole. Is it to politics a campaign for our friends on the left here; or is it to hide things that the government--or is it to give a little publicity for the government? What is it?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . what we're interested in, from a financial standpoint is, if the government doesn't know yet what it's going to get from Ottawa, how can it plan its program? Is it going to plan on the basis of a \$100,000 program or is it going to plan on the basis of a \$300,000 program? Surely this is the basic element at this stage if we're discussing the financial side. How can my honourable friend plan what he's going to do if he doesn't know what he's going to get from Ottawa. Surely if it's \$200,000 it will be a very different program than if it's \$100,000. Now what exactly does he intend to do?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): . . . . . there you see the consistency of thinking on the part of members of the Liberal Party. Just a minute ago they were ridiculing my leader for asking that very question which the Leader of the LP asked just now, because--(interjection)--oh, yes--because my leader asked the Minister as to whether or not this government would consider carrying on at least a skeleton program in the eventuality that the federal government were to pull out, or would they scrap it like the former administration did a few years back. That was the essence of his question and it was a pretty fair question, and the Leader of the LP's thought it was important enough to ask it again. So what's the LP Member for St. Boniface--what's he squawking about? It was a pretty good question you must admit.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman, I endeavoured to indicate on a previous occasion what the basic idea behind the program was, and I'd like to say to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that when he's been talking about this subject generally in previous years I don't think anybody has ever ruled him out of order, although we might have agreed with some of the

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.) . . . . . other observations that he made. The (c) and (d) will be continuing expenses--they will be probably payment of expenses of members of an advisory council to be established and the payment in remuneration of the staff required to carry on the program above mentioned which is the training of personnel and the making of grants. Now I would suggest that, without going into detail, that (c) and (d) are going to be fairly rigidly set-out continuing amounts of money, and that (a) and (b) will be relatively flexible, and that (a) and (b) will probably accurately reflect the amount of money coming from Ottawa; although we certainly intend that not all of our portion will be going for the purposes set out in (c) and (d)--not nearly all of it. A substantial part of our appropriation will be going for purposes set out in (a) and (b). I think that the members opposite can leave the details on this until we get to the bill itself. It will be receiving second reading I believe towards the end of the week and they will have an opportunity to see the exact purposes as they're set out in the bill and we can discuss the matter further at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing here with the principle thing--the details concerning it will come up as it does following many resolutions for the expenditure of money that come before the committee. I think we're now ready to vote. Resolution be adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd still like to know from the Minister though, is he planning on a \$300,000 program at this stage or \$100,000.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I would think that the remarks that I made are perfectly clear. The purpose of introduction in Committee stage and of the first reading is clearly set out in the authority that I have with me, Beauchesne's Fourth Edition of 1958, Section 250, Subsection 3,--(interjection)--216 beginning at the top of the page: "The object of a resolution recommended by the Crown is to give the House a first opportunity to discuss the advisability of making a certain expenditure. The details of the projected measure are not then disclosed and the debate is confined to the resolution which should not be lengthy, although care must be taken that the terms used are sufficiently wide to cover the whole of the bill which will be subsequently introduced." Now it's perfectly clear that this merely contemplates the idea of introducing a bill on this subject giving the general scope and purpose of what the bill will be. There's ample opportunity to discuss the principles of the bill on second reading, then in the committee to debate every little detail of it, and subsequently on third reading, many other opportunities to discuss the bill.

I do think that it would be wise not to give the appearance of endeavouring to discuss at this stage of the bill the details which are specifically reserved for debate at later stages of any ordinary bill. I do invite the co-operation of the House in this regard. It's no attempt to stifle debate; it's merely to try to channel it into the forms that have been set out for a debate.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with what the Leader of the House said in this regard and I think my question to the Minister was not one of detail. I wasn't asking him what specific programs. I asked him what size of a program--is it a \$300,000 one or \$100,000 one. Now surely that's basic to the whole bill. It's not a detail of the bill; it's the bill itself.

MR. EVANS: It calls for details of the bill--at least the detail as to its size. The whole object of the debate is now to discuss the general idea of introducing a bill on this subject and the general principle of allowing public money to be spent on it. And if a bill on that subject is acceptable to the House then the committee passes on it and first reading is held, and then at a later stage if the details of the bill are not acceptable, there's ample opportunity to say so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted?

MR. DESJARDINS: The Honourable Leader of the House quoted Beauchesne is talking about certain expenditure and that's exactly what we're asking. It makes a different thing if it's \$100,000 or \$300,000. He just finished quoting that.

MR. EVANS: I'm not at all aware that I used the word "expenditure" at all in quoting from Beauchesne.--(interjection)--Yes, I must admit the honourable member is right. And it is to discuss the general advisability of making an expenditure for this purpose. It's clearly set out--

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . . you're quoting Beauchesne; go ahead.

MR. EVANS: I wish my honourable friend would let me finish at least the sentence I was engaged on at the moment. It's generally also set out in our own rules of the House here that the object of introduction at first reading is to discuss the general nature and scope of the bill and that no details are to be discussed. I do think it's right, certainly it has been the practice

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . . of the House in the past to say, that when this matter comes up for second reading or when this matter comes up at the committee stage, then comments of a detailed nature will be taken up at that time. I cannot conceive that my honourable friends' rights to debates or their opportunities to make any remarks they want to make are in any danger of being curtailed, and we wouldn't want to do that. It's merely to channel them so that we get some order in debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. CHRISTIANSON introduced Bill No. 87, an Act respecting Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the Orders of the Day, I should like to introduce to the members of the Legislative Assembly 24 pupils from Lorette School under the leadership of Sister Elizabeth and Sister John. The school is located in the Springfield constituency and it's very ably represented in the legislature by the Honourable Mr. Klym. The students this afternoon have looked down from their point advantage on the Legislative Assembly and we hope that they have profited by what they have seen and will take good opinions away from the legislature this afternoon. They may, however, feel that the members at times while they're discussing amateur sports that they're skating on very thin ice. However, we hope that their stay this afternoon has been enjoyable and that they'll come back again some time.

MR. PREFONTAINE spoke briefly in French, translation of which will appear in tomorrow's Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to bring up a matter which I think is an error in the Votes and Proceedings. I'm referring to Votes and Proceedings No. 22, page 3, on the motion of the Leader of the NDP for an Order of Return and it lists on page 3 those who spoke in the debate and the question being put--It was agreed to excepting Clause IV. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think if you will refer to Hansard Page 800 that the question was put without that reservation and it was specifically mentioned at that time that there was no reservation made by yourself, Mr. Speaker, when you put the question. It was accepted by the House without such reservation. I suggest that the Votes and Proceedings are not correct.

MR. SPEAKER: I would inform the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that I was informed at that time that the correspondence, the interdepartmental, was considered to be confidential and could not be tabled, and when I put the motion I was of the opinion that that was fully understood by the House. Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 16, dated March 9th on a motion of Mr. Shoemaker, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

I would like further, Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day to table the annual report of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation for the year ended March 31st, 1961, and to inform the members that in addition they will be receiving a copy of the Eighth Annual Progress Report on Agriculture Research and Experimentation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Health. The question is: Are there any arrangements to ship medical supplies to small communities, smaller hospitals in emergencies. I'm referring mostly to this gasoline blast we had in Winkler where the fire chief had to make two ambulance trips of 79 miles on icy highways--he had to come to Winnipeg to get emergency supplies of blood to help these people. Now I can understand that in a small hospital this is not feasible to keep all the supplies there, but can the Minister of Health tell us if there's anything being done to have these supplies--should the supplies be transported there by plane, helicopter or some way when there's an emergency such as this.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health)(Gimli): No, Mr. Speaker, we have no special arrangements other than the arrangements made by individual hospitals. I would say though

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) . . . . . that as a matter of which may help a little bit in that-- when disaster such as this occurs, of course all hospitals, smaller rural hospitals carry emergency stocks of blood which are delivered by ordinary transport back and forth, and most small hospitals do have an emergency supply, but when you need blood for lifesaving purposes you need a lot of it. And in that case it's always preferable to get proper grouping and matching which means that somebody has to come in with the sample of the blood to get large stocks. We have always found in rural communities that the RCMP are always ready and willing to stand by and assist and in many cases do this. I don't know the particular circumstances in this particular case but could find out. In the far north emergency stocks of blood are usually on hand and in out-of-the-way places as you know, the physician can usually have walking blood banks in that he knows the blood types of the various people in the community and who present themselves in an emergency. But on the whole, in practice, this is something that's difficult to plan for, and certainly I imagine in this particular case--I haven't got all the details but I'd be glad to look into it and see what might be looked at in the future.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will find out more about this as he tells us, could he find out why the chief had to make two trips and why wasn't the supplies shipped to him from Winnipeg and save half the time.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Before the Orders of the Day, unless I'm mistaken I think that the Minister of Agriculture promised to report today the situation of the prospective flood situation around Winnipeg.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, --

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, isn't this supposed to be the day to report? Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall promising to give a report on this date, but I would be glad to get the information for the House, any additional information that is available, and I'll bring it to the House at the first occasion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface already touched on what I was going to bring up this afternoon. I think the members are all aware of the fire that took place in Winkler, the explosion that was with it, and the loss of lives that resulted from it. At the present time 2 or 3 are still in critical condition in the hospital as a result of the fire and the burns that they received. I wish to extend my sympathies and condolences to the family, to the bereaved; the father himself is still in hospital and has received burns extensively and it's a sad affair that this had to happen. Probably the cause is in not taking proper care in the delivering of the gas and servicing the people out there.

But another thing that I wanted to bring up in this connection is that we've now had three fires within a year in that same town, and that in all cases it was a matter of water shortage for the fire fighters. Now I've repeatedly asked that something be done; that water be made available to the town. I think a reservoir is of great importance and is the first requirement, because they need a reservoir as a supply of water from which to draw when wells will not produce enough water; and in any distribution system later on this reservoir will also be required. So I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture under whose department the Water Supply Board operates, just what is being done and how far have developments progressed as to supplying the Town of Winkler with an overhead tank or reservoir to supply them with the necessary water.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland is aware that the Water Supply Board has been working for some time on the problem of developing water supplies for Winkler as well as other towns in the southern Pembina triangle, and I think I'm correct in saying that we are very near to making a proposal to the Town of Winkler in respect of supplying them with water. It is a rather ironical and cruel twist of fate that Winkler has experienced three major fires during this period in which we have been attempting to perfect a proposal to bring water to this community. However, we have a proposal very near to completion which will be submitted to Winkler and we anticipate and trust that it will be acceptable to them. It will include a reservoir, the development of a water supply, and any treatment as well that is required for the water supply and we trust that our proposal will be acceptable to them and that we can get under way with the construction of this project.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table a return to an order of

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) . . . . the House No. 20, dated Friday, March 16, on motion of the Honourable Member for Fisher.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to come back to the point of privilege of the House which I brought up earlier. I see that my colleague, the leader of the NDP is now back. The Hansard, Mr. Speaker, specifically states, that the question was put without any reservation and the House passed on the motion in that way. I don't believe that it's acceptable to the House. I don't think it could be acceptable to the House that subsequent changes be made in the votes and proceedings on the basis of an objection by the government. The objection should have been raised before the question was put, but that was not done. Subsequently it's true, that the Leader of the House got up and said: "with the reservations." The member who is moving the order objected to this and is perfectly justified surely in his objection because the House--and surely the Votes and Proceedings are a reflection of the decisions of the House--and the House had made a decision to accept the order in the affirmative without reservation.

MR. EVANS: I take it my honourable friend is raising a point of order. I remember this incident quite distinctly and the impression was certainly very firm in my mind that the order was being accepted with this exception. That is certainly my memory of the incident and I feel that the Speaker, in this connection, is perfectly correct in his interpretation of the item that appeared in the Votes and Proceedings.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I had to leave the House for a moment, but if you're dealing with the Order for Return that I proposed in respect of the mining accident at Thompson, and I presume that that's what it is--(interjection)--Oh no, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry; I should have been--and I'm glad the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has raised this question because there was no question of doubt about this; that after an argument which took place on various points of order, that Your Honour put the question. It was agreed to. After the question was agreed to, I believe it was the Honourable the Attorney-General said, "with reservations." I said, "no, not as far as we are concerned." You put the question and called for the vote. We on this side said "yea," and the only vote that you put, Mr. Speaker, was the vote as to the acceptance of the order for return. The government members opposite--(interjection)--I remember that, I read that. Thanks--the members opposite had a chance, Mr. Speaker, at that time, after we on this side had spoken out in the affirmative. The government members were silent; they had an opportunity at that time--and quite frankly I had expected them to call for a division. They did not call for a division; they remained silent, and following that, Mr. Speaker, you declared the motion carried. There was no reservations, and had my honourable friend insisted on the reservation, then they should have demanded a vote at that time, which they did not. They remained stonely silent.

MR. EVANS: There seems to be just a difference of view as to what happened on that occasion--(interjection)--well certainly your view is different from mine. I do raise this point of order; the leader of the NDP was out of the House when this rose a few minutes ago. He may not be aware that the Speaker has given his ruling and that the Speaker's ruling is not debatable. If my honourable friend wishes to take any action at this time he would challenge the ruling of the Speaker. I think it's the only course that's open to him. I think any further debate on this point at this time is out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I inform my honourable friend that the only time that your ruling can be challenged is at the time. Now there's no ruling of yours to be challenged because we cannot go back in respect of a debate that has been concluded, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that even the Speaker of this Assembly cannot go back and make a ruling on any debate that was concluded. The debate on the order for return was concluded; you affirmed that the ayes were, in your opinion, in the majority; you accepted the order; my friends opposite remained silent, and, Mr. Speaker, if in this they were negligent, as they are in so many other things in the conduct of the business of Manitoba, then no ruling, no further ruling can change that. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, unless you want to establish a precedent unknown in parliamentary history.

MR. EVANS: If my honourable friend would permit me just a word here. I think he is under a misconception as to what I was referring to--(interjection)--Well I wonder if he'd let me explain what I'm referring to. It was the ruling which Mr. Speaker made while you were out of

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . . the House. He ruled that the item appearing in the votes and proceedings is correct. That is the reference that I had to Mr. Speaker's ruling.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, you can't rule--may I humbly suggest to you, that you cannot rule on that point. Your rulings deal with the questions of debate. Your ruling has no influence on what is contained in Votes and Proceedings. All Votes and Proceedings actually is . is a history of what occurred, and this is substantiated by Hansard, of what occurred.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on your ruling on this matter I raised the point of privilege of the House. You made a statement--someone else got in in between before I could continue the matter--there was no ruling on your part. I merely raised this point of privilege, and we had a statement from you and some discussion and that's the stage that it's at. At the moment we're in the position where the Votes and Proceedings are not in accord with the Hansard and not in accord with what went on in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The statement is not debatable. I made the statement that--I'll repeat it again for the benefit of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party--I made the statement that in my opinion when the government member, I believe it was the Honourable the Acting Leader of the House, made the statement that the correspondence--the inter-departmental correspondence was of a confidential nature, was considered confidential, and could not be tabled in the House, and on that basis I made my decision, and it is my impression that when I put the motion to the House that the House understood that the correspondence would not be included in the library deposit that the government was making and--

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, such was not the circumstance. You are perfectly correct when you said that there were objections across the way to acceding to my request in my Order for Return. Of that there's no argument. But if Your Honour will recall, following that statement there was a considerable amount of debate on this very point. I established, I thought, to the satisfaction of the House, that notwithstanding the fact of inter-departmental correspondence, this was a public matter because of the nature of the circumstances under which I wanted the return. And following that, Your Honour put the motion--we supported it; there was no opposition. The Honourable the Attorney-General I believe at that time said, "with reservations" and I said, "I accept no reservations," and yet the vote still went through. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, again that the government had an opportunity if they so desired to reject the Order for Return, in whole or in part, by voting against the motion to accept the Order for Return. They did not do this; there was no amendment--which actually there should have been--delete clause (4) if that was proper--because that was a debatable motion. This was not done, and I say because of the lapse of thoughtfulness, or call it what you like, on the part of the government, that the order as passed still stands.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might suggest to Your Honour that there is a form in which a matter of this kind can be raised. I would suggest that any continuation of debate or even the debate we have been carrying on, has been, strictly speaking, out of order. Now there is a form here which is proposed as a means for correcting entries in the Votes and Proceedings or Journal, and it would be then--I beg--

MR. PAULLEY: Correcting--not changing. This has been changed not corrected because a vote was taken.

MR. EVANS: Well, it is a correction to be made--in your view a correction--in the entries in the Votes and Proceedings or Journal.

MR. PAULLEY: No!

MR. EVANS: Well, I wonder what we're discussing about--a change if you like, but the title that I'm reading from here says "change". I wonder if my honourable friend would just stop niggling and haggling for a moment until we get some sort of a proposal in front of the House so that it can be considered. My honourable friends don't criticize others--they just nag. The proposal is a form or formula number 68 for correcting entries in the Votes and Proceedings or Journal. My honourable friends would rather have it called "change"; that the Votes and Proceedings or the Journal of the sitting of such and such, be corrected by striking out the words, and then to quote the words, in line so and so, page so and so, or in the alternative, by inserting the words--and then name them--between such and such words and so forth. There is a form in which my honourable friend can submit a motion of this kind. I suggest that if he

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . . wishes to take action in this regard let's do it by--well, my honourable friend from St. Boniface, who is certainly no authority on the rules of the House, shakes his head in contradiction of Mr. Beausnesne. This is quite an example of going from the sublime to the ridiculous I must say. Now I would suggest that if my honourable friend wishes to take steps that are open to him that he should do so, and then we'll be in a position to debate whether or not the motion should carry.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest of my honourable friend the House Leader and quite frankly I haven't seen number 68 of the procedure to--yes, to change in the journal, but I would like to suggest to my honourable friend, the Leader of the House, this--and in this he is incorrect--that while I might use this form to change the Votes and Proceedings of Friday, there can be no debate upon it as to whether item (4) will be accepted because the debate was already concluded and resolved in the affirmative. So, while I can submit, as my honourable friend has pointed out, this form for a correction of the Votes and Proceedings of Friday, there can be no debate as to the matter that was resolved--the acceptance of the Order for Return.

MR. EVANS: . . . . ., my honourable friends' remarks, because, as I have said, his remarks just now are out of order until a motion is before the House that Mr. Speaker can accept.

MR. PAULLEY: I was following your lead.

MR. EVANS: I was offering a form which I thought would be helpful to my honourable friend to get his point of view established.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think that the leader of this group was perfectly in order when he raised this question as a matter of privilege--and a question of privilege is always in order and should be discussed, according to the rules, at the very first opportunity--at the time it occurs if the House is in Session--if not, at the earliest opportunity. The Leader of this party raised this at the first opportunity, namely, before the Orders of the Day. Now it is a question of privilege I submit to you, Sir, because of the fact that the Votes and Proceedings do not record the position as we understood it and as Hansard records it, because what has been stated is correct--that the Honourable the Attorney-General raised the question of the admissibility of question number four, page 796, of Hansard, and he suggested--not because, in his first suggestion--not because it was confidential, but simply on the general ground it was an internal communication between a member of the civil service and his Minister, and he did, certainly suggest that it should not be filed.

But the point is that following that there are actually four pages or more of debate in Hansard, and as the debate continued, with various members taking part, the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and others, pressed the point that inasmuch as these questions dealt with a tragic accident where men had been killed, that there was nothing of a confidential--couldn't be anything of a confidential or private nature in that--and on page 800 the First Minister of the House himself says in answer to a question by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that he would not consider it to be confidential. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that you were perfectly in order in concluding, if this was your conclusion, that following that four pages of debate that the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and others who took part--including those who took part from the other side--had, if not in complete agreement that this could not be considered confidential information, or privileged information--that at least they seemed to accept the inevitable, and I thought quite frankly, that it was on that basis that you put the motion to the House in the original form, because certainly it seemed to me--and I think the reading of Hansard will bear out this contention--that the general feeling of the House seemed to be that there was some reason, on account of the circumstances, for this being given. But whatever the thoughts that passed through anybody's mind--whatever the intentions were--the fact is as stated, that the motion was put without any reservation and neither in your stating of it, Mr. Speaker, or from anybody on the government bench, was a reservation made at that time. True, there had been a suggestion of a reservation earlier on, but four pages of debate or more had intervened and I think a lot of the members of the House came to the conclusion that the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, with some support from other sections of the House, had made the point that on account of the circumstances it could not be considered. But whatever the fact, that's the way it was put, and when

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . . the Leader of the House suggested after the motion had been carried--when the Leader of the House suggested--and this is recorded on page 800--Mr. Roblin--no, I should start one sentence earlier--"Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Mr. Roblin: With the reservations expressed by the Minister, Mr. Speaker." And Mr. Paulley immediately intervened by saying: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the vote was taken on the basis that the order indicated here. The Speaker did not call for reservations"--then there are a few dots indicating some words left out--"basis on which we voted," and the Honourable the Attorney-General also intervened somewhat, but the Leader of the New Democratic Party again interjected: "Sir, I rejected the matter"--and that was true, he had done so--"You have now put the motion and declared it in the affirmative." So, as I understand it, the question of privilege arises, because so far as our group is concerned we have felt that the votes and proceedings do not accurately reflect what was decided in the House on that occasion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I take it that it's acceptable to your honour to continue the discussion under the heading of "A Matter of Privilege" now, and my honourable friend having spoken, I propose with your agreement to continue the discussion.

My honourable friend's memory of the incident is completely opposite to my own. There was at no time that any suggestion during the debate that the Minister who took the objection at the time had in any way amended his position. His position remained consistent throughout and at no time was there any suggestion that the debate had had any effect upon changing his mind. His position was categorical; it was admitted by the Honourable Member for Lakeside; it was admitted also by the Leader of the NDP, that the reservations were voiced clearly; there was no misunderstanding about them during the course of that debate; no indication that that reservation had been changed.

Now we come to a point where my memory is completely different and diametrically opposed to the memory of the Member from Lakeside. As the vote was about to be taken, the Minister called out "with reservations".--(interjection)--Yes. My memory is exactly that. Now my honourable friends--I'm making the statement that that is my memory of it. Whatever may be or may not be the position in Hansard, that is my distinct memory of it, and my interpretation of the entire incident is that the objection persisted from the first moment the question was raised throughout without change.

Now I think we face another question here. The Honourable Member for Lakeside I think raised the point that there was no formal amendment put. Now throughout the time that I've been in this House, and perhaps for a longer period than he has been here, these matters have been handled in this way--that when a Minister voices a reservation and the motion is still put by the member who puts it, it has been, one might say a gentlemen's agreement, that these things will be handled in that way and the information that can be provided will be provided. If my honourable friends across the way are going to get as legalistic and meek and niggling as I've said before, as they show a disposition to being, we may have to resort to the more formal manner of doing these things, presumably on the ground that we can't get on together in the ordinary way that people engaged in the same piece of business can do. I would regret the trend that seems to be developing of legalistic little arguments over every possible points that can come up either of procedure or even on matters of substance. And so I must suggest that if any honourable member wishes to take action with respect to this thing that he has a means open to him. There is a form and a procedure that is laid down by the customs of the House of Commons. I think I'm right in saying that our own rules and procedures do not cover this point. I don't recall any item in our own rule book covering the matter of changing an item in the Votes and Proceedings. But where our own rule book does not cover then the customs of the House of Commons at Ottawa prevail. In Beauséjour there is a form suggested to my honourable friends to bring the matter to a head and, in a case of that kind, it will be those who had one understanding may press for the change in the vote or change in the Votes and Proceedings, I mean, and we will see whether the majority opinion of the House agrees with his interpretation. I think that's all I would like to say at this time. But I do urge that honourable members will avail themselves of the procedures that are open to them on the floor of the House. We would very soon have chaos in here, I'm sure, if we do not follow the rules and procedures that are set down, and here is a clear-cut way in which my honourable friend can secure what he thinks is



(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . . the right thing to be done.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to this point of privilege that we have before us, I must refer to some of the remarks of my honourable friend the Leader of the House. I reject entirely his premise that the attitude of myself and some others on this side of this House is "niggly" or whatever expression he used. --(interjection)--No, it may be so but the reference was made. Because after all, Mr. Speaker, we are, and I agree with the Honourable the House Leader in this, that we are not here to deal with trivial legalities of debate, and in that I agree most heartily with my honourable friend. But if he will reflect to the debate on this particular Order for Return, we attempted to establish, and I think did establish--at least to my satisfaction--that the matter that was before us at that time was of such vital concern that it should not be buried in departmental reports. Now then, Mr. Speaker, further to that, I'm sure that we wouldn't want a formal rejection of an Order for a Return by necessity of having amendments to it. And as the Honourable the House Leader has said, usually we accept these things when a Minister gets up and says, "Well I'm not going to give it to you," or "I can't give it to you;" we accept that based on the fact of normal Orders for Return and matters of inconsequence in some occasions. But the reason that the debate was pursued in this particular matter was because it wasn't just an ordinary routine Order for Return--it was a matter of vital importance, as I suggested at that time to all of the peoples of Manitoba, to all of those engaged in mining and who may be in the future. And that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I was persistent at that time, and it was for that reason, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has pointed out by referring to Hansard--and thank goodness we have a Hansard here in this House now; it's proved its value today--because of the fact that we have it on the record, because of the fact that this was a matter which we consider a very vital concern, we rejected by voice on this side before the vote was taken that the information should not be laid before us. I want to assure my honourable friend the Leader of the House that it's no desire on my part for trivial legalities of procedures or rules of debate but this matter was of such concern in our opinion, rightly or wrongly, that we had to pursue the matter on that particular occasion.

Now then I want to say this to--the Leader of the Liberal Party raised the point and I appreciate the fact that he did because it had escaped me, the Honourable the House Leader has suggested that in Beauchesne we'll find forms in order to have this corrected. I don't know exactly how we go about submitting these forms, possibly in consultation with the Clerk of the House. I may find this out or if the Leader of the Liberal Party wishes to do it because he raised the point, it's quite all right with me. Again Sir, I want to assure you and this House, this isn't a question of triviality, of minor legalities, but it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the government did not oppose when I had rejected the statement in the final analysis, when I had rejected any reservations, they did not oppose. The only motion, Mr. Speaker, that you had before us was the motion on the Order for Return.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I certainly would disagree as well that this is a niggling matter or a small point. There's a very important point here of the Votes and Proceedings of the House recording the decisions of the House. And those of us on this side certainly don't feel that the decision as recorded in the Votes and Proceedings at the moment actually are correct in the light of what went on in the House. I think it's very important that those points do be raised, because that is the one element that we must have here at all times -- an absolute correct statement of everything that goes on. And I disagree completely with the Leader of the House when he says that this is a small point in legalistic discussions.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, will my honourable friend not accept the suggestion that this thing be done in the manner provided for doing it? And if this isn't stopped there I do ask my honourable friend why he will not avail himself of the accepted means of accomplishing what he would like to do.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . do it. I brought it up in discussion . . . . .

MR. EVANS: I would suggest then that the discussion stop at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Public Works. The question is, why did it take the Government of Manitoba over a year to give to the Town of Selkirk and

(Mr. Hillhouse, (cont'd.) . . . . the Municipality of St. Clements an answer as to the proportion of cost that the government would bear towards the repairing of the Selkirk Bridge?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Acting Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Supplementary question arising out of an article which appeared in the Free Press. If the Town of Selkirk and the Municipality of St. Clements put on a double shift in order to cut down the inconvenience through the closing of the bridge, is the Government of Manitoba prepared to pay the same proportion of the additional costs as it agreed in respect of the initial cost?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I think I'd like to take notice of that. This is the first time that the question has been raised and I know there's no desire at the moment for the municipality to do this, but if they would care to do it I'd be glad to discuss it with them.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House, No. 2, dated February 22nd, in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Leader of the House. There's a story from Atikokan, Ontario, that says an unemployed iron ore miner found Prime Minister John Diefenbaker had sensitive ears when tackled about unemployment. He wrote the Prime Minister asking him to get off his backside and do something about employment. Instead of receiving a sympathetic reply the miner received a visit from the RCMP. He was told if he . . . . letters to Mr. Diefenbaker he would be in trouble. Does this government ever employ the RCMP to silence critics of this government?

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kildonan, the question: With respect to vocational and technical training; (1) What contribution is the federal government now making toward meeting the cost of (a) school buildings, (b) equipment and supplies, (c) vocational and technical instruction? (2) To what extent is the Government of Manitoba making use of the contribution of the federal government in providing vocational and technical education in this province?

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

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that it's a written question, and I don't believe it requires a motion. I'll pass over the adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion and amendment to, by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. I'm holding that one. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, on this question, I represent the constituency of Inkster, and the constituency of Inkster has the same interest in their representative as Greater Winnipeg. Member from rural districts have always problems as far as roads, drainage, agriculture and others. Inkster is a part of Greater Winnipeg and what's good for Inkster is good for all constituencies in Greater Winnipeg, and I have never yet in my political career representing the constituencies which I did, asked for a passport of anyone coming in to me to find out whether he's in Inkster or North Winnipeg or anywhere else. He's been received the same way realizing that the interests of any other constituency is the same as the interests of Inkster. For this reason, Sir, I shall oppose the amendment because, years ago -- and I'm doing it on my own behalf and not speaking on behalf of my group or the party -- years ago, by a very large majority, the citizens of Winnipeg, of Greater Winnipeg, had a referendum and with a very large majority decided to have daylight saving, and personally it's immaterial to me. As a matter of fact, being a so-called semi-employee of the railway company, it interferes with my own business between daylight saving and standard time, but nevertheless, I, as a representative of the people of Greater Winnipeg through this constituency of Inkster, feel that I have to listen to "my master's voice". They have decided it's not a matter of principle; it's not a matter of life and death; it's a matter of convenience to a large group of the people of Greater Winnipeg and I am obliged to support them and to uphold, unless they instruct me otherwise.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . . For this reason being very brief, I cannot support any other amendment because it will only help a certain sports organization during the three months, and if standard time is good -- I'm speaking of Greater Winnipeg; I'm not speaking now on behalf of the rural districts -- if it's good for Greater Winnipeg, it's good for six months or three months. Cutting down will not help anybody. Let's have one time. I'm greatly in favour. Standard or daylight saving. It's immaterial, but at the moment, having my instructions a few years ago, I must carry them out honestly and conscientiously.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Do you know what percentage of the votes for Winnipeg voted at that referendum?

MR. GRAY: I do not remember, but I think it was about 80% of the people of Greater Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable the Minister of Health, and the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, could this item be allowed to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand? Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me, as I listened to the discussion on this resolution introduced by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that there is some question about the effect that this resolution, if carried, will have on the whole question of a merchant fleet for the Dominion of Canada, and so on. But after giving the matter further consideration I came to the conclusion that this was really the responsibility -- the actions which I had in mind were really the responsibility of the federal government and the Parliament in Ottawa, and that no useful purpose would be served by debating it at any length here. It was the general idea that we in western Canada would be able to move the goods which we sell and the goods which we buy as cheaply as possible. I, of course, agree, and that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the resolution.

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

..... Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution submitted by the Honourable Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment submitted by the Honourable Member for Springfield. This is the resolution that I promised to give a ruling on. Today seems to be the day for rulings, for some reason or other, and I would make my ruling now. I would rule on the proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for Springfield on the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Fisher. I rule that the amendment to the motion is out of order on the grounds of anticipation -- Manitoba Rule No. 31. The subject matter of this motion is clearly defined and announced in the Throne Speech. I consider the government has given notice in the Throne Speech of its intention to proceed with legislation and agreements on a number of the points raised in the amendment. The motion also asks the House to endorse the early establishment of an Agriculture Economic Research Council for Canada. I submit that the House has endorsed this question in the acceptance of the Throne Speech. A private member's motion asking that the House do again endorse the question, is out of order on Rule 31.

Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what is the disposition of the preceding resolution? The amendment is out of order on your ruling. Who has the adjournment?

MR. SPEAKER: Oh yes. I'm sorry, I made an error there. I'll put the motion. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fisher. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this resolution was brought in by my colleague from Fisher in order to deal with a specific problem, and the member for Birtle-Russell, in speaking to this last week, was kind enough to refer to the member for Fisher as having sponsored this resolution out of a sincere feeling in regard to this problem.

Now, very briefly, it can be summed up this way. In the amendment that the member for Birtle-Russell proposed, the first three paragraphs in fact re-emphasize and reaffirm the problem as was put forward by the member for Fisher, but after having reaffirmed the problem, sympathized with it, he goes on to sidetrack any possible action that might be taken in this Legislature. The member for Birtle-Russell gave us some statistical data as to the taxation levels that obtain in the municipalities in order to raise revenue for public works and road construction, and then goes on to make a comparison between the average mill rate that is levied in the municipalities for public works and compares that with the average mill rate in the local government districts. Now it is true that on that particular basis the picture looks rather disproportionate. That is to say, the municipalities appear to be carrying more of their share of the load as regard to the construction of local roads. That in itself doesn't tell us too much because he doesn't give us any population figures. I realize that that isn't particularly pertinent, but it would have been helpful. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that, among other things, one of the facts that is brought out by the statistics given us by the honourable member is that it could be that the municipalities are carrying too much of a load taxation-wise for public works. Perhaps the percentage grants available to municipalities from the province is not yet adequate. It could prove that just as well, as what he was attempting to prove by the use of those figures.

Now I would suggest that if members opposite are as sympathetic to the problem as the member for Birtle-Russell, then they should not support the amendment but rather the resolution proper, because sympathy alone is not enough. What is needed is action, and here is not a very good case for sidetracking it and giving this problem over to the enquiry commission for study. Here, what is needed is a decision as to a matter of policy, and who can make that decision any better than the administration -- than the government. I consider it unfortunate that after the very good opening three paragraphs of the amendment the members should have

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . . .seen fit to sidetrack this problem. The enquiry commission might have to address itself to a study if this amendment is passed. What then is the final solution? It will still have to come before this Chamber and I daresay we will still have to decide on a question which will, in its final form, be exactly as was submitted to us by the member for Fisher. We're still going to have to decide. It is only a pity that we are postponing the decision for one or two years.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the stand taken by the previous speaker, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, and also the stand taken by the Honourable Member for Fisher. I was certainly surprised when I heard the member for Birtle-Russell move his amendment. The amendment seems to me a condemnation of the government he supports in this House. The resolution stated that there was a policy of paying 50-50 -- on a 50-50 basis for roads in unorganized territory. The Minister approves the fact, stated that there were no roads, but then he goes on further, Mr. Speaker, and he says in the second paragraph: "Whereas in certain areas of this province outside of the limits of organized municipalities no satisfactory provision is made for the raising of money." He attacked his own government who doesn't provide a satisfactory provision -- ways and means. This is a condemnation. After all, the unorganized territories are the creatures of the government and, after all, the government is responsible for them and there is no policy -- no provision according to the member for Birtle-Russell.

The next paragraph goes a little further: "And whereas certain citizens of these areas are deprived of roads to provide access to their homes and farms." Well this is an indictment of his own government. There is no access to their homes, Mr. Speaker. Then he makes a motion to pass it on to the Municipal Enquiry Committee which was started, and he knows it, with respect to finding whether these municipalities in Manitoba should be reorganized. That was the motive behind the instigation of this enquiry. The government is not paying -- it made a little grant at first -- but it is not paying for this investigation and it might not report this year; it might not report next year. It's a very difficult problem they are dealing with and here we have the most pressing problems -- farmers having no roads to go their farms, to their homes. There's no satisfactory provision for the raising of money in these areas. I don't think we should delay action on this. I think the member for Brokenhead was right.

Now we in this House are passing or rejecting resolutions. I read in an article yesterday something like this: "Some resolutions are passed, others rejected, and others amended out of existence. Now I believe this is one that is amended out of existence. For all practical purposes, it doesn't mean a thing. The government will still have to come back. Suppose the investigation committee makes a recommendation. The government will have to thresh it out; analyze it; accept it or reject it; or change it and bring it before the House, I suppose, before any action is done; and all the time these poor people in these organized territories will be waiting. I think that there should be action and I, for one, cannot see a member who supports the government admitting that there's no provision for the construction of roads and that certain farmers are deprived of access. Now I would like to see the government accept the proposal amended in a form which would not delay action for a couple of years, because action is pressing. I would like to commend the member for Fisher for having brought this matter, which is so important, if we can judge by the amendment that was brought forward.

MR. CORBETT: Mr. Speaker, regarding this resolution, I think statistics will bear me out in this, that of all the road money spent in unorganized territories, I am quite sure there isn't over 10% of it spent on School District roads with which this resolution deals. In fact, the government pays 100% for a great mileage of the roads in unorganized territories. In the unorganized territories where these School Districts asked for assistance, where they put on a levy of their own and raised a certain amount, possibly eight to ten dollars a quarter, whatever it happened to be, the government meets that up to a certain amount. It used to be \$500.00 but they may have raised the ante lately. But of all the road money spent in the unorganized territories, that portion devoted to -- in which the School Districts assist, doesn't constitute, I am quite sure, 10% of the money spent in the unorganized districts. Therefore, I will be in favour of this amendment. If we passed the original motion, why they could extend that over -- that original motion could be extended to the whole of the disorganized districts -- their roads have become in terribly bad shape -- even if they had to put up 25%, which they

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd) . . . . . have not been doing in the past. I would say that putting it to this enquiry commission, or whatever it is, there might be some hope of them retaining some of the assistance they have been getting in the past, but if they passed the original motion and they have lived up to the letter of the law, the unorganized districts would be in a lot worse shape than they are at the present time.

MR. SCHREYER: Could I ask the member a question?

MR. CORBETT: Yes, Sir.

MR. SCHREYER: You will note that the -- I hope you will notice, won't you, that in the original resolution it deals only with those roads that are now paid on a 50-50 basis. It doesn't touch those that are 100%, so how will the local government districts be worse off?

MR. CORBETT: The only districts they are paying on a 50-50 basis, I am quite sure of this, are the School District roads, in that the only funds that can be raised in those districts are raised in the School District by a special levy in the School District. On that I am quite sure. I know up in my unorganized territory, up north of Swan River -- it's not mine now any more -- and in the Ethelbert constituency, in the unorganized districts up in that area that the government has spent \$9.00 -- at least 90% -- nine dollars to one on main roads to those districts rather than any they assisted on in the School Districts -- (interjection) -- Well, they're roads anyhow in the unorganized territories -- in grants to the unorganized territories.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. R.G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): May this order stand please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. EVANS: In the absence of the honourable member, might this Order stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg-Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments on this motion. I'd like to point out that The Fair Wage Act was first passed in Manitoba in 1916 for the purpose of ensuring that fair wages were paid on provincial government contracts. Later on, the Act was amended so that it has now been changed so that it also applies to construction work in Metropolitan Winnipeg and on jobs involving \$100 or more in other centres which have a population of 2,000 or more. The fair wage set under the Act for Metro Winnipeg are the rates negotiated by the Winnipeg Builders Exchange with various construction unions which are active in the Metropolitan area. The rates vary from \$1.65 an hour for unskilled labour to \$2.80 an hour for blacksmiths and welders. The rates for the various trades in Zone B, that is in the other centres in Manitoba with a population of 2,000 or more, are .15¢ to .25¢ an hour lower than the wages set for Metropolitan Winnipeg, except in respect of blacksmiths and welders for whom the rates are the same.

In other provinces we cannot find Acts similar to The Manitoba Fair Wage Act. It is unique for Manitoba. The other provinces evidently haven't considered it advisable to set fair wages for construction or for other industries throughout the whole of their provinces. In Saskatchewan, for instance, they don't have a Fair Wage Act, but they set minimum wages and they set minimum wages sometimes for different types of workers. For instance, the minimum wage throughout Saskatchewan for truck drivers and for oil well workers is .90¢ an hour. The government doesn't try and establish a fair wage; it just tries to establish a minimum wage and leaves it for the workers and the employers to negotiate a fair wage, a wage that is eventually agreeable to both of them. So evidently other provinces do not consider that the Act such as we have in Manitoba is one that should be extended to their provinces.

If the proposed resolution before this House was made effective, it would mean that the Act would be applied to the whole of the province. It would mean that the rates set for the larger centres would be similar to the rates to be paid for construction work on farms and in villages and, in many cases, we would find that this would hardly be fair because in many rural parts skilled workers cannot be obtained. They simply are not available. There's not enough

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd) . . . work for them so they have to hire men that can handle a hammer or a saw to do a carpenter's work. It would seem hardly fair to require those farmers and those householders to have to pay regular wages for skilled men to those who are unskilled. In the cities the problem is different. There is no problem to obtain skilled workers. They are available, and when one hires a skilled carpenter or skilled tradesman in the city, you can pay him the regular city wage and be satisfied that you are getting good value for your money. Skilled men are here, but that does not apply to the rural parts of the province.

Furthermore, if we applied The Fair Wage Act to all of the province, it would mean a 40-hour week for all workers, and again, circumstances differ outside of the urban areas. We find that we have large construction contracts, sometimes in northern Manitoba, where the men can't bring their families; where they are alone; where they go primarily to work; to make some money and not to make their homes; and where they want long hours of work to occupy their time and to have substantial funds to send back home. So it would be hardly reasonable to have a 40-hour week on a construction project, we'll say at Grand Rapids or in some out-of-the-way place, where the men are alone and they're only there for the purpose of working.

It has been argued that wages payable in Winnipeg should be paid in respect of large construction projects outside of the city. As often these construction contracts involve the government, the government involved is able to ensure that a reasonable wage is paid. I think it is better that the government ensure that a reasonable wage be paid on these contracts and leave it up to unions and management to negotiate the actual wage rates. This is what was done at Grand Rapids. The government contracts with the contractors provide that reasonable wages will be paid. They list them in six different groups, the highest group being carpenters and other tradesmen at \$2.15 an hour and the contract provided that the men wouldn't work more than 120 hours in two weeks on a straight time basis. These were reasonable figures set in the contract and they left it to the unions and management to negotiate the wage rates for the job. The result has been that the wage rates negotiated have been, in most cases, higher than the rates payable for construction work in Zone B centres, and in six classifications the rates are higher than is payable in Metropolitan Winnipeg under the Zone A classification. Furthermore, the hours of work negotiated have been reduced so that the weekly work week is 54 hours a week, and it would seem that even the unions and management recognize that the conditions that apply to Winnipeg and other urban centres do not necessarily apply to other parts of the province.

We also have the fact that in connection with the government contracts in respect of the Atomic Energy plant on the Winnipeg River, there again the federal government in its contract ensures that reasonable wages are paid, and the unions can negotiate for higher wages and other hours than those in the minimum specified in the government's contract.

So I'm opposed to this resolution, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, I don't think it is fair to extend the Fair Wage to every section of the province; and secondly, we have the fact that in many cases where there are larger contracts the government can see to it, when governments are involved, that reasonable rates prevail; and leave it to unions and management to negotiate as they do in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Cypress, and the proposed amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

This is another one of the resolutions that I was expected to rule on today. I might say that I have perused the amendment to the amendment and it appears to be a straightforward resolution. I believe it's something for the House to decide rather than Mr. Speaker, and I declare the motion in order. Are you ready for the question?

MR. O.F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Osborne, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet doesn't mind,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . I'd like to make just a comment or two on the amendment to the amendment. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to take exception to the amendment to the amendment because it seems to me that while it is perfectly in order, and I agree with you that it is in order; but if we were to support the amendment to the amendment and also the amendment, we would defeat the purpose of the original resolution as presented by my colleague the member for Seven Oaks, because he was dealing with Medicare cards and not hospitalization cards. While I agree with the honourable gentleman, the member for Selkirk who proposed the sub-amendment, that we should eliminate as much as possible what we normally refer to as "red tape" from applications, if we accepted the amendment of the honourable gentleman from Selkirk it would not achieve what we are desirous of achieving, namely, that of making available to people in receipt of only \$65 per month, a Medicare card. At the present time, most of those who make application for exemption of the hospital service cards receive them reasonably with ease. When I say "with ease" I don't mean to suggest that the government just literally hands them out to all and sundry, but in respect of Medicare cards, there is a slightly more rigid requirement before they are granted to the recipients. I intend, Mr. Speaker, before this debate is finalized, before we come to the main motion, be it amended or not, to have a few remarks to make in addition to those today; but I thought that in fairness to the honourable member for Selkirk -- it may have been an omission on his part not to include in his amendment to the amendment the words "Medicare card". Of course I'm not aware of that, but I did think, Mr. Speaker, that I should rise and point out that, because of the deficiencies in the amendment to the amendment in respect to Medicare cards, and while we agree with the general contention of cutting out red tape, we can not support the amendment to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BJORNSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Osborne, that the debate be now adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear your seconder.

MR. BJORNSON: The member from Osborne.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on this resolution, I must first of all acknowledge the incentive given to me by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks to delve into the matter of a universal language and the practicability of Esperanto being part of our University curricula.

I think we will all appreciate that the inconveniences resulting from the diversity of languages has been felt since the dawn of civilization. As civilization advanced, it brought with it a partial relief at different periods, and in different parts of the world, by the spread of such languages as Greek and Latin and English and so on as a part of the political supremacy or as a vehicle of culture. As the Honourable Member from Brokenhead pointed out, for a long time Latin survived as the common learned language of Europe, both in speech and in writing until the rapid development of modern science and modern thought, and the increasing complexity of our modern life outstripped the limited use of a language which was never suited for international use.

Meanwhile, the growth of the spirit of nationality has largely increased the number of literary languages. Russian men of science are no longer content to record their discoveries in French or English and the English students of science and philosophy have to leave unread many important works written in the more remote European languages, or they have to depend on often very inaccurate translations. So it seemed that the adoption of a common language becomes, therefore, more and more pressing. Whether Esperanto is the answer however, or the adoption of an existing language, is a point upon which I have not quite made up my mind.

There are formidable critics of the use of Esperanto, who claim that the language looks like a very bad form of Italian and maintain also that it is less popular among the speakers of romance languages, except in France, for this reason. It seems that there is a better creative language called "Idiom Neutral." The most marked feature of Idiom Neutral is that its vocabulary is definitely and consistently based on the principle of the maximum of



(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd) . . . . internationality for the roots. A systematic examination of the vocabularies of the seven chief European languages, English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Russian and Latin, showed that the number of international roots and words are much greater than supposed. In commenting on the construction of this Idiom Neutral, the Encyclopedia Britannica referred to it "as the simplest language that has yet been devised and most easily understood by any educated European."

In placing this information on record, Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily infer that I give preference to either one of these two constructed languages. In fact, I would doubt that either one of them is that essential to international understanding. About 30 years ago, the Chambers of Commerce of all countries except England, France and Germany, were polled as to their choice for an international language. Of the 44 who replied, five voted for Esperanto; one for German; one for Spanish; eight for French; and twenty-nine for a modified form of English. At a meeting a year or two later after that, Professors of Harvard and Oxford Universities discussed requisites for English to become the international language, namely a limited vocabulary for international use, and a consistent spelling.

Following this, we find Ogden and Richards of Cambridge University teaching English by means of a basic list of 850 words. The distinctive contributions of Basic English are its use of a small number of verbs and its teaching materials and methods. In 1947, the British Government purchased the copyright of Basic English for around \$100,000 and used it quite effectively to teach illiterates and non-English personnel in the armed services.

I have endeavoured to show that there seems to be a wide diversity of opinion of what should constitute the international language. Stanley Rundle, an English expert on this subject, advised that Esperanto has dangers in that, despite the fact that there are some 2,600 roots in the fundamental vocabulary, many national organizations have added extra roots to fill certain gaps, and the new word is the result of a desire to express something for which there exists a special word in the writer's native language, but which may not have no exact counterpart in any other language. He considers this a very dangerous trend for it opens the way for introducing into the international language the very possibilities of misunderstanding we are striving to eliminate. Mr. Rundle claims that even now it is possible for a person with linguistic training to detect the mother tongue of the writer of many works in Esperanto. Despite these criticisms, Mr. Rundle points out that a person of normal intelligence could easily learn it in an hour. Although other references have not made this claim, it apparently is simple enough to be learned without the necessity of expanding the curriculum of the university, even if I were persuaded that it was of the importance stressed by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks.

In closing, I would like to point out that the idea of one government in this resolution became popular after the end of World War II. But the arguments against it when considering the necessity of including the current enemy, Russia and her satellites, proved too much. For instance this continent, Canada and the United States, with more than one-fifth of the world's earned income and less than one-sixteenth of the world's population, could easily be voted into what we would regard as poverty. Forming a government of "good" nations and "bad" nations had too many obvious flaws. But the devotees of supergovernment, while amending their geographical sights, continue to advocate an international layer of government, a government made up for the present of just the "free" or "good" nations, which, presumably, would be predicated on the nation's opposition to the Russian brand of communism.

We might as well face it, Mr. Speaker, all this talk about "free" or "good" nations derives solely from the grammar of power politics. There is very few, if any, free nations in the world today, if by free one means the absence of aggressive acts on the part of the government, and if by free one means that any citizen is free to engage in creative effort and exchange the product thereof with whomever he pleases. This new kind of supergovernment is grounded, without question, in the very best of motives. If it can be argued with logic, and it can, that proper government would maximize liberty by restraining marauders among persons, why is it not just as logical to argue that proper supergovernments would maximize peace by restraining marauders among nations. Peace, of course, is a very worthy object. Most devotees of supergovernment are also devotees of free trade -- a worthy object if there ever was one too.

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd)

However, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, world government cannot help but multiply the world's present governmental absurdities. Government everywhere is conceived on varying degrees of authoritarianism, which is political error. Increasing the scale of the error will not erase the evil. Increasing the scale, as I said, will not erase the evil in this world. We are plagued with governmental over-extension. More of the same will only put the task of correction farther beyond the reach of possibility. I hope I will not be alive, Mr. Speaker, to see the ideal of world government the honourable member conceives in his mind, for the Heaven he dreams of could quite well be a hell for those who still hold that the freedom of the individual is the highest concept of society.

As far as the introduction of Esperanto into our university is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I'm not persuaded it is the ideal language for international use, as I have pointed out. The learning of this language, too, is not of sufficient difficulty to create a lectureship in our university and, therefore, I could not support this resolution.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, unless anyone wishes to speak, I'd like to adjourn the debate. If not, I respectfully move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, could we have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if this order might stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. The proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that "whereas the educational needs of our young people are becoming more obvious in the modern complex society; and whereas employment opportunities of today require academic matriculation or a reasonable standard of technical and vocational training; and whereas such a level of educational preparation necessarily implies having young people attend school for a somewhat longer period of time than at present; therefore be it resolved that this government consider the advisability of raising the school-leaving age to a standard for the entire province and that this be the age of 16 years.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a question which is in the minds of almost all members here from time to time, and I don't really think that it needs any protracted or extended explanation. Let it suffice to say that we are no longer living in a simple agrarian economy, and as our economy and that of the world around us gets more and more complicated, it would seem that one of the best ways of preparing the young people to meet the problems of life is to provide them with more and more education. No one will argue with that, and I think that no one will argue that it is not good, by and large, to have a situation, because of neglect or omission whereby young people can legally leave school without adequate preparation at the age of 14. It's true that in the urban areas the provision is that of 16, but as I said, we are no longer living in a simple agrarian economy. Even in the countryside today there is no real justification for having the school-leaving age at the age of 14 because of mechanization on the farm; because of less and less need for family help at home. This is an outdated provision, having this differentiation between rural and urban school-leaving age regulations.

I think it's no longer realistic to have such a dichotomy, and I would like to cite to members of this Assembly the school-leaving age in other provinces. In Newfoundland, the 15th birthday, without any other qualifications; Prince Edward Island, 16; Nova Scotia, 16 - urban, 14 - rural. Same as here in Manitoba, but they are considering raising it to 16. At least that is the information I received. In New Brunswick it is 16; in Quebec, 14; Ontario, 16; Manitoba 14 in the rural areas, 16 in the city; and in the three western provinces it is 15, with no distinction between rural and urban.

Now there are many reasons why this outdated distinction between rural and urban school-

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . leaving ages should be wiped off the statute books -- or off the regulations. One, as I mentioned twice already, is the fact that there is now no longer any need to keep young farm people at home to help, because of mechanization. Secondly, they must avail themselves of every and all opportunities to get a better and higher education. Thirdly, let us just consider what the effect is of leaving this lower age on the statute books. I would like to quote from Page 104 of the Department of Education report, and we see that in the high school there is a drop of about 1,000 students from Grade IX to X and from X and XI; but from XI to XII there is a substantial drop of about 4,000 in total enrollment in the province. Now there could be two reasons. One could be because of the academic incapacity; the second could very well be because of the school-leaving age of 14, allowing many young people an "out", an opportunity to leave the school system. It's an easy way out I admit, but I don't think we're doing these young people a favour.

Not very long ago I read an article in Look magazine by a fairly prominent American educator, and the title of the article was: "Why are we wasting two million of our youth every year?" The article goes on to point out that we have no adequate provision -- and this of course refers to the US, but I think it is indicative -- "We have no adequate provision for educating and training in technical fields many of these young people whose aptitudes vary and differ as between individuals".

So without attempting to make a long drawn-out case in support of this resolution, I would merely suggest to honourable members that the resolution should recommend itself to them because, in the modern age, education, be it academic or vocational, is urgent -- desperately urgent -- and we should not, by neglect or omission, allow young people to enter life ill-prepared.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland is not in his seat. Oh yes -- excuse me.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, WHEREAS the Deaf and Blind Children of this Province must, at present, attend special schools outside of Manitoba; AND WHEREAS experience has demonstrated the value derived by handicapped children when they are afforded the opportunity of special education closer to home and loved ones; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of expanding the educational facilities for the deaf, blind, crippled and retarded children of this Province by reopening a school, in Winnipeg, to provide specialized education for these children.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, you know every member of this House is being paid to listen to me and I'm being paid to listen to them. It's unfortunate there was such an exodus at the present time, however, the world must go on -- and so are the politicians. The two charming ladies of this House have, last week, shown a remarkable way of putting through their ideas in a very short time and it has, as far as I'm concerned, impressed more than many of the "hour" speakers. Some honourable members value their speech by the pages of the Hansard. I'm sorry that due to my health and other handicaps which I have, it's not my idea to do it. I learned a lesson from them, and I shall be very, very brief.

The problem I'm going to discuss today does not cover the entire problem of the unfortunate retarded, sick and crippled children. Every honourable member here realize for themselves what it means to have a crippled or a retarded child. I'm only dealing with one phase of it, so when the Minister of Education finds that my remarks are worthwhile replying, because he refused to reply to statements which I made earlier in this session -- probably he thought it was insignificant; it's not important and he doesn't need it; when I asked him a

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) . . . . . a question at the beginning of the session -- but nevertheless, if he does find it necessary to reply, please do not deal with the entire situation of the retarded children. I'm dealing with one phase -- a School for the Deaf. I read the report of your department. They're doing wonderful work in Winnipeg. My point and my submission is that, in my own humble opinion, not being a social worker, not being a psychologist, not being an expert on the subject, I feel, as a human being, that in my humble opinion, I think you're making a mistake by refusing for years to give back to the deaf children the school which they had years ago.

I make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, in bringing up repeatedly in this House, the matter of our deaf and handicapped children, simply because having had personal knowledge of much of the misery, suffering, hardship and tragedy in this world, including that of those who are at home, I feel that the government should now provide a much needed school in Winnipeg to accommodate a large number of deaf and otherwise handicapped children of our province. The situation at the present time, based on the return of the Honourable Minister of Education a few days ago, is as follows: The total number of deaf children in the province is 118 -- I believe it's more but as far apparently as his own records are concerned, or his department's records, it's 118. Of those, in Greater Winnipeg, 58; and the remaining portion of the province, 60. The number of Manitoba children attending the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon is 49; and in the remaining portion of the province, 60. The number of Manitoba children attending the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon as I said, is less than of course in the province. The total cost of the province for the fiscal year 1960-61 for those attending the Saskatoon School is \$65,000; for those attending in Winnipeg, \$38,000; and the rest -- we have a few in the United States and one in the East -- which is approximately about \$5,000.00.

I realize that those engaged in Social Service work in other agencies connected with care of disabled children, they, being only human, can perhaps err in their judgment. To err is human. They, being only human, can perhaps want to diagnose a case. In order to diagnose a case you've got to ask the doctor and also the patient, and sometimes the patient knows better than the doctor. Two prominent lawyers, dealing with a certain civil case, could not get an agreement on a verdict. Neither can the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the House. The judge was asked to decide, and the judge in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, is the mother or some closer relative of the deaf affected child. So scientific applications in this particular case, I don't think it can be accepted, although I have read many -- and I have them here, which I'm not going to repeat to you -- opinions of psychologists, of psychiatrists and of those who made a life-long study of this problem, who have disagreed. I hope that the present Minister of Education will agree, but disagree with the former Ministers of Education who have for years rejected this proposition.

The importance of having a School for the Deaf in Winnipeg was recognized many years ago when, in the time of the depression, the Normal School at Charleswood housed these children. Later on, during the second World War, due to extra space needed at this time for various branches of the Army, this school was taken over for their use and it is now being used as a Normal School for teachers, but actually this building should be given back to the disabled children who are in great need of having a school close to home. If the building which was built for them was more needed for other purposes, such as a school for the teachers, something else should have been provided for these children rather than send them to Saskatoon or other parts of the country.

The school in Saskatoon is not being criticized. It may be the best institute in the country. The main point is that, these children are away from home and, as a result, motherly attention cannot be given to the children who suffer from an inferiority complex due to having this handicap and feel the need of their loved ones to comfort them when they are far away removed from their homes. I would repeat that handicapped children, in most cases, tend to be very nervous and suffer, as I have stated, from a feeling of inferiority and insecurity, and cannot readily adjust in school which is far distant and without frequent contact with their families. If such a school could be provided for them in our city, I fully believe that there should be a marked improvement in their rehabilitation. May I repeat -- who is closer to the child and who is more interested in the child -- education and its teacher -- the Minister of Education or the parents? There is no criticism of the Minister, and as he deals with hundreds of

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) . . . . of problems, I realize that neither he nor his assistant can give personal attention to each problem case. The Minister of Education feels that with his academic standing and the position he holds, he knows better, but as I have stated in my opening remarks, ask the patient, not the Doctor.

While I do not claim to be an expert in psychology and its treatment of disabled children, I can at least accept advice from those who have made a life study of the subject. Here, Mr. Speaker, I have a long list taken out from the books I have got in the library in the Welfare office, opinions of people who have made a study of this subject, which I'm not going to read tonight but probably I will later in the discussion, who support my contention, not based on strictly academic or psychological training but of the human beings, of the mother being close to the child, which now they cannot comfortably travel to Saskatoon. It's expensive travelling -- an expense they wouldn't have at home. Let me remind the House again that the rich may have sent their children to well established institutions in America, but the average household-er, the average mother cannot, and the province must assume its duty and responsibility.

I want to repeat again before I sit down that I'm not dealing with the entire program of rehabilitation for the retarded children and deaf and blind and others. All I am asking -- you have 50 children here in Manitoba that go to school in Winnipeg, and they are doing a wonderful job. Why in the world do we have to take 50 and send them away from their homes, their relatives and their parents? I know that this may apply to others, so I'm going to conclude, Mr. Speaker. I may have something to say later on, but at the moment I am going to say please do not reject the resolution. Take it into consideration. We are not instructing the government to build up a school tomorrow, but let them think about one thing. It isn't the cure -- it's the rehabilitation. It's easy to take care of them immediately, but what's going to become of them tomorrow? Every mother wants the child back -- rehabilitated as high as possible -- every mother wants to see the child. I flew to Vancouver last weekend -- spent money because I was lonesome for my children. I only stayed there one day. How do you expect the child who is deaf, a child who is handicapped, a child who needs the motherly love, to be away from home for a long time. I pray, Mr. Minister, I appeal to you -- give some comfort to the mothers here. Tell them, this is a serious matter and we will consider it. We will see what can be done in the interest of the child and the parents.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, a question, or really a point of privilege dealing with the subject matter of the resolution. The Honourable Member for Inkster said at the beginning that I had refused to answer a question on this subject matter earlier in this session. Would he be good enough to tell me when he asked the question and what the question was?

MR. GRAY: I intend to speak about it on the estimates on Education. I asked a question -- a very important one. I have it here and I'm not going to repeat it now, and you just sat down there nicely and quietly and comfortably.

MR. McLEAN: When was the question asked?

MR. GRAY: The question was asked two or three days after the session opened. I could find it now -- I have it here. I could find it but you did not -- take my word that you did not answer.

MR. McLEAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I . . . .

MR. GRAY: All right, I'll look it up and I'll refer it to you tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. THELMA FORBES (Cypress) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. to adjourn the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: This might be the right time for me to call it 5:30. I call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair till 8:00 o'clock this evening.