



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Volume IV No. 21.

February 16, 1960

2nd Session, 26th Legislature

DAILY INDEX

Tuesday, February 16, 1960, 2:30 P.M.

Law Amendments Committee Report .....	599
<u>Motion</u> re School Room Grants (Mr. Dow): Mr. Strickland .....	601
Mr. Gray, Mr. Molgat, Mr. Stanes, Mr. Lisaman .....	604
Mr. Scarth, Mr. Shoemaker .....	606
Mr. Wright .....	607
Mr. Hryhorczuk .....	608
<u>Motion</u> re Pulpwood (Mr. Roberts): Mr. Alexander, amendment .....	608
Mr. Hryhorczuk .....	609
<u>Motion</u> re Teacher Grants (Mr. Tanchak) .....	610
Mr. Prefontaine .....	612
Mr. Alexander .....	615
<u>Motion</u> re Physical Fitness (Mr. Schreyer) .....	616
<u>Motion</u> re Minimum Wage (Mr. Peters) .....	618
<u>Motion</u> re Cancer (Mr. Wright) .....	619
<u>Motion</u> re Fair Wage Act (Mr. Harris) .....	621
Mr. Schreyer .....	622
<u>Bill 56</u> (Mr. Scarth) 2nd Reading .....	623

8:00 P.M.

<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture</u> .....	625
---	-----

The Progressive Index of Votes and Proceedings will be published on Tuesdays on the last page.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 16th, 1960.

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Everett N. McKinnon and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Dental Technicians Association; the petition of William Wallis Donaldson and others, praying for the passing of an Act respecting The Trust Fund of the 45th Battalion of Canadian Expeditionary Force; the petition of The Winnipeg Canoe Club, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Canoe Club; the petition of Reverend Douglas Hill and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Corporation of the Synod of Manitoba of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

HON. STERLING LYON (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I have the first report of the Select Standing Committee on law amendments.

MR. CLERK: The Select Standing Committee on law amendments beg leave to present the following as their first report. The committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman. Your committee recommends that for the remainder of the session, the quorum of this committee shall consist of ten members. Your committee has considered Bills No. 3, an Act to correct certain typographical errors in the text; No. 4, an Act to amend the Pollution of Waters Prevention Act; No. 5, an Act to amend The Insurance Act, No. 1; No. 8, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Manitoba Health Service; No. 9, an Act to amend the Greater Winnipeg Water District Act; No. 12, an Act to repeal the Acts of incorporation of certain corporations; No. 13, an Act respecting the Arborg Memorial Medical Nursing Unit, District No. 36; No. 20, an Act to amend The Interpretation Act; No. 27, an Act to amend the Manitoba Evidence Act; No. 46, an Act to amend The Public Printing Act; No. 52, an Act respecting the Glenboro Medical Nursing Unit, District No. 16B; No. 59, an Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered Bill No. 6, an Act to amend the Insurance Act, No. 2; No. 17, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works, that report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Orders of the Day.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GRAY: I'm sorry.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House, a return to an address by the House of February 2nd, 1960, on a motion of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye, and in this respect, I would like to explain to the House, that a long distance 'phone call was placed at Ottawa, and it was discovered that the approval of Ottawa to table the report had been forwarded to me, and that through some oversight on my part, I had failed to deal with it. As you know, this past week, my department was involved in making a submission to the Board of Transport Commissioners, and that is the only excuse that I have. I would also at this time, before the Orders of the Day, like to lay on the table of the House, the return to an address voted by the House on January 27th, 1960, on the motion of Mr. Schreyer.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the return to an order No. 15, on a motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that there was an oversight with respect to this correspondence, may I ask the Minister whether he will table the letter from Ottawa, if he has one? And when, if he does?--(interjection)--

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, right now.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table, a return for an order of the House, No. 19, on motion of the Honourable Member for Fisher.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to call to your attention, Sir, and to the attention of the House, the presence in the Chamber today of 18 pupils from the Tuxedo School, under their teacher Miss Eva Morris. They are sitting in the gallery to the left here, to view the proceedings today, and I know that the House would like to welcome them.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I direct a question to the Minister of Health and Public Welfare? While I am whole-heartedly in support of the action of the government in receiving TB refugees into the province for treatment, I would like the Minister to tell the House whether any one of the TB refugees occupying a bed in a sanatorium in Manitoba prevent anyone else from receiving similar treatment? The question is asked in view of the prevailing statements that this is the case.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Member for giving me notice of motion. The answer is "no". While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that this afternoon, I'll have distributed to all members, a copy of the Social Allowance Act regulations, plus a copy of the application form, plus a comprehensive review of activities in this department for the past year.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House, a letter which was omitted in an Order for Return by the Honourable Member for St. John's, Order No. 4.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I would like to answer the questions which were raised yesterday by the member for Selkirk, with respect to rates charged by the Manitoba Power Commission for water heaters on the east and the west side of the Red River. I would like to say that the rates which are being charged on either side of the river are the same. However, there is a possibility for some confusion, because we do have a special rate for those water heaters which are controlled so that they consume electricity only during off-peak hours, and the rates for off-peak water heaters are \$2.25, while the rates for the standard water heaters are \$3.00. So the House may be fully informed in East St. Paul and St. Clements on the east side of the Red River, we have 111 controlled water heaters, and 112 uncontrolled water heaters. On the west side in West St. Paul, and in St. Andrews west of the Red River, there are 155 controlled, with 134 uncontrolled. Now the policy of the power commission is to install only controlled water heaters, and it's assumed that ultimately, they will all be converted to the controlled type of water heater. Now most of the ones that are operated by the MPC at the present time, are those that were taken over when the Winnipeg Electric Company customers were taken over by the power commission.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): If one may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Honourable Minister one question for clarification. Did you say there, St. Clements?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, the--

MR. HILLHOUSE: The Municipality of St. Clements?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, the ones that I refer to are East St. Paul, and St. Clements East of the Red River; and the ones on the west were West St. Paul and St. Andrews, west of the Red River.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You're referring to municipalities?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from St. George the other day asked about the possibility of firefighting equipment being made available to municipalities, with perhaps the province sharing the cost.

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . I find that it is possible for this to be done, but not to assist the municipality or the town with its own firefighting problems. It can be done only if the municipality itself already has sufficient firefighting equipment for its own purposes in the opinion of the Provincial Fire Commissioner. Now in aid of Civil Defence, it is possible for the Dominion and the Province to share in costs of firefighting equipment, which would be placed in the municipality, and the only civilian function or normal function that might serve would be if it is ascertained that there are other small towns surrounding the particular town in question, which have not got sufficient firefighting equipment for their own, and it is shown to be necessary or advisable that additional firefighting equipment to be placed at this location for possible use in these outlying locations. In that event the equipment would be used mainly for training Civil Defence volunteers, but would be available as standby equipment for these out-of-town hamlets and villages.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Agricultural Minister, whether he received the PFRA study report of the Fish Lake, Dennis Lake and the area? And if so, would he be kind enough to forward a copy to me?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I have not received the report as yet, but when I do, I will be happy to forward you a copy.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Are negotiations under way between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada, regarding the Federal Government's Roads to Resources program, whereby they will pay 50% of northern roads?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, probably I had better answer that question, Sir, and say that there are no negotiations under way at the present time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, another question. Is the road being built between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids under the Roads to Resources program? Or is it wholly a provincial program?

MR. ROBLIN: This is a Roads to Resources road.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is the Federal Government sharing the cost on a 50-50 basis?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, they are sharing the cost. I'm not sure of the exact basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and the proposed amendment in amendment thereto of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF, and a proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Selkirk in further amendment thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell from the House at this time, may I ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, if there is no one else that wishes to speak on the motion at this time, I would like to ask that the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fisher, and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Dufferin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Dufferin, I ask that this be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, this is the type of resolution we've come to expect from the official opposition in this House, and while they are continually making statements to the effect that this government is everlastingly spending the taxpayers' money, and not showing very much result, I've been in this House coming on four sessions, to date, and I have yet to have them present any resolution that is not asking this government to spend excessive amounts of money. I think the best example that I have to show this would be our own school at Hamiota. This is a ten-classroom school, with a lab and a library, an auditorium the

(Mr. Strickland, cont'd.) . . equivalent of three classrooms. It has terrazzo floors in the corridors. It is masonry construction throughout, and its main feature, in my opinion, is the low maintenance upkeep cost. This building cost the taxpayers of that part of this province \$12,000 per classroom. If we had been having grants at that time, up to \$20,000 per classroom as agreed by the Leader of the CCF the other day--I'm sure if the province were paying grants to that extent, that we would soon be building schools that would have that cost. And nowhere has anyone proved that we wouldn't be providing only frills with these extra dollars. If you add \$5,000 per classroom to the Hamiota school, the Hamiota people or the taxpayers in this school district would have been paying a direct tax extra of \$36,000. And indirectly, through the province, they would have been paying a further \$60,000. Surely to goodness if that is the only type of resolution that we can have from the so-called official opposition, then they are failing, not only the government, but the people of this province. I think everyone realizes that our children should have the best possible types of schools, but we require a good many classrooms, Mr. Speaker. And I feel it would be a very conservative estimate to say that with the number of classrooms that are required in divisions only or alone, we will be paying out something in the neighbourhood of 20 millions of dollars. In the two elections in which I have been running, I've expected a new policy from the Liberal Party, and since I have been in this House, in every resolution that they bring up, I expected to see signs of a new policy being evolved. At one time in my life, I considered myself a Liberal. I realize now, and it bothers me quite a bit to think that I could have at any time considered myself a Liberal--Back to 1951, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government at that time introduced a resolution endeavouring to place on the books of this province, sales tax of 3%. I don't know why they particularly wanted it on the books at that time, but they must have felt it was going to be necessary--or surely to goodness no government would introduce sales tax if they were thinking of introducing a sales tax to provide only frills, as is exemplified by their resolutions--then I think that they clearly need to go back to the grass roots, because I understand they are having a conference this fall--and which we are expecting to have a new platform. And I would like to suggest to them that if this is all they have to offer then surely in 1963 the Official Opposition to the Conservative Government will be the CCF. And while the CCF are not adverse to a sales tax, at least they come out in the open and say that it will be for a new policy in which they believe the people of this province are ready for--and I commend them for it. And I would also call on every member of the CCF Party to support this government in turning down, not only this resolution, Mr. Speaker, but every resolution that calls for an expenditure of unnecessary dollars to the taxpayers of this province.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the honourable gentleman? May I ask the honourable gentleman whether he believes that the school trustees of Hamiota would over night become careless with the funds of their ratepayers, if they were given a little more power?

MR. STRICKLAND: I'm not too certain, Mr. Speaker, that I have the gist of this question, but I imagine it's dealing with the tax dollars and the cost of classrooms. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is the majority of the trustees in this province, particularly in the rural areas, have no knowledge of construction or architectural design, and I'm quite sure that the architects would be quite prepared to put across to these ratepayers or these trustees, the fact that it would cost them \$20,000 to provide decent schools, if that was the amount of the grant.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask another question? In that case, does he not believe that the Minister of Education would see to it that there would be no frills--no unnecessary frills, and keep the costs down?

MR. STRICKLAND: I'm quite certain, as far as he was able or would have knowledge of the situation, that that would be the case, yes.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I would like to advise the Honourable Member from Hamiota, that we in the CCF room, have a lot of applications for a CCF membership and if he qualifies, we'll take him in. This matter has been already fully discussed, Mr. Speaker, and our group is satisfied that \$15,000 for the present time for a school room is sufficient. In view of this, we are going to oppose the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, we frequently hear from the honourable members on the other side that they are looking to us for constructive criticism, and it seems

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . that every time we've proposed something to them, they immediately assume that it's destructive, without taking the matter into further consideration. Now I suggest that this resolution, in keeping with the other one that we have on schools, is a constructive proposition. And I suggest to the honourable members that it is not as they expect--something that will necessarily cost the government a great deal of money. In our opinion, this is a resolution that will bring the Public Schools Act and the new regulations that we passed at our session--special session a year and a half ago now--into line with what has happened since then, and the realities of the situation in the province as they are today. Now, we appreciate that when the Act was passed, you couldn't cover for every possible contingency. New situations develop, circumstances change, and the Act has to be changed as time goes along. Our suggestions are strictly in that regard, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these are constructive criticisms, because I think that they do strike at a need that has developed since the Act has been passed. Our other resolution of 75% across the board to all schools has in it all the protection, I think, the government requires. It must pass before the Board of Reference, and it must have the approval of the Minister. I submit to the House that, far from costing more money to the province, that that resolution would in effect be a saving. This is what we pointed out to the Minister last year, that a number of school districts today felt forced to build the equivalent of ten or 12-classroom schools in order to get the 75%. So there, in my opinion, is a constructive criticism--one that will improve the Act; one that will not cost the government more money, necessarily. It still leaves all the protection necessary to the Board of Reference and to the Minister. Now this particular resolution is--well, I like to consider it--the other leg of this two-fold program. In the City of Winnipeg, or Brandon, or for that matter, Portage and Dauphin, and Flin Flon, there is no problem building a 12-room school. That is automatic. Therefore, the regulations as they stand are to the benefit of those areas, but they do have another problem, and that is the one of cost of land. My honourable friend the member for Carillon pointed that out very clearly the other day, and there is no question that it is an entirely different problem--building a school today here in Winnipeg, to what it is out in the constituency of my honourable friend from Hamiota or in my own constituency. The land values are entirely different, and our suggestion here is simply that where because of local costs, through no fault of the local school board; through nothing they can control themselves, if the costs go up to about \$15,000, that the province should contribute. That, in my opinion, is only fair to those school boards, because they do not control those costs. It's not a question--and we're not suggesting that they should be allowed to go on--on all types of frills; that they have marble halls and all the rest of this. That is not the point. I'm quite sure we can depend on the Minister. And if we can't depend on him, his colleague, the Provincial Treasurer, certainly will see to it, because I know how badly strapped my friend is financially, these days. He'll see to it that there are no frills put in this system--and we're not suggesting frills. Our suggestion is purely and strictly that where those costs, through no fault of the local school board, go up above that figure, that they should not be discriminated against; that they should get the same assistance as in other areas.

There's a further problem to this which may arise in the coming summer. If the school construction program is as large as I think we can anticipate, I believe the Minister anticipates, there's a distinct possibility that costs of construction will go up, because the contractors who will be bidding on these jobs will find that they have more work on hand, not only in the schools but when you consider the remainder of the construction activity in the province, that they will find they are getting caught up on their work. And quite naturally, as the competition decreases on these bids, the costs will go up. Now if that situation should arise--and I submit that it's a distinct possibility with the type and size of program that's coming up--if that should arise once again, through no fault of their own, the local school districts may find that the cost has gone beyond \$15,000. Still, without frills in their program, with just a basic school, giving them the minimum accommodation, it's conceivable that it will go above that. And I suggest that, once again, it is not the fault of the local school board, and I see no reason why they should not benefit from that amount of protection from the government.

The main problem, however, will undoubtedly remain in the city schools and in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite surprised at the attitude that has been taken by the members of the CCF Party in this question. I submit that surely they have not given this full investigation.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . I submit that they have allowed themselves to be taken in, although I don't quite mean it in that term. I don't think that was the intention of the Minister; that they followed his statements the other day, that most schools--or that you could build them for \$12,000 and \$13,000 and so on; that they followed this and have assumed that our recommendation was just to throw the doors wide open. This same thing still applies. I'm sure we can depend on the school boards to watch the costs. They have no desire to see the taxes go up any higher than they have to. We can depend on the Minister to see to it that they watch the costs. But, Mr. Speaker, that same problem will still exist here in the city, and I ask the city members--my honourable friend who just spoke before me; the other members in this Chamber who represent city constituencies, how can they possibly vote against a recommendation of this type, which is purely a protection--and a quite legitimate protection in view of the present circumstances of their position. It's true that in our other resolution, we're asking something which is a protection to some of the country areas. We submit that this one does the same thing for the city, and gives equality of treatment to all, and, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the city members in this Assembly to vote against such a resolution, when it does not provide for frills, but provides only for the basic costs involved in construction. And when the protection is there by the school boards' decision, and by the decisions of the Minister, who must pass on all this construction, I challenge these city members to oppose this resolution in that light.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I accept that challenge. I wasn't prepared to speak on this subject this afternoon, but I would like time to give a little information on it. I feel sure that the motive behind this resolution is quite correct in assuming that material and labour costs will continue to spiral up. The solution, I feel, is not in the increasing of the grants for classrooms from the \$15,000 to the \$20,000 for this reason--and I'm speaking of the secondary schools. I think most of us will admit that the \$15,000 per classroom for elementary schools is adequate. The basis of \$15,000 a classroom or \$20,000 a classroom is not realistic, because in the first place, they have in these schools, the home economics room which costs, I believe, in the 25, 30 and \$35,000 group, because of the high cost of plumbing and so on. That has to be carried by the classroom being classified, I believe, as one classroom. We have, at the other end of the scale--we might have an art room, which is very inexpensive, and that will counter-balance. We also have in that school--we have toilets, which I don't believe are classified as anything. They don't carry a grant. We have teachers' rooms. We have a room for medical examinations and so on, and so on. Mr. Speaker, I believe the solution in this problem--and it is a problem, and is a particular important problem, in view of the large number of schools to be built in this province in the next 12 months and more, the solution is in the change of the formula, not in the increasing of grants per classroom. I feel also that the solution can be found in more research in construction. That, I feel sure, could be done by means of liaison with the architects, or with the Association of Architects, in that new designs of perhaps unit construction, and a fitting together of units to form the type--size of school required on a given premises. A lot could be done in that direction. But the answer, I feel quite positive--and I am associated with the building industry, and I'm interested in this problem--is not, Mr. Speaker, in the increasing of the grant from \$15,000 to \$20,000 per classroom.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I likewise did not intend to speak on this subject at this time. However, as the member from Ste. Rose is tossing challenges around, I would like to make a few observations on the situation. The member for St. James has made the statement, I think, with which we would all agree, that for elementary schools the \$15,000 per classroom seems to be quite adequate. I, like the member for St. James, however, feel that the solution does not lie in accepting this resolution, for to raise the grants so that secondary schools might be built more easily in the larger centres. And this, of course, is myself speaking. I'm not speaking for the Party, and I offer the suggestions as an individual member.

In my opinion, the grant per classroom is not entirely a good plan by itself, because when you consider that there are many rooms in a school which require greater services and greater equipment than does an ordinary classroom, then you see that the grant on a per classroom basis starts to fall apart. It starts to fall short of meeting the objective. Now for instance, a home economics room--when I went to school, we used to call it domestic science--you might have in a modern school, home ec room up to five or six little kitchen units. And it's not beyond imagination to realize that these little units may cost upwards to \$3,000--to \$4,000 per



(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) .. unit. Now, a physics lab may quite well justify being treated, or considered on a separate basis, because here you have the necessary plumbing and servicing connections. A work shop comes in a little different category, and at present there is no inclusion as I understand it, in the grant structure, for any allowance for lavatories. Now here is a place where I feel that it would be good economy to make a separate inclusion, because I'm afraid that we're having cheaper, less substantial, less lasting materials being used--materials which will cause for greater upkeep in use, and in the end result, cost the province, and the school district, more to maintain. Auditoriums, of course, can be considered on a separate category again, because they are huge open rooms with very little contained in them. And I would suggest that a per square feet basis, worked out by the Department of Education and those connected with the building trades, would be a much fairer and afford a better control over rising costs than this shotgun effect of \$20,000 per classroom. It would give much more careful control and be much better for the province. Now in the view of rising costs--since I know a little bit about the building business--I would like to suggest to this Chamber--to the honourable members--a few suggestions which might tend to hold costs down. I believe that there is a great need for standardization of materials. Now you can well understand that if the Department of Education were to accept a particular window unit in its various stock sizes, and require that all architects specify these particular stock sizes, there would be a resultant very great saving because these items would then be made under mass production conditions. Now, I rather imagine that the honourable members are not aware of this, but in many cases, buildings have such odd sizes and shapes and go away from standard sizes so often, that many of the window frames and items such as that are quite often almost put together by hand, rather than by the advantages you would obtain from a production line type of assembly. That could be carried to many more ends than I have suggested. I've only suggested one item of windows, but there are many, many places in which standardization of materials and sizes--size is very important--could very greatly help in keeping the costs of construction of schools in this province to a reasonable level. Now I have touched on one or two of the things within the building field itself, which could control, but I would like to suggest there is another reason causing increased costs, and this is largely due to officialdom and all that goes with it. I'm thinking particularly--I understand there are several of the older schools in Winnipeg, built around the turn of the century, which will probably be obsolete within a few years--be pulled down. But to bring them up to fire regulation standards, they will require to have sums of money spent upon them to bring them up to the present day standard. Now this is a rather difficult thing to express properly, because I can be badly misunderstood. I can say I'm advising building fire traps which I certainly am not, but I do say this, that a study could be made and I'm sure you would realize that it would be found to be true. I can't recall any serious fire in the province where a large number of lives of school children were lost. First of all, children are very agile, and normally go through fire drills--they can get out of the building very quickly. And beyond a reasonable point then, I think we should not insist on standards which may not be necessary because the children don't stay in the schools at night. And this can be applied to many more things than just school rooms. I do believe that we are building up a very expensive way of living in all our ways of living--creating overheads from which we cannot retire. And I think that due to increasing standards acceptable to the various departments of government, and various departments of the municipal governments, we are maybe going farther than necessary, and causing greater expense to the taxpayer. Now, I know it's a very difficult thing to say where is reason and where we should draw the line. It's the same as my own experience in remodelling a building; it's the most difficult thing to know where to draw the line. There's always something more you can add for a little more money. And it totals up, and adds to greater total before you're through. And I would suggest that the Department of Education make a study of the history of the case, and see if certain standards are not actually being gold plated--demanding too many frills--not the type of frills that have been referred to here, but the type of thing which may not be necessary after a true, intelligent study of the situation has been made.

Now then there is another trend which is increasing the cost of schools, in my humble opinion, and that is again a little bit of empire building, in my opinion. You will have a school superintendent, and he goes to these various conventions, and he sees such wonderful things as closed circuit TV, and audio-visual education, and a thousand and one things that are desirable.

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) . . . But again, where do you draw the line? What can we afford intelligently, and what are literally frills? Well, the probable chances are the superintendent--he's an enthusiastic man--he wants to see the children in his section get the best education possible, and quite naturally, he's enthused. He comes home all fired up, and he may pick upon one of these things as his pet scheme--pet baby, or maybe he goes for the whole works. And this very enthusiasm tends to drive the cost of education, and the buildings up. I think it calls for a very great deal of common sense at all levels, to decide very carefully which items are essential and necessary. And of course, I realize too that as time goes on, things which a hundred years ago were certainly not necessary, have now become necessities, but we need a real careful assessment of the situation, in my opinion, to see which things are necessary and essential, and which are simply super-imposed frills--if you want to call them. And I believe that in every phase in your officials who insist upon maybe safeguards beyond those which are absolutely necessary or wise, and I would certainly go as far as wisdom would demand to over-enthusiasm on teachers' and superintendants' parts. And we have today, I think, as a product to the prosperous times we've been living under, a very real problem in keeping the costs of education and buildings down. It, in my opinion, requires just good simple common sense.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, as one more challenged, I can tell the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that I am now against the resolution. If, Sir, it was the intention of those who introduced the resolution--and the Honourable Member from Carillon and the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose, who most ably supported it--to protect the cities against the high cost of land, then the resolution should have been worded accordingly, and not worded loosely, and then the thoughts are brought in after the resolution is tabled in the House. If it is that the cities are discriminated by reason of the high cost of land, then why bring in a resolution which is province-wide, and applies to constituencies such as Ste. Rose, where the cost of land is relatively small? But why not make the resolution read what you mean it to say?

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I'm the third member that didn't intend to speak on this resolution, but I've been tempted to do so. Now it is an accepted fact that I supported the school division plan. This is about the third time I have made that statement. But the campaign that was held a year ago, now prior to the school division vote, certain things were said, and certain implications left in the minds of the electors. I refer at the moment to this booklet that was put out about a year ago now, mailed to some, and distributed to the meetings held prior to the vote. And on page four--and incidentally, this is just a question and answer booklet, limited to one question and one answer on each page--page four they ask the question: "May we take this one at a time, the cost of building schools for example?" That's the question. Answer: "The assistance varies, but generally speaking, it ranges from 50.5% of the approved cost of a five-classroom high school, up to 75%, if the building contains 12 or more classrooms. For high schools one to four rooms, it will be 40%. This applies equally to new secondary schools, or to additions that increase the number of rooms." Now, I will admit that by and large, if the people were informed that the percentage that would come out of the Consolidated Fund was limited to some amount of money generally; but in this one, there is no limitation at all placed on classrooms. Not in this booklet here. On the next question, there is; but on this one, no. So the people were certainly left with the impression that from out of the Consolidated Fund, if they built a 12-room school, for instance, would come 75% of the cost, regardless of the cost. And, of course, there would be thousands and thousands of people receiving this booklet, that did not attend the meetings. It may have been explained further at the meetings that were held, but there would be thousands of people who did not attend the meetings that would vote "yes", based on the questions and answers in this booklet and others.

Now the Honourable Member for Hamiota failed to tell us, (1) what year the school was built, that he referred to, because if it was built ten or 15 years ago at a cost of \$12,000, well of course, the picture has changed considerably in that time. We've heard about inflation and most of us have learned about it the hard way; and most of us in the province attribute the cause of it to the federal people in Ottawa. I know that they argue about that one--the Governor of the Bank of Canada; and the people; and the banks--but we still insist that the Federal Government had something to do with that. But until the Honourable Member for Hamiota tells us when his school was built--

MR. STRICKLAND: 1957.

MR. SHOEMAKER: And did the \$12,000 include the cost of the land?

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Was there a land cost?

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes. It also included the washrooms.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, I do know that it is a fact that land is becoming a pretty big part of the building cost today and it's going to get worse. It's going to get worse all the time. Some member suggested the other day that the cost per classroom of the land at one school—I don't know what one it was now—was running up to two or three thousand dollars per classroom. That probably was a school in Greater Winnipeg. However, I know that in the rural areas, it is becoming a problem, first to obtain suitable land; and then the cost of acquiring the land. And I don't think there is any provision presently in the Act to provide for any sharing of the cost on the land. And I see on page 47 of the book that was laid on our desk the other day, titled "Summary of Report of the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education", paragraph No. 5, it says, "The Commission recommends that, because the land for school sites is often beyond the control of the school board, and many school divisions serve more than one municipality, the province pay the same proportion of the cost of the land for any school as it pays of the cost of the school building itself". That's the recommendation of the Commission here. Now if we had any assurance at all, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St. James could amend the grant formula, then of course this resolution may not be necessary. He has made a recommendation here, and I thought perhaps that he would amend the resolution before he sat down. But he didn't do that. The Honourable the Member for Brandon certainly knows of which he speaks, and he has also made certain recommendations that are all very good. And I rather expected that he might amend the resolution, since the Honourable Member for St. James failed to do that. But in view of the fact that the people of the province were led to believe that from out of the Consolidated Fund would come a percentage of the cost of building regardless of the size of the—of the cost per classroom, then I think that our resolution is in order at the present time. We have a great deal of confidence in the newly elected schoolboard trustees, and I think everyone here has. They wouldn't have been elected if they were not good men. And I am thoroughly convinced that it is not the intention of any trustee in this province to spend the \$20,000 if it isn't needed. I think we have a great deal of confidence in them. Now I know that in attending the meetings prior to the school division vote, that every time the Ministers or the inspectors, or the people speaking at those divisions were unable to answer a question, they generally said, "well that will be entirely up to the newly elected school division board. They have all the authority of the town council; they have all the authority of a local, rural council; they can make their own by-laws; they can borrow money; and they can do everything the council might do". So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, unless the honourable members opposite intend to amend a resolution to provide for what we are asking; then they should vote with us.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I've lost all track of what number I will appear on the agenda here, whether I am the fourth or fifth who didn't intend to speak to this resolution. But having been a member of the Municipal Council for the years 1946-1957, I think I should take up the challenge, because I believe in the municipality of West Kildonan, an elementary school was constructed, and because of the concern of the schoolboard of that day and the council—and credit should be given to a study which they made of building construction at that time—the school was built for less than \$10,000 per room. Now this school was built in an area—one of Greater Winnipeg's finest residential areas, the Garden City area, with not a home there less than \$16,000 in value—but if there is any one thing that the two boards of administration of that day are proud of, it is this; that they were able to build a school, a school which is very safe, which is also very healthful in an area with lots of room, for less than \$10,000 per room. Now that school was built, I believe, in the year 1954 or '55. But I am quite sure that that same school could be built today within the limit of \$15,000. And this question of land costs—speaking for the suburban municipalities, any development which takes place today is always part of a long-planned venture. The land is always set aside for the schools. The City of Winnipeg—I can't speak for them—but would believe that they would too, certainly prepare themselves for future school development. So I would say that this question of bringing in the land value is entirely irrelevant to the resolution; and believe that where you

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) .. have interested bodies such as schoolboards and councils working together with the right type of architects--because an architect can certainly spend your money--he can give you gold doorknobs if you wish them--I think much can be done to keep down the cost of school building. And I would just like to go on record as proposing this proposal to raise the cost to \$20,000 per classroom.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some interest to the opponents of this particular resolution and their argument is that if the maximum grants are raised to \$20,000 from \$15,000, that there is the possibility or encouragement, if you want to put it that way, for schools to spend more money per classroom. The members who have used this argument tell you in the same breath that there have been schools built for \$10,000, \$12,000, \$13,000 although the maximum is \$15,000 at the moment. In other words, they tell us quite plainly that the schoolboards or school divisions, whoever will take advantage of this increase in the amount of grant per room, are not going to take advantage of the fact that the grant has been increased to \$20,000. If they are capable of building the schools for less per classroom, they will do so in the future, as they have in the past, and are doing at present. The \$20,000 grant is there to provide for schools that may find it necessary for some unforeseen reason to spend a little more per classroom--and I don't think there is any danger of what we are told, that the boards will immediately begin to spend more money per classroom. That isn't true of the past. The boards have been very careful in the expenditure of their money. Most of the schools have been built below the \$15,000. Some have been over the \$15,000; it was found necessary. And I think the attitude of the boards would be the same in the future, that not of necessity will the increase of grants mean more expensive schools.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour--

MR. S. ROBERTS (LaVerendrye): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the contention of the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye that there was pulpwood cut and piled in the eastern part of the province which will not be delivered to the mill at Pine Falls. The main reason he gives for this is that the truckers cannot make money hauling this pulpwood at local load limits. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is a considerable amount of pulpwood coming from my constituency, and I know that there is pulpwood being trucked anywhere from 12, 25 miles or over into Roblin and Grandview. There it is loaded on freight cars and freighted approximately 350 miles to Pine Falls. And this pulpwood has to compete at that mill with pulpwood from an area which is much closer to the mill itself. And I think it would be very wrong to give special permits to contract truckers in the southeast area of the province, and not give them to truckers who in other parts of the province are also hauling pulpwood. And if these pulpwood truckers are given special privileges across the province, Mr. Speaker, because highways are frozen and for other reasons, then I think that the same consideration would have to be given to all truckers in the province. Now, before this can be done, there are a good many factors to take into consideration. First of all, there is the effect of the loads on the highway, not only on the roadbed itself, but on the surfacing of the highway, particularly hard-surfaces. Now I think we realize that overloaded trucks and heavily laden trucks can damage particularly the shoulders of paved roads. The combination of speed and load can have quite an effect on the shoulder of even a well-built, well-constructed highway, such as we are building these days. And once that breaking-up has started at the shoulder with over-loads, then we all know it doesn't take very long for that break-up, with continual pounding, to work back into the highway itself and the main body of the highway. Whether the roadbed is frozen or not, this can happen.

Changes would also have to take place in the licensing requirements which might affect some of the reciprocal agreements that we now have with other provinces. There is also a matter of public safety to take into consideration. Braking requirements and general handling characteristics of a large truck would vary considerably under overloaded conditions, and I think I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the overloads that the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye mentioned vary from four, five, up to nine and a half to ten tons of

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) . . an overload in this case. And there is no doubt that the brakes and general handling characteristics of those trucks would be greatly different from those of the same vehicle operated under a legal load limit at the present time.

I also think that we would have to consider, and ask for, the feelings of the Truckers Association of Manitoba, because this licensing or increasing of weight limits during the winter months could have quite an effect on the trucking industry in the province as a whole, and it might be a very economic thing to do. But I think we should also have their opinion on that subject.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that the resolution be amended by deleting all after the word "livelihood" in the fifth line, and adding "and whereas the pulpwood industry is province-wide, and whereas any special privileges grant to truck hauling of pulpwood should be granted to all trucks of the province; therefore be it resolved that the government study and consider all the factors concerned to see if it is in the public interest to raise weight limits when highways are frozen."

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that this amendment is going to do is delay the implementation of any policy and defeat the purpose of the motion—the original resolution. I don't read this resolution as it previously stood to be restricted to any part of the Province of Manitoba, or any several parts of the Province of Manitoba. It applied to all of Manitoba, and the additional whereas doesn't add anything to the motion as it stood. Now, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the timber operations in the province are concerned, there are two phases of the operation that we have to look at; the operations themselves; and the movement of the product from the bush to the railhead or to the mill, whichever may be the case. Now the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that timber operations are pretty well restricted to winter months. In the first place most of the areas within which we find timber are inaccessible until the area is frozen over, because the roads are mostly winter roads, and during the summer months, if you do anything within the bush, the vast part of whatever is produced is not moved out 'till the winter time. And unless these materials, whether they be saw timber or pulpwood or lumber or ties, are moved during the season in which they are cut, then not only the timber operator has a severe loss, but the government stands to lose considerably in dues. A lot of the product such as pulpwood and saw timber and tie timber, are laid on low spots—open spots in the bush, such as swamps, sloughs, lakes and so forth. And if they are allowed to remain there during the summer months, quite a portion of them will disappear in the water and they will sink, or sink down in the swamp and are not recoverable. The operator loses money thereby, and so does the department in the way of dues. If you do anything to forestall or prevent the operator from moving this product out of the bush to the railhead or to the mill, then automatically you are penalizing both him and the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, because we have lost the dues.

Now, who are these truckers that we are concerned with? They are not men who depend entirely on the trucking of timber products during the winter months. They are a variety of truckers. They are farmers who look for supplemental income from trucking timber products during the winter months. They are gravel haulers who do not make enough during the summer months at hauling gravel, and must supplement their income by hauling timber products during the winter, and if we make it impossible for the gravel trucker to find a paying supplementary source of revenue during the winter, then what we're going to find during the summer months is we're going to be short of gravel trucks. And the province, in spite of its big program, they find themselves not in a position to carry out the program because of the lack of gravel trucks. And this is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, because no gravel trucker that I know of up in my area can make enough out of hauling gravel during the summer months to warrant the investment in the trucks that he has to make in the first place. He has to find some other form of employment during the winter. And the only form of employment he can find is the hauling of timber products. Besides these, they are the farm trucks—the gravel trucks—the farm trucks, and then there are those that depend pretty well on the timber operation themselves.

As to the damage to the roads, the Honourable Member for Roblin mentioned the fact that there is the possibility of damage to the shoulder of highways by the heavily overloaded trucks. In the first place, I don't think that they would be overloaded to the extent that my honourable

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . friend anticipates. They are not asking for that type of an overload. They are asking for extra load which would not impair the roadbeds. And I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that during the winter months, the roads will carry considerably heavier loads than they will during the summer months. And any damage that I have seen to our highways was not caused by truckers hauling timber products, but by gravel trucks, and wherever there is a heavy use of highways by gravel trucks, you will see that the shoulders are pretty badly damaged. And in no instance have I seen the same damage done by trucks that were hauling timber products.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I think that the resolution is a fair one. I don't think that this amendment is going to add anything to it. The only thing it will do is to delay the matter and it is urgent that this year's production be taken out now. We may only have another month within which these timber products can be hauled out, and unless we pass this resolution now, a great portion of those timber products may remain in the bush during the coming summer to the detriment of both the government and the operator. There is no need to study this. Both the Department of Mines and Natural Resources very well know what the score is; the Department of Public Works knows well what the roads can carry during the winter months. There is no room for study. This is merely a delaying action, Mr. Speaker, so that the government will not find itself in the position where it puts itself on the record either one way or another. And I think that we owe it to our timber operators--the hundreds and hundreds of people that depend on the operations for a livelihood. We owe it to them to make a decision on this resolution now and not to find some means such as this amendment to delay it so that there will be no action taken this winter.

MR. CARROLL: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: The mover of the amendment has suggested that in his part of the country, truckers are hauling 15, 20 miles and then shipping some 300 miles to the same market that the people adjacent to this area are asking for some relief for now. How is it that they can afford this much higher freight haul from the Roblin area, and incidentally, much farther north to Cranberry-Portage area, which may be over 600 miles in total distance? How can they afford to pay that kind of hauling charges when they can't afford this much shorter haul to Pine Falls?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That's quite a speech for a question. But I don't mind answering that one, Mr. Speaker, at all. There are several factors enter into that difference, and I think that both Honourable Minister and the Honourable Member for Roblin are well aware of it. In the first place, the timber operators in these outlying areas, which are away from the mill, haven't the same type of operation at all; pay much less for the cutters and the truckers than they are paid right here. Insofar as the distance of the haul is concerned, the truckers in the Honourable Member from Roblin's area are quite able to make two, three and four trips a day with smaller loads at smaller cost per unit. That is the difference. And not only that--not only that, Mr. Speaker--but after all is said and done--again I want to point out that this particular resolution is not restricted to any area of Manitoba; it will apply to the truckers in the Honourable Member from Roblin's area; it will apply to the truckers up north in the Honourable Minister's area, if there are any; it applies to the whole of the Province of Manitoba, so there is no room for that argument at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WAGNER: I beg to move, seconded by the member for Brckenhead that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye, resolved that the government consider the advisability of raising the basic teachers' grants in the Province of Manitoba--(interjection: . . . . . seconder?)

MR. SPEAKER: He's not in his seat.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm sorry. The Honourable Member from Carillon, resolved that the government consider the advisability of raising the basic teacher grants in the Province of

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . Manitoba to a level comparable to the assistance within the division.

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

MR. TANCHAK: Honourable Member from Carillon.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the grants have been thrashed back and forth for several days now, but I think it is my duty to bring in this resolution. I feel that an injustice has been done, and I am sure that the Honourable Minister of Education is a kind-hearted man. And I feel that he will listen me out. Although I was not in on Friday when the Honourable Member from Rhineland did bring this up--I had another engagement at Emerson--I understand that it was turned down before it was brought in as a resolution.

Now areas that are not in a division do not receive the same teachers' grants as the areas that are within a division, and the purpose of this resolution is to have the government consider the advisability of treating these people not within the division, as far as grants go, on the same basis as those within the division.

Now just a little background concerning Emerson constituency as far as the school problem is concerned. When the interim report of the Royal Commission on Education was presented, the present administration decided to organize Manitoba into divisions. And they did it in a great haste. I have said that often enough, and I'll repeat it. And I still believe it was done in a great haste. The new School Bill was passed in the fall of 1958 and then in June, 1959, referendum most of the province accepted this plan, except the divisions of Hanover, Boundary, Rhineland and Stanley. Hanover has since accepted the--entered into a division. But the other three still remain. Boundary, which is a part of Emerson constituency, voted against the boundaries of the division the first time, on the grounds that although the plan was acceptable, the boundary of the division was not. I am not blaming the government for acting on this plan, but I am sure blaming the government for rushing the Boundary Commission. I say that the commission did the best they could under the circumstances. The time was short; they had to meet a deadline. They were not given sufficient time to consider fully the facts of the boundaries established--and I am speaking now about the Boundary Division. Rhineland's representation has been represented here already by the Honourable Member from Rhineland. Stanley--I haven't heard any representation from Stanley. I'm not even too sure under whose representation that comes. It could be--it's a joint one I understand. Well, I haven't heard too much about that.

This summer, through my efforts, and the local trustees' association, we were successful in obtaining another referendum in the Boundary Division. It was turned down again, because no change was made in the boundaries as the people desired at the Boundary Commission sitting. Now Emerson constituency, through government action, has three educational policies; the western one quarter of Boundary Division has accepted a division in with the Red River; the central half of Emerson constituency has not accepted a division; they are on their own; the eastern quarter of Emerson constituency is a remote area--(interjection)--I want to understand what you said.

MR. A. E. CORBETT (Swan River): I said the division of Boundary--the people in Boundary, voted not against the divisional plan, but against the boundaries.

MR. TANCHAK: Against the boundaries, yes--the shape of the boundary and the existing boundary. They did not vote against the plan. They agreed with the plan, the educational part of it, but they did not agree with the shape of the boundary as was . . . . . Now besides that, through government action, the government has created two classes of citizens in Emerson constituency; the first class are those that are in a division and in the remote area; and the second class who rejected the division for reasons which I have stated before. You may say that they have brought this upon themselves. Again you will say that we are living in a democratic country, and I think it is a democratic right that all the people can express their opinions, whether they are for or against, and I am sure that the honourable members will agree with me, that it is their duty and it is their right--their privilege. You may say that the people of the Boundary Division were wrong because the rest of the Province of Manitoba accepted divisions and the majority must be right because the majority did accept the divisions. The circumstances may have been different in other divisions, but again, by the same token, I could say that the majority of Boundary Division did not accept the boundaries as they were

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . -- did not vote themselves into a division. So, therefore, they must be right too. I don't think the government has any right to treat these citizens as second class citizens. And I say that the government is treating them as second class citizens by not applying the same teacher grants as in the divisions. To me, it seems that the government is determined to keep on punishing these people for expressing their democratic rights. I do not think that that is being fair. If the government is convinced that these people should be punished continually, I do not think that they have the right to punish the children who had no say in this referendum. I don't think the government has a right to punish our future generations.

As far back as the election of 1957 the Conservative party went around in the by-election and they berated the former administration for not giving more money towards education, and this is the impression that they left with the people -- that if we are elected we'll increase the educational grants by 50%. Now I say that at that time they had no idea what the Royal Commission on Education was going to recommend. It was just a flat promise of 50% increase. There was no rider attached to it; the people were not told that you will first have to accept a certain rider before you will get the 50%, before they fulfilled their promise. Mr. Speaker, the administration may say that if their request was granted there will never be any incentive for the people of Boundary to enter into any division. I do not believe that is right. The people which the government has placed in the position of being second class citizens, they do not wish to stay out of a division. They evidently have a good reason for staying out of the particular division -- the Boundary. They wish to be in a division but not the kind of division that has been recommended by the Boundary Commission, and I am sure that if a proper boundary was given them, I am sure that these people would enter a division. But the way it stands now they feel, and they must be right because the second time they turned it down, that they should be treated as first-class citizens and not as second-class citizens.

I know that the Honourable the Minister, as I mentioned before, would like to see justice done, and I know that although he is with the wrong party, I know that he is still a just and kind man and I hope that his kindness will out by accepting this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. THELMA FORBES (Cypress): If there is no one else who wishes to speak on it.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty to say another word on this matter. I know beforehand that my friend and myself, my friend who has just spoken, will not succeed, but I for one believe that our duty on this side of the House is not predicated on the basis as to whether we will win out or not, whether we will get what we want, but only on the basis of whether we think what we believe is right in our hearts for the people of this province.

Now I am sure that as I rise to oppose this motion that someone on the other side, who is probably the First Minister, will say, "Well, you voted for this program anyway. You knew that these divisions who voted 'no' would get no grants. If you voted one way why not be -- carry on, be logical with yourself." Mr. Chairman, I made my position clear in this House -- Mr. Speaker, pardon me -- when I spoke in the fall of 1958. I'm sorry I could not find my copy of Hansard. I could not find one in our caucus room and I could not find one in the library today; but I have here a copy, a reproduction of the speech I made in the Legislature when I spoke a year and a half ago on this matter, before the Boundaries Commission made their study, before the vote was taken; and I made my position pretty clear. But we have been subjected to such a barrage from the other side of being inconsistent that I would like to, for the records, make my position clear again.

The story, the speech has been characterized, or the headline is, "Mr. Prefontaine criticizes new Education Bill". That's the paper's headline. There is another one, "Mr. Prefontaine Approves New Method of Financing but Claims Same System Could Apply to Smaller Units", and I will quote, and it is a true reproduction word for word, except for punctuation of Hansard. Quoting: "The fundamental recommendation to my mind in this new report and the Bill" -- I was talking of the new report in comparison to the report in 1945 -- "is not one with respect to administration but one with respect to finance. I don't think that in the history of this province we have gone so far as this Bill is going with respect to equalizing the burden of education in this province, and at the same time providing equality of educational opportunity. And I wish to praise the Royal Commission on its work. I am happy that I was a member of the government that appointed this commission. I do not agree completely with everything in that



(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) ... report nor in everything in the Bill, but as far as equalization of opportunity and tax burden is concerned, it is the greatest advance that we have ever made. Now we will really have the strong district helping the weak district." To me that was the main principle in the Bill before us at that time, and I still think it is the main principle -- the equalization of the burden of education. And I was in favour of that. I knew what would happen in my part of the country because I knew that we were a low assessed area with a large population and many authorized teachers. I knew that this special school tax would go down and it has gone down, and I was not going to be a party to depriving my people in my constituency from their share of public funds. We have many children. We of the French race and the Mennonite race, we have many children. They are citizens of this province. We were carrying a very heavy load on low assessment before and I say that I could foresee that taxes would be reduced, and they have been reduced. And I was present, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Education came to the Village of St. Pierre last summer and at the banquet he was told by the Mayor of the Village of St. Pierre that the taxes had gone down. It was a great day for the Minister of Education. I knew beforehand -- that's why I voted for the Bill at that time, that part of the Bill, the financial aspect of the Bill.

And, Mr. Chairman, I have with me here the report of the Royal Commission on Education. There has been a lot of discussion in this House as to whether taxes have gone up or down. The Minister told us that they had gone down in 46 municipalities, but by reading this report last year I could have told you that in these municipalities the taxes would go down because Table 23 shows the balanced assessments below \$100,000 per teacher. It mentions these municipalities, the towns and villages, and St. Pierre is included, and La Broquerie with \$29,000 assessment per authorized teacher is included, and Hanover -- and I knew that this would happen. It was plain. And the Royal Commission had said so, that the highly assessed areas would pay for the lowly assessed areas, and that's a sound principle. I do not know what I would have done if I had been representing say the municipality of Macdonald or the Town of Tuxedo, but I was representing the constituency of Carillon. I knew that taxes would go down. They have gone down. I don't know if they will remain downward for how long because we have quite an ambitious construction program. I hope they will remain but I am afraid that this year they will catch up, if not more. But I say that truly and sincerely I did support it, and that is what I did support in the Bill. But I had reservations because the Minister was offering to the people of Manitoba a plan. To some people it was offered gratuitously, no condition at all, people of the city, City of Winnipeg, school district of Winnipeg, school district of St. Boniface, of Norwood, of Brandon, of Flin Flon, of St. James, you can have all this money, a lot of money without even voting just by changing two words -- putting division instead of district. That was available free to those people but for the rest of the province it was not available without condition.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member permit a question?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yes.

MR. McLEAN: Has the requirements for school purposes gone down in the City of Winnipeg as it has gone down in the Village of St. Pierre?

MR. PREFONTAINE: I'm not asking you that, but you have asked the Village of St. Pierre to vote and you've asked them to vote "yes", and you've put the condition that if they voted "no" they would get nothing; but in Winnipeg there was no condition, in St. Boniface, in Norwood, in Brandon, no condition at all. I say that this is two weights and two measures, not the same way at all. And in my speech I said so in here. But the principle in itself of saying to half the people of Manitoba -- that's the cities -- "you can have this money without condition", and to the other half, "you must vote yourself into a unit" -- seems to me not a very sound one. There should be an alternative. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that according to the present set-up there is no alternative for the people in these divisions but to vote in favour, otherwise they are starving themselves with respect to education. They will not be able to compete with the teachers of this province and they will be second-rate citizens and have second-rate schools. I don't think that's what we want; I don't think that's what we are working for in this House -- and this was a year ago last October before anything was done -- and I said it pretty plainly. I said further, and I acted on it. I said this, and I am quoting: "I will move in

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) ... committee that with respect to grants we treat the school districts that will not be in a division along the same lines as those that will be within". I think that would be possible and I think then that this would provide a free vote. And I did in committee and I didn't get to first base. It was not the popular thing -- absolutely -- it's not popular now. I know I'm making a speech that's not popular, certainly not. My job here is to speak according to my conscience and I say that this is wrong. It's not worthy of our Canadian democratic system and I still said further, according to the present plans the Minister will get a favourable vote but he will get it only after a lot of fuss and discussion. He will get it by indirect coercion -- indirect coercion because of the size of the carrots dangling before the people's eyes. The vote may become a farce and cause expenditures of public money for nothing, because people will not be able to afford to vote themselves out of the scheme. They will come in by force. I was surprised that four divisions voted themselves out -- very much surprised. I said so before and I repeat it, because I cannot see how they can afford to stay out. The Minister said the other day they knew what they were doing. They refused to assume their responsibility of providing a better system of education by transporting children. Why two weights and two measures? Why in the cities -- what did they assume? Did they assume an irresponsibility with respect to transportation? No, not at all. The money is available in the cities but not in the country -- not at all. Mr. Speaker, I say that this is not right and I say to the Minister, suppose that the vote had been the reverse, four divisions voting yes and 32 voting no. Can the Minister stand up before this House and say that he would carry on being so stubborn and doing nothing for the two divisions -- for the 32 divisions:

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Member a question? What did his government do when there was one part of the province voted for a school area and no other part voted for it?

MR. PREFONTAINE: You were not the government at that time -- (Interjection) -- But we did not penalize the rest. At that time -- Don't make too much noise, I can't answer. I would like to answer. I would like to answer. At that time the basic support was \$1400. We raised it to \$2500. We did not punish those who didn't go into that scheme. We did not punish them. We raised it. We raised secondary support to \$1250 over and above the \$2500. We did not act as stubbornly to punish those that didn't want to go into the scheme. We did not ask them to vote like you did on the division scheme. We left it with them to vote if they wanted. It was available to them but we didn't start a big propaganda program with government funds to try and sell the scheme, if not sell ourselves to the people of this province. I say that it is not fair the way this is being handled at the present time. I say that this money now is available to people who did nothing to deserve it, to provide transportation or things of that kind. The Minister seems to be carrying on a war of attrition against these three divisions and these people at the present time. He's got them cornered. You must vote yes or you won't get anything. That's done in other countries but it shouldn't be done in our country. There should be something done. I don't think the rule of the jungle should apply in this Province of Manitoba.

I was very proud, Mr. Speaker, during the last election when a lady got up right in Dauphin, as reported by the paper, saying if the Liberals are back we will give justice to those who have chosen to vote no. She was reported, Mrs. Ringstrom, in the papers and I was quoting it in my constituency -- if the Liberals are elected they will give justice to the area by providing some additional support, raising the basic grants. She didn't go into very many details but she did not like the idea of penalizing and punishing people in a democratic country who had voted contrary to the wishes of the government. I know the government was very, very dissatisfied when these four areas voted no -- very much. And it is, it's all in their flesh I'm sure at the present time to know that there are people, there are children who are not getting their fair share of government funds. I say that the government should change its mind. It's possible, that's why we are intelligent. A fool of course doesn't change its mind or a mule is too stubborn, but we human persons, we should change our mind when we see good reasons to, and I defy the Minister again to get up and say that if the vote had been differently, if 32 divisions had voted no and four had voted yes, would he do nothing now for the 32 divisions after two years? No additional funds? I say the Minister cannot sincerely get up and tell me that he would have penalized the 32 divisions. It is a question of numbers -- there's only three -- we can stand up possibly but where are minority rights? Where do minority rights come in? I say they have their rights as if they were the majority and I insist that we are on solid grounds,

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) ... the Honourable Member for Emerson and myself, when we ask justice and fair play, otherwise I would be disappointed with the democratic parliamentary system under which we are living.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that I am very pleased to hear that the taxes have gone down because of the school plan in the constituency of Carillon. I'm glad one member admitted it. -- (In terjection) -- Did you say that the taxes had gone down in a lot of the municipalities in Carillon? I am very, very pleased.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of nonsensical, as I consider them, statements from the Liberal ranks as far as first and second-class citizens are concerned in education in this province. And I say nonsensical deliberately because they had three different methods of allocating school grants in this province. And do the Honourable Member for Carillon and the Honourable Member for Emerson mean to tell me that those people who lived in elementary school districts and got the grants that they were entitled to were third-class citizens of this province for 40 years? I think, Mr. Speaker, that the principle that school grants are allocated by the province in relation to the calibre and the standard of education in that district is prepared to provide is a well established one. It was established by the previous government. It was established for 40 years that the amount of grants that a school district got was in proportion and in relation to the standards of education that it provided. Now we are being told that it is the law of the jungle. That's nonsense. I think complete nonsense. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this government is doing the right thing in continuing the principle that was well enunciated by the Liberal party in giving grants to school areas in proportion to the calibre of education that they are willing to provide.

MR. FROESE: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I would say that the Honourable Member for Cypress indicated that she wished to adjourn the debate. --(Interjection)-- O.K. who was your seconder?

MR. FROESE: The Honourable Member for Dufferin.

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

.....continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, the following resolution: Whereas physical fitness is a matter of great importance to present and future generations; and whereas physical fitness depends in large measure on facilities for recreation, training and leadership; and whereas the present physical fitness program is inadequate for the needs of the province; and whereas the study of needs in physical education and recreation in the Province of Manitoba has been made as authorized by Resolution agreed to in the Legislature of Manitoba, March 19, 1957; therefore be it resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a program of physical fitness and recreation based on the recommendations of the report of the committee on this subject, submitted June 26, 1958.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that I can be sure of at least the support of one member of this Assembly and that is the Honourable the Minister of Industry & Commerce. This resolution is actually, I like to think of it as being an Evansism if I might coin a phrase because March 19, 1957, the Honourable Minister presented practically the same words in a similar resolution. (Interjection). Well I have no doubt he did . . . and I think that it would be a pity if someone in this Assembly did not follow up this good deed and once more ask the administration to take some concrete action with regard to this question of physical education in our schools and in our communities. We all know that two years ago a committee was set up to investigate and study this question and after some time and after the expenditure of several thousands of dollars, and after going throughout the province holding hearings in different communities, we have now a report which gives very concrete, very substantial, very detailed information as to just what a government can do to improve the standards and the qualities of physical fitness education in this province. If one would turn to Page 65 of that report which I have before me, one can find there at least 160 different organizations throughout the province that made submissions to this committee and the data is all there, all one has to do is read it. I don't propose to speak at any great length on this resolution except that I would draw to the attention of this Chamber the fact that in recent months some men connected with work of physical education have made some statements which are rather telling and which are worthy of consideration. Here we have, for example, the Director of Physical Education, the University of Saskatchewan speaking here in Winnipeg. He goes on to say that "children must be taught the basic steps of physical education in schools because the skills are not something that can be picked up. They have to be taught." He goes on to say that, "physical education in the schools of Canada are for the most part unsatisfactory."

Then too, I have here before me a brief submitted by the Manitoba Sports Advisory Council submitted to this government, incidentally, and in that brief on Page 2 there is one paragraph which I would like to read. The Sports Advisory Council has this to say insofar as physical education is concerned: "This Council is of the opinion that the problems raised by the general deterioration of standards of physical fitness among Manitobans and indeed among Canadians generally, which have been recognized by every authoritative study on the subject in recent years and which was pointed out very emphatically by His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, last summer, must now be recognized as one of the paramount public interest issues. There is no question that in the standards of physical fitness Canadians fall far short of western European countries and in all probability very far behind those of communist countries. The implications of this situation can no longer be ignored and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that anybody would choose to ignore the implications of such a situation.

Well, if we have the situation, what are we going to do about it? We are not asking in this resolution for the administration to accept some vague resolution or to spend thousands of dollars on something they know not what, we are asking them merely to put into practice some of the very practical recommendations of the study committee on physical education. I would refer them to page 10 of the report and I would just quote three out of many possible courses of action that they might follow. 1. - and this would not involve any large outlay of money. 1. We recommend that the province be zoned for purposes of competition and that within each zone a section of the Athletic Association be formed. 2. Assistance be made available for capital costs of gymnasiums. 3. Physical education equipment be provided for on the same basis as

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . other specialized school subjects. And one more -- that professional preparation in physical education be offered at the university level through a specialized degree course such as is done in the provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Well there are many more but surely if this administration would at least put three of these four that I read, three of these four proposals into practice I think that we on this side could not be too unhappy. We should be . . . . to being satisfied at any rate.

I hope that nobody on that side has the feeling that physical fitness is something which is not the responsibility of the province or of the administration. Possibly there are some who might think that this is a matter for local government units to deal with. And that is true of course up to a point but we cannot escape the fact that the provincial administration has far-reaching responsibilities in this connection and I would refer to Page 10 of the report where the committee goes on to say that the provincial government has as its responsibility the assistant local governments for developing community recreation programs and services. This would include provision of leadership and supervision, professional preparation at the university level and consultative and informational services, etc. etc. Well then, it's a fact then or should be accepted as fact that this administration has certain grave responsibilities. Grave because the situation is not very light but is rather grave itself. And so if we have this responsibility at the Provincial Government level we should perhaps then look for some justification in our lack of action by looking at the other provinces, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta. But if we look at what these three provinces are doing then it is all the more reason why we should hurry and start action upon implementing some of these recommendations, because on Page 46 of the report very conveniently for all who would care to read, there is listed for us the programs of all the ten provinces of this country and we notice that in Ontario - in Ontario a field staff of personnel is provided by the Department of Education and of course we can't have too many because howls would arise from the liberal benches and perhaps rightly so but certainly there should be some supervisory talent made available to the schools and communities -- field men in other words, Mr. Speaker. In the province of Alberta and in the province of Saskatchewan there is not too much difference. Both governments give contributory grants to local government, to municipalities, schools and so on for purchases of physical fitness recreation equipment for the construction of certain buildings and so on. Furthermore both provinces provide courses, specialized courses in physical education at the university level. Young men going in there can graduate and then, of course qualified to teach physical education as it should be taught out in the schools of the province. There are also scholarships for those who wish to avail themselves of the opportunity to take these courses at the university. So certainly we are lagging behind in this respect.

The last quotation I should like to make from this report is on Page 27. I like this quotation because there might be a few here who might think that we haven't done so badly in providing facilities etcetera insofar as physical fitness is concerned. The Committee had this to say: "In this province there is a definite lack of facilities and equipment which further inhibits instruction in physical education. Materials and appliances for school sports and games, supervision for sports and games etcetera is totally inadequate for a proper teaching program." Now if that isn't strong language, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. The language is so strong as a matter of fact that it should impress upon the Minister of Education and his colleagues the need for fairly prompt action in this regard. Of course I'm quite sure that the Minister will take some action because I notice that on two occasions now he has, perhaps inadvertently, given us his opinions insofar as physical fitness is concerned, and he seems to be of the opinion that we are not doing as much as we should in this field and further he seems to think that a good job could be done by co-ordinating school and community facilities. Sort of a co-ordinated school-municipal program of physical fitness and recreation. And if this is what the Minister is thinking then I would commend him most heartily because it would well be that this is the approach that will be most feasible and perhaps most successful. And if he is thinking along those lines I think that the children of this province and the younger adults of this province who would care to participate will have opportunities in the near future to do so. All I ask then is that the Minister put some of his thoughts into memo form and from there on into action.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan Whereas the cost of living has been rising steadily since the end of World War II, and Whereas average wages have been increased in order to keep in line with the cost of living, and Whereas in many parts of Canada, including Manitoba, minimum wage rates have not kept pace with the increased cost of living, Resolved that in the opinion of this House, the Government of Manitoba should take the initiative in proposing to the Federal Government that in conjunction with all the provinces, steps should be taken without delay to institute a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour for all workers in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, once again it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce this resolution. I have been asked by many to bring forth this resolution. Many people that aren't covered by union agreements with their employers and also by people that are covered by union agreements and I might add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that people that are covered by union agreements do not stand to benefit one cent an hour from this resolution as the basic wage for people that are covered by union agreements is much higher than \$1.25 an hour. Actually Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution -- we're not asking the government to spend a lot of money -- we're just asking for this government to get in touch with the Federal Government and call a meeting of the Ministers of Labour and see what they can do with this. Let's take a look at the first Whereas, Mr. Speaker. That the cost of living has gone up there is no doubt about that. Using the year 1949 equalling 100 on the cost price index, to the year September 1959 it has risen to 128.3. Now Mr. Speaker, I could have brought this point out month by month and year by year -- I don't think that's necessary. I think everybody will agree that the cost of living has gone up. That the wages have gone up to keep in line with the cost of living there is also no doubt Mr. Speaker. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I'll read the year 1949 first and the latest figure that we have up to October 1959 and will go by provinces. In Newfoundland in 1949 there was no average weekly wage available; in 1959 the average weekly wage in Newfoundland is \$64.54. Prince Edward Island \$33.62 comparing to \$55.24 in 1959. Nova Scotia \$33.76 and \$49.61-70 in 1959. New Brunswick \$37.62 in 1949, \$60.86 in 1959. Quebec \$41.85 in 1949, \$71.85 in 1959. Ontario \$45.40 in 1949 and \$77.49 in 1959. Manitoba \$43.76 in 1949 and \$71.05 in 1959. Saskatchewan \$42.79 and \$71.55 in 1959. Alberta \$45.96 in 1949 and \$76.71 in 1959. British Columbia jumped from \$46.94 to \$82.03 for a weekly average.

Mr. Speaker, those figures speak for themselves. I don't have to elaborate on them any further and I might add that in 1949 Manitoba was fourth as far as the provinces are concerned. In 1959 we dropped to ninth which is not a very good sign for Manitoba. These increases, Mr. Speaker, I think were brought about by organized labour fighting for its rights as the cost of living was rising and we were able to negotiate with employers and get these increases. There will be many Mr. Speaker, that will say that if we keep on increasing our wages that we're going to price ourselves out of world markets. That, Mr. Speaker, is not true. It might come as quite a surprise to very many in this House and very many outside this House of what the actual facts are, because there is always two sides to a story, Mr. Speaker. On the one side we always hear the cry of high wages but we never hear of the increasing productivity of the people that are getting these higher wages and as an example, I might cite for you, Mr. Speaker, and for the members in this House -- I'll just read a short paragraph taken from the Canadian Packinghouse Worker, and it says: "Russell Bell the assistant research director of the Canadian Labour Congress has this to say: "The facts are clear. Labour costs in Canada are lower than in eight leading trading nations of the world for which statistics are available. These include Argentina, France, Germany, Japan, The Philippines, Norway, The United Kingdom and The United States." Time and time again one sees references to the fact that Canadian workers are being paid so many times as much as workers in Japan and elsewhere in the world. This, of course, is true, but there is never any account taken of the difference in productivity rates of Canadian and foreign workers, Mr. Bell said. For example, the output of the Japanese worker in 1955 was only \$444 in US currency compared to \$2,259 US currency by Canadian workers

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) . . . . The average output of the Canadian worker, states Mr. Bell, is 9 1/2 times as great as for the Japanese worker. On the other hand wages for a Canadian worker was only 5 1/2 times as great as for the Japanese worker. It would come as a genuine shock for a lot of people to learn that because of this big difference in the productivity rates average Canadian labour costs for the entire economy are lower, and no higher than Japanese labour costs. That, Mr. Speaker should be food for thought for many. The other day the Honourable Member for St. James mentioned that labour and employer would have to get together or we're going to price ourselves out of world markets. I might point out to the Honourable Member for St. James that as far back as 1950 this offer was made by my union to our employer that we would agree to sign a two year contract without a wage increase if they would agree to keep the prices at the level that they were at the time. That was refused and I'm quite certain Mr. Speaker that labour will always see the other side of the story. The Honourable Member for St. Vital the other day said that it is a pretense that we of the CCF are the only ones that care about the people that toil. I don't think that's true, Mr. Speaker. If it were a pretense why is it that all the resolutions that come from this side of the House are always watered down and in the end mean nothing. Let's see who the pretenders are. This is a simple resolution. It's not asking the government to spend money. Let's see who the pretenders are. Let's vote for this resolution.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher the following resolution: Whereas cancer continues to take a heavy toll of human life in Manitoba; and Whereas the diagnosis and treatment of cancer often creates an extremely difficult financial situation for the people afflicted with this illness; and Whereas in many cases debts are created which take many years to repay; Therefore Be It Resolved That in the opinion of this House the Government of Manitoba should give consideration to the advisability of establishing a program whereby the diagnoses and treatment of cancer would be paid for by public funds.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of this resolution I first wish to look back and give credit, thanks to those who have done so much in this work in the past, because much good work has been done. The Canadian Cancer Society who now have taken unto themselves the burden of raising funds for research and who contribute in many ways to this disease of cancer. They have also taken on the job of informing the public because with this insidious disease this was a necessity, to allay the fears of many people in regard to some of the conceptions regarding it. Also the the Manitoba Cancer and Research Foundation. I believe this was evolved from the Manitoba Cancer Relief and Research Advisory Institute which was started back in the 1930's. Now today the Manitoba Hospital Services plan certainly does ameliorate this situation in regard to cancer. We also have our medical plans, too, which do much to help but in most of these medical plans where cancer is concerned, it is often claimed by the promoters of these schemes that these conditions are pre-existent and this in itself creates quite a hardship. I was looking over a report of our own Cancer Institute here in regard to the facilities that we have in Manitoba, and in the report -- I would just like the privilege of reading this -- "During the year under review members of the Foundation have studied its various activities and supported by the members of the Medical Advisory Board have concluded that while the radio-therapy department at St. Boniface Hospital in respect to its staff, equipment, and facilities for the patient's care and comfort is entirely adequate, the same remarks do not apply to the radio-therapy department of the Winnipeg General Hospital. The treatment of patients is carried out under grave difficulties while proper provisions for patients' comfort is essentially non-existent. No improvement in either respect is considered possible within the existing building. It goes on to say that the plans that they had, the hopes that they had for the government's support, the hopes that they had for the fund in regard to the hospital services-- the Manitoba Blue Cross, I should say, Mr. Speaker, the surplus funds that were to be turned over for this work, however I understand that the Minister of Health is certainly sympathetic to the cause; he is well aware of the situation in Manitoba and we're certainly hoping that he will

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)....give this his attention.

As a matter of interest in the greater Winnipeg area -- I should say the two clinics in the Greater Winnipeg area which are the only two in Manitoba we had 570 new cases in St. Boniface in the year 1958 whereas at the Winnipeg General we had 1,158. Now I think we could say this honestly in Manitoba that we have a certain amount of care for people suffering with cancer. For instance we have pretty complete care for indigents and we also have care, in my opinion, which is beyond the amount that we should give to people of higher income groups. For instance people of high income groups can get over the first shock of cancer and then receive extended treatments by cobalt bomb and such at the two clinics. Their high income of course makes it possible for them to overcome the care of surgery and loss of income as a result of it, but people of limited income are usually knocked out after the first round. In other words, we make them indigents. We can honestly say then that they are able to get free treatment, but do we really want to make them indigent as a result of this insidious disease? We have much public information today which certainly allays the fear of cancer, and for this we owe a debt of gratitude to the Canadian Cancer Society, but we still have this fear of debt. No one wants to apply for the Social Assistance under the new Social Allowances Bill. That's the last thing that people want to do although we must recognize that it's there for them. It seems to me that if we can sustain people at this time of emergency by giving them this free diagnosis and treatment of cancer we are doing very, very much to improve the conditions of our people.

I spent some time in our municipal office a week ago looking over the records of people who have had this disease in their families, and while many of the accounts were of large hospital bills, many of them extending beyond a thousand dollars. I was also able to get there information in regard to the history of these families in regard to cancer, and certainly it drained their resources beyond all normal expectations. Now in our neighbouring province, and I hate to use the word Saskatchewan because I was born in Manitoba and I would like to be able to think that we are able to keep up with them, but I was quoted in the House the other day that in the Province of Saskatchewan on health alone they spend 28% of the total estimates on health; whereas in Manitoba we spend 10.9; and in the Province of Ontario they only spend 11.2. Now if they can do it there I think we could do it here too. It is interesting to note that the cobalt bomb was first used in Canada in Saskatchewan; that they spend close to \$1,300,000 a year in our neighbouring province while we here spend I think roughly \$197,000; and in looking over the estimates I can see no allocation for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer. In fact I believe it's down a little from last year. It's true that support is given by the government for this work but not to the extent that it provides free diagnosis and the complete treatment of cancer.

Now it's interesting to note that the total in Manitoba over the 18 years, and I went back to '32 because I think a lot of good work had been started then, we've treated a total of 38,800 people in Manitoba. In Saskatchewan they've been doing this for 27 years, the last 15 of which has seen complete free treatment for cancer, and in this 27 years they have a grand total of 62,907 people, and that does not include the review examinations since 1932. Now I mentioned before that in our two clinics in Winnipeg we have a total of new cases per year of 1,728 -- that's for the year 1958. In Saskatchewan in 1958 they had 20,560 new cases. Now these two clinics of course are located in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, and they are well staffed with a Director of Cancer Services supervising. They have two full time physicists whose job it is to look after the radioactive factor in treating cancer and that is certainly a step in the right direction. Now I believe we could do this in Manitoba. I think that \$179,000 -- \$180,000 roughly is too little to spend here and I know that many will say that, well free care is provided, probably under the Social Allowances Act. Free care is also available to people of high incomes because of the availability of the use of the cobalt bomb but my plea, Mr. Speaker, is for the people of low incomes, people who do not wish to become indigent and who need a helping hand in the diagnosis and treatment of this disease.

Now in Saskatchewan it is interesting to note that the private practitioner benefited in the year 1959 to the extent of a little over half a million dollars, because there the patient can have his own doctor. I should say too that it has been accepted in Saskatchewan by many organizations, for instance in Saskatchewan I believe the Ladies' Auxiliary of the United



(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)....Commercial Travellers have given \$30,500 in support of this worthwhile venture, and I was told the other day by one of our local doctors that the ladies of the Eastern Star here in Manitoba have also contributed greatly. So it seems to me it doesn't matter which province you're in, Mr. Speaker, the need is the same. We have the same type of people who are willing to rally round the cause because I think that most people realize today that this insidious disease is increasing probably -- I believe it's 2% a year. I should say too that the Canadian Cancer Society provides a social worker in each clinic of Regina and Saskatoon and that the lay education is also carried on by them. But I believe that here in Manitoba that we should have this time shown in the estimates some provision to take care of this complete diagnosis and the care of cancer patients.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Public Utilities, that the debate be adjourned.

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 Member for Churchill. -- Order stand?

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is unavoidably absent and he'd like to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF party.

MR. GRAY: With permission of the House I would like to have this matter stand until some other day. My leader is not in the House now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, whereas the Fair Wage Act now sets the rates of pay which must be paid to construction workers in Greater Winnipeg and certain other cities and towns in Manitoba, at rates which are considered equitable after discussions between labour, management and the government; and whereas some of the largest construction projects in this province are being carried out in areas not now covered by the provisions of the Fair Wage Act; and Whereas we believe that workers are entitled to fair wages and proper working conditions wherever they may be working; Therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House the Fair Wage Act should be amended to extend its provisions to cover all construction workers in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member move the motion?

MR. HARRIS: Moved by Mr. Harris, seconded by Mr. Peters of Elmwood -- Honourable Peters of Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood is not here.

MR. HARRIS: Seconded by the Honourable Member from Kildonan.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, our main criticisms of the Fair Wage Act as it stands now is that its application is limited to certain parts of the province while some of the largest construction project now under way in Manitoba are being carried out in areas not covered by the Act. As far as private construction works are concerned the Fair Wage Act only applies to an area within the Greater Winnipeg Water District, and the cities and towns with a population of 2,000 or more. It has been contended for many years by those employed in construction industry that the Act should apply to the whole of the province. This is the purpose of assuring that no unscrupulous employer should be able to engage in unfair competition with another employer by paying a lower rate of wages. Each year the Fair Wage Board holds meetings and tries to determine what the wages and hours of work should be for the succeeding year. This Board is composed of five members, two of whom represent employers and two represent employees; the chairman is an official of the Department of Labour. The term of office for members of the Board is three years, after which they may be re-appointed. In some cases it has been the practice for the government to ask labour organizations to submit names of suitable representatives to be members of such Boards. If the government comes to life in this matter I would strongly urge that favourable consideration be given to consulting the Manitoba Federation of Labour. With regard to representation I would remind the new Minister of Labour of the duties of the Fair Wage Board. The Board has to submit a report in writing to the Minister

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.) . . . . of Labour not later than the first of March each year. An offer of the Department of Labour -- an officer, I should say, of the Department of Labour, may hold public hearings. The Board may make its report to the Minister of Labour. It is published and any persons may send in written submissions. After receipt of such submissions the Minister may approve or disapprove of the recommendations of the Board. He may send them back to the Board or he may change them. Then, if any changes are made the amended recommendations are published and become binding on all employers in the areas affected.

Another important aspect of this legislation has to do with safety and inspection. Construction workers need greater protection than is now provided. In addition to wages and hours of work there should be included specific regulations with respect to the safety of workmen. This seems to be one area where the Department of Labour is not adequately staffed. There are not enough qualified inspectors to make sure that the terms of the Act are fulfilled and that all safety precautions are being taken. Further, even when employers are found guilty of violating the Act the penalties imposed are far too light to be a real deterrent. These penalties for violating these regulations were established many years ago. The value of the dollar in the meantime has gone down, consequently, the penalties should be increased. I recall the case of a worker being killed last summer when the walls of an excavation caved in on him. The employer had been warned but had taken no precautions. He was fined \$25.00. Now, Sir, I would like to read something that I took out of the Press-- "Lack of Shoring in Ditch a Factor in Death of Workman - Jury rules. A former Hungarian freedom fighter who took part in the 1956 uprising in Budapest against Communist troops died Monday from injuries received in a cave-in at Kirkfield Park. The accident ended the man's efforts in recent weeks to get his wife and year old daughter back from Hungary where they had gone on holidays this last summer. Isphan Fedor, 21, of 46 Kate Street was pronounced dead on arrival at Deer Lodge Hospital. He had been buried more than an hour up to his neck in clay while fellow workers strove frantically to free him. Another workman, George Edward Holden, 31, of 297 Parkville Street, Kirkfield Park, was also buried nearly up to his neck but was rescued by fellow workers. A doctor from Headingly arrived to administer oxygen to Fedor during rescue attempts and it is believed that Fedor died of severe internal injuries. Deputy Minister of Labour Elliott Wilson said today all construction companies are provided with regulations governing excavations. Workmen, according to regulations, are not permitted to work in trenches unless adequate shoring has been provided. The rescue worker Holden said that excavation did not have any shoring at the point where he had been standing. Shoring had been placed a few feet back down the trench but none had been put into the newer section. Fedor up to the time of his death had been trying to get official approval . . . ." I will not go on from there but it goes on to say that "the Building Trades Protection Act should be rigidly enforced and periodically spot inspection of trenches should be made by the Department concerned. " It goes on to say that "the inspectors haven't power enough to go in there and to force them to come out of the trenches and different places where these regulations should be enforced." So there is one bad feature of that Act. At the present time, even in Winnipeg, there is not adequate inspection. Fatal accidents have occurred because the inspector was not empowered to have the operations stopped until proper safety conditions have been fulfilled.

To return to my main point that the Fair Wage Act should go to all parts of the province, let me illustrate it by reference to Part 2 of the Act. Under the terms of this part of the Act industries other than construction industries may be covered, but here again instead of being applicable to the whole province the Act is confined to certain zones. If we are to have a Fair Wage Act, and surely all will agree as to its necessity, let's have an Act that applies to all of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Well now, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to adjourn the debate nor do I wish to take up any long amount of time. I merely wish to support my colleague in what he has said here on this subject because I think that there is a growing need for the Fair Wage Act to apply to areas where it does not apply today. The need is growing because in years to come I

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.)....have no doubt that more and more towns in rural Manitoba will be putting in sewer and water and this is construction of a kind that can be rather dangerous. I happen to live near a town, the town of Beausejour, and a few years ago they were putting in sewer and water and during this period of construction -- excavation, no less than three workmen were rather seriously injured. One of them was killed. I don't know just where the fault lies or where the negligence could be attributed to, but I do know that if there are going to be many more towns in this province putting in water works, or similar services where there is some construction involved, that we could do a very wise thing here and extend the Fair Wage Act so that it would apply to those areas where it does not apply now. Let us hope that more towns will put in sewer and water and let us give the working men who labour at this task some greater degree of protection.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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 Member for St. John's.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, my speech I think will take more than the time we have till 5:30. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the House to adjourn the House?

MR. ROBLIN: I personally have no objection if the honourable member wants it to stand, but I would point out that we will be on private member's tonight so that he can complete his speech if he wishes to.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well I was wondering if it could stand over until -- I could start it ...

MR. ROBLIN: No, because I'm afraid we'll want to go into estimates when this item's over, so I think we should either have this speech now or perhaps let the item stand until next Private Member's Day, whichever my honourable friend would prefer.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we've made very good progress today on Private Member's Day and there have been one, two, three, four, five, six resolutions as I see them that have been stood over. A good number of them have not been spoken on. It would appear to me that the House could extend the courtesy to the honourable member that he speaks tonight. It is very difficult if he has a long speech to speak for 15 minutes and then break it off and then start again tonight. If we had not made progress I would certainly agree with the Leader of the House, but in view of the progress that has been made I can't see why this could not be extended.

MR. GRAY: I think if the Leader of the House holds the members a half an hour like they say last night, I wonder if we couldn't call it 5:30 or adjourn the House.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've got no real objection to obliging in this respect. Perhaps we could call the second reading of Bill No. 56 now and after that's dispensed with then we could consider it 5:30. That would meet the wishes of my honourable friend I think and he can talk to us tonight on this resolution. So if that's agreeable I would be quite willing to propose that.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. ROBLIN: I just want to say one thing though, that before the members rise it will be possible now to distribute the Bill on Metropolitan Winnipeg and I'll ask the staff to have that done before we adjourn. That can be done right away. If you would now be so good, Mr. Speaker, as to call this Bill No. 56.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 56. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

Mr. Scarth presented for second reading Bill No. 56, An Act to amend the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District Act.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, the amendment asked for -- sought for is merely an administrative amendment. At the present time the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District Act provides that debentures shall be sealed with the seal of the corporation and shall be signed by the Chairman and the Treasurer of the Corporation or by such other person as may be authorized by law to sign them. To keep consistent with Winnipeg - the City of Winnipeg practice and the Greater Winnipeg Water District, it is the desire of the Sanitary District that the Treasurer

(Mr. Scarth, cont'd.).... who is responsible for the delivery of the bonds and debentures should sign them.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Now, Sir, if you would agree to call it 5:30 we can meet again later.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Man.
ASSINIBOIA	Geo. Wm. Johnson	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Robert Gordon Smellie	Russell, Man.
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	Beausejour, Man.
BURROWS	J. M. Hawryluk	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
CARILLON	Edmond Prefontaine	St. Pierre, Man.
CHURCHILL	J. E. Ingebrigtsen	Churchill, Man.
CYPRESS	Mrs. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 5
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q.C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Peter Wagner	Fisher Branch, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
KILDONAN	A. J. Reid	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 5
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjomson	Lac du Bonnet, Box 2, Group 517, R.R. 5
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 9
LA VERENDRYE	Stan Roberts	Niverville, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Walter Weir	Minnedosa, Man.
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Obie Baizley	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
PEMBINA	Hon. Maurice E. Ridley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	John Aaron Christianson	15 Dufferin W. Ptge la Prairie, Man.
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	W. B. Scarth, Q.C.	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Holmfield, Man.
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
ST. JOHN'S	David Orlikow	206 Ethelbert St., Winnipeg 10
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Wpg. 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q.C.	Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	Lot 87 River Road, Lockport, Man.
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	A. H. Corbett	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	E. I. Dow	Boissevain, Man.
VIRDEN	Hon. John Thompson, Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan	512A, Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1