

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 27th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Keith Turner, praying for the passing of an Act for the relief of Clifford Junghans, Henry Junghans, Albert Chesick and Harvey Chesick.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Mary Eileen Abbott and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Art Gallery.

The petition of The Central Trust Company of Canada, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the petitioner to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba.

The petition of C. A. C. Realty Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the petitioner to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba under Section 321 of The Companies Act.

The petition of Mytro Mandybura, praying for the passing of an Act for the relief of Mytro Mandybura.

The petition of Sister Maria Robertine and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Providence Ste. Therese.

The petition of Gudmundur Paulson and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Elizabeth M. Crowe Memorial Hospital.

The petition of Industrial-Talcott Financial Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the petitioner to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba.

The petition of Niagara Mortgage and Loan Company Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the petitioner to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba.

The petition of The Fidelity Trust Company, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Fidelity Trust Company.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 71 an Act to Amend the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act; and, Bill No. 74, an Act to amend The Judgments Act.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood) introduced Bill No. 82, an Act to amend The Labour Relations Act (2).

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my right where there are seated 60 Grade 11 students from the Sisler High School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Tanchak. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows. We trust that your visit to the Legislative Assembly this afternoon will be enjoyable and beneficial. We hope that as you watch the proceedings here and listen to the debates, that it will encourage you to take a keen interest in this your Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Utilities. The question is: Is it the intention of your department to make any modifications in respect of spring load restrictions on bulk milk truck shipments?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Member from Selkirk for giving me notice of his intention of asking this question. I am happy to be able to reply to it generally in the affirmative, by saying that discussions have been held between the Highways Branch, the Department of Public Works and the officials of the Motor Carrier Board. I'm pleased to be able to announce that due to the perishable nature of the product, bulk milk tanks will be permitted to operate on provincial trunk highways up to 350 pounds per inch width of tire, and all reasonable steps will be taken to maintain this weight even if further general restrictions do become necessary on account of road conditions. In cases where this procedure is considered by the Chief Inspector of the Motor Carrier Board to be inadequate, the Highways

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) . . . . Branch has agreed, on the Chief Inspector's recommendation, to issue special permits to enable the carrier to handle the production. Where municipal roads are involved, it will of course be necessary for the operators to make satisfactory arrangements with the municipalities concerned.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madame l'orateur, avant les Ordres du Jour j'aimerais vous rappeler que la soirée annuelle de La Société St.-Jean Baptiste en honneur des membres de la Législature provinciale aura lieu cette année au gymnase du Collège St-Boniface, ce soir, mercredi le 27 mars à huit heures et demi.

Translation: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to remind you that the annual reception of the St. Jean Baptiste Society for the Members of the Provincial Legislature will be held this year in the gymnasium of St. Boniface College tonight, March 27th, at 8:30 p.m.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General. Yesterday, and I now have the Hansard, there were some very definite statements made by the member for Wellington. He stated that the NDP signed candidates' certificates with his name, giving authority to scrutineers; he stated further that ballot boxes from Poll No. 10, very specific, were in the NDP committee rooms from the time the polls closed to some time after 11 o'clock on election day. He indicated that there were many other irregularities in that election. I asked the Minister -- or asked yesterday for the government to have an investigation of this matter. I would ask the Attorney-General now whether it's the intention of the government to investigate this at once.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, this matter, as my honourable friend is aware, is under discussion on the resolution which is on the Order Paper. We, of course, will be prepared to take any guidance that the Committee on Privileges and Elections may wish to give us with respect to any further investigations that may or should be carried on.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, under the Orders for the Day, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, in French, invited us, I understand, to the "Pea Soup" tonight, but I still want to be sure that this is what he asked for.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I think that the honourable member should realize not to place any future members in the Legislature in such a predicament, and that he should vote for the option of French in Grade 1.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that on page 580 of the second paragraph from the top of the page in Hansard, that I'm quoted as saying: "In mental retardation and mental deficiency, we don't have to take a back seat in Manitoba to anyone." I think I would like to alter that, as I had meant to say in modern attitudes and care of patients suffering from retardation and mental deficiency, we don't have to take a back seat in Manitoba to anyone. I would respectfully ask this be corrected, Madam Speaker, because I sound bad enough in Hansard as it is.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the Table a Return to an Order of the House No. 9, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Many Manitoba businessmen have expressed concern that anti-American statements being made by the Prime Minister are adversely affecting their businesses. They contend that American annoyance will hurt tourists, investment and export industries. In view of the Minister, will this type of talk not hurt the program of this government to induce American markets and to lure the American tourists to this province?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, the answer to my honourable friend's question is "no".

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I'd like to say that my wife is down in Minneapolis now with her relatives, and she's healing American and Canadian relationships.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that a humble address be voted to His Honour the

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd).... Lieutenant-Governor for copies of all correspondence between the government of the Province of Manitoba, and of its boards, commissions and agencies and the Red River Exhibition during the years 1961, 1962 and to date in 1963.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, that an order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) The total number of automobile accidents for Manitoba for the years '58, '59, '60, '61, and 1962. (b) The total number of automobile accidents occurring on that section of Provincial Trunk Highway No. 1 between Headingley and junction of Provincial Trunk Highway Nos. 1 and 4. (c) The total number of persons killed in each of the above years. (d) The total number of injured in each of the above years.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, we are prepared to accept this Order for Return, as I take it amended by the Honourable Member for Portage by adding the word "years" in (c) and (d). It appears on the Order Paper in a slightly different form, but the way he read it, it would appear to be acceptable by adding the word "years".

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, in the absence of my honourable colleague, may I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable the member for Lakeside.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I think that in spite of what I had said the other day when this bill was preceded by the resolution stage, that I would perhaps have not spoken at all on second reading, feeling that I had made my own position clear and I guess that's about all that I need to do in this regard. But like my honourable friend the Minister of Health, I found that I had made a rather unfortunate presentation of my case or had phrased it unfortunately the other day, and I decided that I had better give some explanation about that phrasing.

I was concerned to find that the press had reported me as saying that I felt that I was worth the amount that was being proposed in this Bill and I immediately was going to get ready to stand up and ask the press to make a correction in that regard, but unfortunately for me, before I had done that the Hansard came on our desks and to my surprise and chagrin and embarrassment, I found that I had said just about what the press said that I said, and I'm reading now from Hansard at page 214. After having said that I thought it was a mistake to increase the indemnities of the private members, I said, "I have to report I suppose" -- this is the Hansard quotation -- "I have to report I suppose, in fairness, that if it is granted I shall accept my portion, holding the view that I do that I am worth the amount as well as some of the other members of the Legislature. I think there are some here who are worth a good bit more and I think there's some here though that are not worth any more, so if it is going to be general, I'll take mine and not make any promises about giving it away." I want it understood that what I was saying was not that I thought I was worth the amount, but that I thought that if some of the other members of the House were worth the amount, then I was worth it. I was comparing myself with some of the other members of the House. And when I mentioned that I thought that some others were worth more, I was meaning that I realized that some other members of the House were worth more than I, not more than the amount that is proposed in the Bill, because I still hold to the opinion that the remuneration for private members that is proposed is more than the most of us earn here.

Now I know that there is a disposition among members of the House to argue that this must be considered as an annual salary and that you can't consider it as being just the remuneration for the time that we are here. I simply can't accept that premise because I have found through experience that the vast majority of us, almost all of us, carry on another business or profession or career of some kind; and while I know that there are many who have to give a great deal of their time at the portion of the year that the House is not in Session, I still

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)..... maintain that the salary that has been given in the past is adequate for the situation.

But that is not all, Madam Speaker. I mentioned the other day that this would be a 60 percent increase for the private members over what had obtained when the present government took office. It's considerably more than that for a good many of the members -- of the private members. I just revised that computation by figuring out that, for all the private members, at least a 60 percent increase; and, of course, those who are not private members get that as well. But for those members who find it necessary to live away from home while the Session is on, it's an 80 percent increase. I've made no attempt to find out how many that is, but I would guess that the number is substantial. For those two private members that belong to the northern seat, the increase since this government has taken over is 110 percent.

Now my old complaint of going too far too fast applies again. The First Minister mentioned, quite properly, in his remarks here, that we couldn't escape in this Chamber the invidious position that here we are, people who have to set our own salaries. Not many folk are in that position unless they're completely self-employed. This is an embarrassing situation for us, I'm sure, but I think this is one of the reasons that we should be very careful to not go too far too fast, because of the fact that we are setting our own salaries.

Some of the other salaries of course that are not under discussion in this particular Bill might be mentioned too. It's probably interesting to note that the First Minister gets the lowest percentage increase of all. He gets the same increase numerically as other Cabinet Ministers, but because his salary is higher the percentage works out to be the lowest of all. The Deputy Speaker, I think -- and I'm speaking of the increases not provided in this Bill but since this government took over -- the Deputy Speaker, I believe, gets the next lowest increase. The other Ministers besides the First Minister get the next lowest increase, 57 percent as I work it out. All private members get 60 percent. Madam Speaker will have a 74 percent increase, but this is statutory. I guess we can't complain about it inasmuch as it is statutory; inasmuch as I was the one who moved the motion that made it statutory. But I think I should indicate in passing, Madam Speaker, that that legislation was put on the Statute Books of this province on the understanding that a move would be made toward the permanent speaker type of arrangement in this House and that that move, in turn, would be initiated and carried through on the basis of full consultation with the members of the other Parties in the House as well as the government group. The other increases since the time that this government took over are, as I indicated, going all the way from 80 percent in the case of private members who find it necessary to live away from home to 110 percent in the case of the two northern members.

No one realizes better than I do, Madam Speaker, that this is not a big item numerically or proportionately or percentage-wise compared to the total budget of the Province of Manitoba. It's a small item, but the principle of it, in my opinion, is big. I'm sorry to see that this example is being set by we folk here who have the opportunity of setting our own salaries, and I'm afraid that it will be followed all too readily by other people in public or semi-public positions, some of whom have already, in my opinion, shown a readiness to pay themselves very good salaries. Though comparisons are supposed to be odious, Madam Chairman, I can't help but compare what we are doing for ourselves here with what the government has up to date done for the senior civil servants of the province. Now I could quite properly be called a hypocrite I think if I tried to pretend that I had been an advocate of high salaries in general. I'm not trying to pretend that. I have usually held that in public service and in the civil service, that salaries did not need to be as high as in some other more competitive positions. In the public service, because of the fact that they were able to set their own salaries and they should set a good example. In the Civil Service, because there are other fringe benefits, including security of tenure; excellent working conditions; ample holidays and pensions; and many other things that make that occupation desirable.

So I'm not pretending that I've been an advocate of the high salary schedules in general, but those who have served in the House with me for some time will remember that, even while taking that position, I have always maintained that the senior civil servants of the Civil Service were the ones who should get the increases and get the preferred treatment, rather than the rank and file of the senior civil servants, because I think it's the senior ones, the Deputy Ministers, the heads of boards and commissions and that type, and to a lesser extent the branch

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) . . . heads, they are the people who really carry, along with the Ministers of course, the responsibility for the department; and they are the ones that are mainly responsible, I think, for the high standing that our Civil Service properly enjoys. So I went to the comparison with the Deputy Ministers -- just the basic rates of the Deputy Ministers, not checking on those who for one reason and another are paid an extra remuneration -- but just to what appears to be the basic salary of \$15,000, and if my figures are right, since this government has come into office it has increased these essential civil servants, on whom so much depends, by 25 percent, as compared to the percentages that I mentioned. And to one of these civil servants -- to one of these senior men and one who, in my opinion, does as good a job as any of the Deputy Ministers -- to one of them the increase, if my figures are correct, has been only four and one-sixth percent, and that one happens to be the one that sits at the end of the table here. I'm amazed to find out that the disparity that has existed for some time in some of the senior civil service salaries continues to exist.

I suppose it's no more essential that all Deputy Ministers, all branch heads and all other senior positions should be paid exactly the same salaries as it would be that all the people in other walks of life and professions should be paid exactly the same salaries, but just as we have at least some uniformity between the salaries that are paid to -- basic salaries to the Members of the House, at least a standard by which the extra amounts are paid; at least a complete uniformity as far as the Ministers of the Crown salaries are concerned and the difference made only in the one case of the First Minister, to which I think no one would object. Surely there is some reason for some uniformity in the ranks of the senior civil service, as represented by the Deputy Ministers, and so I can't escape that comparison.

But to come back to our own situation and the one that's immediately before us in this Bill, I simply have to recall that a very short time ago there was an election and every one of we folks who sit in this Chamber right now knew what the salary was for an MLA when we were running, and we all seemed pretty anxious to get in here and get it. In fact, it wasn't only we folks who are lucky enough to be the survivors of those contests that were willing to serve for this amount of money. There were twice that many more approximately who were quite willing to do the same thing. Something in the neighbourhood of 170 good men and true and a couple of good ladies, and I'm sure true ones also offered themselves for these positions at the going salary.

To go a little further with the statement that the First Minister made the other day of the fact that it is a bit invidious that we're placed in this position of having to deal with our own salaries, quite frankly I don't know any way of escaping from that position and a lot of us seem to show no tendency to escape from it; we continue to come back here year after year. In addition to that, is the other rather invidious position that these increases seem to, nearly always, come right after an election. I don't suppose it's to be expected that the most of us, and I try to be realistic even when being critical, I don't suppose it would be realistic to suggest that most of us would go around campaigning on a platform that if we were elected we were going to increase our salaries. There might be some of my honourable friends here, but the most of us, I think, would rather soft-pedal that particular plank in our platform, if we had it at all, and I think this adds to the invidiousness of the situation.

Well, Madam Chairman, there isn't very much more that I can do about it and I regret that I find myself in such a minority, but I felt that I had to state my position so that my vote, if this should happen to come to a vote, would be understood. I hope that I have succeeded in correcting the unfortunate impression that I left the last time of pretending that I thought that I was worth this amount of money. I don't think that any of the private members, for the length of time that we stay here, require this amount of money, and of course it's the private members indemnity that we're dealing with at this time. So it's my intention, Madam Speaker, to vote "nay" and I appreciate the opportunity of putting my reasons for it on record.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, before dealing with the question before the House, may I be permitted to transgress one second only and make a comment on the reply given to me by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface when he invited, I understand -- (Interjection) -- it's in order -- it's in order -- it's in order. Just half a minute and I'll be through. By the time that you stop me I'll be through.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... Speaker, if I may interject with the cattle calls that I hear behind me on the question of order...

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Order. Order.

MR. PAULLEY: May I, on a point of order, Madam Speaker...

MADAM SPEAKER: Excuse me, there are two of you on the floor.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. GRAY: May I continue my one statement?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member may continue.

MR. GRAY: Yes, thank you very much, Madam. I know I could get along with women better than with men. He replied in French an invitation -- or he asked an invitation to go tonight to St. Boniface to have a hot soup or whatever there is. When I asked him why he had to demonstrate just now an invitation to everybody in French, he replied, "you should go to school."

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh no -- no.

MR. GRAY: Well I don't know French, but that was informed me. However, I can assure my honourable friend that I'm not going to be there in protest of his statement. Now I'll come to the other point under consideration and I'll take a few minutes, and you, Madam, can sit down and rest.

You know, Madam, I have had great respect for everybody and particularly in the years gone by for the honourable member from Lakeside as Premier. I worked under him as Minister of Agriculture, as Provincial Treasurer. In my humble opinion, and with great respect to him as an individual, I maintain that, to my thinking, he is playing politics, period. Okay, now. I'm making this statement and if the speaker asks me to re-word this statement I will, but after all, I got to be honest with myself.

A MEMBER: More of those calves calling.

MR. GRAY: Believe me, Sir, whoever made the remark, I am trying and I think that my reputation in Winnipeg so far is honest -- (Interjection) -- Okay. It's your opinion; you're entitled to it. You're being paid for your opinion. Here is a situation that no member of the Legislature asked for an increase of indemnity. I'm sure about it; I didn't ask. The government felt that they should get an increase. The increase is going to be given and every member will receive it and use the \$800 to the best advantage that they know of.

Now let me tell you something about one individual. I want you to know that in 1925 my maximum income was \$100 a month -- not in the political life, but personally. Those who have earned more in those days probably could not appreciate it. I had to raise a family of four children and then when the City -- at that time the Independent Labour Party in their wisdom, not in the wisdom of those citizens, asked me to run for the School Board. I agreed because I felt that it was a great honour to me. I spent a third of my life in a dictatorial atmosphere, and when some people come to me and said, "here is a chance for you to be a law maker", to me it was a message from God -- "go ahead and take it". I accepted it and I was elected and there was no wages attached, not one cent of indemnity -- not one cent. I spent a lot of money being elected because I wanted to be elected, and there was no indemnity. So I spent four years on the School Board without any remuneration, and let me tell you now, that at that time between 1926 and 1930, the highest class of men in the community in Winnipeg of all groups and parties were members of the School Board and they wanted to contribute something towards the welfare of the children.

In 1930 I was asked to accept the nomination as an alderman and I did, and elections were very expensive because I wanted to be elected. I begged from everyone for a dollar, for a 50¢ contribution to help me to get elected. When I came into the City Hall the salary was \$90 a month. It didn't pay my election expenses and there was a depression of ten years. I was active in all committees in connection with helping the unemployed, which I'm not going to recite now. I had to spend practically all day down there for \$90 a month, and I stayed there for 12 years.

When I came into this Legislature, the indemnity was then \$1,900 a year. I had to pay my expense; I had to pay my out-of-pocket expenses of being an MLA; I had to help out my Party; I had to pay income tax on this -- for \$1,900 a year -- and I state here that seldom, if ever, have I missed a Session because I love the work. I was very proud of being a lawmaker

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)... after being kicked around for a quarter of my life in dictatorial countries. Even today I did not ask for the increase. I didn't ask the Provincial Treasurer to have it increased. I didn't expect it, but once it was given and there was no objection from anybody except one individual, and still he claims that he is going to take it -- he is going to take it and use it. I have no apologies for accepting it -- absolutely none.

I think that the more pay that a public representative will get, the better man they can get to administer our affairs, because a good man -- any doctors and businessmen who make 50, 60, 75 thousand dollars a year are not going to sacrifice to come here and say I'm going to work for \$4,800 a year because I want to help the people. I haven't seen anyone yet that has offered it. So why he -- I'm thinking of a word, not hypocrite -- I'm thinking of a proper word and I haven't got it. Why should we, why should one individual come in and put on the public market, so to speak, to be condemned because I, like he, accepts.

The average labourer doesn't realize what we are doing. He's getting \$1.00 an hour, \$1.25 an hour -- I don't know how much he gets -- and they try to multiply this and figure out here is a member gets \$4,000 a year for two weeks, or four weeks. He doesn't realize that his job is all year round. He doesn't realize this, and he says I have to work for a dollar an hour or \$8.00 a day, and here is a member from the Legislature comes in and stays here a month or two and gets so much money, and then multiplies this by the hour and he finds out that he is getting more an hour than the average labourer. And what do we get? If you gentlemen who don't sleep late listen to some radio station about "Beefs and Bouquets" -- it may be foolish, but if you could hear the condemnations they have against me and against everybody else that we are not earning our money; that their husband has to work for \$200 a month and we are getting \$4,000 for two months.

I think personally that my dear friend, for whom I have the greatest respect for years and years and do still have, and I'm still consulting him on many things, that he was absolutely wrong. I think he was born very much too early in this world because he does not appreciate -- he wants to go the same way; the same path as we had then. He still believes in cultivating your land by oxen. He still believes in developing by horses. He does not see, and it is really very painful for me to tell him that, because I do know that he's a pioneer; I do know that he's a Canadian-born and I'm a goddam foreigner come here and tell him what to do. But after all I've got to be honest about it. I've got to be honest about it, and I say to the honourable member that has spoken against it, it has made publicity. When I speak in the House, not a word from the press. When he says he doesn't want \$800 he got a headline. So I say that it's absolutely wrong; it's foolish; it's behind the times; and sooner or later that wonderful pioneer in this Parliament, the pioneer in this Legislature who has sat here for forty years should realize once and for all that time is marching on. What happened forty years ago is not applicable today. He, as an old legislator who is going to retire sooner or later, should encourage the young people and tell them here boys, come in here, work, sacrifice and if you can't afford it, we'll pay you for it. After all, I, this individual, this foolish goddam Polack...

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member will please watch his language.

MR. GRAY: I'm sorry. I apologize. Pardon?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member will please watch the language he uses.

MR. GRAY: I'm sorry. I humbly apologize. I very humbly apologize but I can't help it. Sometimes it comes out of you. I have no notes in front of me to guide me. Should feel that encouragement has to be given to the young people, to the young people. I feel that I sat here too long. I should give another young man a chance to come in and carry on under the present and future provisions. I'm sorry, Madam, I can't talk any more. I feel it sincerely. I feel it very intimately that I think that to see one of our leaders in public life -- and I call him a leader and I'll always call him a leader -- he's proved that -- should come out in the way that he did to oppose a resolution which no single member asked for, but the government felt they should get it. I'm sorry.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I rise to deplore the despicable attack that's been made in this House by the last member. When he said that he didn't have much more to say, I say to him, better he hadn't said what he said in the first place. My honourable friend is entitled to be opposed to this legislation; he's entitled to be for it; but he's not entitled to

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... accuse someone else here of opposing it for political purposes, particularly when it happens to be the man sitting here as the member for Lakeside who has been very clear in his position about this in the past. If my honourable friend hadn't spoken previously, at other times in this matter; if he hadn't voluntarily turned the increase that was given to him when he was the Leader of this Party over to a college for welfare work on a volunteer basis completely; if his record in this matter wasn't clear, I could almost understand some of the things said by the member for Inkster. But, Madam Speaker, for this man to get up and make the attack that he has on the member for Lakeside, when the member for Lakeside has at all times been very direct in this, when he made his speech indicating very clearly that he was speaking personally; that he was doing this, not wanting to embarrass other members of the House, but that this was his deep feeling and a feeling that he'd expressed here in the House on many occasions before. I deplore this type of attack; I deplore this statement indicating a political motive behind the statement of the member for Lakeside.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I really had no intention to speak on this matter, this resolution, because I'm amongst those few present who have the least experience in this House and probably the least knowledge regarding the amount of time and effort that we will have to contribute in the position to which we were elected, so I certainly had no intention of discussing the suggestion of the increase in indemnity.

However, Madam Speaker, I was prompted by some of the statements made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and I felt that some of those statements were such with which I wanted to deal. I'm not going to deal as long and certainly not as violently as we have already heard today, mainly because I don't have the many years to recount to you of the service which I have been able to offer and mainly because I've known the member for Lakeside for a few years and only casually. But as a citizen of this province, I have known of the honourable member for many years and, as far as I have ever been able to judge, his integrity has never been questioned. I believe he commands the respect of many of the people of the Province of Manitoba. I also believe that he can be wrong; has been wrong; will be wrong in various issues; but I have no doubt in my mind that the people of Manitoba remember and recognize the contribution which he has made and will continue to make to the affairs of the people. But there were some comments he made which I felt I ought to deal with.

When he spoke about the return to members of the Legislature, I listened but I had no reaction because, as I say, I don't know enough about what it is. I do know that I dread to walk into my office in the morning because I know how difficult it will be to extricate myself very quickly, and I suppose the answer will be that I'll have to stop going to the office in the morning and at least not have the difficulty of extricating myself. I don't know what loss I will suffer from my personal income -- that has yet to be seen. I must say that when I look across the room and I see several members of my own profession who have agreed to give full time in the interests of government, I shudder to think of what is happening, or has happened to their practices. I cannot imagine just how they're going to fit back into the normal course of their profession when we on this side of the House have succeeded in throwing them out of their jobs.

Therefore, I don't want to deal any more with the specific motion, but I do have the right to deal with certain comparisons made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Firstly -- I'm not too clear and I hope you'll correct me -- but I gather that he was somewhat critical of the salaries paid to civil servants as being somewhat high and that salaries paid to deputy ministers may be low. Is that an unfair summary of what was said? May I interrupt myself to ....

MR. CAMPBELL: .....Madam Speaker, but that's not correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: All right then I won't deal with what the honourable member said on that field, except to say this, that I've had a little experience in the problem of attempting to bring in people into the civil service and it is true that they are offered good hours and good pension rights and good sick leave rights and all the fringe benefits, but basically I don't feel that they are being offered sufficient return for the services which are expected of them to attract the people that I feel that we need in the civil service. I feel that we need people with dedication and people with ability. I feel that we should be prepared to pay civil servants enough to attract them from private industry, rather than wait for private industry to attract them away from civil service work. I think that the people of the province and of the country



(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd).... are deserving of the best servants and should not have to take a second seat to private enterprise. I say this because I have had the experience of finding it difficult to get people that one wants to come into jobs in the Civil Service because the salaries paid are not high generally.

Now there is one remark that the Honourable Member from Lakeside said and which actually brought me to my feet and which I will quote and which I don't think I have misinterpreted, and that is that this might be an indication to people in other fields of public service to ask to increase their indemnities and, in his opinion, some of them are getting too much now. I'm not asking him any -- well he's nodding so I assume this is the correct summary. Well, Madam Speaker, I have had a little experience in the municipal field and I don't know of very many people, or I don't know of any group of people, I mean any municipal body which fits into the description which I have just used in summarizing something that the honourable member for Lakeside said. What he said may apply, but if it does, it applies to municipal councils or school boards of which I am not aware.

I would like to point out, Madam Speaker, that in my limited experience in the municipal field, I have found that there are three economic groupings that find themselves as public representatives. I have found a group of people to whom the indemnity becomes a very important and substantial part of their annual income; I have found a group of people who, because of independent income either through retirement or through other means, are able to offer themselves to service regardless of indemnity; and I have found a third group of people to whom the indemnity forms a sufficient part of their annual needs to be important, but not of such importance as to deny them the right to offer themselves for service.

Now the first group of people are the people generally who are those that we should not be concerned with. In other words, people to whom this indemnity becomes so important that it becomes part of their need, are people who are likely to be more inclined to cater rather than to serve; more inclined to be sensitive about their re-election; and to be sufficiently confirmed in their principles to stand on issues which may not be popular. I would hope that people to whom this income becomes so important that they must be re-elected, that an indemnity -- a remuneration -- will be offered in their positions to attract people who will eventually defeat them. It is wonderful that there are people who have independent income and who offer themselves for public service, but we should not permit the situation to exist or to continue where we are limiting to such people the opportunity to sit.

It seems to me that when we deal with the third group of people to which I referred, and that is those to whom the indemnity is important but not important enough to sacrifice principle to stay, those are the people that we must encourage to offer themselves for public service. These are the people, Madam Speaker, whom we find all too seldom in the municipal field, because they are at the stage of life, both in terms of age and in terms of economic security, to be afraid that by offering their services they will be denying themselves an opportunity to improve their financial status. Those are the people who must be sufficiently remunerated so that when they offer themselves, they know that if elected they will be able to give of themselves without jeopardizing their future or their present income.

I feel that with the opportunity I have had of observing people in municipal life, and it has been limited I know, I feel that the remuneration that they have received is very well earned. The time that they have given, whether they are in my opinion able or not; whether they've contributed or not; the time, the sincerity and the effort which they have given in their field is certainly one which does not warrant a suggestion that they are being overpaid. I felt I owed it to former colleagues to speak in this way.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I had no intention of speaking on this. I will vote for the motion, but I also want to join my Leader in protesting strongly the untrue accusation of the Honourable Member for Inkster. This is one of the most unfair accusations that I have ever heard. I have been privileged in sitting in caucus with the gentleman concerned and I found him to be an obstinate Scotch in many instances, but I always felt that I could respect him and respect him as much as I would respect my father, and he is certainly old enough to be my father.

But there's one point that I want to bring here today, Madam Speaker. I feel that we are crying "wolf" a little too often in this House. I think that this was very wrong, these

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... accusations today. I think that if the honourable member that made them would realize that he is not helping anything by always worrying about the foreigner-- he's the only one that has mentioned that about himself before, nobody ever did. He's trying to bring in something, for personal reasons I imagine. I don't know why, but he's not going to come to the meeting -- to the ....

MADAM SPEAKER: You should refer to what you are saying here in the first place rather than introduce anything new here.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, I haven't heard your remarks.

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe you should keep on the topic that you got up to speak on, rather than introduce anything new here.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, would it be asking too much to be given permission to answer the remarks that this honourable gentleman made on the same subject about myself when he first stood up. Could I be appointed the same privilege that he received?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, if I may be allowed a word on this point of order, I take the ground that the Honourable Member from Inkster was entirely out of order when he implied a motive behind the remarks that were delivered by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and that was allowed to pass at the time. I do not think, however, that is right to let it go a second time and that my honourable friend from St. Boniface should accept the Speaker's ruling on this point and drop his remarks.

MR. DESJARDINS: What are the Speaker's ruling? There are two things here. The speaker is allowed -- and it's stated that the member might proceed on his remarks about the invitation that I made.

MADAM SPEAKER: When I allowed the speaker to make his remarks, I could not hear what was going on due to noise from the section and I allowed him to go ahead. However, I call the member now out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, that's fine. I will not talk about this. I'm still protesting the way that the honourable member spoke about my former leader. I think that it is definitely wrong and I would bring this point to the House, that too often we have prejudices ourselves and we accuse others of having prejudices. That reminds me of the story of a coloured man who stuttered, and he said: "Ju-ju-just because I'm coloured, I-I-I can't get a job as-as-as an announcer." Well if that doesn't show what I'm trying to prove here today, I don't think anything will. I think that we should not always bring this question of being a foreigner. Nobody's accused anybody of this at all.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: On what ground am I out of order, Madam Speaker? I'd like to know, because I haven't the faintest idea why I'm out of order. I'm speaking on the same motion -- (Interjection)-- Well why was he allowed to go for 45 minutes?

MR. EVANS: On a point of order, Madam Speaker .....

MADAM SPEAKER: Order! Order! Order!

MR. EVANS: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I take it that the subject of the debate is the amount that is going to be paid as an indemnity to the members of the Legislature. I cannot see that my honourable friend's remarks concerning prejudice or the story that he used or anything to do with racial differences has any bearing upon the subject of the debate, which is the amount of indemnity to be paid to members of the Legislature.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, could the Leader of the House tell me why he didn't make the same remarks just a few minutes ago when somebody else was speaking and he allowed this man to make those accusations?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Does the Honourable Member for Rhineland .....

MR. PAULLEY: I understand, Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rhineland was going to adjourn the debate. I would like to speak before that, with permission.

MADAM SPEAKER: Did you say you were going to adjourn the debate?

MR. PAULLEY: He was, but I was going to speak. It's rather difficult for me, Madam Speaker, in light of the tone and tenor of the debate to stick strictly to the content matter of the resolution, and I hope, Madam Speaker, without going out of bounds to any appreciable extent, that I may be able to make, I hope, a reasonable presentation and a summarization of

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . some of the charges and countercharges that have alleged to have been made during this debate.

I want first of all to say this, that I regret that the whole tenor of the debate has not been on the basis entirely contained within the resolution. We heard the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House stand up and criticize very vigorously some remarks that my honourable colleague from Inkster made. I don't think that I need to inform the House that there is no honourable member in this House that has made a greater contribution to the land of his adoption than my honourable colleague from Inkster.

A MEMBER: Order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the honourable member stick to the . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I am, Madam Speaker, because . . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I ask who is the Speaker of this House?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member wishes to continue and speak on the proposed motion, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, he will be permitted to do so.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I don't know who in this House can interpret my following words. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains called me to order but he didn't know, and may I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, you did not know either, but I was going to say, after I had made the remark of the contribution that my honourable friend and colleague from Inkster had made to the well-being of the land of his adoption -- Madam Speaker, if these cattle would kindly desist from their bawling for a moment, I would then go on to say . . . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I again humbly appeal to you to listen to what my next remark is.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has permission to the floor if he will stay with the subject, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, that is what I am doing, because I'm attempting to justify why it is that the Bill which is calling for an increase in the indemnity to the members of this House should be passed. If I cannot have the respect of this House, and I don't expect respect from this outfit, but if I haven't got the respect of the House to listen to my arguments to substantiate why I say that the Bill should pass, then I say that democracy is being trampled on here in the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba today, because this is what I was going to do and this is the tenor of my remark. Now, Madam Speaker, I ask you, as the governess of this Assembly, is not this line of reason keeping within the bounds of the resolution that is before us? I await your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has permission to proceed.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say, Madam Speaker, that I think the contribution of my honourable member and friend from Inkster, over the long years of devoted service . . . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, this is exactly what I was doing -- exactly what I was doing. You know there was one that was allowed to proceed. You know what happened, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We met with the Cattlemen's Association this morning and apparently we brought some of their stock in with us.

MR. MOLGAT: On a point of privilege, I resent the statements made by the Leader of the NDP. This discussion was started by one of his members in a most despicable fashion. The terms that my honourable friend is using are not parliamentary.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Go to it boys. Don't hold back.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that the Leader of the New Democratic Party should keep his remarks parliamentary and within the scope which we would expect.

MR. PAULLEY: I will try not to be quite so forceful in the truth. Madam Speaker, what I was attempting to do was to establish the rights of the Honourable the Member from Inkster, because of his long service to this community and to the community as a whole, to feel that he can support a resolution of this nature in the Legislature. I think, Madam Speaker,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . that my friend has justified that, unlike some people think, that people offer themselves to serve in this body simply to get the salary. The record of my honourable friend's devotion to duty has proven his worthwhileness and if, Madam Speaker, sometimes in the tenor of debate my honourable friend gets a little bit vigorous, I think that this is also an indication of the devotion of duty of my honourable friend to his community and establishes the fact that he is well worthy of his salt. I wonder, Madam Speaker, if you heard the remark that I just heard from the Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: When?

MR. PAULLEY: I think it is most regrettable.

MR. DESJARDINS: Just a minute, Madam Speaker, I haven't opened my mouth. What's he talking about? Get your right member, eh?

MR. PAULLEY: All right, Madam Speaker, I apologize.

MR. DESJARDINS: Put those glasses on.

MR. PAULLEY: I apologize to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface if it were not him. May I ask you, Madam Speaker, if you heard one of the remarks -- or a remark that has just been made by one of the members to my right.

MADAM SPEAKER: I did not hear the remark.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I think it is most fortunate, Madam Speaker, for the member that you did not. Madam Speaker, I can see that it will be impossible, because of certain circumstances in the House prevailing at the present time, for myself or for anyone else to make a logical contribution to this debate because of the attitude and actions of certain members within this House. I just want to say this, and then I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that he take the adjournment. I just want to say this, that I regret very much that the calibre of debate on this important question has been of the method that it has and the mannerism that it has been. My honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party agrees with me, but I want him to promise me that he will read Hansard when it comes out and point out to me wherein my colleague made any greater accusation as to the propriety, as to the calibre and as to the privileges of the members of the House as made by his former Leader.

On this basis, Madam Speaker, again I want to say that I respect, as a man younger than he, the noble contribution made to the Parliament of the Province of Manitoba, to the School Board of the Winnipeg district, to the City Council in Winnipeg, and many of the other agencies that he has been associated with throughout all of his years. I want to pay a tribute, as a man considerably younger than he, to the invaluable services that have been rendered and are still being rendered by the Honourable Member for Inkster, who is not yet receiving a fair remuneration for the quality of the job that he has done on behalf of those who came here from other lands and those who have had the privilege of being born here. I join with him in the support of this motion because it is in recognition of the jobs of the likes of my honourable colleague that I can do this without equivocation. My conscience is clear, and I suggest to those whose conscience is not clear, to vote against the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, two members were allowed to discuss the lack of sincerity of a member. Can I have the same opportunity to discuss the hypocrisy of some people on that other side? -- (Interjection) -- I have not. I was called out of order. Who is the Speaker, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member was called out of order. You have spoken once.

A MEMBER: He was called out of order three times, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, with your leave I would like to say a few words on this motion and I promise to stay strictly within the scope of the motion before us. As a matter of fact, I shall not name members at all. I intended to speak in any case, Madam Speaker, and it's with some temerity that I rise to speak at this time, because of the peculiar circumstances that we were faced with here today.

I, for one, do believe that a man can oppose this motion with sincerity because it was, as late as the turn of the century, a pretty common understanding, at least in Britain, that Parliament was more or less intended as a gentleman's club and people that should have the privilege and the right to sit in Parliament more or less expected to be men that were to the

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . . manner born; and I can see that some people may still think that public service, or a man sitting in Parliament should have a sufficient capability to earn sufficient income from other sources that would make him more or less independent of whatever stipend that he would receive by way of parliamentary or legislative service.

I, of course, for one, do not agree with that kind of reasoning or thinking, because in any country that wants to call itself democratized in a fundamental way, there must be opportunity for people to be represented by people of their own kind or people of lower income -- stations in life -- and it would indeed be pretty difficult if not nigh impossible for a fairly large number of MPs and MLAs to serve their country and their people if remuneration were not at a level that would enable them to live with a fair amount of comfort and security -- although security in politics of course is not to be desired, I suppose -- but certainly we don't want levels of remuneration to be so pitifully small that members have to deprive their families of some of the more basic necessities of life. I think, and I think for that reason I find it not difficult at all to support the motion.

But there is even a second reason. I'm not sure, and I promised not to mention names, but it seems to me that some members have tried to put the argument that the level of remuneration, indemnities in Manitoba, compare pretty favourably with other provinces, and I don't know if it was tried to give the impression that perhaps indemnities in this province were higher than other jurisdictions with similar population and provincial net production. Well, in the first place, it seems to me that if you want to draw comparisons -- often this is odious to do in any case -- but if you want to draw comparisons, I think that you can compare the level of indemnity in Manitoba with any other province in this country with similar population, or on a population basis rather, do it proportionately, and I don't think that our indemnities are too high. I would like to point out that it's true that our indemnity is a few hundred dollars higher now than it is in Alberta, and Saskatchewan I believe, but they have pension plans there that we don't, and I think that in compensation for that one can justifiably say that because we do not have a pension plan here there is some justification for having the indemnity a couple of hundred or three hundred dollars higher.

So for these reasons, Madam Speaker, reasons of comparison with other provinces in this country; and for reasons of having to do with the change in thinking as to who should be able to sit in a Legislative Assembly or Parliament, I believe there has been a change in thinking since the 1880's and '90's when Parliament was more or less considered to be a gentleman's club. So for these reasons, Madam Speaker, I can with equal sincerity support the motion that is before us.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

..... Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 2. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act for second reading. Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to draw to the attention of the House that the explanatory notes on this Bill are obviously in connection with another Act and they do not pertain to this one . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Will the Honourable Minister explain the Bill though, Madam Speaker.

MR. WITNEY: The Bill simply removes the minimum fine of \$25.00 which is provided for in the penalty section of the present Parks Act. The maximum fines are up to \$200.00 and I forget the number of days in jail. The maximum fine is \$200.00; the minimum fine as it is written now is \$25.00. We are removing the minimum fine and giving more leeway to the magistrate.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Will the Minister tell us the reasons for removing the minimum fine.

MR. WITNEY: The reasons, Madam Speaker, are because we consider that some of the infractions against the Act are such that do not warrant the imposition of this minimum of \$25.00 fine and that it should be left more to the discretion of the magistrate.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: . . . . . give us an example of those infractions?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, park entrance fees, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in other words, the purpose of this Bill is so that those people who refused to pay my honourable friend's park entrance fees last summer and who went through his barriers and who are not prosecuted can now be absolved I presume without having to pay any fine at all. Because I understand there were a number of them last year who did go through without making payments and we will be in my honourable friends' estimates shortly so we can have more details on that. But he's presumably now passing this Bill so that that will not be necessary for the people who were not prosecuted last year, and also to permit those this year who go through to receive the same lenient treatment from my honourable friend's department.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, we had some 20 people who would not pay the park entrance fee last year. We didn't have any repeats. Most of them came along and paid it later on. But when we took the matter to the Attorney-General's Department as we did do, we found that our regulations were such that we were not able to successfully take them to the Court. Those regulations are now to be changed and we are making this change to the Act itself.

MR. JOHNSTON: Would the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources . . . . .

MR. EVANS: I wonder if I could raise a point of order just for consideration at this moment. We're engaged in a formal debate. I think sufficient time may not have been left for all the honourable members to ask their questions before the Minister closed the debate. I am sure it can be interpreted that his last speech was a speech closing the debate. Now I would not want to limit the opportunity at the moment for any other member now to ask questions, and perhaps, Madam Speaker, you'd be willing to consider on this occasion the debate has not been closed and to allow my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie or anyone else to ask questions or make their remarks and the Minister again to have an opportunity to close the debate.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on the point of order I think the position that the Leader of the House takes is excellent. Some of the members may not have been aware that we are still in the House stage and that there is only the right to speak once. Actually when the Minister rose to make a reply in the first place he was closing the debate. I agree with the position taken.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister was closing the debate. Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: I wonder if Your Honour would consider allowing my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie to ask his question and again to allow an answer . . . . . I really raised this from the point of view of the opposition, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend was, shall we say, caught in circumstances where the debate had been closed rather more rapidly than he had expected and if Your Honour were inclined to overlook it on this occasion, I'm sure this side of the House would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave of the House to proceed. Agreed.

(Madam Speaker cont'd) . . . . . The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The question -- perhaps the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources might not like to answer it but -- was the purpose in making this change in the Act so that you could prosecute people who refused to pay park entrance fees?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 8, The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell) presented Bill No. 8, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, this Bill is an attempt to bring the procedure in Local Government Districts into uniformity so far as elections are concerned as far as possible with the provisions of The Municipal Act. Councillors are required under The Municipal Act to be ratepayers but electors elect the ratepayers to the council. There is provision in The Municipal Act for the establishment of unincorporated village districts. In 1960 the sections providing for the election of members to the unincorporated Village District Committees were amended so that qualified electors were empowered to elect ratepayers to those committees. In the Local Government Districts the Unincorporated Urban District Committees are very similar to the Unincorporated Village District Committees and this Bill will provide for the same procedure in the Unincorporated Urban District Committees as is presently followed in the Unincorporated Village Districts. In other words the councillors or the members of those committees will still have to be ratepayers but the people who vote at the elections for those members of committee will be electors not necessarily ratepayers.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, can this principle be applied to all municipalities, to the ratepayers, to elections? If you found it advisable to allow a certain municipality to give the electors the right rather than the ratepayers, why not apply it to all municipalities?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, for the Honourable Member for Inkster, this principle already applies in all municipalities. It was changed in 1960 so that it would also apply to unincorporated village districts and we are now making the same principle apply to the unincorporated urban councils in local government districts as well.

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

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, this first item is a companion bill to another bill which has already been before the members in a preliminary stage and I wonder if I might have leave to hold this because I think the two of them should be dealt with at the same time.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the member permission? Agreed.

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 20, an Act to amend The School Attendance Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, members will recall that last year a resolution was adopted by the Legislature recommending that the school-leaving age be increased to 15 years of age. The Bill that is now before the House provides for an increase in the school-leaving age to 15 years effective the 1st day of July 1963; and a further provision for an increase to 16 years of age effective the 1st day of July 1965. The other provisions of the Act are only ancillary, the other provisions of the Bill rather, are only ancillary to the change which is made as I have indicated.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, aside from the fact that we had a resolution last year, I was hoping that the Minister would give us some of the reasons for this particular Bill. Now I don't think that I, any less than anybody else, would like to see our children in school as long as possible and obtain an education, but I'm not too satisfied that this is going to accomplish that. There are two sides to this question -- I can see both advantages and disadvantages. Now I think that our children pretty well go over the age 16 at the present time with very few exceptions. It would be interesting to know as to how many do not attend school to the age that now is proposed in this Bill. It would also be interesting to know what these children do when they leave school at 14. What I have in mind, Madam Speaker, is this, how this Bill would affect the child itself and the other children in the classroom.

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) . . . . .

Now if we should find from statistics or from any other information that is available as to how these children if they are forced to remain in a school after fourteen, how are they going to affect the children in that same class? It is possible that if the child is unable to obtain any higher education because of certain defects or just not being able to, period, is that child going to affect his classmates in the same class? Is it going to be of over-all advantage to have him in that class? I know from personal experience that there are children sometimes in a class -- they're not bad children in that sense but because they lag behind everybody else, they tend to create the wrong atmosphere in the classroom, and is this a serious problem at the moment? Are there very many children who are dropping out of school at fourteen? And has the Minister any idea at all what these children do when they do drop out?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would just like to make one brief comment in connection with this Bill. I'm happy to see that the government is proceeding along the lines that were approved last year. You may recall Madam Speaker, that last year we presented a resolution -- I believe it was presented at that time by the then Honourable Member for Burrows, John Hawryluk -- calling for a school leaving age of 16. Subsequently this was amended by the government, I believe it was the Minister himself, to the year 15, in order to be able to assess the situation in respect of availability of teachers and I'm glad that the Honourable Minister has brought in this Bill this year to implement the resolution.

I'm also very happy of the other clauses in the Bill, Madam Speaker, that will increase the school leaving age to 16 following the 1st of July in 1965. I think with all the emphasis that is being placed these days by industry and economists and educationalists of the desirability of increased education and the availability of increased education, that this Bill is a proper one. I compliment the Government of Manitoba once again in following the lead of the New Democratic Party in this field.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Chairman, I wish to register my protest against this Bill at this time. I feel that this is a matter that should be left with the parents and not be regulated through an Act. I feel that this will leave us with a good number of troubleshooters in our schools who will probably just have a poor effect on the other students and therefore will harm us more than it will gain us.

Certainly, most parents will encourage their children to continue in their studies in school so that they will obtain a good high school education, but I feel that we're going too far and too fast with this Bill.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I couldn't help but rise when I heard the "too far-too fast" you hear it so often, but in this case I wonder that the Honourable Member from Rhineland where he has been for so many years when education has been talked about in this province, in this country and indeed in this world, to think in terms of going "too far and too fast" when we are now at the stage of making it compulsory for children of 15 years of age to attend school. I wonder when would be the time in the opinion of the honourable member, when it would not be "too far or too fast" to recognize that children of 15 still ought to be at school. I'm certain that the honourable member knows that if a child is obstreperous and difficult that he can be expelled from school, and that's a different way of dealing with a situation. Rather than have him say my excuse is that the law permits me to stay out of school, that child ought to be put in a position where he knows that he is being chastized and punished in some way by being kept out of the school, denied a privilege because of his ability, rather than permitted to attend. And unfortunately, we must admit that there are some parents who are still inclined to feel that their 15 year old can go out to work and bring some money into the household, rather than to recognize the importance of study.

Certainly this enactment has been much too slow in coming before us and actually the way has been shown -- I'm not going to talk politics at the moment, although it has been shown that way too -- but the way has been shown in the urban centres. It is years now that in the City of Winnipeg 16 has been the age, I think that applies to a number of the outlying suburban school divisions, and certainly this, I feel, is only recognition of what is being done in the majority of schools and an acknowledgement of making law where the practice has already come about, rather than imposing something on people who are not ready for it. I think the suggestion has been made and possibly the Minister during the course of the debate today on another occasion



(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) . . . . . will indicate to us that probably this affects a small percentage of students ages 15 and 16 in the Province of Manitoba. I suggest that because many, as the Honourable Member for Rhineland says, have been doing this voluntarily; and secondly, many school districts and if you take the School District of Winnipeg alone, many have had to attend at age 15 for a long time. So this probably affects very few and to the extent that it does finally cover those few, I think it should be welcomed by this House.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture shouldn't be speaking on a subject that can and is handled so well and ably by our present Minister of Education, but in Manitoba the educational program is so tremendously important to the people of rural Manitoba, that I am compelled to say something on this subject.

A great deal of our work in agriculture of the province is in the field of education, but the thing that impels me to support this legislation enthusiastically is the knowledge that 9 out of 10 of the young people in rural Manitoba must find a place for themselves off the farms. Everywhere we turn these days, no matter what the media of communication, we are told that our problems in unemployment arise out of the fact that we have failed as a nation to prepare ourselves for the impact of science and technology, and I think it behooves us as legislators, as a senior government, to give this kind of leadership to strengthen the hand of the parents. It is true that the majority of the parents want their children to continue on in school, but it isn't always easy for them to win over the approval of a headstrong 15 year old or 16 year old. I think most of us can think back to the days when we were 15 or 16 that was just about the time that we felt we knew all the answers. It seems to me that this gives a great deal of moral support and strengthens the hand of our parents in Manitoba insofar as possible to see that the facilities that are being provided for the young people today are utilized, and I think that even if there are just a few of the young people who are salvaged through this piece of legislation, they're well worth it. Nobody can put the value upon even one individual, the potential of an individual and the contribution that he or she may make to the coming generations. If we can save just a few, and help just a few, then this is well worth our support. I am wholeheartedly behind this legislation and commend it not only to this House, but to the people of Manitoba.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, this has been an interesting debate and I'm going to make some comments about the fact that some of the views expressed here this afternoon were not expressed on previous occasions when the principle involved in this Bill was being talked about in the Legislature.

First of all, with regard to the suggestion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that we're only following the lead of his party, of course as the Honourable the First Minister once observed it would be very difficult to imagine any idea that hadn't at some time or other been mentioned by the members of his group, and so of course if that constitutes following the lead, I suppose one must admit to it. However, I want to assure him that so far as we here are concerned we'll be leading the band wagon in education for a long time to come and perhaps willing to let him take whatever credit he considers is his due.

Now with regard to the suggestions that have been made by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains and the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. This of course points up something that is interesting to remind the House, because the resolution asking for the increase in the school leaving age actually came before the Legislature on two occasions, and on the first occasion I made a speech pointing out the very facts which the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains has pointed out and I received no support from him at that time; and indeed some of the facts pointed out by the Honourable Member for Rhineland I mentioned, and I received no support from him either. I was indeed on that occasion a lone voice in the wilderness or in the Legislature, but I did try to point out at that time that this was a problem which was a disappearing problem, because with institution of school divisions in 1959 and the availability of high schools, the transportation of students to school, the provision of textbooks, the authorized textbooks, the number of children who were not continuing in school until they had completed their high school was a rapidly diminishing number and that in actual fact in my opinion at that time there was little need of legislation. However, that was two years ago and while it was true that the resolution was voted down, I did make those points at that time. Last year the same resolution came forward and I'm certain that some of the members thought I was pretty

(Mr. McLean cont'd) . . . . . old fashioned; again I had the same view but it was thought advisable to amend it and in effect say that this year we would bring forward an amendment to raise the age to 15, which is now being done.

Now, as I say, it's perfectly true that there are two sides to this problem, and it's also perfectly true -- and I want to make this quite clear -- that it is a disappearing problem. Of course in that sense I suppose that the school leaving age loses much of its importance, because there are, relatively speaking, a few pupils who do not continue until they have completed their high school training, or alternatively, until they've exhausted all the possibilities that are open to them. We estimate, and I want to make it quite clear that this is only an estimate, that if 16 were the school leaving age as of today, that there would be approximately 2,000 children in school in Manitoba today that are not there now, if the only factor was the question of the legal school leaving age. Now a greater proportion of that, approximately 2,000 would be in the group from 15 to 16 and a lesser proportion in the 14 to 15 group. Perhaps members of the House will also remember that there are certain groups in Manitoba who -- how should I put it -- perhaps as a matter of policy, do not encourage their children to continue in school beyond age 14. They will be the more substantial groups that will be affected by this change. It is, as a matter of fact, one of the reasons why I am rather anxious to proceed in, what I'm sure many of the members consider as very cautious way, because I'm not anxious to disturb what may be custom too radically all at one time, and I think we must acknowledge perhaps their reasons and so on.

Now the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains said if the child is unable to absorb what is being taught, and this is, of course, a great problem and that is one of the reasons why we must continue the preparation of courses and the designing of courses that will make the stay in school worthwhile for these people that we're now saying must stay longer than was formerly the case, and it raises that most serious problem of which we are aware and I'm aware that we must be careful to do things that will make the best possible use of the time that the children will spend in school.

With regard to -- he said, is it a serious problem? Well, that has always been my point that I never did regard it as a very serious problem. And what do these people do when they drop out of school. Well of course most of them go to work. They work on the farms or in the forests or in industry of one sort and another. Many of them, it is regrettable to say, with of course a very low -- that is a very early age of school -- being one of the reasons why we now have upgrading schools for those who are unemployed. In my opinion Madam Speaker, the measure proposed is one that is satisfactory. It deals with a diminishing problem. It does not make such a dislocation immediately as to cause any difficulty for anyone concerned and in my opinion we shall arrive at the desirable situation with the least inconvenience to all concerned and with the greatest possibility of advantage.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Manitoba Teachers Society Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, this is a Bill to amend, as indicated, The Manitoba Teachers Society Act, brought forward at the request of the Society. I would like to read into the record of these proceedings today the resolution which was passed by the 43rd annual general meeting of The Manitoba Teachers Society which was held in Easter week, 1962, and which resolution reads as follows and I now quote: "Whereas the 1961 annual general meeting unanimously expressed the desire to make a contribution to the educational welfare of the new state emerging in our troubled world and; Whereas the need for aid to education in such countries still exists; Be it resolved, and it is hereby resolved that The Manitoba Teachers Society Act, Chapter 262 of the revised Statutes of Manitoba, be amended by adding after paragraph (g) section 4 thereof the following paragraph to be known as paragraph (h) namely: (h) to establish and to administer a fund to be known as the Educational Assistance Fund which fund shall be used for the purpose of promoting or advancing education in such country or countries as may be designated from time to time by the Society."

Madam Speaker, as the Bill indicates, this will give The Manitoba Teachers Society the

(Mr. McLean cont'd) . . . . . necessary statutory authority to participate in such measures as they may consider advisable in aiding education in the countries of the world where we, as citizens of Canada and indeed as citizens of Manitoba, are now participating to a greater or lesser extent in providing educational services. I welcome this step on behalf of The Manitoba Teachers' Society. It indicates an obvious and indeed a real desire on their part to work along with Canada in its interest in the development of countries throughout the world. We of course are particularly pleased because we have had a special interest in this Legislature with the establishment of our own teachers -- the provision of our own teachers -- to education in one of the Commonwealth countries, at the expense of the Province of Manitoba and of course our interest in working with the Government of Canada in the recruitment of teachers from Manitoba to serve in Malaya. This is, in my opinion, a mark of good citizenship on the part of The Manitoba Teachers Society which we welcome and which I'm certain the members of this House will endorse and approve.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I join with the Minister in commending The Manitoba Teachers Society for this decision. I think this is a fine example of one of the voluntary associations here in our society coming forward and offering to help in other areas, putting money of their own to assist others who are less fortunate. This is an excellent step on the part of The Teachers Society. I believe that the Honourable Member for Selkirk can in some way be particularly pleased to see this coming forward, because as I recall it, in the discussion some two years ago here in the House on the subject of assistance in education in other Commonwealth countries, the Member for Selkirk at that time had suggested that possibly an approach should be made to The Manitoba Teachers Society as he felt that they would be interested in following up on this through their own association. I'm happy to see that this has now come to fruition and I'm sure it will be successful, be to the advantage of the Society and of our associates in other nations.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, as a former member of this organization, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Teachers Society for its action in this regard. Everyone is well aware of the need for helping under-developed countries to up-grade themselves, both economically, technologically and in education and governments throughout the free world have been doing as much as they feel they can in helping such countries, but quite often there is a specific role that can be played by voluntary organizations outside the scope of government, and this is a perfect example of it. I can only hope in closing that the efforts of the Teachers' Society here will bear very distinct fruit in the years to come.

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

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne) presented Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Fair Wage Act for second reading.

Madam Chairman put the question.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, this is an amendment to sub-clause (b) of clause (i) of Section 2 of The Fair Wage Act. The amendment will exclude towns to the population figure of 5,000 from zone B of The Fair Wage Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Is that the explanation? Madam Speaker, I want to make a comment or two on this Bill. I would have liked to have heard from the Minister as to why this is being done before I spoke, and I trust and hope that before the debate on this Bill is concluded that we will have the reasons of the government as to why this Bill is before us at the present time.

It is my opinion, Madam Speaker, that this is a retrogressive step that the government is taking in the construction industry here in the Province of Manitoba. The government opposite often tells us in this House that they are a forward-looking government. If we needed any proof to the contrary, I think Madam Speaker we have it in the Bill before us at the present time. As we know that under The Fair Wage Act in zone B at the present time, zone B applies to all towns having a population greater than 200 -- (interjection) -- 2,000 -- thanks -- than 2,000. The purport of this Bill is to eliminate from the provisions of zone B all towns and centres under 5,000; which in effect means, in my opinion, that those engaged in the construction industry, those working in construction industry, in towns of 5,000 and less, will have not the benefit of the provisions of The Fair Wage Act at all.

One of the industries referred to in the thousand page volume of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, one of the segments to the community and industry that this committee points to as one of the industries that will not make any advance is the construction industry. For if we

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) . . . . . look at the report from this Committee, we find that they make note of the fact that we have 25,000 in the construction industry in Manitoba today and that we will still only have 25,000 in the construction industry in the year 1975. We've expressed concern in this House because of a lack of growth in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, and yet in this chapter in the report of the committee, indicating no growth in the construction industry of any material degree, I think is an indicator that something is askew. And I want to say to the Honourable the Minister of Labour that you are not going to encourage the construction industry in rural Manitoba, in the smaller centres in Manitoba by eliminating those towns under the population figure of 5,000 from B zone rates. Because if what the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future says is correct Madam Speaker, we're going to be faced with an insufficient number of construction workers, and I suggest Madam Speaker, that in the diversification of industry, the very type of legislation that we have before us for our consideration today is going to be detrimental to the small communities that are anxious to get ahead in the construction industry, anxious to get factories and industrial plants. Because, isn't it only logical to come to the conclusion that those engaged in the construction industry -- and I'm thinking at the present time of the worker -- that he is going to perform his labour in the centres in which the remuneration is greater, and to wipe out from the provisions of the zone B all of the towns and villages that this particular piece of legislation will do, I suggest will act as a further deterrent to the decentralization of industry here in the Province of Manitoba.

I say too, Madam Speaker, that when we were dealing with the estimates of the Minister of Education, we -- and I'm sure we will be also when we're dealing with the estimates of the Minister of Labour -- we're emphasizing upon our youth to take courses of apprenticeship, vocational training school and the likes of that. And I think this is to the good. But Madam Speaker, if while we're attempting to encourage our young men to go into the construction industry, the building trades and the carpentering through the media of our apprentice training system in our vocational schools, the very presentation of legislation like this is acting as a further deterrent to these young fellows going into this field of endeavour. I note that in this field the report of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce shows that for the year 1961 the construction industry -- total value of construction industry decreased here in the Province of Manitoba whereas across the whole of the Dominion there was a net increase. And I want to warn the government in legislation of this type that if -- and we're all sincerely hoping that it will happen -- that if as the result of the likes of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future we are going to have an explosion and an expanse in our industrial field and in the construction field, that if legislation of this type is enacted you will find that there will be an emigration in the construction industry of the capable workers in the industry.

So I say, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Labour and to the government, take another look at this piece of legislation, because I think rather than do what it appears to be in the mind of the Minister of Labour, it will have exactly the reverse reaction and will be harmful to our rural areas. I know, Madam Speaker, that in the past when we here in our particular group have proposed that the provisions of The Fair Wage Board be made uniform right across the Province of Manitoba that there has been objections to it. And on many occasions I frankly confess there was a lot of arguments insofar as the very small communities were concerned, but Madam Speaker, I suggest that this is just the reverse, that you're not going to protect, the government is not going to protect those in the communities of 5,000, that they're going to be left to the wolves and that they're not being given the consideration that they should. It may be, Madam Speaker, that some of those that are engaged in the construction industry on the other side than that of labour might feel that this will be an advantage to them, but I want to warn even them, Madam Speaker, taking into consideration as I mentioned earlier a review of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, that they too will lose out with legislation such as this. And I ask the Minister of Labour and the government to take a second look at this before attempting to enact it in this House.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I would like to add a few words to this debate in view of what the Honourable the Leader of the NDP -- the statements he has made. First of all he says that this legislation would be retrogression, a backward step in other words. Well, Madam Speaker, this would assume the Honourable Leader of the NDP believes that this is an ideal piece of legislation and works to the benefit of Manitoba. If that were so I would be

(Mr. Lissaman cont'd) . . . . completely in agreement with the Honourable Leader. However, this is one piece of legislation that does not work to the best interests of the people of Manitoba. Now coming from Brandon, a city which is still going to be in zone B, theoretically at least I should be opposed to this amendment to the Act, because this then would take these smaller towns out of an area into which Brandon builders could go, because obviously they're going to be undercut by the wage rates, so it puts Brandon in a relatively worse position. I'm not through yet --(interjection) -- you're drawing conclusions before I've come to my conclusion.

Madam Speaker, first of all all the reason for this Act not working is basically this that we do not have a pool of skilled workers in the province; we do have an approach to that pool of skilled workers within the City of Winnipeg, and that may be largely why this Act has pretty generally worked within the city, although I can remember several years ago the second builders organization, -- I believe it was the Home Builders Association -- protested very vigorously. The reason for the protest is largely this: The Act is so absolutely rigid, so inflexible that it defies good common sense thinking. The interpretation drawn upon a tradesman is -- for example a carpenter -- is the minute he picks up a hammer and saw and he uses them on the job then he's a carpenter. --(Interjection) -- Well because of the rate being paid, so it is true insofar as this.

Now first of all, there are people in the trade because of the lack of the pool of skilled workers in the smaller centres and in the house building trades, who first of all would not pass as qualified carpenters; but then even within the carpenter ratings themselves there are varying degrees of capacity and ability. For example, I would -- this is an illustration I've used before -- I doubt if members have seen three men walk down a street unless they're walking together, walk at the same rate; people don't eat at the same rate even. And the answers to how a man can be employed in the building trade must be measured by his production because it's a very competitive business. Now when you try to take and compare a place like Winnipeg where the wages have been set at the most lucrative end of the trade by members of the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange and the Winnipeg Building Trades and then try to -- granted with a small differential -- go out into the country and make those rates apply across the country, then it means that this Act is too rigid, that the qualified carpenters aren't available in many of the smaller cities so that building costs too much.

Now I think that this is probably a step in relief of the smaller centres, as I said earlier as a citizen from Brandon I should be objecting to this, but I think some recognition must be taken of the fact that this Act is too rigid, it demands rates which are out of all reason be paid in certain circumstances. Now first of all I want to say here very clearly that I am not an advocate of low wages: I have within my employ men who I keep more or less the year round --try to keep them on winter and summer regardless of work -- who are getting more than the government schedule or labour board schedule, Fair Wage Act schedule calls for. And I believe that these men are worth it; they produce. When you run into situations where you have a saturation of work and you have to employ men who could probably earn \$1.50 and pay them \$2.25 an hour it hardly seems a reasonable rate, and there would be an inducement, just the opposite of what the inference of the Leader of the NDP has said that this would be a retrogressive movement and wouldn't encourage men to come to trade: it would encourage men to better themselves with the offer of a higher wage, well -- he shakes his head. I remember in 1952 I received a letter from the Taxpayers of Minnesota Association -- I don't know how they got me on their mailing list -- but it provides a nice little object lesson that the Honourable Leader of the NDP might well meditate. This letter proposed that -- the writer was a school teacher -- "Now," he said, "we come into this classroom"-- He said, "We have 25 percent of the students who periodically and regularly earn superlative marks; they're way above the class. Then we have about 50 percent of the class that most always gets a passing mark, and then," he said, "we have 25 percent of the students who regularly and periodically fail. Well, we have this noble attitude that we must do good for others, so some day when we come to teach this class we say to ourselves, 'Now here's these poor people at the bottom; they have a very difficult job in keeping up; they almost always fail. But here's this group at the top who very seldom fail; in fact, they always get good marks; so they don't need those marks -- they're getting a pass. Let's take their marks, put them down here to this group.' So what happens in a few weeks? The people at the top say: 'No matter how hard we work we can't get these better

(Mr. Lissaman cont'd) . . . . . marks any more.' The middle people aren't affected too much. The people at the bottom of the class say, 'Well, we don't have to work very hard; we're getting these marks handed to us.'" Now this is the very argument that I say that this will not be a regressive action. It will encourage men -- I see my honourable friend is getting ready to bit back a bit -- (interjection)-- it will give people an opportunity to improve themselves.

Now, when he talks of emigration to the larger centres, this is true, and this is unfortunately what makes for the lack of skills that could be so in the smaller centres across Manitoba, because there isn't the year round continual work in the smaller centres. I can tell you that even despite the fact that wages are higher in Winnipeg than in Brandon, Winnipeg builders and Winnipeg sub-trades can come out and bid and take the jobs in Brandon. Now the economic situation or economic set-up being as it is, this couldn't happen unless there was better production, and there is, for these reasons. For many, many years, in fact right now, there weren't specialized tradesmen in Brandon, like marble workers, terrazzo workers. One man who was an expert tile setter, he had to give it up. He went to work for the Fire Department for years. We don't have specialized trades like lathers. Specialization can only come about where there is continual employment and lots of employment, so that when you -- I know it sounds nice to be able to think that you can legislate wage rates and so you're automatically legislating jobs across the province. Nothing could be truer. The worker must be paid relatively what he produces, and in the larger centres you will find more skilled men.

You'll find many, many good skilled men in Brandon because as the city grows we are able to give employment to more skilled men, but the one thing that probably I have always felt that was very bad about this Act, and I hope to see further changes in it, is that it's so rigid, that it works another injury on the people of Manitoba. We go to no ends almost to encourage winter work. Now there's no sense in trying to escape the fact, but winter work costs more than summer work. No, you just can't do anything else. We have always faced the problem of seasonal unemployment in the building trades in Manitoba. After all we have cold weather. Well under this Act -- first of all before I come to that may I say this, that I have always felt that in order to really encourage and create winter employment, then there must be a price inducement to at least off-set the increased cost, but maybe even a bit more than that; to off-set some of the inconvenience of winter work. Now I'm probably not referring so much to these huge buildings projects that are going on. I'm thinking of the ordinary householder doing a little bit of work here and a little bit of work there, because full employment can only come about with everyone spending money and having work done, and your big government buildings, your school program, will never give us full employment. It takes the private consumer also consuming. Well, for instance, think of it. You want work done in your house in the wintertime. It's convenient. While the muss and fuss is going on you can't go out and have your meals on the lawn like you can in the summer. When the painting comes about, it pretty nearly drives you out of the house sometimes -- the smell of it. So these are real inconveniences, and a price inducement should be offered; it should be able to be offered to overcome this. Now the plain fact is that this Act is so rigid that if a builder and his men, if they agreed with him that they would take a cut for winter work -- the builder would take his cut, his men take a cut -- they would be absolutely going contrary-wise to the law and could be prosecuted. Now this is a good Act, then, you say? I can heartily sympathize with the people in these smaller centres who have pleaded for this exemption from the Act.

Another thing it does in these smaller centres. Many times the men who are doing carpentry work realize that they're not a fully accomplished journeyman; they may have some other part-time employment. They have agreed, more or less, between them and the consumer of their services that a fair rate would be so much an hour -- probably you'll find right now in many of the small towns, \$1.50 an hour. Well, when you insist on this rate -- and immediately a small town goes from, in the past, from 2,000 to 2,001 population or from 1,999 to 2,000, you say, well tomorrow you must double your wages immediately almost. This upsets the economy of the city and the town, and things must develop naturally. It's sudden change that always creates the difficulties and the problems in the world, not the gradual changes that come about over the years, that people accommodate themselves to.

Well, Madam Chairman, I'm afraid I'm running on at great length, because I could speak on this for hours, but I wanted to offset some of the misconceptions that the Honourable

(Mr. Lissaman cont'd) . . . . . Leader of the NDP had expressed, and I hope I haven't added to the confusion but these are my thoughts on it and I will certainly vote for the Bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to refer to the Orders. Unless I missed it, I don't believe that Bill No. 40, An Act to amend the Soldiers' Taxation Relief Act, was called. I think the eagerness of my honourable friend, the Minister of Education, to be forward with his business might have accounted for this and if we had the leave of the House I would like to ask officially that the item stand in the absence of the First Minister.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the member leave of the House to let it stand? Agreed.

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

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member from St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55, section (b).

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we proceed on this. Just before we finished yesterday evening I was mentioning the fact that I had seen a brand new sign between here and Transcona in reference to Concordia Hospital. If I recall correctly I said the sign said "in the fall of 1963 or '64." I've taken another good look at this sign, Mr. Chairman, and the sign reads, "construction expected to start in the fall of 1964." I just want to make that statement and correct that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . hospitalization . . . . .

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . . to answer some questions. If I could clear them up now, I'd be happier and so would the Opposition, I imagine. Mr. Molgat's request for breakdown of expenditures under Appropriation (a) to (a) (6) (d), Maintenance of Mental Defectives Outside of Institutions. I have that breakdown. I would pass a copy of the breakdown to the honourable member but I should for the record say, St. Amant Ward, \$381,000; Broadway Home, \$18,480; Home of the Good Shepherd, \$13,256 -- that's for eight boys and -- foster homes where children are placed, Children's Aid Society, Hospice Tache, Mennonite Benevolent Society, a total of \$56,264.00. The other breakdown -- and I'll pass a copy of that to the member -- is the breakdown of expenditure appropriation (a) to (a) (6) (e), Grant for training mentally retarded children outside provincial institutions; grant based on \$20.00 per month for each student in attendance for half-days and \$40.00 for full days. The special classes are now held in 21 locations listing, Altona, Boissevain, Brandon, Lions Club Dauphin, Deloraine, Flin Flon Kinsmen, Gimli, Glenboro, Grandview, Kelwood, Killarney, Morden, Portage la Prairie, Selkirk-Canadian Legion, Silver Ridge, Steinbach-Kinsmen, Swan River, The Pas, Virden-Kinsmen School, Winkler, Greater Winnipeg, 3 -- Kinsmen School, Fort Osborne Barracks, St. Boniface Riverside Lions Club, on the basis of an estimated attendance figure of 293 pupils for half-days and 259 for full days which has been provided to us by the Association for the ten months 1963 school year, and taking into account our experience over the past several years that 95 percent of the possible grants are earned and the estimate is therefore \$165,000.00.

The Broadway Home program. The vocational rehab program for selected male students from the Manitoba School -- and I think we should call that the Manitoba Training School; it would be a good name. Through the Broadway Home program is listed 59 -- it uses the word "processed", that may be an unfortunate word but nonetheless it's the word used from the time the boy goes from Portage into employment and is watched and supervised and so on. For the year 1959, five; 1960, an additional 11 for a total of 16; 1961, additional 12 for a total of 28; 1962, an additional 16 for a total of 44; 1963 an additional six for a total of 50. Actual cases processed are 44, because six of the boys were through twice. The total number of males presently employed is 34; the remaining 10 have been returned to the school. I'll give the honourable member a copy of that.

(Mr. Johnson cont'd) . . . . .

The per diem costs for these large provincial institutions for the fiscal year '61-'62 is the last year that I can get this worked out for, and I think the House has had these figures before. The '62-'63 figures were not worked out but gives the indication; Brandon 405, Selkirk 465, Manitoba School at Portage 438. Rated hospital bed increase in Manitoba from '48 to '62. The closest figures that the department could determine in 1948, 4.2 beds per thousand public general hospitals only; '53, 4.5, '54, 4.4, '55, 4.6; 4.7 in '56, 4.7 in '57, 5.7 in '58, 6.4 in '59, 6.7 in 1960, 6.8 in '61 and 7.1 in '62. Since 1958 we include public, general, chronic and company hospitals. I think the big point here is with respect to chronic hospital beds. That's the place where the biggest jump has been. I could pass this information over to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition who asked for these particular questions.

I could inform the House -- someone asked me last evening if there were any more reports on winter operation of sewage lagoons. We have a number of copies within the department; I'll leave another six on the Table. If anybody's particularly interested they could obtain one, either here or through my office. I would lay down with that something that is public information and there is no reason why it shouldn't be tabled for anyone who is interested in this particular matter, because I do think it's important, and these are suggested standards for sewage lagoons for the use of consulting engineers submitting reports to the Manitoba Department of Health. This might be useful.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for the information that he has given me. I'll have to check my notes; I think there were a couple of other matters I've asked him about. I can come back on those, but he certainly has given me detailed information here to most of my questions.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate I asked certain questions from the Honourable Minister. Some of them he has answered; others I found the answers in the Comparative Statement of Revenue Expenditure that he gave all the members. Now one of the questions was the amount received from premiums. This we have here at \$12,886,000.00. The amount from the Federal Government \$17 million. The total cost of the Plan 39 million, 190. Now the province give us 10 million 225. Now this is the question, from what we understand the special grant from the province was 3,175,000 leaving a balance of 7 million, 468 -- 7 1/2 million. The first question that's not answered: does all this amount -- is this the correct amount, the 7 1/2 million -- the money that comes from the special six percent income tax and one percent corporation tax that was put in a couple of years ago? Is that the correct amount. Now the second question is -- I couldn't find it anywhere, maybe he gave the answer -- where does this miscellaneous income of \$147,000 come from? Now I would very much like to have the total estimated amount raised by the special six percent income tax and one percent corporation tax, because as I understand it all this amount was supposed to go in the Plan. Another question that I would ask: what happened to the one million surplus? Is that going on any special fund, construction fund or anything of that sort?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, before the Honourable Minister answers those questions I have a couple to pose. On page 23 of the statistical supplement to the Annual Report we have the average length of stay of patients in our own hospitals and elsewhere, and for the year 1961 the average length of stay in Canada is 9.1; in the United States 9.3 -- that's of our patients; in other countries 10.6; and in all hospitals outside of Manitoba 9.2. Well it's a matter of curiosity with me and also seeking information as to why non-resident in-patient care in Manitoba hospitals runs to 12.3? Is it a matter of public relations or what is the reason for that very large discrepancy -- it's an increase of approximately 33 1/3 percent over the whole? That appears on page 23, at the bottom of page 23. And then looking at the rated capacity and occupancy of our hospitals here in the Province of Manitoba, at a glance you notice that the rated bed capacity is below the beds set up in very very many cases. It would indicate that most of our hospitals have more patients than their rated bed capacity is, and the percentage of occupancy in some cases on the rated bed basis is away over 100 percent -- and that seems to run right through all of our hospitals with some exceptions. The over-all average shows the same thing.

But now I come to my question, Mr. Chairman: On page 26 in the hospitals of 61 to 125 beds, we note in this particular classification that there is some congestion in some of the



(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) . . . . hospitals, and some of them it's pretty serious like Brandon where the beds and cribs at the rated bed capacity is 78, and the beds and crib beds set up is 160, which would indicate that there are more than twice as many patients in that hospital as it's set up to hold. In that whole division the beds set up are higher than the beds rated capacity. Now insofar as occupancy is concerned, the rated beds, the lowest there is Dauphin. Now looking at Dauphin the beds and cribs, rated bed capacity is 104; beds and cribs set up only 84. In other words, they were not using, as I interpret these figures, they were not using the full capacity at that hospital. And their percentage occupancy is the lowest in that particular classification, 57.63. Now that, in spite of the fact that in the new born section their average stay is away higher than most in that classification.

Now I wanted to ask the Honourable Minister this: if Dauphin was not making full use of the hospital it did have; why was it doubled in its capacity and we have a new 104 bed addition to it? Now there might be a good and sufficient answer for it and the reason I'm asking this is not that I begrudge Dauphin the hospital it has -- I'm just as proud as any of the residents of Dauphin in that hospital. I think it's a wonderful hospital. But it's only a short while ago, Mr. Chairman, that my community asked for a hospital and we were told that a hospital wasn't warranted in that community, in spite of the fact that the nearest hospital to Ethelbert -- that's Gilbert Plains. Dauphin -- is 35 and 37 miles to these two hospitals. And yet here we see close to \$2 million being spent which under the information given in this particular booklet would indicate was not warranted. I would like an explanation, Mr. Chairman, of this because I may have to answer these same questions to my constituents.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the figures 10,378 were estimated last year, actual 10,225, is made up of the personal income tax and the one percent corporation tax, plus the \$3 million, approximately, from the provincial revenue entered into this item here. Last year we estimated, if you recall, 10 million 378. The actual for '62 in the annual report is 10,225. It was an estimate; I remember at first we weren't too sure how big this figure would be. I think that would answer the honourable member's question with respect to the 10 million. Is that the information he wanted?

Now with respect to the statistics, Mr. Chairman, this particular table . . . .

MR. DESJARDINS . . . . . this was an answer to only part of the question. My next question was the total estimated amount raised by the special six percent income tax and the one percent corporation tax. And then also I wanted to know what happened to the million dollar surplus and where this miscellaneous income came from. Now maybe that last one was answered and I missed it.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . . the honourable member the other day it shows really -- I tried to be more helpful this year in giving the whole projection of the five years where you see a surplus over the five-year operation of \$224,000 which is in the assets of the Commission, showing a million dollar surplus in '62, which is, of course, carried forward again in the assets of the Commission. But the point is that all of the six percent income tax on taxable income, plus the one percent corporation tax, plus three million, is turned right over to the Commission as this is the actual figure for last year of the ten million two. Two five in the sheet I gave you. The 17 million is the government's share. The miscellaneous revenue is made up, last year of 135,000 in third party liability and \$12,000 which is interest and miscellaneous revenue. That is money that's sitting there drawing interest in between payments and so on. So you have the premiums, you have the grant, plus the income from this tax; you have the federal monies; you have third party liability and miscellaneous, giving you your total income for the operations of the Plan and the total expenditures are 39 million as you notice. That is where the 1,069,000 in the actual report that we have here is recorded.

With respect to these tables . . . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . . Honourable Minister wouldn't mind -- I want to get this. This is important. Am I correct then in taking from this answer that the total amount that they estimated, of course, the amount raised all over the province by this six percent income tax and the one percent corporation tax amounts to \$7 1/2 million?

MR. JOHNSON: Seven million, two twenty-five.

MR. DESJARDINS: Seven -- and that is the whole of the six percent and one percent. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: With respect to the Dauphin -- the question I think the honourable member was pointing out is the low utilization of the Dauphin facility and the interpretation of these statistics. I've got the wrong book here. Whenever you hand someone a complicated book of statistics you ask for the questions, and it's my own fault. I was just trying to give you some idea of the magnitude of the operations of the plan in distributing this thing. I'm not sure about Brandon -- this doesn't of course make sense -- that beds and cribs set up 160 with the capacity 78, but this was in 1961-62 when the old hospital -- before it was rebuilt; and I would like to get the story on that from the commission. I remember it was the older building and this is now being replaced by a brand new structure. I would have to get some help with the interpretation of this this evening to interpret that to you.

At Dauphin -- I think the honourable member said "beds set up 104, utilization 71; the utilization is low." I don't think this is realistic either. I would like to check these particular figures because from my own personal knowledge I know that the Dauphin facility has just been extremely busy until we got the new hospital opened this past year, and it would seem to me that these figures might be misleading in view of the changeover in renovations that have been going on in the past year, but I will get the full story on that.

Earlier, the honourable member mentions the hospitals outside of Manitoba -- patient days incurred outside. I think we are saying that patients who spent time in Manitoba who were ill, received more care than our patients received outside in their average stay and so on, and I think this has really been the pattern in Manitoba for some time, and I think a partial explanation might be this, that patients leaving Manitoba -- these costs we pay outside of Manitoba -- are usually emergencies of Manitobans travelling and so on, and people who go to Rochester which is about the only other centre people go to, yet we drain Western Ontario and quite a few from the eastern part of Saskatchewan into Manitoba, which has been traditional. We tend to get probably the sicker patients coming from these areas for treatment in Manitoba hospitals. As you know, we have reciprocity with the other provinces in payment of accounts except that when our patients, for example, go to Saskatchewan, not all in-patient drug costs are covered and these people write to us when they get back and wonder why -- but this is where certain deterrents come in. Saskatchewan has it I think in in-patient drug services; Alberta has a deterrent of a dollar a day and B. C. a dollar a day. We have reciprocity fully with the other eastern provinces. I could only interpret that on page 23 as I've told you. These other figures, when I examine them closely I'm a little confused and I would like to ask for some further interpretation myself.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to report on the comparative statement of revenue and expenditure that the Minister gave us the other day, extending over a five-year period the revenue and expenditure figures.

I note that in the Annual Report that the Minister gave us a copy of the other day -- it's the blue book -- that Exhibit "A" showing the balance sheet for the Hospital Services Fund, shows that the previous deficit that was in a balance as at December 31st, 1961 was \$5,420,951 and the excess of revenue over expenditure for the current year, or for the year 1962, of \$1,069,000-odd reduced the deficit to \$4,351,000.00. Now then I note in the estimates, the estimated projection for the year 1963, that the estimated revenue from premiums is approximately \$13 million. The estimate of the grant of the Province of Manitoba all inclusive of income tax is \$10.6 million, from the Dominion of Canada \$18.4 million; the total revenue approximately \$42,138,000 with expenditures of \$43,455,000, leaving an estimated deficit for the year 1963 of \$1,317,000.00. If we take a look at the extension over the five-year period, we find that the last deficit in the fund occurred in the year 1960 where there was a deficit of \$1,675,000, and the following year in 1961 there was an increase in the premiums which brought about a revenue at that time of almost \$19 million. Now in view of the anticipated, or estimated deficit for the year 1963 of \$1,317,000, I would like to hear any comments from the Minister as to how they are going to attempt to recoup this deficit. Are they going to do the same as they did in the year 1961, following the deficit year of 1960?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . . we should end up in the black again at the end of '63. The expression of the work drill on this long sheet was to give the honourable members a picture of the last five years. The assets and liabilities of Exhibit "A" are the way things are recorded for the purposes of the Annual Report, I imagine by the Comptroller-General, who is still carrying forward that original \$5 1/2 million deficit which we inherited with the inception of the universal hospitalization, but this as you know is because we're always six months in advance -- for the first six months of operation of the plan, premiums were collected and this was the \$5.4 million. I think the assets and liabilities Exhibit "A" section is just the method by which the Comptroller-General records this . . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, still on this comparative statement sheet. If the Minister's answered this before I wish he would ignore my question, but if he hasn't I wonder if he would explain to the committee, in estimating for a \$4 million increase in insured services costs, is that \$4 million increase almost entirely because of increased patient load or increased coverage of insurance, or is there some one other major factor involved? Or is it just natural growth in number of insured? It's on this sheet.

MR. JOHNSON: If you would look at, roughly on page 23 of the Annual Report you will note this is the insured services section for last year. This is insured services in public, general, federal, company hospitals, and hospitals outside the province, which pretty well gives the breakdown. The increased costs are made up of the three things really, (a) the improvement in standards of care, that is, extra services that may be added during the year make up one component -- that's a good way to classify it. Another component is the increase in services or the increased utilization of beds that may be brought into force; and the third component that can increase that cost if of course the matter which we debated last year, the increase in salaries, costs, increase in staff and so on, and that breaks down into really three components, so that estimate is really for insured services in hospitals and is the sum total. But this, of course, in the Estimates here is an estimate. By this time you make retroactive adjustments it's carried on . . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this statement of revenue and expenditures, I'm still having a little bit of trouble. In 1961, we had a surplus of close to \$2 million. Now, I'd like to know what happened to this surplus. We have the total revenue for the following year '62 of 40 million, 259. Now the only place this is listed as being carried over to the following year, the only possible place that it could be, would be in that \$10 million 225 grant from the Government of the Province of Manitoba. Is that in there or what happened to that two million?

MR. JOHNSON: No, it's not in there. This five-year comparative statement is just showing where the money's coming from and how it's being expended over the five-year period. It is true we had -- on this sheet shows a \$1.9 million surplus in '61 which was carried forward into this year. The \$10.2 million does not include any of the surplus at all. This is the straight payment as I've stated earlier. The actual figures, I think, were about -- where income tax is \$7,225,000 -- this was the amount of money turned over on that tax of one percent corporation, plus six percent personal, and this is the money received. The two hundred and twenty-four over the five-year period is in the assets of the commission.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, then at the end of '62 we'd add the surplus of \$1,069,000, plus \$1,974,000 of the previous year? That's with the surplus so far.

MR. EVANS: I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.