

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Friday, January 20, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of Harold George Gniewotta, and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Lutheran Campus Foundation of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Committee of the Whole House

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): if the House would allow this item to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, if I may, put before the House some annual reports: the Annual Report for the Department of Agriculture and Conservation for the year ending March 31, 1966; also, the Annual Report of the Milk Control Board of Manitoba, October 1, 1965 to December 30, 1966; and the Co-operative Promotion Board Annual Report for the year ending March 31, 1966.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, yesterday I was allowed to make a statement and I was quite surprised to be given answers by the Honourable Minister of Labour because I didn't expect -- I didn't ask for any -- didn't ask any questions -- but I have some questions now of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I would like to know if the Honourable Minister realizes that at the present the owners -- and I'm talking about the natural gas installation now -- the owners have no responsibility whatsoever, and also that the gas company is supposed to be responsible for installing proper protection devices while they are installing the gas and that little if any supervision at all exists at the moment. I was speaking to the owner of this building and he said he was never told a thing. He didn't even know what was there and I myself had been told in the past by some gas company officials that this was not dangerous.

I would also like to ask the Honourable Minister if his answer of yesterday does not prove exactly the point that I was trying to make, that we should take steps -- that he should take steps now, immediately, to protect the public and bring in legislation, and does he intend to do it now.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the questions as notice but I would like to clarify one part of the statement that I know I made yesterday about the inspectors. I believe the Honourable Member from -- not St. Boniface -- your colleague from the Interlake, Mr. Guttormson, asked the question if there were city inspectors. I find that there are inspectors, that the inspectors are the utility people who are responsible for the installation of pipes from the main to the building, then the licensed installers from the building and meter to the unit. These people are qualified, licensed, and have to make registered reports to the department and follow the regulations. I realize that there are weaknesses and we may have to have further enquiry and investigation into this matter. I might tell you that the investigations are proceeding at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister tell me if he is satisfied with the protection given the public in this regard?

MR. BAIZLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, you can never be satisfied when you have accidents of this nature, but I think the very fact that a community is made up of people that there are weaknesses and there will be accidents. I'm satisfied that by and large the present inspection system is one of the best in the country.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I wish to direct to the Honourable the First Minister. At the present time there is a bill before the Federal House, the purpose of it being to enact legislation creating a deposit insurance corporation to protect funds of depositors in banks, trust companies, loan companies and such. The Act goes on to say that the benefits, or the services of this corporation may also be available to depositors with similar corporations incorporated under provincial law. Now my question is, Mr. Speaker, is the government giving any consideration to making this type of protection available to the people of Manitoba on a compulsory basis, as it were, similar to that which it is intended to become available to those dealing with federal corporations.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will take advantage of whatever possibilities are opened up to us by means of the federal legislation when that legislation in fact does become law, but I should go further than that and say that we ourselves are concerned about the same problem that that government is concerned about and it will be our intention in the relatively near future to ask this House to join us in studying this problem. We expect to introduce a resolution which will include, among other things, the matter to which my honourable friend refers and we will be proposing that this matter receive our urgent consideration.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. I noticed an item in last night's newspaper dealing with a student enrolled under Program V and this story seems to indicate that there is still difficulty - there is still some problem in the issuing of the allowance cheques to the students on time. Could the Honourable Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, give the students enrolled under Program V some assurance that cheques will be made payable promptly.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question raised by the Honourable Member from Burrows, we have close to just under 3,000 people receiving allowances today at our Institutes of Technology and under the basic upgrading program. I have looked into this matter of cheques on three or four occasions now and we've had complaints coming back such as in the nature expressed by my honourable friend.

The practice is that as the student is enrolled the cheque is made out two weeks in advance in the expectation that he will be there at the end of the two week period. The cheques are then taken to the places where the student is enrolled for payment. Sometimes the student isn't there or he has missed five days or three days during the week. In some cases he may have been ill and didn't report in. We don't dock them - we don't withhold payments when they're sick - but when they are absent, as many of them are, at the time or they may have moved, have been absent and moved, we can not endorse the cheque through the Comptroller's office unless there has been the attendance except for illness or some other good reason, so then we're forced to take the cheque that hasn't been delivered back and the Comptroller issues a new cheque and this causes some delay. Sometimes students have moved, sometimes people have neglected to phone in and tell us where their new address is, and there have been a combination of factors which have in some instances caused this unfortunate occurrence.

However, the department are doing everything they possibly can to see that - and have been now for over two months - are doing whatever they can to get the cheques to the students, but we do require this kind of co-operation too.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the first one. I think the main concern to the students, or what they'd really like to know, is on what day will the cheques be issued. Could the department set up some procedure that - if it means delaying the payment of the first cheque, for example, commencing with a two-week delay or what have you - but setting up some procedure pursuant to which they could advise the students the cheques are made payable on whatever day of the month it may be and then they'll know that come that day they will receive their cheque. These people live on a very tight budget and to them it's important to be able to assure their creditors that they'll be in receipt of payment at a certain time.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll certainly be happy to look into anything that will improve the situation, but we do have these practical difficulties. I would point out that I believe, as it starts now, as the student comes in on a course, two weeks hence -- in fact the cheque is made out two weeks in advance in the hope that he will be there each day. If it's illness, there's no alteration in the cheque; but four or five days absenteeism for example, doesn't justify the cheque so it has to come back through the Comptroller's office.

But I will -- as recently as yesterday I had a further discussion with the administrative staff to do whatever is possible to speed up this in anyway we can. However, these are the rules and some of them have to be adhered to. It would be most helpful if these people also would contact us when they move. For example, three fellows moved from one town to another, and we have no idea where to send the cheque and it makes it most difficult.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now be good enough, and I believe there's general agreement on this, to move down to the motion for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): May I Mr. Speaker, just make a brief comment on this. I have no objection, as I indicated to the Minister who has just taken his seat, but I'd like to have a little clarification on what the procedure will be. Now it's my understanding, and subject of course to correction, at a conference which was held yesterday that the general idea would be that we would go into Committee of Supply today to hear the statement of the Minister of Education and then having heard that statement we would come out of the Committee and not go further into estimates until Monday. Is this generally correct, Mr. Speaker?

MR. LYON: That is the understanding Mr. Speaker. We will move into Committee of Supply, hear the statement by the Minister, come out and then go back to the Order Paper and go through the regular business on the Order Paper.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. 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.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Education, Item 1 (a). The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, it is once again my responsibility to introduce the estimates of the Department of Education, and it is with a heavy sense of responsibility and some pride that on behalf of the government I present this tremendous increase in the estimates of this department for the coming year. The explosion in knowledge and the demand to meet the change which is so evident all about us is reflected in this huge appropriation. I do hope that over the next several days I will be able to indicate to the honourable members the reasons for the sharp increase in expenditures and I will expect to introduce, if I may, each appropriation with a brief statement outlining the significant features and/or changes in policy inherent within them. I will do my best to make material available to the honourable members.

In this connection I would say I would hope the annual report would be on our desk -- would have been there now but for some printing problems -- it should be out any moment and I'll do my best to listen to your comments and constructive criticism and do my best to answer questions. Also, to assist honourable members, there will be a model of the new Manitoba Institute of Applied Arts and photographs of the various technical institutes at Brandon, The Pas and the Junior Vocational with some figures on these, in display form in Room 254 in the coming week and from 10 to 12 each morning I have asked the head of the division, Mr. Angood, to make himself available to explain to any of the honourable members who wish to take advantage of this to see the model which was prepared in concert with federal authorities showing the new institute. These and other helpful suggestions I will try to bring out during the course of the estimates.

However, in view of the single district division referendum, I would this morning like to share immediately with you a statement directed to the improvement of the quality and the financing of the public school system. To assist the honourable members in grasping the import of this change of policy about which I am to speak, I will ask the Clerk of the House to distribute the statement which, with the forebearance of the House, I would like to read as it is a matter of such great public importance. Would the Clerk distribute these copies.

May I suggest to the honourable members that appended to the back of this statement is a comparison of the former Foundation Program that we have operated under since 1959 with a copy of the new proposed outline of that. There are three phases, two dealing with the former teacher salary schedule and one sheet dealing with the new schedule. However, I would ask honourable members to go -- I am just informing you, this is at the back of this statement. I would now like to share this statement with you, Mr. Chairman.

During the last eight years dramatic and important changes have been effected in the quality of education offered to the young people of Manitoba. These improvements have made

(JOHNSON cont'd)....necessary changes in the administrative structure of the education system of which the creation of larger school units is one. At the same time, an increasingly complex society has required that post-secondary education be improved through expanded university programs and improved technical and vocational education. The number and quality of the teaching staff has been improved and curriculum has been and is being reformed. Many of the most dramatic improvements are presently in the process of being realized. Universities are being expanded, a new university is being created, a junior vocational high school will soon be completed and technical training centres are in operation, or in the planning or construction stages in several Manitoba centres.

The foundation of the entire educational structure is the primary and secondary school system where children receive their first formal education. The proposals which I will outline today, Mr. Speaker, are proposals for the improvement of that system. First, we must continue to improve the quality of the primary and secondary school system. Part of this process calls for a revision of the administrative system through the creation of the Single District Divisions. The program of these divisions will be based upon a greatly enriched Foundation Program. To finance the Single District Divisions and the new Foundation Program on an equitable basis, we must revise the system of financing primary and secondary education.

The second requirement to make such a program feasible is a more equitable system of taxation and financing capable of meeting the growing costs of the improving system of education. The costs of education will inevitably rise as the system is improved. The number of students can be expected to increase and the number of years each student spends in institutions of education must also continue to increase. At the same time, the costs per student can be expected to rise as the schools and physical facilities are improved and as more specialized and highly trained staff is retained. Finally, in response to rising levels of living we can expect an increase in the salary levels necessary to attract teachers and other staff. We do not believe that the present taxation system can support these growing costs. Even with growing provincial support, equalization will be necessary to support continuing improvement in the education system. And continuing improvement of the primary and secondary school system is the aim and objective of all of the proposals which I am about to outline.

THE PROPOSALS

To finance these continuing and costly improvements during the next few years, we propose a set of interlocking changes in the administrative and financial system. These will consist of a drastically revised Foundation Program intended to cover 100% of the costs of a standard system of primary and secondary schools in the province. This proposal is interlocked with a plan to finance this Foundation Program by drawing 65% of its cost from the general revenues of the province and 35% from real property taxation. This proposal, in turn, is interlocked with a plan to raise the 35% by means of a uniform standard levy applied to all of the real property in all of the Single District Divisions in the province. The uniform standard levy proposal is further interlocked with a plan to graduate the levy in order to provide tax relief to those home owners and farmers presently paying an unduly high portion of education costs. Allowance will be made for municipalities to raise this levy against the actual assessment in use in the municipality in cases where the equalized assessment is substantially different from the actual assessment. This plan is integrated with a proposal to discontinue the School Tax Rebate in all present or future Single District Divisions. Finally, in those school districts which do not opt for Single District Divisions, the present financing system will remain in effect except that the School Tax Rebate may be deducted at source by the municipalities. There are certain schools financed largely by the federal government and two schools operated under specific agreements with large industries which will be excepted from these proposals.

The Foundation Program

It is proposed that the Foundation Program be greatly enriched for the Single District Divisions, to include 100% of the costs which are considered to constitute a normal program for primary and secondary schools. These grants will include an increased schedule of salaries for teachers. This schedule will not necessarily match salaries actually paid under existing collective agreements; in some cases it will exceed these agreements and in other cases, it will be less. In addition, the new Foundation Program will provide for a reduced teacher-student ratio in both primary and secondary schools. This will make possible smaller classes with special arrangements for the provision of kindergarten, the provision of better facilities for the handicapped and the provision of other services.

(JOHNSON cont'd)

The new Foundation Program will provide for large increases in grants for maintenance costs, administrative costs, the cost of supplies, text books and transportation. For many school divisions the Foundation Program will cover 100% of the actual costs of these items. The Foundation Program will meet 100% of the approved costs of school buildings and school buses.

(The proposed salary schedule and Foundation Program details are appended.) The detail of the revised Foundation Program is actually appended to the paper which I present this morning. We intended earlier to put it separately but we just put them together, so this amendment can be made in my statement here so the two programs can be compared. Some indication of the order of magnitude of the change is given by our estimate that the new Foundation Program would total about ninety-five million dollars in 1967, if all districts opted to form Single District Divisions. This compares with an estimated total for all primary and secondary school budgets in 1966 of ninety million dollars. The new Foundation Program in 1967 would exceed the total of school costs in 1966 by five million dollars.

FINANCING THE NEW FOUNDATION PROGRAM

To finance the new Foundation Program, the province will contribute sixty-one and a half million dollars. This will constitute a direct provincial contribution equal to 65% of the total ninety-five million dollar Foundation Program. The remaining 35% of the cost of the Foundation Program (thirty-three and a half million dollars) will be financed by taxing the real property of the province.

Throughout this discussion it is assumed, for the sake of clarity, that all school districts will opt to form Single District Divisions. In practice, this may not be the case and arrangements will be proposed for the continuing support of those districts which opt to maintain multi-district divisions. It is our belief, however, that the new Foundation Program, the new financial arrangements, and the improvement in education which they will provide will encourage all districts to vote for the formation of Single District Divisions.

Raising the Thirty-Five Per Cent

At the present time, property within a given school division is taxed according to the needs of that division. Provincial grants are adjusted to compensate, in part only, for the widely various ratios of school costs to real property assessment in the individual division. In Single District Divisions and for division secondary schools, costs are levied against the real property assessment in the division.

This system results in mill rates in school districts ranging from eight mills to over thirteen hundred mills in extreme cases. Variations between twenty mills and fifty-five mills are common. It is obvious that this is not an equitable system of taxation. In order to equalize educational costs, it will be necessary to pool the product of real property tax levies on a province-wide basis. This concept is essential to a more equitable tax system. If more equal educational opportunity is to be offered to all citizens, it is reasonable and necessary that taxation also be equalized in order that the burden of the costs of education will fall more equitably upon the citizens of the province.

It is therefore proposed that to finance the schools, all real property be taxed equally except that which occurs in school districts opting against Single District Divisions, and a small amount of property covered by statutory exemptions. In short, a uniform standard levy against all property is proposed. This is in harmony with the findings of the Mitchener Commission.

The School Tax Rebate was introduced in 1964 primarily to compensate farmers and home owners for the rising costs of education as manifested by real property taxation. Since it is now proposed that the portion of the costs of education to be derived from real property taxation be collected in a more equitable manner than formerly, it is proposed that the School Tax Rebate be discontinued in favour of a system of taxation which will fall most heavily on those most capable of meeting the costs.

In order to finance 35% of the proposed ninety-five million dollar Foundation Program, it will be necessary in 1967 to levy real property taxes yielding approximately thirty-three and a half million dollars. In proposing the mill rates to be levied in Single District Divisions in 1967, a number of criteria have been kept in mind including the necessity to relieve the

(JOHNSON cont'd) home owner from some of the rising burden of school costs. The sharp increase in the assessed value of farm property has also been a criterion. The unsatisfactory ratio of capital investment to farm income has also been kept in mind. Careful analysis of the tax base, the impact of various alternative proposals and the overall requirement to establish an equitable system of taxation have led to the proposal of a differentiated levy.

These criteria indicate that the present taxation on revenue bearing property, that is commercial and industrial property, would not be excessive if it were made uniform. The taxation on homes and on farm land, on the other hand, is not only inequitable but somewhat excessive. Therefore the system which has been designed distinguishes between farm land and homes on the one hand, and revenue bearing property on the other. No attempt has been made to reduce the burden of real property taxes on revenue bearing property below what it would have been in 1967 if no change were made.

The proposed uniform standard levy for 1967 is nine mills on farm and residential property except apartment blocks, and thirty-three mills on all other real property including apartment blocks and on personal property. These mill rates will be based on the equalized assessment and the personal property assessment. Where municipalities so choose they may levy taxes for these purposes on the actual assessment in use in the municipality. In these cases, the province will calculate levies to be imposed. These levies will be calculated to yield an amount equal to nine mills on the equalized assessment of farm land and residential property, and thirty-three mills on other property in that municipality. These mill rates in combination with the 65% contributed by the province will be adequate to finance the ninety-five million dollar Foundation Program.

It is important to note that the proposal to share on a 65-35 basis the costs of the Foundation Program does not imply that the ratio of provincial contributions to real property tax contributions in a particular Single District Division, will equal 65-35 division of costs. The costs of the Foundation Program in a school division will no longer be assessed against the real property in that division. To finance the Foundation Program, all property in the province will be taxed under a uniform formula. The ratio of real property assessment to the costs of the Foundation Program in any particular school division will no longer be meaningful.

It is equally important to note that the uniform standard levy cannot be expected to remain constant at the equivalent of nine and thirty-three mills. The 65-35 division of costs of the total Foundation Program for the province will be fixed by Statute. Provision will be made, however, for annual adjustment of the nine and thirty-three mill rate to yield 35% of the anticipated costs of the Foundation Program in any year. The costs of education in Manitoba are expected to rise. The total of real property assessment is also expected to increase steadily but at a less rapid rate than the cost of education. Mill rates can therefore be expected to increase from time to time. At the same time, the cost of the provincial 65% share will also rise; and rise by about twice the amount of the local share.

COSTS AND PROGRAMS IN EXCESS OF THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM

The expanded Foundation Program will not cover all of the costs of primary and secondary education in Manitoba in 1967. Costs in excess of this program will be experienced, particularly in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area where school divisions have increased the services which they offer beyond the standards proposed in the revised Foundation Program.

There is no intention implicit in the new proposals to criticize the provision of such extra services in any school division. It is considered, however, that such services should be provided only at local option and that the costs of such services should be met by taxing the real property within that school division itself. It is therefore proposed that the cost of programs in excess of the new Foundation Program be financed by special levies on real property imposed by the Single District Division Boards.

It is anticipated only small special levies will be required outside Metropolitan Winnipeg. Within Metropolitan Winnipeg, it is anticipated that special levies ranging from four mills to twelve mills can be expected, and that in one or two cases special levies may reach fifteen mills in 1967.

The purpose of the uniform standard levy equivalent to nine mills on farms and homes, and thirty-three mills on other property is to relieve the farmer and the home owner of some of the burden of the rising costs of education. The special levies, however, will not be graduated. Similarly, no graduation will be permitted in levies for municipal purposes. In short, the present practice of equal levies within a municipality for municipal purposes will be

(MR. JOHNSON cont'').. continued. Only the uniform standard levy designed to finance 35% of the costs of the Foundation Program will differentiate between residential and farm land, on the one hand, and other property on the other.

THE IMPACT ON THE REAL PROPERTY TAXPAYER

Under the revised system a real property taxpayer in a Single District Division will pay a uniform standard levy calculated on the basis of the equalized assessment of nine mills for farm land and homes, and thirty-three mills on other real property in the municipality in which his property is located. In addition, he will probably pay a special levy, the size of which will depend upon the extent to which the program of the school division in which his property is located exceeds the Foundation Program. He will no longer receive the School Tax Rebate.

This is a more equitable pattern of taxation designed to replace the present inequitable pattern made up of hundreds of different levies which vary from one school district to the next. Those who have been paying relatively low school taxes on their real property, and there are some, will face an increase in real property school taxes in 1967 over 1966. Those who have been paying high school taxes, and there are many, will find their net real property school tax bill reduced. Generally, farmers and home owners, except for those who have been paying relatively low school taxes, will find their taxes reduced; in some cases, sharply reduced. The owners of commercial and industrial property will generally face some changes and these will usually be upward although in some high tax areas commercial and industrial property taxes will be reduced. Tax rates in the Single District Divisions will be closely comparable, varying only with the special levies necessary to finance programs in excess of the Foundation Program.

The fact that some taxpayers in 1967 will face increases in real property taxation for schools while others face decreases does not indicate that inequities in taxation are being created. The increase in some cases and the decrease in the others derive from the inequities which presently exist. No program of support from the province compatible with the financial resources of the province could be large enough to reduce all school taxes to the level of the lowest school taxes paid in 1966. The overall general effect of the proposed revisions is to reduce taxation on homes and farm land while holding taxes on other property at about the level which would obtain if no changes were made.

The Use of Actual Assessment Instead of Equalized Assessment

The equalized assessment is a sound base for determining the value of taxable real property within a given municipality. Many municipalities, particularly in the rural areas, choose to use an older assessment, generally referred to as the "actual assessment", for the levying of taxes within their municipality. We do not propose to impose upon such municipalities the necessity of using the equalized assessment for the levying of municipal and school taxes. We therefore propose that the contribution from real property in any municipality to the financing of the Foundation Program should be calculated upon the equalized assessment, but that the actual levying of taxes may, if the municipality so chooses, be based upon the "actual assessment".

In such cases, the province will calculate the dollar yield of the uniform standard levy on all real property in the municipality and then calculate the mill rate necessary, on the basis of the actual assessment, to raise the dollar equivalent of the uniform standard levy applied to the equalized assessment. The municipality will then be required to impose these mill rates and to pay the amount which they are required to raise for the financing of the Foundation Program.

In municipalities where the actual assessment and the equalized assessment are identical or nearly identical, the uniform standard levy will be almost exactly nine mills and thirty-three mills. This will be common in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. In other municipalities, particularly the rural municipalities, there is often a marked variation between the equalized assessment and the actual assessment. Where this variation is, say, 33% the levy on the actual assessment to raise the uniform standard levy would be twelve mills and forty-four mills. Such variations would be common in rural municipalities. Smaller variations between equalized and actual assessment are common in the incorporated towns and villages.

The variation in mill rates from municipality to municipality necessary to raise the uniform standard levy will not reflect an inequity in the tax system, but merely the variation between the equalized assessment and the actual assessment in that municipality.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)

MULTI-DISTRICT DIVISIONS

Every effort will be expended to encourage the electors to vote for the creation of Single District Divisions. This encouragement will include the offer to extend to existing and new Single District Divisions, retroactive to January 1st, 1967, in the current year, the proposed enriched Foundation Program and the revised tax system. This plan is designed to finance an improved and improving standard of education in the Single District Divisions at diminished proportional cost to the real property taxpayer.

The government does not propose, however, to offer increased financial incentives to the maintenance of Multi-District Divisions, because such divisions are not considered capable of achieving the primary educational goals of improved standards and equalization of opportunity, or more equalization of opportunity. Where the electors choose, therefore, to retain Multi-District Divisions the present system of grants will be retained. No new incentives will be offered. The School Tax Rebate was designed to relieve the burden of school taxes on the home owner and the farmer. While it is less effective in achieving this goal than the revised tax system, it continues to have a useful effect. The School Tax Rebate will therefore be retained in those divisions which do not opt for the creation of Single District Divisions and will be deductible from the individual tax bill at source.

EXCEPTIONS

Some school districts, by their very natures and their complete lack of assessment, will not have the opportunity of being brought under the new Foundation Program. These will be the districts commonly known as Special Revenue Districts, namely, the school districts of Camp Shilo, Fort Churchill, Brooke, Goulding - which is at Gimli Air Base - Harold Edward (all of which are located on military bases), Pinemuta (a radar base) and Pointe du Bois, Pine Falls and the White Shell, which are financed by major industry in the towns.

ADMINISTRATION

The uniform standard levy will equalize the impact of the costs of the Foundation Program on the real property taxpayers of the province. The expanded Foundation Program will give impetus to the equalization of opportunity in the primary and secondary school system of the province. The creation of the uniform standard levy and expanded Foundation Program make necessary the creation of a new instrument of administration to pool the product of the uniform standard levy on a province-wide basis and distribute it to the Single District Divisions.

A Public School Finance Board will be created. It will be comprised of five members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and it will be provided with a technical staff. It will be charged with the responsibility of financing the expanded Foundation Program for the Single District Divisions in the province. Its responsibilities will include:

- (a) Receiving and reviewing the budgets proposed by the Single District Divisions to determine the portions of the budgets covered by the Foundation Program, and to encourage economy of operation;
- (b) The annual estimation of the total sums required from real property taxation in order to meet 35% of the costs of the Foundation Program;
- (c) The calculation of each year of a differentiated uniform standard levy on the total of all real property in all Single District Divisions in the province adequate to meet, in that year, 35% of the costs of the total Foundation Program of all Single District Divisions;
- (d) Collection from the province of the remaining 65% of the costs of the new Foundation Program;
- (e) Payment of grants to school boards adequate to meet 100% of the costs of their respective Foundation Programs; and
- (f) Control of capital expenditures, including expenditures for school buses, and school buildings.

In short, it will be the general responsibility of the Public School Finance Board to regulate and control financial matters related to the Foundation Program. It will remain the responsibility of the Minister of Education to control and to determine the content of the Foundation Program and to revise it from time to time.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.)

SUMMARY

The foregoing proposals are of fundamental importance to the continuation of progress in education in Manitoba. They include the revision of many practices which have been in use for many years and some of the revisions are sweeping. They are intended to provide a new and streamlined framework for educational administration and financing.

We cannot propose so many revisions, Mr. Chairman, without anticipating that unforeseen consequences and anomalies will arise during the first months of the operation of the new system. Problems which may arise in this way may require executive action and we will ask the House for authority to meet them as they arise.

We are aware, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the system which we propose is not perfect. No doubt improvements may be suggested in the course of the full debate which we expect on these proposals. We are open to constructive suggestions. We feel, however, in the light of the need to continue the improvement of the education system and the need to finance this system in the most equitable manner possible, that the arrangements which we have proposed have much to commend them.

APPENDIX I

COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED GRANT SYSTEMS

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
1. <u>Grants Toward Salaries</u>	100% of salaries up to maximums on a scale for elementary teachers and a scale for secondary teachers according to experience and qualifications. (See Appendix III).	100% of salaries up to maximums on a single scale for both elementary and secondary teachers according to qualifications and experience. (See Appendix II).
2. <u>Grants Towards Maintenance</u>	75% of expenditures up to expenditure of \$750 per authorized teacher, (i.e. a maximum grant of \$562.50 per teacher).	100% of approved expenditures up to \$1200 per authorized teacher.
3. <u>Grants Toward Instructional Supplies</u>	50% of expenditures a) for each authorized elementary teacher up to maximum of \$200 per teacher (i.e. maximum grant expenditure of \$100 per teacher). b) for each authorized secondary teacher up to \$225 per teacher (i.e. maximum grant of \$112.50 per teacher).	100% of approved expenditures up to \$400 per authorized teacher.
4. <u>Grants Towards Administration</u>	50% of costs up to expenditure of \$120 per teacher (i.e. maximum grant of \$60 per teacher). N.B. - Maximum grant for division \$10,000.	100% of approved expenditures up to \$450 per authorized teacher.
5. <u>Grants Towards Transportation</u>	60% of costs up to costs of \$166.66 per pupil transported (i.e. maximum grant of \$100 per pupil transported).	100% of approved costs up to costs of \$175 per pupil transported.
6. <u>Capital Grants</u>	40% on elementary schools up to eight classrooms, 60% on elementary schools 8 rooms and over. Sliding scale from 40% to 75% on secondary schools. (i.e. 40% on 4 room high schools; up to 75% on high schools 12 rooms and over).	100% of costs up to a maximum cost per classroom set out in regulations and approved by the Buildings Projects Committee.
7. <u>Text Books</u>	100% of approved costs of authorized textbooks.	100% of approved cost of authorized textbooks.

APPENDIX I - continuation

B: FINANCING

Present

1. The grants for salaries, maintenance, supplies transportation and administration at the rates set out above are provided by:
 - a) a general levy over each division based on a formula. The general levy rates under this formula vary from six mills in low-assessed divisions to about 15 mills in high-assessed divisions; and
 - b) government grants to make up the difference between the total grant and the general levy.

The remainder of the costs of these items is levied over each division and district as a special levy.
2. Capital Costs are financed from outright government grants at the rates listed (i.e. 40%, 60%, 75%, etc.) and the remainder of the cost is a special levy over the district or division.
3. Divisions receive 100% grants on costs of authorized textbooks.

There are three levies in all multi-district divisions:

1. General Levy calculated according to the formula over each division.
2. The division Special Levy, which is the amount of money required by the division over and above the grants provided by the formula.
3. The district Special Levy, which is an amount required by the district over and above the grants provided by the formula.

Proposed

The grants for salaries, maintenance, supplies, administration, transportation, capital and textbooks at the above rates would be financed by a levy of 9 mills on non-commercial property, and a levy of 33 mills on all commercial property. The difference between the total cost of the Foundation Program and the general levy would be the amount of government grants.
For example - The total cost of the proposed Foundation Program in 1967 is estimated at \$95 million

The General Levy will raise an estimated	\$33.5 "
Government Grants will therefore be an estimated:	\$61.5 million

There would be two levies in single-district divisions:

1. The General Levy at the 9 - 33 formula.
2. The Special Levy over the division for costs in excess of the Foundation Program.

C: LEVIES

APPENDIX II

PROPOSED SINGLE-SALARY GRANT SCHEDULE

Years Experience	PoAo	P1Ao	P1A1	P1A2	PoA3	P1A3	P1A4	P1A5	P1A6	P2A6
0	2200	2600	3700	4100	4000	4500	5200	5900	6800	7700
1			3900	4300		4700	5400	6100	7100	8100
2			4100	4500		4900	5600	6400	7400	8400
3			4300	4700		5100	5900	6800	7800	8800
4			4500	4900		5400	6200	7200	8200	9200
5			4700	5100		5700	6500	7600	8600	9600
6			4900	5400		6000	6800	8000	9000	10000
7						6300	7200	8400	9500	10500
8							7600	8800	10000	11000
9							8000	9200	10500	11500
10									11000	12000

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SACRAMENTO

APPENDIX III (1)

APPROVED AMOUNTS FOR GRANTS RESPECTING TEACHERS OF ELEMENTARY GRADES

Steps Completed	Ao	P1Ao	P1A1	P1A2	P1A3	P1A4	P1A5 or P2A4	P2A5 or P1A6	P2A6
0	2200	2600	3000	3200	3400	3600	4000	4400	4700
1	2200	2600	3100	3300	3500	3700	4100	4500	4800
2	2200	2600	3200	3400	3600	3800	4200	4600	4900
3	2200	2600	3300	3500	3700	4000	4400	4800	5100
4	2200	2600	3400	3600	3800	4200	4600	5000	5300
5	2200	2600	3500	3700	3900	4400	4800	5200	5500
6	2200	2600	3500	3900	4100	4600	5000	5400	5700
7	2200	2600	3500	4100	4300	4800	5200	5600	5900
8	2200	2600	3500	4300	4500	5000	5400	5800	6100
9	2200	2600	3500	4500	4700	5200	5600	6000	6300
10	2200	2600	3500	4700	4900	5400	5800	6200	6500
11	2200	2600	3500	4700	5100	5600	6000	6400	6700
12	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	5800	6200	6600	6900
13	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6000	6400	6800	7100
14	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6200	6600	7000	7300
15	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	6800	7200	7500
16	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	7000	7400	7700
17	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	7200	7600	7900
18	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	7400	7800	8100
19	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	7400	8000	8300
20	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	7400	8200	8500
21	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	7400	8400	8700
22	2200	2600	3500	4700	5300	6400	7400	8400	8900

APPENDIX III (ii) APPROVED AMOUNTS FOR GRANTS RESPECTING TEACHERS OF SECONDARY GRADES

Steps Completed	A3	P1A3	P1A4	P2A4 or P1A5	P2A5 or P1A6	P2A6
0	3400	3900	4400	4800	5200	5900
1	3400	4000	4500	4900	5300	6000
2	3400	4100	4600	5000	5400	6100
3	3400	4300	4800	5200	5600	6300
4	3400	4500	5000	5400	5800	6500
5	3400	4700	5200	5600	6000	6700
6	3400	4900	5400	5800	6200	6900
7	3400	5100	5600	6000	6400	7100
8	3400	5300	5800	6200	6600	7300
9	3400	5500	6000	6400	6800	7500
10	3400	5500	6200	6600	7000	7700
11	3400	5500	6400	6800	7200	7900
12	3400	5500	6600	7000	7400	8100
13	3400	5500	6800	7200	7600	8300
14	3400	5500	7000	7400	7800	8500
15	3400	5500	7200	7600	8000	8700
16	3400	5500	7400	7800	8200	8900
17	3400	5500	7600	8000	8400	9100
18	3400	5500	7600	8200	8600	9300
19	3400	5500	7600	8400	8800	9500
20	3400	5500	7600	8400	9000	9700
21	3400	5500	7600	8400	9200	9900
22	3400	5500	7600	8400	9200	10100

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.)

In this opening statement, referring to the appendices which are before you, we have tried to indicate the previous program and the proposed outline. The Appendix II is a combined Teacher Salary Schedule and Appendices III and IV are the former Teacher Salary Schedule which will enable honourable members to compare the general nature of the new proposed foundation program.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that there is a fair amount of meat in this opening statement that honourable members may wish to examine a little further, and I would close my remarks with that introduction.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise unless there are any questions the honourable members wish to put before

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): The only questions I have, Mr. Chairman, was this the understanding that was arrived at, because I was not party to it, that there would be just the statement by the Honourable the Minister and that not even questions would be asked at this time, or was it that there would be - I quite understand that there was an agreement that the estimates as such would not be proceeded with - but what I am asking is was there an understanding that this would terminate the discussion at this period, or that questions would be entertained and that contributions from any members who wanted to speak at this time would also be in order.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, it was my own impression that for the purpose of the committee at this stage it would be simply to hear the Minister's statement because I would fear - and I'm only speaking of course as an individual - if we got into a period of questioning of the Minister and statements from members of the House, and I'm sure that all of the members of the House will have questions and will have statements to make, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that possibly the better thing to do would be to cease the sitting of the committee at this particular time without the questions and then we would have an opportunity to inwardly digest what the Honourable Minister so ably presented to us this morning and come armed with one or two minor questions on Monday.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if that was the arrangement then I would be -- we're certainly agreeable to it.

MR. LYON: I would then move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if the Minister -- have you additional copies of your white paper that may be available?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I kept control of every copy in my office, to my knowledge, except that six were given to the press. I think I have enough copies in my office, and if one member from each party would like to come down and get some for the other members I'll meet him there immediately.

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

IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now be good enough to revert back to the items of business on the Order Paper as they appear following the Orders of the Day. The first item would be the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the Order for Return, and then just carry on through the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. LYON: Being absent, I presume we will allow the matter to stand unless somebody else wishes to speak.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words at this time on this, if I may. I would like to say a few words because I was surprised and a bit shocked by the statement made by the First Minister yesterday. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a little tired and fed up with the First Minister getting up in this Chamber and making statements that he knows are not true, or at least should know are not true. He told us that there was no -- ever implied a promise to the member of Rhineland that he would be given a chance to speak, and as far as we were concerned on this side, certainly he did imply it and I'm sure the member from Rhineland

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) felt the same thing.

There was also another statement yesterday when the member from Selkirk asked the First Minister if it was true that the White Paper on education had been given to the press and he said "no", and I understand - and I have this from good authority - that this was not the fact and this is after -- just a few minutes after we heard that the press already had a release of another release. I think that the First Minister is so busy trying to get publicity and so on that he forgets his duty here. Now he made another statement. He made the statement

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, the First Minister is not in the House at the present time. There is a rule of procedure however in the House that if a member of the House, any member of the House makes a statement with respect to a matter and gives his word or his knowledge insofar as that knowledge goes, the common courtesy suggests that that statement be accepted by members of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the common courtesy would ask that the First Minister should spend some time in this House also, and I repeat, it's all right to be courteous; it's also a good thing to be honest and to be careful. The First Minister

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, no implication can be made, again according to the rules of this House, about the honesty of a member of this House. We all presume that all members of this House make honest statements at all time according to the best light that they have.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend could wait his turn to speak and give me a chance, I made the statement that the First Minister made statements that were not true. Either he knew they were not true or he should know, and I repeat this - he should know. Now we can't accuse him - I'm not accusing him of not being honest, but I certainly can think what I want to think if the member keeps on making statements like this. Yesterday in this very Chamber the First Minister said that all the members of this House voted for all the Act of the Manitoba Development Fund and that, Mr. Speaker, is not the case. It is not the case

MR. LYON: On a point of order, the Honourable the First Minister made no such statement yesterday.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Honourable the First Minister made that statement -- except one - except one. All right, my friend is playing on words again, Mr. Speaker. What is the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member would resume his discussion in that particular direction when the Honourable First Minister is present. As has been pointed out, there are rules that imputations should not be made of that nature. I wonder if you are suggesting that the Honourable the First Minister is not aware or is not being honest, and I'm sure the honourable member would not wish to leave that impression on the House.

. continued on next page

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I made the statement that the First Minister made a statement that either he knew was not true or he should have known, and if I'm given a chance to explain this - if my good friend can stay in his seat, his chair for a minute - I'll read, and I think you will understand what I mean. The First Minister said yesterday - and my honourable friend is playing on words again - he said there was only one member that voted against this and this is not true. This is the point that I am trying to make and I can refer you to Hansard of April 25, 1966, on Page 2241. This was after - well maybe we should go to Page 2236 of the same date and I made the motion: On Page 16 of the Bill, I would like to move an amendment. I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that Part II Extraordinary Operations, comprising Section 41 to 45 of Bill No. 80, be struck out and that Section 46 and 47 of said Bill be renumbered as Section 41 and 42 respectively." Now anybody can read this - my honourable friend the Attorney-General also, on Page 2236.

On the same day on Page 2241, after this debate on this amendment, we had the vote after a few words from my leader: "Mr. Chairman put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost." "Mr. Evans: May we have a standing vote, Mr. Chairman?" The government asked for the standing vote - the government - and it is very clear. "A counted standing vote was taken, the result being as follows: Yes, 10; Nays, 31". The statement that my honourable friend made yesterday, was that a true statement? He said that he had read everything on it. He said this, and once we have answered, I'll hope that my humble friend the Attorney-General who aspires to greater things will be able to read it and realize that sometimes he should just sit down and leave the others, especially when he doesn't know exactly what he means or what he wants to say, just try to pretend that there's something else and play on words like he is very good at doing.

We also said on this development fund, we also said that our interpretation -- we are told now that we voted for this and this government is full of these tricks. They bring a Bill that might have three or four different principles in it and if we vote against one, they'll say that we voted against the other principles. They have done that. They have made statements on TV during the election campaigns and so on, and that, Mr. Speaker, are not true statements; this is misrepresenting things to the people of Manitoba.

Now at the time, our interpretation -- and we said, there is not one time that we debated this that we did not say that we wanted more information, that we felt that this Act provided us with the opportunity of getting more information. I'm not going to go into this, I think that my honourable friend from Lakeside certainly made that clear yesterday.

Now the Honourable First Minister also said that we must establish this -- this has to be established by a bank. He said it's either this free enterprise or forget about it and accept socialism. Well that amendment that they defeated -- by defeating this amendment, they accepted socialism. My honourable friends to the left are honest about this. They say what they mean. They say that they are interested and that they adopt a certain principle. They stand on their two feet. I might not agree with them but I respect them, but my friends across try to be on both sides as they always do.

Now I asked if the Board of Directors of a bank do not get any information. We are told that this should be run like a bank. Do the directors of a bank get any information at all? I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are the Directors; we are representing the public, the taxpayers; and even if this information given was confidential information, if it was given to a committee of this House where we could safeguard, but what safeguard do the people of Manitoba have at this present time

The Honourable the First Minister also said that he has no information at all, but he was going around the province not too long ago cutting ribbons, telling the people that this is the government that made this possible, this is the government that did this. He wasn't supposed to know anything about it but he was taking full credit. I ask him, and I ask the Attorney-General who is always ready to come in this, how can the First Minister go to Switzerland - how can he go to Switzerland if he doesn't know anything about the Manitoba Development Fund and then come back waving a letter of intent? How is that possible, Mr. Speaker? How can you say I don't know a thing about the Development Fund? How can you go to Switzerland and these people -- you know what they received from the Development Fund. The First Minister didn't know anything about that and he came back waving a letter of intent. How can he explain that? Does he think the people of Manitoba are all gullible? They are not that gullible.

We have had other examples of people like this in politics accepting the credit and moving the responsibility, blaming others for any failures. We have the best example of Alvin Hamilton

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd), taking all the credit for sales of wheat and this is being done by the Wheat Board. The Wheat Board is responsible for the sale of wheat. This kept Mr. Hamilton in power for quite a few years.

There is another thing. We were led to believe that this fund was supposed to lend money for those that could not find any other available sources, and we know that this is not the case at all. My friend yesterday talked about the socialism and my honourable friend from Lakeside said that although he did not agree with the policies, the principles of the NDP Party, he felt that if this was the case, if we were going to go in business that at least we should have the information, and I certainly subscribe to this. As I said before, I do not agree with the theories of the socialist of the NDP but I respect them because at least they're above board, they're honourable and they tell the people of Manitoba what they want. They make no bones about it and they've always done that.

Now, we are told also that we voted for this and that we never complained. The First Minister said yesterday, "Why did you vote for this?" We voted for the principle of this fund; we still want this fund. We know that certain information cannot be given to everybody. We are saying that there must be protection to the public; we are saying that we are directors, that we are elected representatives of the public and we are entitled to get some information; we say that nothing in that Act says that we should not get this information; but from the start when this was first brought in, and last year again, at all times, every occasion, every chance that we had -- the Honourable Member from St. John's said yesterday that we had a chance to study it and we didn't complain. Well this was wrong. He also said that we voted for it. I think that he was mistaken in this; he was repeating the words of the First Minister.

When I brought this amendment last year I mentioned this, I said that we would vote for the first part although we still insisted that we still wanted more information, and this is on the same page. I'm not going to read it, it's Page 2236, and speaking on the motion the Honourable Member from Selkirk repeated this. The Honourable the leader - my leader - the Leader of the Official Opposition also spoke and he repeated the same thing that we wanted more information, so let no one say that we voted for this blindly and that now we want to change the rules of the game, like the first Minister said yesterday. First of all, we did not approve all this Act. This was not a correct statement and at no time did we accept the present rules. We accept the principle of the Development Fund. Could you see us voting against this? We've always encouraged that. We told the government that they had a responsibility to do. Now because we accept this does that mean that we want to accept their rules? This is not the case; this is not an afterthought that we've had, Mr. Speaker. From the first year that the fund came into existence, and last year again, we repeated - and this is what we are asking now - we want the information. This is public money; we represent the public here and we have a responsibility and the right to know what's going on and this is what this government is denying us in telling us. I for one - and I'm not accusing anybody - but I for one do not believe that they do not get any information at all. It's odd that a while back just before the Christmas recess, holiday recess, the First Minister told my leader that this was all hogwash, and all of a sudden he has replaced Mr. Grose. I for one do not believe that they had no information. I don't believe that at all, because if they had no information the First Minister could not go to Switzerland, make a deal and come back waving a letter of intent. This is impossible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, Since I am not a member of the government I do not have access to the inner workings of the Cabinet and I can only judge things as an observer, and I would make several observations about this whole question.

First, the government acts as if they did make a good deal on this Monoca and other such programs, and then they act as if they have something to hide. This is where all of this confusion arises. They appear to believe that they made a good deal but then they act as if they didn't. This is the impression that they create. It may be a false impression but nevertheless they create it, and then they are perplexed when the Honourable Member for St. Johns and other New Democrats and other members of the Liberal Party ask questions regarding this impression that they made a bad deal. I think to my own mind, if I listened to what they say and I listened to their debate and their words, there is an impression - and this is what we're asking questions about - that they gave away the province on this Monoca project. There is an impression that we are taking all the risks and that they are taking all the profit. It may be a false impression but it's a real impression.

Now, this is basically because of the way the First Minister and other people have answered these questions as if they could not reveal information, and the impression is created that there

(MR. DOERN cont'd). . . . is something to hide. Now I personally have been quite concerned about it and I have made some my own investigations. I have spoken to people; I have read reports and so on; and I now have an impression - and this is only an impression - that it was a good deal. I don't know, but I now have the impression that it was a good deal, and when I look at the Premier and other members of the Cabinet, I think there's no doubt in their minds that they did make a good deal, but they don't give us the benefit of some of their knowledge. The Premier keeps saying wait and see, and stick around, and he who laughs last laughs best, and then he gives us a confused metaphor about the proof of the pudding is when we will see the factory established, but this really is not good enough.

If we wait, and other people who are interested in investing in Manitoba, if we wait five or ten years, or a couple of years until we see these factories built, that might be too long. We can't stick around and wait for the actual factory construction, because the point is this impression of a bad deal will get around, and as a result of this there may be delays on the part of other investors; there may be some dismay as a result of the impression we're creating; and there could be a lack of confidence in either this province or in the government of this province, and this could have serious consequences. It could encourage investors to look elsewhere.

There's such a thing as confidence - business confidence and public confidence in the Government, etc. - and if they play with this they know that they are playing with fire. They can't give the impression -- they certainly can't do it in fact and they certainly can't appear to be making bad deals or to be uncertain in their action. So everyone has said it and I just repeated rapidly that we do have annual reports of the Manitoba Development Fund and it says clearly in the Statutes that the Cabinet, through the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, may ask for any information, etc. We're not asking for the microscopic details in the inner machinery of these companies. We're not asking for that information and we're not asking for information that might jeopardize the competitive position of these companies. What we are asking for very simply is the general details of the loan and the interest rates, and that's all - and I think we have a right to that - and it's clearly laid out in the statutes.

So if the government is creating a false impression, which I happen to think that they are, if the First Minister believes that he has made a good deal, then let him give us the general information that will allay these fears and that will put down this impression, because it's not good for Manitoba and it certainly isn't good for this government.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the Honourable Member for Rhineland still has that adjournment. We move on to the next item. Second reading of bills. The Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, would the House allow this item to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debates on second readings. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I would ask that you allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

MR. EVANS: May I have this item stand.

MR. LYON: the Government Orders, Mr. Speaker, I presume it would be in order now to move into the Private Members resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolutions. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to let this matter stand, and may I say that I am under the impression that the Orders of the Day start again at 2:30, so that we have a second opportunity --(Interjection)-- Well that's my impression from my casual reading of the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: I ask leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would ask that the Speaker ask leave of this House to allow this resolution to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate. The Honourable Member for Russell.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): In the absence of the member, could we have this matter stand please.

MR. LYON: We were referring, Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of clarification, to the resolution moved by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, the adjournment of which stands in the name of The Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. SPEAKER: I ask pardon of the House. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne --(stands).

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).....

The Honourable Member for Emerson. --(Stands). The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I believe you missed a resolution didn't you?

MR. LYON: I believe we perhaps skipped one resolution. At the top of Page 6 of the Order Paper there is one standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (Stands).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Lakeside, WHEREAS the Government has announced plans for the construction of a power development on the Nelson River; and

WHEREAS a great deal of material will be required for the construction of this project; and

WHEREAS it is vital that the government take steps to transport this material in the most economical way; and

WHEREAS an extension of Highway No. 6 to the Provincial Road 391 would cut the hauling distance by approximately 250 miles; and

WHEREAS a road between Grand Rapids and Provincial Road 391 would open northern Manitoba for further tourist developments; and

WHEREAS it would open the north to the rich stands of pulp wood and timber; and

WHEREAS a road from Grand Rapids to Provincial Road 391 would also save the people of Thompson, Snow Lake, Wabowden, Wekusko, and other northern communities approximately 250 miles when travelling to Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of immediately constructing an extension to Highway No. 6 to the vicinity of Ponton on Provincial Road 391.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, this is the second time that I have introduced this resolution to the Legislature. Last year when I introduced this resolution I had support from several members of the House who spoke on it, the member for Churchill, the Minister of Public Works, yourself. However, when we came to vote on the resolution it was defeated. I'm hoping that this year I'll have better luck and that the members who I expect to speak in favour of the resolution will also support it.

I'm encouraged as well, Mr. Speaker, that the fortune of this resolution will meet a better fate this year in view of the meeting that took place at Thompson not too long ago at the annual meeting of the federal constituency of Churchill. I understand at that time a resolution was introduced at that meeting synonymous with the one that I'm introducing here and introduced at the last session, and it was passed. Therefore, I am hopeful that with the support of that constituency group that this might pass and receive the blessing of the government. I am also aware that tomorrow a delegation of the Chamber of Commerce from Thompson along with Chambers from my area are meeting with the Minister of Public Works urging that the government proceed with the road which I am asking for in this resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see that there's a great deal of support for this resolution in the Interlake and in northern Manitoba.

However, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this resolution if it's accepted will not only benefit northern Manitoba and the Interlake, it will be of great benefit to the people of Manitoba as a whole. The government has announced a giant power project on the Nelson River involving untold millions of dollars. This project over the next few years will require a great deal of material, and what better way could we save money than to deflate cost by building this road so that freight costs could be reduced to get the material up there. People who have examined the situation tell me the saving would be 250 miles one way; that is, if you travel from Thompson to Winnipeg via No. 10 you'd save 250 miles by travelling direct through Grand Rapids and into Winnipeg via No. 6. So you can see the tremendous savings that would be made available to the Manitoba Hydro, the Provincial Government and the people of Manitoba in total. Such a road would open up the north for a great deal of development. It would open up areas that have not been reached before for tourists, for tourist development; it would open up pulp and timber stands which are not accessible at the present time, and as I said before, it would save the people of Thompson and those other northern communities a great deal of time and money when travelling to Winnipeg if they had this road available to them.

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, there's no question in my mind that this road will be built, but if it's built now it will be of great benefit to the Provincial Government and the Hydro who are going ahead with the Nelson River project. Just imagine having this road -- we would have a road from the Gulf of Mexico to Thompson if this road is completed, and I envision in the years ahead a road from the Gulf of Mexico to Churchill. What a tremendous tourist attraction this would be for the people of Manitoba if this road is built. To me, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of economics as well. The saving in transportation costs could easily be put toward the cost of building this road, and it's our good fortune, I think, that the terrain that this road would have to cross is described in general as excellent for road building. There are not many lakes or swamps that this road would have to pass, so it wouldn't make the cost out of line. The economic boom that would result in the Interlake and northern Manitoba is unlimited. All the towns along No. 6 highway and right into Thompson would receive a great deal of business and the effects would be untold. We have programs designing to try to help the Interlake and northern Manitoba, and I don't think that any program could help as much as putting this road through to encourage people to travel up that way and encourage the development of tourist locations, hunting and other businesses that would be suitable as a result of this road.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take any more time with the committee. The resolution is virtually self-explanatory and, as I said, I would ask that all members of the House support this resolution in the interests of the people of Manitoba as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: I just rise, Mr. Speaker, to lend the support of this group to the proposition of the Honourable Member for St. George. This is not new. I believe we took the same position last year insofar as the construction of this road is concerned. We feel that it would be a good thing for Manitoba to open up and further develop the extension of the highway system, particularly in this area referred to in the resolution. There is untold wealth in the general area that can only be exploited through the provisions of more adequate transportation facilities in the area. We have advocated in the past in this general area that consideration should be given to extending the rail services beyond Gypsumville through to the north as well, but in the absence at the present time of any consideration of any positive nature it appears that the alternative may be as suggested with this road. Of course, even if the railroad were to be built in that general area I would imagine that a highway would follow eventually in any case.

I think the Honourable Member for St. George is on sound ground when he speaks of the linking by highway or shortening the length of the highway system between here and Thompson by the building of this road, and relates it to construction that is going on in the Nelson River area. I appreciate the fact that the government's coffers may be a little strained at the present time due to expanding costs and possibly reduced ability on the part of the citizens, and the taxpayers of Manitoba, to continue the ever-escalating costs of government in the operation of our society in some areas, may feel that this can be postponed, but I am sure that the dollar and cents return from the construction of this highway now would well repay itself in the near future. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my honourable friend the Member for St. George that our position is still the same, and we support him in his endeavour to have this road constructed now.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to at this time join in to accept a resolution of this type. In fact we in northern Manitoba always accept money for development of the area, and we would encourage other members to possibly get more of this type of resolution in. I feel that a road of this type is very important, and I think that consideration must be given more and more to opening up the now barren part of Manitoba, the centre part of Manitoba, which up to now has been neglected through the fact that a road is not provided to allow people to get into that part of the area and open it up. This would help some of the reservations along the line, certainly some of the towns that are already established, and we could foresee where it would help establish more towns and more resource industries. But I, as a representative of the Churchill constituency, which I often like to plug in the fact that it is half of the area of the province, we must consider the whole of northern Manitoba, and it is my thought at this time, should we be considering an alternative route to the Nelson River development entirely, or should we be considering what we can do with a route that would continue on and lift Lynn Lake out of its isolation? Here's an established town that's been isolated for many many years. It is a growing town. It is one that is providing more and more resource dollars for all of Manitoba, and all of Canada in fact, and still today they're isolated,

(MR. BEARD cont'd). . . . and I think that in considering priority we must wonder what we should do, for I feel that the residents in Lynn Lake would be sad indeed if they found that they were going to be left out in the cold again. And I think that we should consider what we're going to do about opening up not only one part of Manitoba, but the whole of the central part of the north, because it is only through the road or transportation system or communication being able to open up the further parts of the north that we will really get the real advantage of these types of roads; because up to now it's always been in the southern part of the province and the north is looked after, after. There's a tail end of everything and I just wonder, when we're considering programs like this, if we shouldn't be considering the whole of the province. Too often we look at the maps that cut off the northern half of the province and we forget that there are areas up there that have to be developed, particularly the established areas; and I think that in resolutions like this we must adjust our thinking to include the rest of Manitoba, the rest of Manitoba that was not developed with the Hydro program, the rest of Manitoba that has never been developed by a highway program or a telephone program, or those other government services which we offered to the areas that lie around the boundaries, around the west side of the province, and are neglecting the north and the centre parts; and I think that these things should be considered by members of this government and of this Assembly when we produce resolutions that would develop one area of the province and leave out the rest. Certainly it is right to say that we can only go a little way at a time, but if we continue on with a program where we stop at any given point, then we are in fact discriminating against the rest of the province, against those people who are trying to adjust and trying to develop the northern part of the province, an isolated area.

And so it is that I rise at this time with the two thoughts in mind; we can still go from the Gulf of Mexico to Thompson but we can't come from Lynn Lake to Winnipeg, and while I'd be happy to see this type of a road provided I do think that we must, as this debate continues, consider what should be done to not only look after one part of the province but what can be done to link up the whole of the province, to look after those who have not, and to try and adjust our thinking to the development of the province as a whole rather than the province as a half.

I think that any project which will improve northern conditions, or any program, is good but my thinking at this time runs parallel with probably the Provincial Treasurer, in that a 50-cent dollar is quite a bit cheaper than a 100% dollar, and I don't know why we can't get the message through to those that could assist us in the east by providing a 50-cent dollar to develop inter-provincial lines of communication, and it was with this thought in mind that I submitted a resolution which will probably come up in the paper later, asking that they reconsider a program which would allow us to develop programs such as this on a basis where all of Canada would contribute toward opening up the resource areas which contribute many dollars towards the treasuries not only of the provinces but of the federal government as a whole, and if all of Canada is going to gain financially out of the development of our resources, then I think it is only right to go to those people and ask for assistance to make these added dollars available, and if there is a construction program in which the rest of Canada can assist not only Manitoba but the rest of the provinces to develop their resources, then I think a program such as this should be made available so that we can make sure that all of Canada progresses and develops as one, and I think that this would in many ways help us in the more isolated areas to have a feeling, a centennial feeling, of being more a part of Canada as a whole.

So it is I wish to impart these thoughts at this time. I support the program. I support the resolution. But I would like members at this time to think a little further than just half the province and probably give more and more consideration to extending resolutions and programs which would allow them to take in the whole of the province at one time.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be now adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: leave to have this matter stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House? The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LYON: was adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may we have this stand in the absence of my colleague... for this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Attorney-General for his assistance this morning. With regard to the next resolution standing in my name, I would like to inform the House that I have

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd), . . . given this matter further consideration and in the light of the several comments that developed in the discussion that went on, many of the points put forward certainly considered and have some merits. I therefore feel that the motion ought to proceed. I call on the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Could I have this stand please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move this resolution, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert: WHEREAS the farm implement testing program which was operated by the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture has been of tremendous value to farmers in Western Canada; and WHEREAS the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan has bowed to vested interests by abandoning this program; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government give consideration to the establishment of a farm implement testing program in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the farm implement testing program as has been set up in the Province of Saskatchewan some years ago by the then CCF government, I might say was some advantage, or a major advantage to the various farm people not only in the province of Saskatchewan but in the three prairie provinces, in fact, which have had connections with that program. I want to point out that I was one of those that was a recipient of the pamphlet that this program issued and that I certainly found it of great assistance in determining the quality of new implements coming on the market, the availability of implements, the various recommendations of improvements of implements. I believe very strongly as I know that many farm organizations in this province do, and I say this by having consulted with these farm organizations. The Farm Union people, the Farm Bureau, the Vegetable Growers Association have all indicated that they are very much interested in this type of a program to ensure farmers in this particular province that we do get the right type of equipment built for the purposes which are required in this province, and that there is a flexibility in this equipment, recognizing the various needs of different areas, and without such a testing program we are then, of course, left to the, you might say mercy of the implement manufacturer, as the one that might determine our needs or may care less, you might say, so that in effect we don't truly have some way or some means of expressing what we as farmers, as producers of our primary products want in terms of improvements in implements or the development of new implements.

The program which was carried out in Saskatchewan for a good number of years I am sure proved very successful, and I am rather disappointed that the present Liberal government decided to abandon this program and in fact, if I am not mistaken, I believe the only program carried out there now is connected in some way with the University of Saskatchewan in a very minor way. To cite an example, I recall a few years ago where we had purchased a certain piece of equipment which was tested in the province of Ontario, and of course the company assumed that having had this piece of equipment tested in the province of Ontario that it logically would be suitable for the province of Manitoba, not of course recognizing that the soil conditions vary greatly, and having purchased this piece of equipment I found out to my sorrow that it was a very bad investment, and that had we had some implement testing program in this province I am sure that this implement would not have been put on the market in Manitoba without -- that is, with the exception of the areas in the lighter soil communities, probably the south westerly portion of the province would have been the only area in which these implements would have been effective. Actually, at that particular time the company which I was dealing with at that time attempted to sort of test this implement on my particular farm, and they had certainly adhered to the guarantees to a degree, but after too many breakdowns this company said to me, "I think we had better take this machine back. I don't think we can stand up to the guarantee. It's too costly for us to maintain." So this is something that I am sure is in the interests of all farmers in Manitoba, and I'm sure that before too long our government will be receiving briefs from farm organizations requesting exactly this very program.

I attended a meeting of the Farm Bureau last week and this was discussed at some length, and it was my interpretation of that meeting that they are intending to present a brief requesting

(MR. USKIW cont'd)..... that this province consider such a program. Now, having regard to the financial difficulties of the government of this province, I might suggest that possibly here is an area where this should become a project of the three prairie provinces. Logically, the conditions are very similar; that is, the soil conditions of the three prairie provinces are quite similar, and logically we could set up an interprovincial or a joint program of the three provinces in the testing of farm implements. Some of the pamphlets that I have received from the authority responsible for testing these implements in the province of Saskatchewan have indicated in many instances various weaknesses in certain pieces of equipment that were put on the market. They have also served the industry by reminding the manufacturer where these weaknesses are, and the manufacturers incidentally did improve on these pieces of equipment, so that although this may have been somewhat of a bugbear, you might say, to the manufacturer, to have to go back and improve the piece of equipment which they thought was sufficient, but in the interests of the agricultural industry in the province of Saskatchewan and indeed in the three prairie provinces, I would say that this would be interpreted as a small sacrifice on the part of the implement manufacturers as compared to the benefits gained by the farming community as a whole. So I strongly urge the government of Manitoba to give this particular resolution the utmost consideration. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rock Lake, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave of the House? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. PAULLEY: have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: Also the following three resolutions standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: This matter stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. SPEAKER: There are two more for the Honourable Member for Inkster. We hold those too. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Interjection) We go back to the proposed resolution for the Honourable Member for St. John's standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, last year we had a very fruitful and profitable debate on a similar resolution. I think there was generally full support from the House. I personally support this resolution. The committee was formed and of course became non-operative because of the election which interceded. My first reaction was to adjourn this debate and perhaps go over some of the very pertinent important details which were debated and brought forward during the debate last year, but on reconsideration and in reading over the introduction by the honourable member proposing this resolution and the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I feel it would not be in the interest of the House or time. I would urge members to support this most important resolution which has become important because of changing in our society. To get the thing voted on; I understand there will be the minimum of delay in appointing the committee; get the committee to work and let's have the benefit of their deliberations. I urgently urge members to support this resolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows:

WHEREAS many mothers in low-income families must work in order to supplement their husbands' income; and WHEREAS many mothers are forced to work to support their families because their families lack another provider; and WHEREAS many women trained in professions now suffering shortages of personnel, such as teaching and nursing, would once again make their services available to society could their children be properly cared for at a cost within their means; and WHEREAS it is anticipated that increasing numbers of mothers will find full and part-time employment outside the home and it is to the benefit of all society

(MR. HARRIS cont'd). . . . that proper care for their children is available, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of establishing public day nurseries in communities where the demand for the service warrants such action.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you a few things that I have seen around about in Winnipeg here as I was going along on this day nursery business. One little case that was brought to mind was a lady that came back from Hamilton here with a little child. Her husband for some reason or other had left her. Now she was a Winnipeg girl and she'd come back to Winnipeg, so she had to go out and provide for herself and her child. Well naturally a mother like that coming into a city like Winnipeg, or any other city as far as that goes, if they haven't someone that they can go to, it's pretty hard. Well, she had parents here, very old people you might say, and they had to look after the child. Well, they did as best as possible for the child, but being grand-parents you don't sit on your grandchildren like you would on your own children and you kind of more or less pamper them, so this is what happened to this young child, and he got into such a state there that she found she would have to do something. Fortunately, she made connections with the United Way here and got her child into one of their day nurseries. She was one of the fortunate few. I would like to say this, that it is fortunate we have such places, and to think that less than 250 kiddies are looked after in such a city of ours like the City of Winnipeg.

Taking the whole province of Manitoba the same way, in these smaller communities, they have the same problems maybe on a smaller scale, but the problem is there. It is a Manitoban problem; we don't have to look outside on anything at all. I have a son, and he was educated and took up electronics, so last week he came to me and he said, "Dad, I feel I can't stay in this province any longer." He said, "My business is expanding and I don't see any future. It's going to cost me \$40,000 to expand and I can't tie myself down to that much. I haven't got that much money to go and expand to that extent. So," he said, "I'm going to take this next week off and go to B. C." So he and his wife go. They have two small children. The wife and I, we look after these children. One is a year and a half, the other is five. I can appreciate what these various old people have to do for their children and their children's children, because by gosh, I'll tell you, they've worn me out.

MR. ROBLIN: I've got two just like them, Lem.

MR. HARRIS: I have a lot of fun with them by gosh, but I'll tell you, I'm not as young as I used to was, and the younger chap is something like myself, a big robust chap you know. In fact, they had to have special shoes made for him, his feet are so wide, 3-E. And he's a big fellow you know. So one day, just to show you, I sat beside him; I was eating my dinner. The chap - I suppose he's 14 months old - and he grabs my arm like this, and I thought, well, he's just a youngster, I won't take no notice of him. The next thing I couldn't figure out what was wrong with my arm! Sure, it took me a little while to catch on. This little guy, he'd really bruised me up. Well, I'm telling you, if he'd gotten a little rough with me what would have happened to me? So I say you can see the problem here.

Now, we have a problem with all these different young children, and we have it in Manitoba. The other day I was watching TV and here was a bunch of little kids in Hong Kong. You people might have seen that program. Who was it? It was the Unitarians that were taking these young kiddies in and they were giving them exercises. I thought to myself, gee willikins, at least the problem is around the world and these people are less fortunate than us, but we have the means to provide for ourselves. But are we doing that, or are we saying like this, "Well, this isn't our problem" but I say yes, everything is our problem. We are here in this House to see, to iron out these problems, and if we don't go and do these things, well then we are lax. We are legislators in here and we don't do a job, and our people come to us and say, "What are you doing there? You're taking our money for nothing," and I often wonder if in a sense they are right. We bring up these various things here and we are smothered. I don't blame any Minister that is concerned with these problems; I know that they have problems with the necessary cash coming back to finance these deals, but with a country like this and with the money we should have -- you look abroad and you see these various countries, what they are doing in this respect for their children, and it seems here we are callous to everything that goes that way. We say, well, we are robust, we are Canadians. We are no more robust than any other race and we have to look after our children because they are our coming citizens.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I've spoken many times. Last year I spoke on these day nurseries, and it was given very scanty attention. Now this is a big problem in another sense. We have

(MR. HARRIS cont'd). . . . various things coming up here. Now this one is a different problem because it pertains to our children. I have pointed out there are more working mothers now because of the necessity to work. The husband isn't earning enough. The mother has to go out to work to supplement the income into the home. So, she has young children. You say she is going to leave them here, with someone, a teenager, so on so forth, all the way down the line, grandparents, uncles and aunts. But that's not good enough. My young grandson come along just yesterday and he said to me "Grandad", yes, "I have a letter given to me by my kindergarten teacher," so I thought well the parents are away so I am going to see what the letter has to say. Here was a receipt for a week, he is going to kindergarten, a private kindergarten for \$9.00 for the week, for one child. Now how many of our people that are earning a lowly wage could pay \$9.00. I know my son and his wife don't begrudge paying that 9.00 for the child to go out -- and I see a vast difference in the child when he goes along and he goes into a kindergarten and something like that, because there is good basic training in there; but when you go there, when these little children go along and they are cared, just looked after to see that there is no damage done to them or anything at all like that, there is no basic training at all and that leads to the child later on becoming a juvenile delinquent.

So you go downtown -- and I am sure if you would go along into these departmental stores and you would ask these people in the stores, the detectives, how are they getting along with these younger children pilfering; and I am sure, Sir, you would have many a sad story told you. These kiddies are going downtown -- their fathers and mothers are working -- these kiddies are a little older, they are going downtown, they have a little spare time before their parents come home so they go downtown, they go through Eatons or Hudsons Bay and they see these various things on the counter. Well there is nobody around to say "nay", it doesn't take much for a child to take something away from the counter. Well eventually the detective catches up with them. Here they are started off on the wrong way of life. That is one of the stories that can be told on this thing alone itself.

My neighbour was telling me the other day about his child, had gone downtown - both father and mother were working. These two young girls had gone downtown and of course, according to the father his child was right and the people in the store were wrong. Well you can draw your own conclusions from that. But they wanted friendship rings, so the next thing you know they were up in the office in one of the stores there for taking these rings, so it was said. But they got out of it some way or another, the parents got them out of it some way or another; but it just shows you how these people go down into town.

Now years ago my neighbours came to me and they said to me, Mr. Harris we would like to start a community rink in here. They are going to build a new school in Weston and the rink that was on the site where the school is going to be built is going to be destroyed. It was a community rink. So I said, well knowing how things go, I don't feel like starting because I know eventually you will be the horse that is hauling the cart, so they persuaded me to come in with them. They didn't have one cent to rub against the other. Well we started an executive. They asked for a president - they elected a president, a secretary, a treasurer and so forth. I was put in as treasurer so when we sat down as a new executive there was no one getting up to appoint committees so I thought to myself well, I have a little idea what should go on, so I got up and I started things rolling but I found out the load was left to me all the time.

Eventually we had bought two box cars and put them side by side, a loud speaker system, we had a rink with boards all around and there was lights on either side, telephone poles and lights. We contacted various people and got various things done, which was good of these people. This went on but we found out we were just a bunch of baby sitters. The kids come out of school and they come over to the rink and you just sat there and watched these kids until their parents come home. So you went to these parents and said "Now look, what about coming over and helping us out with these various projects? We would like to put different things in there." "Oh yes," but the day never came that these people would come up because they worked all day, mother and father, they come home at night, they were tired, I was tired too but still I had thoughts for different peoples.

Well it brings to mind a phrase, "latch key children:" You go along and you meet these children. They go away in the morning and they take their lunch to school. If they come home the house is empty, so what do they do with these children, the mother and father, they tie the latch key around his throat with a piece of string. Now if you are coming home after 4:30 you can use the latch key, and go in the house. The house is empty - and fortunately today we have gas, and we have various things that heat the house; but you can imagine if we had coal fires

(MR. HARRIS cont'd). . . . what would happen to these various kids? What kind of accidents would happen? Even today with gas, like the member for St. Boniface was talking about the big fire there the other day, you can't pinpoint anything but when something strikes you say, why was this, why was this? Why? And you ask, but nobody answers. It's all right. If your child would be gone, if your child would be gone then what would you say? That would be a different thing entirely. Oh yes, I can look after my own, so you hear, but I say there are less fortunate people than us and I say we are Manitobans and we should try and look after our citizens and the less fortunate. But no. I am appealing to you on the opposite side there. Take and digest what I am talking today. It is all right to say yes, we are doing something; charity is doing it not the Province of Manitoba, charity. Sure, I pay to the United Way, I'm glad to pay to the United Way, I'm proud to pay to the United Way, but we should go and examine these places and we should find out what we should do for these people.

Mr. Speaker, I had written out a speech but I thought to myself, why do I have to speak, my heart is full. I am telling you, telling you what is in my heart. I am not speaking from the written word. They are my thoughts; I put them down. But, Mr. Chairman, let us examine this thing please and let us not brush this thing off, because I say it can be your child tomorrow. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin this debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have this stand, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Can we have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Could we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Could I have this matter stand please?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Could I have this stand please?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: I wouldn't want to break the uniformity Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I request to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, seeing that everything is going along so harmoniously, I will likewise ask the House to let this matter stand. And also the next resolution too, so we can get home and have a bite to eat.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? Agreed.

MR. LYON: We have now reached the end of the private members paper or private members resolutions. I wonder if at this point we could consult the members of the House as to their wishes with respect to this afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, make a brief comment on our rule book at this juncture of our sittings today, because I think a very interesting matter has been the subject of some discussion among various individual members of the House in regards to our position on Fridays. If you will look at the rule book, Mr. Speaker, it shows that on Fridays between the hours of 2:30 p. m. and 5:30 p. m. is private members day, and in our rule book it sets out the routine order of business for Friday afternoon, namely starting with written questions, motions other than government motions, private bills, public bills and orders other than government orders, government motions, then government bills and orders. . . . This indicates to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... me, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with the rules of the House, in effect, Friday afternoon is a separate sitting of the House, and I raise this question because we have been considering it. Now I have no personal objections, and neither have, I'm sure, the members of my group to not meeting this afternoon, but I raise this point now, Mr. Speaker, so that it may be considered by those who are responsible for the conduct of the House and principally yourself of course Mr. Speaker.

I think possibly in the past we have more or less just agreed that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair, or Madam Speaker, as the case was last year, just left the Chair at 12:30 and then we carried on with pretty well the order paper of the morning instead of really adhering to the rules and starting more or less afresh on Friday afternoons. Because to do otherwise, if we carried on that way, Mr. Speaker, providing the debate had continued until 12:30 this morning, and then you just left the Chair until 2:30 in the afternoon and we carried on, according to the setup in our rules, government business would have two chances on Friday, and private members only, in essence, one, particularly when we get into estimates, because we start out as we did this morning, Sir, at 10:00 o'clock with the routine order of business then we went into government business, and following that we came into private members resolutions. But, had we, in effect used all of this morning on government business and then only a short portion this afternoon on private members resolutions, according to the setup in the rule book, we would have been back in government business for the second time in the same day.

Now I would suggest that in accordance with the rules, technically speaking we should start a new sitting this afternoon. But I realize at this stage of the House there is the important matter of the consideration of the white paper presented by the Minister of Education this morning, that it might be the thought and will of the House not to meet this afternoon, but I raise this question now, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact we have a few moments before it is 12:30. I state my case; I think that I am on sound grounds, but I think the matter should be considered.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, the point is very interesting. I think I can discern the cause of our trouble, I hope I can, and that is we started out by having private members day on Tuesday afternoons, which was the first sitting that day, and if one looks at Tuesday only then the thing seems to be quite reasonable. That you start off with your private members business, go on to government business and then Tuesday afternoon, you switch back. But it seems to me that we should rewrite this rule for the sake of clarity. I think what we intended when we wrote this rule was that on Tuesday afternoons we should give precedence to private members business, and Tuesday evenings, on to government. That Friday mornings we'd give precedence to government business and Friday afternoons would be private members. But we did not intend that anybody, either public or private items, should get two kicks at the cat on the same day.

So that what I would suggest is this, Mr. Speaker, that we follow the intent of our rule in the interim, that is, that on Tuesday afternoons its private members first, and if we don't finish up private members before we adjourn, we automatically start on government business in the evening. Whereas on Friday, we should start with government business in the morning and if we don't finish up we should automatically start with private members business in the afternoon, but if we do finish government business, we keep on with private members right through the afternoon, but do not come back to government orders. So it looks to me as if the rule should be clarified.

I think however, that you, Mr. Speaker, and our custom in the past is clear as to what we really want to do and we can follow that until such time as we can have some consideration about the rewriting of this thing. But I would suggest that perhaps the Clerk of the House could propose a redrafted schedule in Section 19 to make it perfectly clear what we're after and so that nobody gets any unfair advantage. So perhaps we might agree that we follow what I think we all intend, and then make sure that the rule is rewritten to come into conformity with that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if we may consider this as a point of order, so that we all are within the rules in discussing it, I would like to say that I am very largely in agreement with what the Honourable the First Minister has said, except that I would add that it seems to me that even though we have just recently revised these rules, and even though the booklet has not yet I think been printed in its permanent form, that we seem to have had several minor disagreements as to the interpretation of several of the rules already, and I would suggest to the First Minister, that it would be a good idea before the rule book is printed in a more lasting form, because I believe that is the intention, is it? -- that we should revive the rules committee and let's have a look at these few that have been giving us concern. If my honourable friend finds this one so confusing, then I am certainly an advocate of having the rules as clear as possible.

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

It seems to me that it's not as unclear as the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party would suggest because as all of us legally trained gentlemen are aware, the beginning of Section 19, Rule 19, controls the Section, and it begins by saying the ordinary daily routine of business shall be as follows, indicating that this is to carry through the day, and I would think that the practice that we have followed in the past of carrying right through Friday on the one order paper is the proper one. However, undoubtedly there's a difference of opinion and so I would agree with the suggestion of the First Minister that we should for the time being carry on as we have in the past, but let's have the committee sit again before these rules are printed in a more permanent form, and let's deal with the two or three matters that have continually aroused some difference of opinion.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General and I, two great legal authorities, have found it difficult to agree on the interpretation of where third reading of government bills should come, and I am sure that with our usual good will, that if we could sit down in a committee together that we could come up with a rule that both he and I could agree on and that the rest of the House could. So let's agree with the suggestion of the First Minister now, and then let's reconstitute the committee on rules and try and get them so that even we in the House can understand them.

MR. LYON: If that suggestion is then agreeable, as I understand it is on all sides of the House, I would move that the House now adjourn, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare.

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