

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 21, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: Before we commence proceedings this afternoon, I would like to make a short announcement. Further to my recent announcement it has been drawn to my attention that the name of the Acting Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms which appears on Page 2701 of Hansard has been misspelled. The proper spelling should read Charles Tranter.

And whilst I have the attention of the House may I introduce some students. We have in the gallery 33 students of Grade 11 standing from the Precious Blood School. These students are under the direction of Miss Delorme. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there has been some agreement reached among members of the House to consider private bills and public bills that are introduced by private members, as they appear on the Order Paper on Page 20 and again on Page 7. I understand there is agreement to call those bills first before we move into resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 51. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto, standing in my name. In that the committee referred to in the amendment has been appointed, it would seem to be in order for the debate on this subject to continue. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to Bill No. 61, the same applies. In that the committee referred to in the amendment has been appointed it would seem to be in order for debate to continue in this regard. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would just like to make one statement and that is, of course the Society of Occupational Therapists are somewhat disappointed. I have attempted to explain the position; I think they understand the position. However, it does bring up rather a difficult problem. They are a very new society of young people; they haven't any money in the bank; and the difficulty was how to make a motion that the House may approve or otherwise refunding of the money, and so with that in thought and no committee in which to recommend same, after this motion is put, if I may, Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, make a motion to that effect.

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

MR. STANES: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that, by leave, the fees paid with respect to Bill No. 61, an Act respecting Occupational Therapy, be refunded.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: There is only one thing on this. I certainly do not oppose this but I think in all fairness - I wonder if the mover and the seconder would include the same thing for Bill 51 on this. I think we should do the same.

MR. STANES: I don't know whether I'm in order to change the motion or whether it should come from the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. I don't know what the procedure of the situation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I am just wondering if the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre would care to comment on the suggestion that has been made.

MR. COWAN: I certainly would be agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it in order that the motion be amended to include Bill 51? Do you so move?

MR. STANES: I am in full agreement and so move, Mr. Speaker. I am sure my seconder would have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? That is, to do with Bill 51 and 61.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, could the honourable member clarify this point for us? Were these fees paid in anticipation of becoming members of an organization established under this Act? --(Interjection)-- I see. Thank you.

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

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews) presented Bill No. 108, an Act to amend an Act to amend and consolidate the Acts incorporating "The Fidelity Trust Company", for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, the Fidelity Trust Company was established in 1910 by a special act of the Manitoba Legislature. All trust and loan companies must be incorporated under a special act of the Legislature or the House of Commons, but not under the The Companies Act similar to other companies. On February 15, 1913, by Chapter 103 of the Statutes of that year, various acts incorporating and amending the Fidelity Trust Company were consolidated into one. By Chapter 117 of the 1965 Statutes just two years ago, Mr. Speaker, Section 16 of the original Consolidation Act having to do with the capital stock of the company was altered.

The capital stock of the company was to be \$2 million, being divided into one million shares, each having a par value of \$1.00 each and designated as Class B common shares. There are 643,775 of these Class B shares issued. In addition, there was to be 100,000 Class A common shares, each having a par value of \$10.00. There are no Class A common shares issued.

It was the intention of the company to issue Class A common shares, and it is necessary to prepare a prospectus and receive the approval of the Public Utilities Board of the Province of Manitoba, who must issue a security issuer's license to enable the Company to offer the shares on the public market. During the course of the preparation of this prospectus, it was discovered that the present Section 16 of the Charter contained some ambiguous wording which might later lead to some unnecessary confusion and complications.

Foreseeing a possible problem arising in the future the Fidelity Trust Company is seeking Bill 108 to avoid making trouble and to provide a remedy in case this situation should ever arise. In addition, the Fidelity Trust Company decided to split the 100,000 common shares of \$10.00 par value each in the Class A division to one million shares of a par value of \$1.00 each. Thus the holders of the Class A common shares and the holders of the Class B common shares would rank on a parity each with the other, and be in exactly the same position as each other with the single exception that the holders of Class A common shares shall have only one vote for each ten shares they hold, compared with the holders of the Class B who have one vote for each share that they hold.

This is the only alteration in the actual corporate structure of the bill that we have before us, and as I repeat Mr. Speaker, nobody is adversely affected by this amending bill because there are no Class A common shares issued.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to hold up the passing of this bill on second reading. I want to draw to the attention of the committee which will be dealing with it that there is that discrepancy between the voting rights of Class A common and Class B common, and of course the fact that there are no holders now of Class A common shares indicates that no present person is affected. There is a discrepancy then of a 10 to one proportion in voting powers based on the \$1.00 investment per share regardless of which of the two classes.

I am informed that this is not an uncommon method by which companies do set up their capital structure in that the founding members wishing to retain control, give themselves this extra 10 to one power in vote, and therefore I can't say that I am really opposed to it because I don't know enough about it. On the other hand, I assume that the Securities Commission has to accept responsibility for the manner in which this is presented, and I would like to think that when this bill comes before the committee that there will be some sort of report from the Minister or from the Securities Commission itself indicating its reasoning or support for this type of share structure as well as an indication from the company of other companies of a similar type that have similar restrictions on the voting powers. I think that they ought to be prepared to indicate the reason for it in order to convince the committee that this is fair. And secondly, that there is proper provision made so that prospective purchasers for Class A common shares will know at the time of their purchase that they are acquiring parity in returns from the company with the Class B but they are not acquiring the same voting powers. I think that as long as people know what they are doing, investors are aware of the benefits and of the disadvantages, then they have the perfect privilege of investing their capital as they see fit. The thing we have to make sure about is that they are aware of this and I presume it's the responsibility of the Securities Commission to make sure that they become aware of it, so that I am quite in favour of passing this bill on second reading but I think that the committee ought to look at this aspect of it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The understanding is we proceed now to Page 7. The adjourned debate on second reading, Bill 42, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks in dealing with the bill which has been presented by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks and the amendment by the Honourable Member from Selkirk. I find it very difficult to support this bill. The Shops Regulations Act has been working quite successfully in the rural part of Manitoba, in which I live, for some time and while Bill 42 may be close to solving the problem, I don't think that it will. I can't understand, Mr. Speaker, if the urban municipalities are not able to legislate the Shops Closing Act, how the Legislature can. I also don't understand how we can put the government in the inventory business in attempting to find out the changes no doubt that will come from year to year in the stocks in the various types of shops. I would like to associate myself with the remarks that we are going to hear from the Honourable Member from St. James, Mr. Speaker, but I fail to see how I can support Bill 42.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment because, as the honourable member just mentioned, it would create chaos. Whereas I cannot support the bill which is amending the present act, I do think that the present act as it stands is worthy of being on the books. I think there are a number of reasons why it is not working as well as it should, so if I may, it's rather difficult to speak on the amendment without really speaking on the motion as it is, Mr. Speaker.

As I understand, the sponsor of the Bill, which is that there shall be some order in our shops closing and opening provided it is in the interest of the public, and with those thoughts I subscribe. However, the method is of course the one which interests me and in looking into this matter - and I believe I am fairly accurately informed - I understand on the present Act, which is Section 6 of that present Act, the municipalities may at the moment pass by-laws closing classes or class of stores between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. It can also separate the different types of stores. It can say that certain stores will remain open, such as small corner grocery stores and so on. It's under this section of the Act that the barbers are closed and others. So, at the moment, we have in the present Act facilities whereby the municipalities may create some order in the interest of the public in having orderly store hours.

The other method in which store hours can be regulated, Mr. Speaker, is by means of a petition from sections of stores. Now one of the complications in the Greater Winnipeg area is there are a number of stores which are almost impossible to define. We have stores that sell frankly soup to nuts, and it's very difficult to say what store or what type of business they are presently employed in and contained in, and therefore which group they should be a part of such a petition. I really am not that interested in what a store does. If the general public feel that the stores should, as so often has been said, close at 6:00 o'clock every evening except Thursdays and Fridays, and of course Saturdays, they should be closed at 6:00 and so on. This is the general thinking I think among the public at large. At the moment this can be carried out by the municipal councils at the present, under the present Act. It's also stated in Bill 42, I believe I'm correct in stating, that although the petition may be presented to the council if one has, by this Act, defined the various classes and kinds of stores they may be in, the municipal council still has the prerogative to do or not to do in regard to a by-law. So therefore the prerogative is still up to the municipal council. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we leave the present act as it stands at the moment whereby we can have regulation in our store hours, find out the reasons why it is not working, and then perhaps at a later date with more information - which may be political, I don't know - then take steps to correct the present act, so I am very much opposed to the amendment and I am opposed to the bill as it stands.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word in connection with the amendment that we have before us on Bill 42. I will not deal with the question of the bill itself at this time, but of course the amendment that has been proposed would mean that the discussion on the matter would cease and the bill of course would be killed. And I would like to appeal for the rejection of the amendment because of the fact that at the last Session, I believe it was, when the matter of the Shops Regulations Act was before the House, it was a tie vote on second reading of the bill, indicating at that time, of course, that there was considerable support within the House, and of course we do not know whether that support is here today or not. But I'm trying to illustrate by referring back to a year ago, Mr. Speaker, that simply to kill the bill at this stage will not give members an opportunity to declare themselves insofar as the bill

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... itself is concerned, and I think personally that it would be well to defeat the amendment that we have before us and that the bill should be given its consideration on second reading, and I respectfully suggest that in view of the closeness of the vote last year possibly we could allow the bill itself to go to second reading so that we could have representation from all of those concerned, industrialists, business people, small business people, and also the workers who are concerned with the Shops Regulation Act. So I would appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the House to reject the killing motion that we have before us and allow the discussion to proceed.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Yeas and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. For the benefit of those members who were not in the House when the matter was discussed, we're dealing with Bill No. 42, the amendment thereto as put forward by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs: Cherniack, Craik, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Steen and Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 36, Nays 14.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried. Are you ready for the question on the main motion as amended?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of public bills. No. 103. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 103, an Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulations Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, on this bill I'm quite clear. Mr. Speaker, I have been surprised at the importance of the horse-breeding industry in this province. I was surprised to find that the total payroll is in excess of \$300,000 a year, that they employ more than 412 people plus trainers, jockeys, grooms, etc. I have been surprised to find, Mr. Speaker, that their purchases almost exclusively in Manitoba - largely Winnipeg - during the race meets exceed \$700,000 a year. In addition to that, there is a number of other expenses which are incurred during the period of the race meets that it's impossible to get an accurate count. In addition to that, there's feed, equipment and then there's the housing of the staff; there's also the people that visit Winnipeg, visit the province because of it. So, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about quite a large industry, an important industry. Their total investments exceed \$2 million.

I mentioned this business of the horse-breeding because this is a business, and I also was surprised to find that these are people of all walks of life who are in this business. Now, Mr. Speaker, the number of days permitted for testing these horses, which is really the main purpose of a race meet, is an important part of their industry. At the moment they're restricted to 42 days and because of the restriction in this province we are finding there is a movement by the horse breeders away from our province into other provinces where they have more days. The reason for that is not only to get more racing and more testing, but of course the larger the race meet, the more participate, the larger the purses and the better the test. So consequently there is a tendency to move - and it's a tendency which is growing - move away. An example of that probably is in Saskatchewan. Most of the horse racing meetings there come from horses in Alberta but they themselves have very little or no industry in itself.

I'm sure it will be of interest to the members to know that, compared with our 42 days permitted, B. C. have 110; Alberta have 88; Ontario 196; Saskatchewan, I've explained; the Province of Quebec have no regulations. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you'll be interested to know that this is the only province in Canada that controls the number of racing days through the Legislature. All the other provinces control it by means of charters. This is the reason why there is no limit in Quebec because the charters cover the whole year. I was in Montreal in

(MR. STANES cont'd)... the fall of last year and they were having a horse race meet there even with snow on the ground. We issue charters in this province, but having issued a charter for racing, we then say, "No, you can't use it because we'll not allow any more days."

Another effect of restricting the number of days, Mr. Speaker, is that the people running these meets are forced to try and pick the highlights of the week which means that there are blank days, which is not an asset to the industry or to the people here who wish to go to it.

If we allowed racing according to the permit system, which I would suggest some time we should do, we would allow 76 days. At the moment we allow 42 days. Now this bill is purely permissive and it's requesting that the horse racing commission that we set up a year or two back be permitted to allow an extra 14 days. I'm assured by them that this will not be automatic; they may not allow this full 14 days extra.

So I firstly want to say, Mr. Speaker, how important this industry is to us; it's important they be allowed a given number of days; that the reason for the days is peculiar in Canada; this is the only province that controls the number of days by the Legislature in spite of the fact that we do issue charters.

Now some people have said that they are against it on a moral basis or something of that kind. I would suggest we have a parallel. In the last week or so on another bill which is before the House it was stated that the hours of drinking is up to the individual, and I would suggest the number of days of racing or participation of the individual is up to himself. I personally don't get much enjoyment out of going out to the race track; I'll be quite honest about it. But that doesn't mean to say that I wouldn't permit somebody else who wishes to. This is my peculiarity. I'm not right or wrong. So the extension of days, Mr. Speaker, is purely permissive and I would suggest that those who feel that we should have restricted days, either keep it as it is at the moment or reduce it, then I would suggest that we control this through the charters which are issued by this province.

Mr. Speaker, we often hear, too, from time to time of people opposing the number of days of racing and certain extension, on the basis that there are credit problems arising from it. I would suggest that this is a personal matter and whether one allows the extension of days or whether one abolishes racing in this province would make very little difference, because that money will probably go somewhere else and I think this is really a red herring on the particular problem.

So Mr. Speaker, just to sum up in brief, I think we have an important industry here, we want to try and keep it here; it is not restricted to a few people - it's restricted to a large number of people. It is employing an increasing number of people. I would like to see that they be allowed to have enough days so that they can expand the industry which is good for all of us. I would suggest that the other matters be controlled through another source. I strongly recommend that this bill be passed in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I feel bound to make a few comments on this bill, and in doing so I express my own opinion only. I was interested in hearing the Honourable Member for St. James speak of this horse racing as a desirable industry. I don't think he stressed too much the tourist promotion aspect of it but I think one should recognize that it is an attraction to many tourists and, as he does indicate, he was surprised to learn about the amount of work that's provided to a number of people that are involved in the care and the raising and the racing of horses. And of course he didn't mention this in his figures but I assume there's also quite a bit of work provided for those people who are involved in the gambling aspect of this industry, and there was of course revenue to the province. All of these seem to be favourable and advantageous arguments in favour of the industry and therefore the growth of the industry.

Well, of course he also said that the main reason for running these operations is the testing of the horses, and I have yet to understand the purpose for which one tests horses. Does one raise racing horses in order to test whether or not they will be good in a race? And just when is the test and when is the result? When is the attempt to ascertain the progress one has made in raising the horse and when do we reach the stage to say, "Well now, this horse has been tested and now may race." And of course this is an awful lot of nonsense and I think we should see it as much.

Of course, it is known as the Sport of Kings, and I'm assuming at a time when kings had all the money they could possibly use it was a pastime they had where they would breed horses for racing, or possibly for tournaments when they would joust up and down the plains of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . England with spears and armour mounted on these horses. But let's be a little more realistic and recognize that this entire Sport of Kings is based entirely on gambling and that it could not exist without gambling, and I think that's true. And if it were a matter of testing, I'm sure that horses are tested daily on private race tracks and would not need to have an extension of days in order to improve the testing abilities of the owners.

I have always been opposed to gambling; I think it was something that was instilled in me at a very early age. I have seen marriage breakdown. I've seen neglect of children. I have seen destruction of human dignity as a result of gambling. There are too many who can't afford to gamble who are involved in it, mainly because they are the ones to whom the dreams of a windfall are so attractive. The wealthy man who gambles as a pastime is playing with something that is not too real to him, or the poor man of course who limits his gambling to something that he can afford to lose, is a person to whom this is a pastime and often is involved with games of skill which are a test for himself. I think horse racing actually is one of the lesser forms of gambling in that the skill involved on the part of the gambler is very remote and usually relies on remembering his telephone number, or his great grandmother's age, or his licence number, or all these various very important manners in which one decides how to gamble on a horse race.

Nevertheless, we find that there are a large number of people who are prepared to go to a race track and bet money, and who ought to know but maybe -- well I would say apparently don't know, that out of every dollar they gamble some 20 cents is taken away first, both by the government and the operators of the track or the testing arena, if I might coin a word for the benefit of the Honourable Member for St. James, and that should they win, then the money that they invest again in gambling, again gets 20 percent taken out of it, and their winnings are reduced as they go on with their gambling. Of course, if they lose initially then they have a complete loss and that's the end of it, but the fact is that the odds are against them, they're wagered against them, and yet people do gamble. I would like to think that the people who are sponsoring this bill will see to it that at the entrance to the race track there is an archway over which there shall be a sign saying, "Through these portals pass suckers". I would like to see that over the gambling wickets where one pays in the money and hopes to draw out more, that there be a sign saying, "You are about to make a sucker bet." I think that's legitimate. We talk about unconscionable transactions and we talk about truth in lending and truth to the consumer, and the truth is that any bet that's made of this nature is a sucker bet because it is a bet made against odds at all times. But now I'm becoming older, more mature and more realistic, Mr. Speaker, and . . .

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): More Conservative.

MR. CHERNIACK: More conservative. Well, in the sense -- the Honourable Minister of Education is suggesting that I'm becoming more conservative. In the things that count I believe I've always been conservative, with a small 'c', and one which means care and caution, but to the extent that the reactionary elements of the Conservative Party with a capital 'C' is concerned, I'm happy to say that my association with members of that party has only taught me to be less Conservative with a capital 'C' and more aware of the needs of the people of the world, and more particularly of this province, to let me fall into the trap of agreeing with the Honourable Minister of Education.

Now that I've been distracted I want to come back to what I was about to say, and that is that I have now come to recognize the fact that you cannot by legislation, by restrictive legislation, control this gambler's instinct. By education there should be a strong effort made to make people aware of the fact that if they would gamble they should realize that usually they will lose, that the odds are against them in any form of gambling, even government-controlled, which it is in this case, but of course much less so when one is out in the open market and permits himself to be drawn into professional gambling endeavours. But the fact is that it has proven impossible to legislate against gambling. Any game one goes to, any baseball game, one can find his neighbours betting on the next pitch. It seems to be an instinct that many people have. I'm happy that that's one instinct that I haven't acquired but it is something that has happened and in this sport of kings where the government has entered into the field of participating and gambling both as to revenue and as to control, the purpose of course was, aside from the revenue, to protect against racketeers and protect against false and fixed odds and fixed races.

Well, I think that in recognizing this, we've already done this, I don't know that the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd), . . . extension of racing days makes it any worse. I see that the Honourable Member for St. James is shaking his head it doesn't make it worse. It certainly doesn't make it better, but the fact is that we're into it and it should be either in or out, it seems to me. There's no motion before us yet that we get rid of it all and if there is then I'm going to decide then how to vote, and I'm not even sure yet; if there's no more debate I may well vote for the bill in order to bring it into second reading and hear people on both sides to come and speak to us as they did on the liquor question so that I could form a more intelligent opinion on this matter, but possibly there will be other speakers today who will persuade me that by keeping the number of days down to its present, we would control the gambling, which, I again repeat, I don't agree with.

But let me suggest to the Honourable Member for St. James and to all others who are in favour of this form of an industry in the province, that we should, having accepted this principle, we should accept the concept of government-sponsored and controlled gambling and not limit it only to a certain number of days, and not necessarily limit it to this device of testing, the raising of horses. The point has been made before that we should go into sweepstakes - government sweepstakes to pay for health. To me this is a completely immoral approach; it starts from the gambling aspect. I think that people should be charged taxes and know that they're paying taxes for a particular purpose which is necessary and important and which they support. I don't believe that one should obtain revenue for government out of these side methods of getting some percentage out of the gambling instinct or something of that nature. Therefore, I don't really accept this portion of the revenue of the province that it gets from horse racing as being a morally correct one. But again I shrug my shoulders and say, well if that's the way it's going to be how about this question of government-operated sweepstakes so that citizens of Manitoba will have an honest dream of windfalls, that they will be able to say, "Well at least with the government controlling it there's the least amount of fixed odds in it or of graft."

If it is monetary gain that our people want without putting any effort into it, without making any positive contribution to society but just throwing a few dollars into a pot and hoping to come out the winner of the grand return, then are you prepared to consider sweepstakes? And once we accept the principle of horseracing and sweepstakes, and if we're talking of an industry and a tourist promotion, should we not consider government-operated gambling casinos? Because that's the same thing really. It gives a person an opportunity to bet a buck and hope to make many more, and would this be inconsistent with the policy of continued operation of horseracing? The benefits are clear, the same as were previously indicated: tourist promotion, industry, giving employment, revenue to the province, giving the gambler a legal and supervised field for his desires. Am I being inconsistent in relating one with the other? If I'm inconsistent I'd like to be told in what way I am inconsistent, and if I am consistent then I'm asking members of this House how far do they want to go in the field, in the endeavour in which they have already been involved for so many years?

I'm looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to hearing the discussion at the committee level, and indeed in the House level if there will be any, and speaking as I do for myself alone, unless somebody changes my mind before the vote is called, I propose to vote for the bill just to hear what is going to be discussed in committee because I think this is a pretty basic and moral issue which I would like to hear developed both on a Conservative viewpoint as well as that of a Liberal one.

MR. LYON: I'm presuming that he is aware, in fact I know he is aware, that all of these forms of gambling about which he speaks; horseracing, gambling casinos - what was the other? sweepstakes and so on, these are all matters, are they not, of federal jurisdiction, and this province has no jurisdiction, this Legislature has no jurisdiction over legalizing any form of gambling at all.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I would point out to the Honourable Minister that there have been many resolutions of this House directed to Ottawa asking for various changes. I'm fully aware of the fact that the Minister himself has supported some of these, and having the position that he holds I'm sure that he knows the manner by which Attorney-General can discuss with the federal legislative authorities manners in which laws can be changed on a federal basis to carry out provincial endeavours, so that I find it a little unusual for me to be telling the Honourable the Attorney-General how he can go out to carry out that which he thinks is important to him.

MR. LYON: I thank my honourable friend for his answer. Would he permit another

(MR. LYON cont'd).... question? The speech that he made, then, would he not agree would be better directed to the federal House of Commons rather than to this Legislature?

MR. CHERNIACK: Could I answer that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: ... get along with the business of the House. I believe the Honourable Member for St. John's has made his point and he's had a few words with the Attorney-General. Surely that would satisfy the situation for today.

MR. CHERNIACK: I was asked a question, Mr. Speaker, I should answer it.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. CHERNIACK: The question was that I take this matter to the House of Commons and I want to tell the Honourable the Attorney-General I can still learn a little from him and I intend to stay here for another short while until I learn all I can from him and then I'll consider other forums.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, like my honourable friend the Member for St. James, I do not attend the races either and so I don't know too much about it, but I have some very good friends who own very good horses and I'm sure that they would be in favour of the bill, but one of the objections that they raise is this: they tell me that in Manitoba on the pari-mutuels that on \$100.00 collected, the track and the Dominion Government take \$6.00 and the province take \$10.00 for a total of \$16.00, and that every other province in the Dominion of Canada takes only 5 percent or \$5.00 out of a hundred, and that this applies to every state in the Union. And I'm wondering whether or not we should take a look at this. They argue that it is a pretty important issue. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend has estimated the additional revenue to the province by granting the extension that is proposed in the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, some of the technical questions I cannot answer and I would suggest that perhaps they be referred to an expert at the committee stage. I would like to thank members for their contributions. I just wanted to correct something I omitted to say, or say something I omitted to say, Mr. Speaker, and that is the extension of the flat racing I am assured will in no way affect the harness racing. The harness racing at the moment is subsidized by those of the flat racing and it is their intention in no way to reduce this amount but rather to increase it. I think there was some doubt and I meant to mention it when I introduced the bill, Mr. Speaker, but this affects flat racing and the extension of flat racing will not in any way curtail the amount of harness racing.

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood) presented Bill No. 107, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the present Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, which was drawn up in 1960, expressly forbids a member of Metro Council to stand for nomination for the Legislature or for the House of Commons, and it is my intention by bringing in this bill that that should be corrected so that a person who sits on Metro Council will be able to accept a nomination for the Legislature or the House of Commons without resigning his seat, and then if that person is successful in election that they should be able to then -- however, the person -- I'd better explain this again. The person would not have to resign his seat unless he were elected.

The present law says that as soon as you accept nomination you must automatically leave Council, and I think that this is unnecessarily restrictive, that a person should have the greatest possible freedom, if he's a Metro Councillor, to run at a so-called higher level, and that if he is successful that in that event he will not be able to carry on his duties as a Metro Councillor and therefore would have to resign his seat. I think that the present situation again creates unnecessary by-elections where a Metro Councillor may wish to try for the Legislature or the House of Commons, and in the event that he is unsuccessful he then holds neither seat, in which case there would be a by-election for the seat he left; in some cases the individual would go back and re-win his original seat, which would in a sense be a wasted exercise on the part of the voters and of himself. In other cases he may be somewhat embarrassed by the lack of success on his part and may decide therefore not to run, and may either retire from politics or run later on. I just feel that a person should not have to, in general, resign a seat he holds, either in general or else not resign unless he is successful in another level.

Some members of the Legislature are fortunate in the sense that they are able to hold

(MR. DOERN cont'd).... municipal office. We have at least one or more school trustees and there are several mayors in this House who are able to combine their duties. I think that it would be a little much to expect a Metro Councillor to be active on council which is quite onerous, and at the same time sit in this House. I think that if he won election to this Assembly he should therefore resign his Metro seat, but I think a Metro Councillor should have the right to stand for office without losing his seat and then if he is elected, and only then, would he resign his seat. So I urge the members of this Legislature to give consideration to this bill and I hope that they will support it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 64, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter 1956 (2), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, one amendment in this bill provides, for the purpose of providing public recreational facilities, the City may enter into an agreement with the Winnipeg School Division for the provision of any facilities to be used jointly by the City and the Division for recreational purposes. Another amendment provides that citizen members of the Traffic Commission shall be appointed by the Council instead of by the Commission as at present, and that the chairman of the Commission shall be appointed by Council from amongst the members of Council appointed to the Commission.

Another amendment will enable Council to take away the voting rights of paid civic officials who are members of the Commission, and when the bill goes to Law Amendments Committee it is proposed that three more amendments be made to the City Charter, which all arise by virtue of other bills that have come before this House at this session.

The first item has to do with a change in the value of property which may be the subject of a mailing notice in the tax bill application. This corresponds to a change being made in the Real Property Act so that mailing notices may be given where property is assessed at \$2,000 or less, instead of \$1,000 or less as at present. The second amendment provides that \$1.00 will be the charge for a tax certificate instead of 50 cents. A third amendment provides that if an accident is due to a sign, under the proposed change to the Limitation of Actions Act which has been given second reading by this House, the period of limitation for damages arising from an accident resulting from a sign, the proposed change is from a six months period to a two-year period in which action may be taken. The proposed amendment will require notice of a claim to be given within seven days of the occurrence of the act giving rise to the claim. However, where a person injured dies, the want of a notice is not a bar to an action. An amendment will also provide that in other cases the want, lateness or insufficiency of notice would not be a bar to an action if a judge considered that there was reasonable excuse for the want, lateness or insufficiency of the notice, and if the defendant would not be prejudiced in the defence of the action by the want, lateness or insufficiency of the notice.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to oppose the bill but I would like to know from the mover of the bill whether this bill has the approval of City Council, and is it the unanimous approval of City Council or is it the minority, or does it come from other sources? Because earlier this week in the Committee of Law Amendments we had a bill before us to amend the Winnipeg Charter and we had one of the aldermen of the City get up in front of that committee and tell us that he did not know where the bill came from, that as far as he knew there had been no decision by Council to request this bill of the House and it seems -- I suppose that anyone who wants to present a bill can do so but it seems to me that if we are to consider a bill to amend the Charter I would like to know the origin of the bill, who in fact is asking us to do this. Is it the City Council or is it a private individual? If it's a council matter, then I think that I would be prepared to look upon it more favourably than if it is like the other bill which was before us just a few days ago. Now I would hope that the member can tell us about this and also, when we reach the committee stage, that there will be members of Council there to speak on the matter.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the items in the other bill were also brought to the House by virtue of decisions of the City Council, and again, the amendments proposed in this bill are brought to this House because of decisions by the City Council. At the Law Amendments Committee we will have the Solicitor from the City of Winnipeg.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 116, An Act respecting The City of Winnipeg and the Young Women's Christian Association of Winnipeg, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the YWCA have now started construction of a new building in Winnipeg which provides for living accommodation for quite a number of young ladies as well as other facilities, but without the passage of this bill they have not the funds with which to construct a swimming pool to part of the building and to be used in connection with the building. The YWCA are quite anxious to have the swimming pool constructed now because it will mean a saving of cost if it is constructed at the same time as the rest of the building, and because building costs seem to go up year after year it will also mean a saving in cost if they can get ahead with the building now. The City of Winnipeg have agreed to give the YWCA, for the purpose of constructing the swimming pool, \$180,000 payable \$30,000 a year for a period of six years. For this, the YWCA have agreed that the swimming pool will be available for public use for 30 hours per week during July and August, and for 20 hours per week during the rest of the year, and the public will have the use of the swimming pool for these periods each year for 20 years.

At present, the City of Winnipeg operates a swimming pool known as the Sherbrook Pool, and after all the revenues it costs the taxpayers of Winnipeg \$30.00 a year to operate, so that the City Council consider that this is a very good deal as far as the public of Winnipeg are concerned because the swimming pool and the building will be operated by the YWCA at no cost to the city other than this gift of \$180,000 which they will make over the next six years.

When this matter came to Council there was no recorded vote, so as far as the records of the city are concerned, this proposed agreement was approved unanimously.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I have many reservations about the matter of principle and wisdom. However, I think out of courtesy on these bills I will support it to go to second reading, in order that we may ask City Council their opinion on these various subjects I have in mind.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, I would like to say a few words on this bill. Last year, at the very end of the session, we were involved in some problems with this matter of the YWCA and with government support for their development, and there were some differences of opinion at that time between the Minister of Municipal Affairs today and the Premier as to the assistance to be given. I was one of those who felt that the government should proceed and give the assurance to the group that was required, and permit Metro, who were going to assist them, to go ahead with their plans. It appears now that the City of Winnipeg and the YWCA have reached an agreement here which I certainly rise to support, not to object to, because this, I presume, has the complete approval of both groups and merely requires our assent.

I note, however, that the schedule for public swimming is included here as a portion of the act, and I presume that this is again the agreement of both groups, and, if this is the way they want it I am not going to oppose that, but I wonder if it wouldn't suit their convenience as well not to have this as a portion of the act, but to have this as an understanding by letter or by agreement between the YWCA and the City of Winnipeg, because I fear that if this is going to become a portion of the act, that assuming both groups wanted to make a change in this after a few months operation, and that this happened to come a short time after the House rose, they would be tied to the schedule for virtually a full year before any change could be made. I can quite understand that the City would want to have an assurance, if they are putting money into what is in effect not a city building but a building owned by others, that they would have the facilities, but it might be suggested to them that they might consider this before we reach committee stage, whether they could not have another means of having this assurance without getting it part of the act, which would tie their hands. I note too that at the back of the schedule, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be some mistake where we show total hours as being 1,173 hours per week. I trust that this is only a typographical error in the bill and will be changed. There might be some problems in enforcing that part of it, so I merely make this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, so that the mover of the bill might, if this has not been considered, check it with both groups and I intend to support the bill on second reading.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I think that's a very good suggestion and that I'll certainly see what can be done about the question of the schedule being changed or being removed, so that it wouldn't have to come to the Legislature every time they wanted to change the schedule.

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

MR. LYON: ... move to Page 8, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Member for St. George will not be here this afternoon and actually he had adjourned this for me in my absence, and I wonder if the House would agree to have me proceed now. Now this would mean I would close the debate. If there are any others who wish to speak, I have no objections. Well then, if there are no objections, Mr. Speaker, I will close the debate on this resolution.

As I mentioned on the introduction of the resolution, it is one that has been before us on numerous occasions in the past and has been turned down by the government on every occasion in the past. The determination of the government appears to be weakening a bit, I might say. In the past, the Attorney-General usually became involved in the debate at one stage or another to tell us that an Auditor-General was not required. On some occasions the Premier himself felt it necessary that he oppose it. I note this time that neither of the two gentlemen have become involved in the debate and it rested upon the shoulders of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre to voice the government's opposition to it. So it seems to me that bit by bit the government's determination is being ground down and that possibly next year we may even get the resolution passed since we are only down now to one member on the government side speaking on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, quite seriously, I think that the proposal that we are making here is a useful one for the Province of Manitoba. The arguments have been repeated on many occasions and I don't think it's necessary for me to go over them again in detail. I reject the statements of the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre when he says that the job is now presently being done by the Comptroller-General. That is not the job of the Comptroller-General in the Province of Manitoba. The facts are that we do not receive from the Comptroller-General of the Province of Manitoba the type of reports that the House in Ottawa receives from the Auditor-General. The contact of this House with the Comptroller-General is at the Public Accounts Committee, and the Public Accounts Committee, we see him there, we are entitled to ask question; he verifies that the figures that come to us from the Public Accounts are correct; if we need additional information he gives it to us. But it is not correct to say or even to suggest that it is the job of the Comptroller-General here to examine on the manner in which government departments conduct their work. That is clearly not his responsibility. His responsibility - and I submit that he does that responsibility quite well, and I'm not suggesting that he should be changed or there's no criticism stated or implied in what I say about the job that he is set up to do - his job is to see to it that the appropriations which are passed by this House are in fact spent in the way that House intended them to be spent, and that the appropriations are not switched from one department to another; that there's no overspending; and that the financial aspects of it are followed according to the decisions of the House. But there's a far cry, Mr. Speaker, between that function and the function performed by the Auditor-General in Ottawa, which is to analyze whether or not the funds have been properly spent, whether or not there has been any waste, any inefficiency, any mismanagement. Surely this is what the Auditor-General in Ottawa does.

Now I know that the work of the Auditor-General is not pleasant for the government, as a rule, because he does uncover a number of events during the course of the year which should not happen, and he comments on them quite forcibly in his report. But Mr. Speaker, this is his function and in doing that he is performing a very useful function for the House of Commons and for the people of Canada, because if there wasn't that watchdog, then how much more would be going on, Mr. Speaker, if there wasn't the knowledge that there is someone who will be verifying as to the extent of the expenditures? When we look at what he does find, what would happen if there were no Auditor-General? I submit there would be even less care and less concern about the way in which the money is spent.

Mr. Speaker, we repeat here in this House on many occasions how government expenditure is going up and going up, and we need only look at our own experience here where in the period of some 10 years our budget has moved from about \$80 million to a present budget of about \$350 million, and that's not taking into consideration capital expenditures which are tremendous as well when you consider our public utilities like hydro and telephones. When you look at the increase in these expenditures and the fact that we have to turn around and tax our people for them when this House - over our objections, I agree - but nevertheless, this

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... government at this session has passed a bill to impose a five percent sales tax on the people of Manitoba; when a lot of those people who will be paying that tax, Mr. Speaker, barely have enough to make a living on; when we are going to be taxing a lot of people who really cannot afford to pay this additional tax; then I think that there's a responsibility of the members of this House and on the government to ensure, as far as possible, that every cent of that money is properly spent, that every step is taken to ensure that the public is getting value for its dollars; that there isn't a five-cent piece improperly spent; that we are not taxing our people any more than we need to to accomplish the responsibilities of government. And surely an Auditor-General in the Province of Manitoba would perform that sort of a function. Surely the statement that he makes about the various departments in Ottawa that he studies are an assist to the government itself, to begin with, to make the necessary changes in its administration. Surely they are an assurance to the public of Canada that someone is paying attention and studying this.

The Member from Winnipeg Centre says, well, nothing happens on the report of the Auditor-General. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I can prove that every one of his recommendations has been acted upon but certainly, Mr. Speaker, a report like this one, put in the hands of a body like the House of Commons, puts the members of that House in a position where they can insist that government follow proper procedures. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, if the members of this House were supplied each year with a report of a similar nature as that of the Auditor-General. Would not my honourable friend the Member from Winnipeg Centre be one of the first to get up and say to the government: Correct these things. I'm sure he wouldn't even wait for the Opposition to do it. I'm sure that the government members themselves would be the first to say, "If these things are happening, then let's get them corrected."

I'm satisfied that the individual members over there are concerned about this themselves and they would want this to happen, and if it ever should happen, Mr. Speaker, that the government members didn't want to do it, well surely there's no hesitation in the mind of my honourable friend that the members on this side of the House wouldn't be insisting that the government take action. Surely he doesn't think for one moment that we would be sitting by, year by year, and letting a report clearly indicate cases of waste and extravagance, and sit here and say nothing about it and let the government proceed.

Now this, Mr. Speaker, isn't a particular criticism of this government. I want to make that very clear. Not of this government. And surely I said that in my introductory comments to the resolution, because I pointed out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that over the years the Auditor-General's report had shown these weaknesses in government, regardless of what party was in power, and I deliberately read from clippings going back over a period of some 12 years to make it absolutely clear that this was not a partisan question, and I'm not putting it forward now as a criticism of this government. I have criticism of this government; I'm not afraid to voice it; but this particular resolution is not one designed to be critical of the government. It's one designed to promote efficiency in government regardless of what party is in power; one designed to ensure that the public has a protection, which I think it requires regardless of which party is in power. So I would like my honourable friends to get it out of their minds that this is a partisan question or that it's aimed at them. Quite obviously it will always be more embarrassing to the government than it will be to the Opposition, because the government is the one that's administering at the time. But quite obviously too, Mr. Speaker, the government has an even greater responsibility to ensure efficiency, to ensure proper management, so it would be to their advantage to have this rather than to appear, as they do now, to be afraid to have such a body.

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions that in any large business, be it a private corporation, be it a public corporation, that there are bound to be areas of waste and extravagance. I submit that there have been far more with this administration. This I have no illusions about, and I have given many indications in the past of that. But be that as it may, all large corporations are bound to suffer from this because of the involved procedures, the fact that there's a very large staff; the fact that management sometimes get remote from the people who work, and so on and it's recognized in business that this is a proper and sound manner of proceeding. Many businesses in fact make it a point to bring in business consultants at various times, to hire outside firms to come and make an analysis of their operation, to recommend to them where improvements should be made and so on. This the Auditor-General does. He does this on a composite basis, year by year. He, by the fact that he is a permanent employee, not responsible to the government but responsible to the House, he's in a position to follow through

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . year by year the practices and to see to it that the changes are made as he recommends.

And so Mr. Speaker, I say to the government members, get it out of your mind that it's a partisan question. Look at it as a question of what's good for the people of Manitoba. Look at it as to whether or not you can conscientiously vote as you did last week for a five percent sales tax and then turn around this week and oppose the appointment of an officer to ensure that that five percent sales tax is properly spent. Get it out of your mind that this will be a costly procedure. On the contrary, it will pay for itself many times over. It will save money for the people of Manitoba. Think clearly now when you make your decision this afternoon on this matter, that this is the way, or one of the ways, in which you can ensure that when you support increases in taxation, as you have done, you are also saying to the people of Manitoba, "But I support as well an analysis to make sure that that taxation is turned into the best results for the people of this province."

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the nays have it.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. For the benefit of those honourable members who might have been out of the House, we're dealing with the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition at the top of Page 8.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs: Baizley, Beard, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

. continued on next page

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief since there's nothing that I can add to what my colleague from Selkirk has said on this resolution and amendment already and I just wish to agree with him in what he has said.

I feel that the employer not only has the right but he must assist the Board to determine the appropriate bargaining unit and to determine that the majority of such people selecting such unit to be the bargaining agent and with the amendment that's been proposed it says "that the employer's right to provide." I think that it's not his right, it's "he shall provide." I think it's his right and his duty. And if we turn to Page 998 in Hansard I think the Honourable Member for Selkirk explains it quite clearly that the purpose of the employer appearing before the board is to submit to the board a list of employees which is private as far as the board is concerned and if he has any objection to any employees that are being included in the bargaining agreement, any employees who occupy a managerial position or supervisory position; and the second point is the right to object to whether or no a bargaining unit is the appropriate one. I think those two are the most important things in this resolution.

I think that on application for certification the Labour Board has to decide these two questions: first whether the union seeking certification has a majority in good standing of employees; and the second point, whether the unit is appropriate for the collective bargaining. So I feel because in those two instances the employer has to deal with a bargaining agent, in fact the bargaining agent is the only representative of the employees with whom he can deal. For example, if there is more than one shop in the city - I think you can't have one shop in the unit and not have maybe three or four of the other shops in - the employees of the other shops also in the same unit, so I think it's most important that the employer is and does appear before the board; so I cannot see how I could support the amendment and the resolution.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of all concerned, we are dealing with the amendment to the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster in the middle of Page 8.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Miller, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 39.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing debate if I speak. I'd like to have the matter stand with the indulgence of the members, but if anybody -- unless somebody else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, again the same matter applies here. The Honourable Member for St. George is absent. He had adjourned this for me. If there are no objections I am prepared to speak at this time. If others want to speak first I have no objections at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on the sub-amendment to this resolution and spoken in favour of it. I rise now to support the resolution although I have some hesitations as to what the government is doing. For one thing they have in my opinion removed completely the original resolution which I intended to support and by the amendment have taken that resolution out completely which I regret to see. I would have preferred if a study is required that it not rule out the original resolution as introduced by the Member from Logan constituency. However the resolution itself I think is - or the amendment itself is a good one provided that this isn't going to be used by the government as a method by which to do nothing. This is what I mean when I say that I have reservations on it, Mr. Speaker, because I have noted in the past that

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) this government when it has a problem is very keen on sending this problem to a committee and then let the committee worry about it. Maybe if you wait long enough and stall long enough the problem disappears and we may never have to deal with it; and if this is the purpose of the resolution then I'm certainly not prepared to support it; but if this is a genuine attempt to look into this question - and I agree that the question does bear study - then I am prepared to support it provided that action will result from the hearings of that committee. -- (Interjection) -- How will we know? Well that's a very good question I agree. We cannot guarantee at this stage that it will but we will have another session a year from now and if there is no action then, then I certainly will not be prepared to support any extension of such study.

I note that the Federal Government have introduced such a study in Ottawa on a national basis and I trust that we will be living up to the conclusion of this amendment where it says that it is desirable to co-operate with the Federal Royal Commission because there would be no sense obviously in duplicating the two points.

I would hope that from a provincial standpoint we would be looking at some of the areas where there is a particular need in the Province of Manitoba for the assistance of women. I mentioned previously, for example in the field of nursing, the field of teaching, where there are many women now not actively engaged in these professions and yet trained for them, there's a desperate need here in this specific field for action. I think there's a very definite need for a change in our approaches to training and retraining, particularly in the case again of women who may have had some training years ago and now want to get back into the working field; we should have retraining courses established specifically to suit their particular convenience. By that I mean that if they are housewives instead of having full day courses and courses that last say a period of six months all day that we should be prepared to change our courses in those cases and say have mornings only so that they can continue with their family work during the course of the afternoon; or evening courses or whatever is required to make sure that we can fit them back without disrupting completely the home structure. I think that this would apply to nursing, to teachers, to specific areas of training such as homemakers' courses, nursery school courses, kindergarten courses and so on, and that this can be done by proper adjustment of our courses. I am sure the Department of Education could work some of these matters out. I think similarly from a university standpoint, not simply really on the matter of women, but for many other people who may be working in the day time, or part days, that we can adjust our courses again to make our training facilities fit the needs of the people that we want to retrain without having to force them into the type of pattern that we have normally accepted, of courses full time over a period of six months in the case of university or a full year in the case of say nursing. These are areas where there's in my opinion some very immediate need because of the needs of the Province of Manitoba for trained people.

Now I recognize that this resolution goes far beyond that. On the notice or Votes and Proceedings you will find as well, Mr. Speaker, Notice of Motion by my colleague the Honourable Member for Selkirk constituency which deals not directly with the matters here before us but with some that are associated with it, again on the matter of women's rights, and I would hope that that resolution will receive consideration as well. The group of women called "Minus One" or "Women Alone" who met I think with all the groups of the House recently presented a brief to each caucus, I think showed to the members some very definite areas where this particular group have problems and where action can be taken by the government without any great cost simply by making a decision and it would assist materially these families and the children in them. I would think that in those briefs presented to us there will be many other areas not included in the motion by my colleague, but areas that could be studied by this committee. So I think that from the standpoint of the women themselves, the welfare of the Province of Manitoba, that this study can perform a useful function. But it can only do that, Mr. Speaker, if the determination of the government is in fact to proceed, to proceed and come out with recommendations and not to shelve the matter and send it to a committee where hopefully it will die. If that is the intention, then it's a sheer waste of time. There is a job to be done here. I hope that the government in setting up the committee will be very careful in its choice of personnel. I would hope that the criticism that we have made in the past from this side, that the personnel has been chosen on a political basis rather than on an ability basis, will not need to be repeated in the case of this commission. I think it is too important. I think that their recommendations can have a very long-lasting effect on the development of our province and should be taken seriously. And with those provisos I am prepared to support the resolution, Mr. Chairman,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) but I make it very clear that only if this means action by the government and not delay.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was brought up originally on day nurseries it went back and forth on the floor and was debated very thoroughly, I thought very well - they gave their opinions out here - and it was called a socialistic bill, and it was called this and was called that. That was fine. Everybody gave their opinion. I was glad to see that. Then we come out and the First Minister brought in this amendment which as the Press said, killed with kindness the day nursery resolution. That was all right too; that was still his privilege. But I say when this was brought in, when this was put in here to be brought up in the House, it was on December 6th and this thing had been cooking in Ottawa for a long while and one of our members had been pushing for the status of women, all the way through - Mrs. Grace McInnes. Now this thing was brought up by the government on February 4th down in Ottawa and it was announced by the Premier in which he was informing the House of what he was bringing in for the status of women. I won't go into too much detail but I would speak on what our Leader said in the House of Commons: "I hope the terms of reference will spell out in particular the problems of working women and working mothers, the whole problem of nursery schools, the problem of women who have to hire baby-sitters and housekeepers and to enact laws enabling them to charge this as an income tax deduction. There are a great many problems in our modern society which women have to face today which were not common 10 or 20 years ago. I hope the term of reference will be wide enough to allow a full investigation into the problems which confront modern working women in order that they may have fair treatment, equal to that of men in our society. May I say to the Prime Minister that the selection of the personnel of this commission is extremely important and I hope the government will keep in mind not only the professional women and business executives but also the membership on the commission of women who understand the point of view of women in the labour force and particularly the problems which confront them at this time." That was our Leader, the Honourable Tommy Douglas.

I go here not to the Social Credit who was their Leader at that particular time, R. N. Thompson, Red Deer. He was all in favour of it too. There's only one man that I don't see there and that was the Leader of the Conservative Party; he's quiet on that. That's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would give us the date of that particular Hansard for the record.

MR. HARRIS: Friday, February 3, 1967.

Now I'd like to go back to our resolution on day nurseries just to carry on. I go down to the resolved part: "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government consider the advisability of establishing public day nurseries in communities where the demand for such services warrants such action." I don't mind anybody bringing in an amendment; I would be all in favour of anything like that; but, is it going to be in the sweet bye-and-bye? We want it now; we don't want it five years from now when the thing has gone - not gone past - it's getting worse every day. We want it right now. That was what we were asking for. We just asked for day nurseries. All this stuff that's coming in is coming in from Ottawa. We know it's going to come, just like the pension plan's going to come. Just like the guaranteed income is coming right now. It's all coming. I can wait for this too. I know it's coming. But I say, on this thing here we know all about these women; we've been in contact with some of these women that were with us there the other day and we sympathize very much with their cause, but I will say, Mr. Speaker, in the future when people look back on the last half of the 20th century they will probably realize that it was a very trying time to be a woman. In the days of the suffragettes at least women had something tangible to fight for and something concrete to point to when they had won their first victories, but today's woman is confronted with a different kind of dilemma. Her problem is one of adaption, of taking her place in a society where lip service is paid to the equality of women and where prejudice and resentment and refusal to consider the need of modern woman still makes life extremely difficult.

This whole problem was brought into the news recently by the announcement of a Committee of Status of Women from Ottawa to look into such things as discriminatory laws and illogical taxation concerning women in Canada. Most thinking men and women believe that the whole question of women in the 60's ought to be examined very carefully indeed, although of course we will always have the few die-hards who refuse to acknowledge the economic facts of life and

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) who will continue to insist that the woman's place is in the home. It is easy to slip into the belief that women are in fact accepted in our society as being equal to men. Yes, we have women MPs; we have two charming women MLAs in this Chamber, and it just shows to you what can be done when the women go out into the world. But if they are tied down, and actually in this world today a woman has to go out in the world more or less to supplement the home life and lots of time she has to be the sole breadwinner. When I think of these things, it makes me often wonder what kind of a world this is. The man, he just thinks that woman is woman and that's all to it; but there's more to it today. You go into any country of the world - I've heard of people talking here about Russia, how the women work in Russia. You don't have to go to Russia. You go right here in Canada and see how many women are working. Never mind pointing the finger at Russia or China or any other country in the world. Take a look at your own country, never mind any other country.

Yes, we have women mayors and many women in other spheres of public life; we have women doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, all fields which were considered to be the preserves of men only 50 years ago; but the fact remains that for a woman to become a doctor, lawyer, teacher or clerk, she has to juggle other parts of her life in order to cope with her responsibilities. If all the women in these fields were single then it would make some sense to treat them equally with men. However, more than half the women working in Canada today are married women and of these the largest group consist of women between the ages of 25 and 34, the years when most of them are coping with births and upbringing of their families. Of course, they need and are entitled to equal job opportunities with men, income tax legislation that does not discriminate against them and equal status in the eyes of the law, but they need more than that; they need to be recognized as different from men, with different needs and special problems. In some ways women themselves are to blame for the lack of progress made in such areas as the provision of adequate day care facilities, to name just one of the long standing problems facing the working woman. Many women are reluctant to discuss the arrangements they have made for their children's care. They are so eager to be accepted by the world of business as being equal to men that their domestic life becomes something that has to be kept in the background, hidden from the eyes of the competitive working world. But strictly speaking the whole ideal of women's equality is a myth when it is based on the premise that they are the same as men. If women are to continue to carry on their traditional roles as wives and mothers - and heaven help us if they are not - then it's time we stopped pretending that they are set out for work on the same basis as men. If getting a job is compared to a race, then women are handicapped right from the start by the ties of their traditional rules and any militant female who refuses to acknowledge this sets a woman's search for the same kind of work-equality back in the dark ages.

Of course there are single women who don't need any special consideration, but it is still in their interest to insist on the kind of atmosphere in our society that makes it possible for the married women with responsibilities to work outside the home. Today's single woman may be tomorrow's married woman and then she will reap the benefits she helped to bring about. It is embarrassing for any writer interested in the problem of working women to keep reiterating the special need of women. The same things have been said so many times that it is humiliating to have to keep on repeating them, especially when you consider that practically nothing seems to get done about them. They need adequate legislation to ensure maternity leave and benefits; they need income tax concessions to enable them to claim for the help that they might be able to find for their homes. They need many many creches and day nurseries. In my opinion the provision of some of these basic facilities will help to remove some of the taboos that keep them out of top management and business jobs. If their affairs were better managed in the domestic field, they would be better risks in the business world. Our whole approach to women at work needs bringing up to date. Why can't we have luncheon facilities in our public schools? In a country like Canada, with its long severe winters, they need school lunches for all children, not only those of working mothers who have a special problem coping with broken up school days. Why can't our school buildings be used for keeping the children of working mothers off the street until their parents get home. Come to think of it, why can't our school and business hours be shuffled about a bit so that they more nearly coincide. We have a whole generation of older women who didn't have the educational opportunities available for women today. Why can't we use these women as housekeepers, supervisors, lunchroom attendants. We do need something done for women, not just on women as workers, we need a study of women as women; women as they really are, trying to fill all the roles that society casts

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) for them, for if we do something like that, maybe, just maybe, we might make a start in being really progressive in what is at present a pretence of equality.

Women fill 37 percent of medical research jobs in Soviet Russia - 37 percent - so you can see, when people talk, they point fingers at other countries - these people are not working on little jobs; they have gone out into the field these women and they are doing jobs that maybe some men can't cope with, but these women are doing it and you go into some of these factories, it's not the men that can do the job; some of these jobs are so fine it's only the women that can do the jobs; and I'm telling you it's time we woke up in this country and found out what is going on. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs)(Cypress): I wish to adjourn the debate. If the honourable member wishes to speak he may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I think I'll let the Minister of Municipal Affairs take the adjournment.

MRS. FORBES: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable member appreciates, I believe the Minister said that she was going to close the debate when she spoke. -- (Interjection) --

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, this resolution originally called for the establishment of community colleges and in speaking on the resolution and in moving his amendment the Member for Emerson unfortunately, and in my opinion, has pretty well defeated the original purpose of the motion itself; although he speaks in the spirit of it he ends up coming with suggestions that I think in fact would lead us absolutely nowhere.

I think it is necessary for Manitoba to recognize what is happening in Manitoba and why we aren't doing the job that we should be doing. We keep talking about the fact that standards in education have changed; we all recognize it; and all we have to do is look about us to see that this is so. It isn't many years ago that - and many people here probably remember this - that it wasn't uncommon for children to leave school in Grade 8 or 9, this would be the completion of their education; but today completing high school is taken for granted. There are billboards pointing at the children on the street saying, "Finish your education." But the question is - what then? Should the completion of a high school course irrespective of whether it be general or the matriculation or commercial or vocational - is that hardly the end of education. Now some children do go on to university; others perhaps prefer a trade or technical education and they enroll in those institutions. But some are between high school and university or technical school - there's a large restless group that haven't found themselves as yet. They're not attracted or interested, nor do they have perhaps the aptitude for a trade or technical training and too many of them lack the university credits required so that they can go on to university, because perhaps they may have taken a general course and couldn't go on to university, or perhaps due to lack of interest they didn't achieve the necessary standing, they just didn't make it. So the large majority don't go on to either university or technical training, they go into jobs. Some of them are quite anxious to get into the labour field -- I mean labour in the sense that they go into offices, they go into factories, any number of jobs that are available. In some cases this is good because in some cases some of these younger people do need the maturity, they need the maturing influence of being on their own for a little while, perhaps a little independent for a little while; but it isn't too long before they realize that they're also at a dead end and then something sometimes bestirs them and they realize that maybe they'd like to do something about it, they'd like to go back to school. Others even develop an interest in some academic subject or subjects or perhaps they thought of going into a profession which they weren't ready to even think of in their high school days. But today they have no school to look to and this is incidentally true of the rural parts of Manitoba. It's true we do have the MIT and it's doing an excellent job, but it's limited and it's only one school in Manitoba. As I say, the rural areas in Manitoba, particularly, both its younger people and its adults they are I feel the ones most severely hit by the lack of an on-going educational process beyond the secondary level. In my opinion a public comprehensive community college is certainly the answer

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) because these community colleges can combine adult education, junior university courses, technical and vocational training - they can all do it within one institution, the comprehensive institution.

The other thing about them, and this has been the experience in other jurisdictions, in other areas, that such community colleges because they're based locally, because they're much smaller, because they're closer to the people in a sense, they're sensitive to the diversity of the student, to his ability, to his aspirations and to the interest that he has; and they can also take into account the social, the cultural and the economic needs of the community that they may be serving, so that in the rural area you could have a school of this nature which would far more reflect the needs and the wants of the community which it serves. An institution of this kind, a community college, can offer a diversity of programs, it can have a flexible admission policy - this is most important - the stress can be on counselling and guiding and - shouldn't forget this - also I think at a lower cost, a lower cost than university because they're concerned only with under-graduate courses, they don't have the post-graduate courses, they're not interested in the expensive laboratories, the expensive post-graduate courses, so I think they have in other areas been proven to be able to operate at a lower cost. Then too there's a willingness on the part of the community college because it is more flexible, because they're perhaps not established to conform in a specific manner and a specific thought. There's a willingness to depart from the traditional and to accept new ideas and change with the times more readily than an institution like a university, because the emphasis on community colleges is more on teaching rather than on research and it can as I say reflect the immediate needs of the students and offer them perhaps a better understanding of what is being done.

Another advantage - and this again to the rural areas as I'm going through them - is the fact that they could be much closer to home and I think this is important for the rural areas. Certainly people in Greater Winnipeg going to university here don't have the problem that the rural students do, but a rural student coming into Winnipeg has the problem of having to find residence, the cost is certainly a great one, much greater than what is faced by city students, so that if you had a community college, if you had community colleges in Manitoba with open-door admission policies - admission policies, by that I mean all students who could properly undertake further studies are allowed to enter, and it doesn't mean that they have to have any particular standing or academic standing. They could encourage everyone despite their high school courses to enter, and despite age - it wouldn't matter; and there too again the rural areas could benefit because as far as adult education goes, Manitoba and the rural areas outside of Greater Winnipeg is really sadly lacking.

Now there has emerged in the last, I'd say particularly in the post-war period, a very definite recognition of the importance of providing this wide variety of opportunity for both adults and the young people to continue their general education and to upgrade their skills. Perhaps the most striking example is right here in Greater Winnipeg where the City of Winnipeg on its own initiative - has to do it on its own initiative - opened an adult education day centre. They took a school that was about to be closed for lack of students in one of the older areas and they decided they'd have a school available for students, for adults, who had not achieved Grade 11 and 12 and had dropped out of school earlier. The school was big enough to handle 120 - the enrollment exceeded 200. The pressure is so great that next year they'll be going into larger premises, a larger school that will be able to accommodate 375 students, and as of last week I am told the indications are that this too will not fill the gap. It's amazing how apparently a need that wasn't fully recognized by everyone was sitting there all the time. The other interesting thing is that these students have shown far more devotion to study than you find in most high schools, even at university. These are students who are trying for a second chance, they're adults, and maybe that's the reason, maybe they appreciate it more. But now at least they have an opportunity they never had before.

I won't go into the question of whether the \$100 fee charged by the City of Winnipeg should be continued; this is something I think that they should determine on their own, although I go into some of the remarks that were in the newspapers recently with regard to one school trustee who felt that if the fee were eliminated, if the \$100 enrolment fee was eliminated it would attract welfare recipients who would go back to school. Now this is a terrible thought. They'd actually go back to school and they might even get an education, they might have to get off welfare rolls. Such a terrible thought. That's the Winnipeg School Board, they can live with that. I don't have to fortunately.

To underline the fact of how necessary education beyond the secondary level has become

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) is again the achievements of the Manitoba Institute of Technology. This started off, and I think the Minister himself is probably quite surprised at the fast pace which is developing within that institution - I mean the growth, the big demand on it and there's a still unfilled demand. I know that there's an expansion being planned and I predict that that too will not be enough to fill the demand even within Greater Winnipeg, because people have recognized that there is a critical need to provide a post high school or what they call perhaps tertiary education to supplement the education that used to be simply provided at the university.

Now one of the things that irked me, if I might use that word, the Member for Emerson when he said - in talking against the resolution as it stood he said, "Here we try to saddle our people with some new projects before really investigating the effect that these projects would have on education." I don't know where he's been living but my complaint is that Manitoba is lagging, we've been lagging for years, and now we seem to be lagging again. But unfortunately he is perpetuating that very philosophy, that very thought, because he is saying we're not ready for it and should investigate it. It's been investigated; it hasn't been found wanting; it's been found effective.

British Columbia has I believe a number of community colleges; Alberta has six or seven, something like that; Ontario has announced a network of what they call College of Applied Arts and Technologies - it's the same idea. In Quebec a very interesting situation has arisen. They're establishing 30 institutes as they call them to provide a gross program of post high school education and in the not-too-distant future all students wanting to go to university in Quebec will have to go through these institutions first. In other words, this is a pre-university level of education. And yet here in Manitoba we're still talking about them and when we do bring it up in the form of a resolution it's suggested that we're trying to saddle our people with some new project before really investigating the facts. Well, I suggest if we sit back and wait for anyone to investigate it, we'll never have it, because we're 10 years behind the times now.

In the United States too -- even the Member for Rhineland wants it I'm told. In the United States too, these have swept across the country. There they're called "Junior Colleges" but the title, as I say, doesn't mean a thing. They are comprehensive colleges. They provide a year or so of general education beyond the high school and they've been tied in now with the post high school institutions which arose to meet the needs of industry and business, that's the technical schools, and they're combining there and now combining them into one institution in the form of a comprehensive community college to handle both phases of it and actually to make for a better educational system because it has been found that it isn't wise to separate the students who are perhaps taking academic courses from those who are taking technical courses, but rather they should be together, they should learn to understand each other and work together. The comprehensive community college which emerged in the States tried to make post high school education easily available to all the people in the community; and they do this through an open-door admission policy. They enroll any high school graduate regardless of the program he took at high school, and this is very important. And for adults they provide a make-up course, irrespective of what sort of public schooling they had. If they can come in, if they can handle the curriculum, they can continue. The only thing that can limit them is their own ability, their own interests. As I say, in conjunction with this, extensive guidance courses and counselling services are needed in order to help the students, particularly the adults in many cases, to plan a program which is suited to their individual talent and their interest.

Another advantage of course is that the community college, differing from the university, can handle its enrollment on a full-time or a part-time basis. A person can enroll in these colleges in the evening, or take only afternoon courses; they needn't take a full course, they can take a partial course. They can be operated on a semester basis and therefore operate all year round, so someone who's really interested in upgrading themselves can simply enter and if they really want to apply themselves and have the time and the effort and the diligence, can perhaps achieve the academic courses they're lacking within a 12 month period.

Now the problem of course, and the reason why we need these colleges is this: that some young people who ought to attend universities, don't attend. As I said because at high school age maybe they had no interest or because perhaps being human, we know that people's abilities differ not only in degrees but also in kind, and that many secondary school graduates whose abilities don't specially tend towards academic or bookish studies, have on the other hand an

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) ability to excel in some other direction but today they have no scope within our public school system to find themselves. They may be able to deal effectively with other people; some people have a knack for this. They may have an ability to manage practical and technical affairs. They may be artistic or musical or have dramatic talents, in other words their capability and initiative for getting things done is there. Sometimes in terms of just sheer good common sense they may even exceed or may surpass someone who has a formal education, but they don't fit into the lock step system of our institutions today and so they end up at the end of the line, having taken a course which maybe they weren't ready for, which maybe they disliked and therefore didn't make the necessary standing and come to a dead end. And it's these students, these and the adults who want to come back and today have nowhere to come back to and should be given an opportunity to come back.

There are many students, as we know, who enter university, they've taken a matriculation course, although perhaps they should have taken a general, but they've taken a matriculation course because the general course leads nowhere, so they've gone into university, but they weren't ready for it. I think proof of that is the fact that in the first year of college the dropout rate and the failure rate is fantastic; it's something like a third, I'm told.

Now obviously it was one of two things: Either these students aren't ready emotionally or intellectually for college or for university, or there's a weeding out at the university level - and I'm not being critical at this time of the university people. They have these massive enrollments in the first year coming in. It's difficult to cope with classes of 400 and 500; they don't want to water down their courses so they simply throw it at the students; they do make it tough and as I say the results are that you get a 33 percent failure rate. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is demoralizing to a student, it's debilitating; it leaves a student absolutely nowhere. I think at that age in particular to have a defeat can have very serious repercussions on any child and I think it's something that if we had community colleges, a lot of this could be avoided.

The community colleges as I say could have a sortation, could provide the sortation that's required, and many students as I say, would then go through community college, might not go on to university, but the mere fact that the open door policy permits them to come in and then matriculation of their courses is necessary so that on completion of the community college course the university will accept them. This of course is important so that those who do want to go on and have shown by their desire, their ability and their accomplishment that they can do it, should of course be able to go on to university. Others on the other hand may go into other fields but at least they will have had the chance and certainly the extra one or two years of community college education would certainly be a positive factor to them, would enhance their abilities not only to lead better lives but to lead more productive lives.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, there's no need for delay. Community colleges are not new; they've been proven elsewhere; we need them, I think where it is feasible, such as in the major centres in Manitoba, they should be started now; we shouldn't wait. For the rest of Manitoba, they need them. I'm not saying no to this. I think they need them as much or if not more than Metropolitan Winnipeg; and as the new technical vocational institutions are built in Manitoba, these nine or ten that we keep hearing about, I think it's essential that they be not only technical schools, but under one roof; that they be enlarged, that they include a comprehensive community college as part of the structure, as part of their program. But to do that we should today vote for community colleges, because the planning must start now and if we delay on this any longer the situation will be that eventually the Boundaries Commission will bring in a recommendation, the schools will be built, and it'll be too late at that time, we'll probably be told to change the plan, because the plans are made and things are in the works. The government today should start planning for a community college program to encompass all of Manitoba.

The Honourable Member for Emerson, I think, suggested that we must not fall into the trap of waiting - how did he put it - just a moment, I don't want to misquote him certainly. Yes, he said that "Community colleges are no more important than kindergartens, unitary divisions, vocational schools, but most of these projects are still on the ground floor and they're still not working properly." And that's his reason for saying, "Well, we're not really quite ready I suppose for community colleges because . . . ". But we mustn't fall into the trap of waiting 'til every segment of the educational effort is fully developed. If you're going to wait till all the "t's" are crossed and all the "i's" are dotted, you'll get nowhere, because education is an on-going process and what is valid today, what is needed today will probably change completely in 10 years. We're far behind other provinces in technical schools, for example.

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) I know the government blames the former administration; the former administration blames I don't know who - I know they blame someone - but the fact is we're still behind after nine years of this government. Sure, they're moving; I admit that; but in the meantime how many thousands of children since 1959 have gone through the educational system and have been short-changed because they have nothing to look forward to and nothing at the end of the line. Perhaps five years from now there may be these schools but think of the thousands of wasted lives literally and I for one feel that we owe the youth of our province an apology for not having provided them these facilities up to now.

So I for one, speaking for the members of the party, will vote against the amendment and I trust that it will be defeated so that we can support the motion in its original form so that the government can give immediate consideration to planning for a community college program in Manitoba.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. JOHNSON: Before it's adjourned, could I have a few words on this particular . . .

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time on this particular amendment to say a few words. I found the last address most interesting as it pretty well covered the waterfront of our youth and the opportunities as the Member from Seven Oaks sees the picture, and as I sat here and listened to him I wondered how in the world he could vote against a sales tax as he pictured further and further expenditures of a fantastic magnitude to us. -- (Interjection) -- They were going to borrow for this.

I can't support this amendment for some of the same reasons the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks pointed out because this resolution pretty well pre-empts the function of the department, the Minister as is traditionally set up in this province, plus the Advisory Board and Department of Education, plus a host of advisory boards - as a matter of fact I've pointed out to the House we have an advisory committee in connection with every single trade and technology that's in operation in our system today, something like 55 trades and 13 technologies at this level.

However, on the whole I'm not at this time - in saying this I want to point out that while I think both speeches have covered the waterfront in this area, one pointing out how all these matters should come before the Members -- I want to say that I am as interested as they are that each member of this House get as much information as possible at this time because we are in the midst of an educational revolution. In the last few years we have quadrupled and then some our technical and vocational facilities; in the last eight or nine years there's been a revolution in secondary education; there's been an explosion at our universities and I'm the first to say we're just beginning to open new doors of opportunity. At the university level the picture is well known to honourable members with the estimates and the facilities that are being created, and at the secondary level we're well aware of the government's hopes and aspirations in this area, and with the record of our high schools over the last few years, because those boys and girls that went into high school in our province in 1952 - there were I think only about half that reached high school. Today our retention rate is up a fantastic amount and this is again going to put more and more pressure on us at the post-secondary level. I think it's most important, as I say, to get as much information to the members as possible.

The other thing about the resolution as it is, we have the University Grants Commission legislation before us - I think the bill was distributed today - in which at the university and post-secondary level we would have a body who could continue in that area the work of the Council of Higher Learning who have performed a most useful function and I think well in the priority of things before us. I hope to outline in the introduction of the University Grants Commission, generally the work of the Council. This was a very necessary step to rationalize the present and future roles of our affiliated colleges with all respect before we got into community colleges per se. Community colleges are a subject not only of discussion within our own city and Winnipeg School Board level, they're a matter of discussion at the Canadian Association for Adult Education who have been pursuing this for the last few years and these minutes and proceedings are available to everyone. They point out that community colleges really in their opinion fill the gaps that exists today and we have to approach this with great caution because with our geography and distance and concentration and density of population we have to be particularly careful how we approach this. Community colleges really fill the gaps that exist today as we know. We have the university pattern, we're into technical vocational high schools, vocational training at the post-secondary level, adult upgrading and retraining. And what are

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) these gaps - because they're definition of community college is really a year or two of the secondary level as we know it in our province plus a year of university or a year of technology or a combination of same. I really think that at the post-high school level we will have to examine these gaps most carefully between the observations we receive from the present Council of Higher Learning to whom we have referred the matter and also from our newly established University Grants Commission as they take over and examine this whole area of post-secondary education. It may well be that as one province's thinking our established institutes at The Pas, Brandon and Winnipeg may well serve as community college bases as we develop the - for example in Winnipeg the Institute of Applied Arts on to our MIT, with some academic upgrading courses we have in effect a community college. So community college definitions vary depending on who the last person was you spoke to, but basically I think that community colleges should offer a combination of academic and technical and/or university training and we have to proceed with caution, as the Winnipeg study showed, as our Canadian Adult Education Associations found out; they recommend you have to have at least 40 to 80,000 people in an area to have the kind of community college that they're talking about.

We have people who in general terms have defects in their present education; we have those who need retraining and finally those who wish to broaden their general educational base and we think that the Adult Education school in Winnipeg to which we give full grants - this may be the pattern, we're learning a great deal from this, as to what the provincial role should be in this area in the future. Again we need density of population to get enough students for a proper school of this type. We've got evening classes, we've got university extension work, we've got 3,800 people coming to night classes at MIT in Winnipeg alone at the moment, we have 1,500 in day courses in technology and trades. So more and more opportunities are opening up.

I think it's important too that, if you're looking at community colleges, for example if you look at the western part of our province with our new trade and technology centre with a new university - what are the gaps in that region of Manitoba with that population density? You just can't simply build community colleges in every community and we'll have to - this is why we'll need several disciplines examining this particular area.

I do think that it's important for the House to recognize again in defence of how fast this is developing, that today as we stand here there are 1,500 adults who have made a personal decision to come back for upgrading to Grade 7 or Grade 10 level on the basic upgrading courses; we have 800 who are upgrading in industry today throughout this province in industry; we have 1,000 at MIT; we have 3,500 people this morning in our current programs in really adult upgrading and retraining, filling in defects and so on. How we pull these several disciplines together into a community college type of operation -- we have to know precisely what we're talking about. The definitions of junior colleges as I have seen them to date are Grade 12 in this province plus one year university; the definition of a community college is two years at the post-secondary level in technology or one year of technology one of university. So we need these - it will be interesting to hear what the Council has to say on this and interesting to see the Advisory Board's recommendations, the several technical vocational advisory boards, our University Grants Commission and so on.

I feel generally that while I'm as keen as anyone in this House to see all the information come before the honourable members, I cannot support this amendment as recommended by the Honourable Member for Emerson for some of the reasons I have mentioned. On the one hand, for example it mentions an interesting point here - academic freedom. Traditionally, as he knows, universities have enjoyed academic freedom at the post-secondary level in other areas such as technology and so on. Here we have the problem of national boards which set the standards in lab and X-ray technology and the several conflicts in here will have to be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing I would worry about, and I say it with respect, is that if we're going to get on with the job, and speaking very bluntly, get on with the job of rationalizing many of these problems in our province as we have been doing through our existing Council of Higher Learning who have made certain recommendations and worked out very satisfactorily, unless we allow this initiative of individual boards and see the problems through their particular eyes and relate them to us and so on - if all of these matters including some emotional matters are going to come before a committee of this House including budgetary items and what have you, I think education would ground to a standstill in this province, and I say that

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) respectfully whether I'm the Minister or one of the members opposite if that day would have ever come.

I think we're not ten years behind the rest of Canada and I say quite on my own that the more and more I study this whole matter of vocational training and so on the more convinced I am that we're going to end up ahead because we're doing something in this province that's not being done in other provinces. We're developing alternative courses at the high school levels to fit people, appeal to young people and to prevent an exodus at too early an age in my opinion into vocational types of training. This is really most important to us in Canada to develop our young people academically as far as they can possibly go before going into these courses for the simple reason that they have to be as adaptable in the future. We are getting on with the job, as we have said earlier, of developing regional vocational high schools which is our next priority; rationalizing our affiliates is another priority before us today, handling the bulge at our existing universities, doubling the premises of MIT this year alone at a cost of around possibly eight or more millions of dollars to provide a total of 5,000 day students' bases in that vast complex, and all this means that we're going to have to have to examine most carefully the particular pattern we follow as to the establishment of community colleges and I think it's best left to the type and the method by which the government is approaching this matter.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might contribute a word or two to this debate. I hadn't really intended to say anything but I think probably that while I'm not an educator I might have something to contribute from a practical viewpoint.

This discussion of community colleges, I really wonder if many people really have a firm fixed idea of what a community college really is. I think they see many things in the picture of community college. And certainly no one in this day and age can deny the value of education to young people both in the true values of life and in the dollar and cents earning capacity of young people; from both approaches people's lives can be fuller and more profitable. But I do believe that when the Conservative Party first came to power in Manitoba there was a very real need for a great deal of attention to be paid to education and I think we may be now though approaching a period of some danger simply because the situation has changed and is changing. Now in times of austerity there is always the greatest scrutiny paid to how we spend our money, are we getting the most for our money. In prosperous times there isn't that same scrutiny given and with more money available and with more and more people becoming enthusiastic in getting on the general bandwagon of education and the lackening or lessening of the critical attitude as to whether we are getting the best, I think there is some risk involved in this field.

Now I would -- and I may say right now that I'm expressing my own views as a result of my own experience -- and I would like to suggest this that we may be in setting up our various technical schools and the idea of community colleges thinking of them as ends in themselves or providing an end education to young people and that this maybe the limit of their capacity and it fits certain groups of people. I would like to urge that we always keep this in mind, that I think that, for instance when a trade is being taught we should always -- in the academic side of the education you give along with that trade -- it should be a part of another academic course. In other words, so that a young person doesn't go along a trade course and then because he has a real awakening as to the value of knowledge and wants to go further and sees the necessity of getting more education then he finds that he's in a blind alley and must back-track and go up another avenue to further his education supposing he wants to then, having had the awakened desire, to complete a college course.

I would like to suggest that in all these courses we take the academic element and use as closely as we can academic credit courses that can be used as a credit toward furthering an academic education but merely adapt it to that particular trade or technique. I think it's a very real fact that many many young people never have the real enthusiasm for learning and seeking knowledge just for its own sake till they've been aroused and been taught by their trade or business the practical value of that education. I think looking back, one of the greatest criticisms I could make of our educational system is that many of the subjects that we as young people took it was difficult to see any practical use of that particular course, and I think for example if an instructor in geometry had said to the boys: "Now, look carpentry is largely applied geometry," for example. Taking these various courses and showing the real value, that algebra is the basis of very complicated electronic computations and so on, that a simple and beautiful desire for knowledge would have been awakened in young people to a far greater extent than our purely dry academic approach gives.

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.)

So I would like to see that, whether it's through our technical schools, we take and say well, these are literally community colleges or whether in some areas we develop what is broadly thought of as the community college, that we leave the approach clear to further education; and in this regard I would like to comment on this, too, that in the various states of America, many of them I know, and certainly in England, in the various engineering courses, architecture and so on, there is always the possibility available to people who come up, so to speak, through the back door, through the trade, to get degrees in varying fields of engineering or architecture without the more rounder and fuller purely university academic type of training and I think that it's important that we try and leave those back doors open because some of your best engineers and architects are ones who come up through the trades and have that practical experience while they were accumulating the purely academic.

Now, you see I'm not quarrelling with either side of it. I know that practical experience is necessary; I know that the academic technical knowledge is also very necessary. What I'm pleading for is the best of both worlds, a blend of the two and always the possibility of a young person to go on further without walking into blind alleys and I'm afraid that very easily we can fall into this trap in setting up these institutions and special courses that are dead end in themselves. I think there should be always the element of the academic side of it - being simply, by bending a little an approach into further education.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, as usual the Leader of the New Democratic Party has brought out his favourite resolution, that of government automobile insurance and it didn't take any of us by surprise this year when it came on the Order Paper again because we figured that this would be an annual event from now on until he was convinced by someone other than us that government insurance wasn't the answer. I was very interested this morning when our Provincial Treasurer this morning announced a Committee will look into this very matter of automobile insurance and while I don't suppose he will be satisfied in the end result, because there's a very definite difference between defining automobile rates than going into the matter of government automobile insurance: two separate things altogether. But I know when he hears representatives of various insurance companies present themselves that I know that they in turn will convince him I'm sure with the figures that they will present in their years of operating automobile insurance in the Province of Manitoba and also in the Dominion of Canada. As most of us know most of these companies that sell automobile insurance in Manitoba also sell it in numbers of provinces in Canada too. So they do business all over our good country of Canada.

But in reading this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member contradicts himself because in one instance he's in favour of a co-operative insurance, the next instance he wants government automobile insurance, and they're two separate things entirely. Because if he's a friend of the co-operatives he can't be a friend of the co-operatives and also have government insurance in the same instance. I have before me a list of the companies doing insurance in Canada and I think there are about 15 co-operative companies doing insurance in Canada and also in Manitoba and if we were to do away with those co-operative insurance companies, then I don't think they would be too happy if we were to decide on government insurance. I think he should pay particular attention to that because I know this will be brought to his attention because these co-operative insurance companies are going to be in here at this committee presenting themselves, and I hope that you in turn can explain yourself on this resolution when that time comes. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I tell you these co-operative insurance companies can speak loud and clear I know, when they come before a committee and they will do so.

There is a particular charge made in the speech that you made here the other day inferring that these companies weren't doing right by the people of Manitoba. Is that not right? Well, this is just like a statement I would make if I said that due to the fact that Jimmy Hoffa is in jail, as one of the leaders of the Teamsters' Union in the United States and also representing Canadian unions, that all labour unions were wrong; they were criminals; everybody was a criminal who belonged to a labour union. I don't think that just because you make a charge

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) like this that all the automobile insurance companies doing business in Manitoba are all wrong. In fact I don't think they are wrong. In fact one or two of them as you say might be not treating their people in a fair and just manner but I would say they are not all criminals; neither are the labour unions all criminals. I think you should be pretty careful when you make a broad statement of fact which can't be supported in any case at all. I think that you're going to have to back up a lot of statements because while I don't like sending Hansards around even though they cost 10 cents apiece I'm going to have to send a couple out to the insurance companies so they can be ready when the time comes.

But I think this committee will do a good job. I think they will. I think there's a lot of good men on this committee and I know that the experience that they've had, these hearings both in Ontario and Nova Scotia, the one in B. C. I think there's one going on in Alberta, I think that was adjourned waiting for the report from B. C., will also help us in our final decisions. I think this will be the time that we'll use their reports to our advantage when arriving at our final decision.

I think that the honourable member, before he makes statements or brings in resolutions like this, that I think he knows about as much about insurance as I know about the railroad business and I think that this is pretty easy to say that the CNR aren't running their business in a real good manner; that they come to the government asking for subsidies, but I know that I would be the last one to say that they're not running their business in a real good manner, in fact I wouldn't want to ever think of putting a resolution on to that effect. -- (Interjection) -- So I think this is going to take a lot of supporting when the committee meets, when the several companies who are doing business in our province, and have done business over the years, with the people of Manitoba. I have heard of very few complaints being both involved in the insurance business with the automobile insurance companies.

There has been a suggestion over the time that many of these companies operate together with one rate book and here is the rate book. But that does not say that all the companies operate under that rate book. Far from it, because I have another rate book right here. It represents the rate book of one particular company in the Province of Manitoba and they do business in four provinces in Canada and operate and use this rate book. They are not the same rates, they don't operate under the same policies as this rate book here; it's separate entirely. I think that we do have a choice in the Province of Manitoba when we decide on whether we want to buy insurance and this is only rightly so. There are other rate books which are put out by various companies and the co-operative are one -- I can go down the list here, the different rate books. I think this is the right way to do business in the automobile insurance business because it's highly competitive and goodness knows if we have government insurance we'd have a monopoly and that wouldn't be the right thing in the automobile insurance industry today. Neither would it be in the fire insurance business. -- (Interjection) -- And the hospital insurance business too; I agree; I quite agree; Yeah.

I would like to say that, I think in best interests I'd like to continue because this is really a good subject and I want to get my poke in now before the committee. I think, Mr. Speaker, if you'll call it 5:30 I'll carry on on Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: It's 5:30.

MR. LYON: I just wondered, Mr. Speaker, if anybody intended to adjourn that. -- (Interjection) -- You're not finished, oh.

I beg to move, Mr. Speaker -- Oh yes, before I move adjournment, might I remind members of the House that the Law Amendments Committee will be sitting Monday morning at 9:30 in Room 254 and Private Bills Committee at 12:30 the same morning in the same room.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer that the House do now adjourn.

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