

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, November 6th, 1958.

Opening prayer read by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports of Standing and Select  
Committees

DR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the fourth report of the select special committee.

MR. CLERK: Your select special committee beg leave to present the following as their fourth report. Your committee has considered Bill Number 8, an Act to provide assistance to farmers in establishing, developing and operating their farms, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

DR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion  
Introduction of Bills  
Orders of the Day

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I think the members of the House and citizens of the province at large would be glad to know of this letter, which I have just received from the Honourable R.L. Stanfield, the Premier of Nova Scotia.

He writes: "Dear Premier Roblin, The people of Nova Scotia appreciate greatly the generosity of your province in donating \$10,000.00 towards the Springhill disaster relief fund. The need in Springhill is very great, and Manitoba's contribution will help to meet this great need.

I would be grateful if you would make it known to the members of your government, and indeed to the people of the province, how much we in Nova Scotia appreciate this assistance. Yours sincerely,  
R. L. Stanfield."

MR. A. A. TRAPP (Lac du Bonnet): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

Several days ago a request was made for the tabling of information, or rather correspondence between the Federal Government

MR. TRAPP (Continued)

and the Provincial Government, on the matter of farm credit. I would like to know if that will be tabled in due course?

HON. ERRICK F. WILLIS, Q.C. (Minister of Agriculture and Immigration): We were just in doubt slightly, in regard to the consent of the Federal Government, because you have to always get that. But as I have now, today, discovered there is but one letter which points to the fact that federal officials are going to be in Winnipeg and will discuss the Act with me. That is the only letter. We will be glad to table it.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable First Minister.

Is it his intention if the House, the work of the House hasn't finished tomorrow afternoon, to sit tomorrow night? And if so, if we haven't finished the work Friday night, has he any intention of sitting Saturday?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm afraid we'll just have to see what progress we make, Mr. Speaker, before I can give a positive answer to those statements, those requests.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question I'd like to ask, I'd like to direct one to the Minister of Public Utilities.

Has the government given any consideration to expanding the present policy of construction, telephone construction to rural subscribers?

HON. JOHN CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities): You mean are we going to change the policy, the policy that's been in force? We haven't as yet changed any policy with regard to the expansion of telephone service. No.

MR. GUTTORMSON: But are you considering changing it?

MR. ROBLIN: .....members of the government what advice they are going to give the Crown.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable First Minister along the lines the honourable member has asked.

Speaking for myself, I would rather postpone till Monday than sit on Saturday. Let's have one Sabbath free please.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll keep that in mind, Mr. Speaker.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following bills, #2 an Act to amend the Public Schools Act, #8, an Act to provide financial assistance to farmers.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 482 of the Bill.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is the only section of the bill that has not been finally dealt with in committee of the whole. Is that correct? This is the only section of.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The only section of the bill what.....

MR. ROBLIN: It was requested last night by the honourable the member for Rhineland that this section should stand to enable my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition and others to debate it, which we agreed to do.

MR. CAMPBELL: I appreciate the consideration of the committee in letting it stand, because I found it absolutely impossible to be here last night because of a previous commitment. Non-political, I might say. And I wanted to, as I mentioned in the special committee sitting, I wanted to make some further remarks in connection with the matter of grants. And once again it's our old friend "regulations" that I am referring to.

I understand that Clause "A" of Sub-section 1 has been amended by striking out the words, "such amount as is stated in the regulations." Is that correct? Now, what I would like to suggest, is that the same thing, exactly the same thing be done in the next sub-section. And my reason for suggesting that, in addition to the general question of having the Act leave so much of the business to the Lieutenant-Governor in-Council by regulation, is that, I think that, when there's so much attention being paid, and properly so, to the size of the grants that will be made available under this changed or extended policy, that it would be entirely appropriate to have the actual amount stated in the Act, or percentages, because I call the committee's attention to the fact that so long as the words in the fifth and sixth line of B, Clause B, of Sub-section 1, remain in effect, that there is no commitment whatever in this Act, that these percentages that are mentioned immediately thereafter will be paid, because the wording is that, "toward payment of the approved expenses incurred in each year by the board of the division, and the board of each school district included in the division, for the purposes hereinafter in this clause mentioned, such amounts as may be described--prescribed in the regulations, but not exceeding in respect of any such approved expenses the following percentages thereof." And then it goes on with the 100 per centum, 75 per centum, et cetera.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that in a matter so important as this, that the policy having already been decided and enunciated by the Minister and the government, that there would not only be no objection to putting in the actual percentages that are to be paid, but that they would be quite prepared to do it as they were in the first sub-section. And consequently I have an amendment prepared along that line.

MR. CAMPBELL (Continued)

While I am speaking though, I would like to refer to the next page, top of the page, sub-clause 9, where the percentages for the cost of each new secondary school building is set forth. I realize that this has already been discussed in the special committee, but I would like to again reiterate the point that I was trying to make there. That I think that the graduated scales, and I know that I do not express the unanimous view of my own group on this, because there's room for honest differences of opinion, of course, as to how this should be approached. In my opinion, the fact that we have the graduation in the amount that is contributed toward construction et cetera of the secondary school buildings is a graduation where the larger the school the higher the percentage that is paid; that it will add to the centralizing effect that I feel quite sure a lot of the parts of this province will not want to see in force. As far as I am concerned, I would prefer to see a flat rate, - as generous as possible of course - but still a flat rate, paid for all the various sizes of secondary schools. However I realize that this has been dealt with quite extensively already, and I do not propose to move an amendment on it at this time. I mention it simply and in regard to reverting to the other one, I offer to you as an amendment, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the honourable the member for Rhineland, that the words, "such amount as may be prescribed in the regulations, not exceeding," I've put those in quotation marks, that the words, quotation, "such amounts as may be prescribed in the regulations, not exceeding" quotation marks, be struck out of lines five and six of clause B, of sub-section 1, of section 482. I move that, as an amendment, seconded by the honourable the member for Rhineland.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Presented the motion....5 and 6 Clause B.

MR. ROBLIN: I wonder if those are the right lines, what are the numbers in the bill?

ONE OF THE MEMBERS: 13 and 14.

MR. CAMPBELL: ....I am interested.....in lines of the sub-section.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, as a member of an ancient and honourable profession, I am just as much opposed to regulations as anyone else. However, in this modern day and age, it's a well known fact that it is necessary in many instances, to provide for matters by way of regulation. I think however that we may correctly say that in this bill we have gone as far as has ever been done before in any piece of legislation having to do with the Public Schools Act, to eliminate the use or the abuse of regulations, and in many instances have spelled out in the form of the statutes the provision being provided for. In this instance, however, we consider that it is necessary to maintain in the Act, the provisions, such as appear in the original bill, and for that reason we are opposing the amendment which has been offered.

There are two general arguments on the matter. First is that

MR. MCLEAN (Continued)

the weight of experience and usage is that it should be provided for by regulation. As I pointed out in the House the other day, the matter of school grants has always been a matter of regulation and is so provided for in the present Public Schools Act. I pointed out that in the instance of part 17, which provides for secondary school areas not only are the grants provided by regulation but indeed, the whole body of the scheme is in..is set out by regulation and the section 340 is little more than an enabling section to allow the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations in effect, by order-in-council to set out the whole law, in a sense as it applies to secondary school areas. So that the first point is that on the basis of the experience and the usage that has been accepted that is what has been done before and I am certain that those opposite who are now anxious to prescribe or limit the use of regulations would not have done so if they hadn't felt that it was necessary in the interests of good administration.

There is however another point that I would want to make, because this suggestion was raised in, on, I believe on second debate, on second reading, and immediately after that we began to consider from all possible angles, the matter of limiting the use of regulations insofar as section 482 is concerned. There was no problem with respect to sub-clause (A) because that is a once only grant that can easily be fixed and there was really no object in referring to regulations there. However, with respect to the other grants, and we examined it from every possible aspect to consider what would be the effect if we took out the provision for providing grants by regulation, and in every case, our conclusion, it was abundantly evidenced that we might be writing in a factor which would make it impossible to properly control the grants to be made. In other words that we would be writing into the bill a sort of, in a sense an escalator clause which we couldn't control, we, or whoever might be here, couldn't control at a later time. Because, of course, it's not suggested, it has never been suggested, that under any and all circumstances that the provision, the amount of money provided from the provincial treasury should always keep going up. There will always have to be some control. The effective control, of course, are the votes of the people of Manitoba. They judge how we administer their monies and to what extent we provide money for education, and we have indicated what the policy of the government is with respect to that. We, of course, are going to carry out that policy and intend to do so in the future. But to not give us any 'latitude', if you want to use that term, would be to make it extremely difficult to exercise any control over monies that would be required for this purpose.

So it is for that reason that I do oppose the amendment and say to the House that we cannot accept it. I'm not certain whether it's necessary for me to say anything with respect to the second point concerning the capital construction contribution for secondary schools, beyond pointing this out, that in the interim report of the Royal Commission - which was a unanimous report - as shown on page 57, the recommendation of the commission was that certain grants up to 75%, or, at least being 75% to be paid to high schools of not less than twelve classrooms. And that was confirmed further on page 93 when the recommendation of 75% for

MR. McLEAN (Continued)

construction of high schools was recommended.

Now this report is a unanimous report. The chairman of the Commission, the former Deputy Minister of Education in this province, Dr. Cuddy, a member of the commission who has been, I think, for a lifetime associated with education in Manitoba; Brother Bruns who has been a school principal, a high school principal; Mrs. Wood who has been a school teacher very much interested in education, and Mr. Stefan Hansen, and representing, I think it may be fairly said, all shades of opinion, certainly from various viewpoints and that is their unanimous recommendation.

Now we haven't gone as far as that recommendation. We are, it is true, providing the largest assistance for the twelve room or more high school but we have graduated that assistance so that in places where it is considered not advisable to construct a larger high school, they will receive not the high amount but more than the basic support of 40%. And in the scale which has been now adopted by the special committee there is no incentive to a school district or school division to construct more classrooms than they would need, because as they go up in size, the contribution required goes up proportionately, although it decreases, that is to say, as they reach this upper limit the school division does receive better assistance in a sense than they would for a lower school. But it is in some respects perhaps a better scale in that sense than the one originally proposed.

It is our belief that experience will show that the larger schools will be required not because people will be brought from larger areas but because more children will be attending school from the existing areas. We mustn't overlook that factor that this plan is one designed to make high school education available to a larger number of boys and girls. And from there, as it were, the territories which are now reasonably adjacent to high schools, there will come a larger and larger number of boys and girls. And that in itself will require larger schools, aside altogether from any centralizing effect that this might have.

MR. CAMPBELL: If the member will permit me, inasmuch as I have been moving this motion, I think I can state the remainder of my argument very quickly and perhaps the Minister would prefer to deal with one at a time.

I want to thank the Minister for his explanation because I think I can compliment him most sincerely on attempting to look at these questions that are raised on their merits and to give the very best explanation he can for either meeting them or not meeting them as seems the best to his judgment. I can say quite frankly that I think the Minister has made an excellent job of piloting the bill through the House, through the committee. I congratulate him not only on his interest in it but on his capability in advocating the various provisions of it, and I certainly don't want to impede the progress of the bill at this stage. However, because my honourable friend is so well informed on these matters and I shall say no more about the construction grants, I know it doesn't properly arise under this motion, except to say that I give the Minister credit for not accepting the recommendation in full of the Royal Commission, because I think this is better in my opinion, than what

MR. CAMPBELL (Continued)

they recommended and there are other cases where their recommendation hasn't been accepted. And all I'm suggesting is that we might get a little further away from it than my honourable friend is doing. However, that's all the point I wish to make on that.

But in regard to this one, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that it is the Minister's intention to pay the percentages set out here. I'm sure that that is the intention and, if it's the intention, then I think it's better for everybody concerned to state it without this qualifying phrase. Because, and I recognize what my honourable friend has said, the force of what he said with regard to the necessity of some regulatory power. But if he will look at the first sub-clause under "b", I submit to you that he doesn't need for regulation purposes any 'elbow' room whatever on that one because what (i) says 100 percentum of the actual salary paid to each teacher, the authorized teacher and the authorized number of teachers but not exceeding the amount applicable to that teacher as set out in the scale of grants prescribed in the regulations. So on that one, which is an extremely important one of course, on that sub-clause (i) there is a regulation in that sub-clause by itself to take care of any of those 'elbow' rooms that he might need in that regard. Then the 75 percentum of the maintenance of school in (ii), that one I am sure is already covered under a section dealing with the approved costs. And so all along the line, the (iii) 60 percentum, etc., "as required or authorized under regulations made." You see the point is that you've got here not only regulations but a double set of regulations because you have the controlling sub-clause with regulations in it and then several of the controlling sub-sections, no, clause, the controlling clause itself with regulations and then several of the sub-clauses themselves capable of regulations. Now I'm sure that my honourable friend intends to pay the amounts that are set out here. Going on down to B(iii) and so on, 40 percentum of the cost of such capital repairs, renovations, replacements "as are approved by the Minister." And the one just before that, "as are approved by the Minister."

Well, I think that you've got double regulation here to provide the protection that the honourable the Minister needs. However, that's all I intend to say on the matter, Mr. Chairman, and we can have the vote on it so far as I am concerned that's sufficient.

MR. D. ORILKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition doesn't understand this set-up at all.

If you assume the fact that the government has not agreed to pay the full salaries or 75% of the maintenance of schools or 60% of the cost of transportation, that if they have not agreed to pay the full amount whatever it may be in the particular district. They have only agreed to pay the percentage according to the amount which they have set out as being the maximum allowable. Once you assume that, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me necessary that you must say somewhere, and if you say it twice, I see no difference than if you say it in each separate section, that you will pay according to the regulations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet, I would like to say something although the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he

MR. ORILKOW (Continued)

wasn't going to move an amendment, I was happy to hear him say that he didn't speak for his whole group but I would like to say something about his remarks about the grants for capital cost. I thought, Mr. Chairman, that the members of this House accepted in principle the recommendations of the interim report of the Royal Commission, and the bill, Mr. Chairman. But as I listened to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, it seemed to me that either he didn't understand the interim report or else that he actually objected to it. Because the whole point of the interim report and the bill, Mr. Chairman, is certainly built around the idea that if we are going to have adequate secondary education, we must move towards having larger schools with more classes.

Now the honourable member said I think yesterday in committee that he thought that in a four-room high school, one could provide an adequate education. Well, Mr. Chairman, let's look at the situation. If you take a high school, grade 9, 10 and 11 and that's what we will have with this set-up, and you will take an average of six subjects per grade - you have 18 subjects. Now that would mean if you had only four teachers that each teacher would be required to teach approximately five courses. Now I submit, Mr. Chairman, that no teacher, I'm not being critical of the job that's being done. They've done the best that they could but no teacher can be competent really to teach five courses. If you are going to have a four-room high school certainly they're not going to be able to do the job which they can do in a larger high school where there can be more specialization. But even forgetting that for the moment, Mr. Chairman, if you have a four-room classroom it means that so many of the courses which ought to be offered cannot be offered.

Now, we heard this morning - we were in committee and we heard the President of the Farmers' Union, Mr. Patterson speaking, and some of you will remember, he spoke about the drift of the young people from the rural areas to the city, and he pointed out that when they came to the city they were unable to get skilled work, in many cases, because of the type of education which they had. Well I submit, Mr. Chairman, that unless we can get the rural areas to have larger high schools, in which you can have more specialization, and more option that the young people who are going to come into the cities and towns, will not be able to get the jobs which they will be looking for. If you don't have shops, if you don't have home economics, if you don't have commercial, if you are restricted to traditional courses, their ability to get jobs will be that much less. And, this is what the honourable member is suggesting, when he is saying that we ought not to encourage the larger high school.

I want to point out one more thing, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that one thing in which the rural high schools ought to be encouraged to really promote, is the field of shops. It is even more important to the rural areas than to cities, because of what I've seen of a farmer he not only has to be -- know something about crops, he's got to know something about keeping books, he's certainly got to know a good deal about keeping his equipment and machinery in good condition. And I can't think of a better way for him to learn how to do these things than in a modern,



MR. ORLIKOW (Continued)

well equipped shops room. And, for all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to be - encourage the growth -- I don't say that we can -- I don't disagree with the government when they reject, at least for the present, and maybe for a good long time, the idea that no high school should be less than twelve rooms, I think that's probably not practical at this time, but certainly we ought to encourage high schools to grow in size, and we can give all of this service we want to that idea, Mr. Chairman. If we don't give a financial inducement to the local areas to work for, then certainly we're not going to get it. And I certainly support this clause as it is and reject completely the suggestions made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. C. MILLER (Rhineland): Quite frankly, I must confess that I cannot follow the argument of the honourable member for St. Johns. When he suggests that the Leader of the Opposition stated or inferred that the teacher grants should be spelled out in legislation, he is suggesting the same practice that is followed now. And I want to suggest to my honourable friend, the Minister of Education, that there is a section in the Public Schools Act, where the amount is spelled out under which the great majority of the grants are paid. And - I'll come to that, I'll come to that. And it's under section 178, sub-section 3; "unless otherwise provided, the guaranteed annual support of each school district shall be \$2,500.00 in respect of each of the authorized numbers of teachers." Now that is the controlling section.

Under the proposed bill, it is suggested that this section do not apply, and all the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that the alternative formula be put in the Act. And, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that such is an easy matter, because, I'm quite sure, and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he suggests that the Minister has given serious study to this bill. We all admit that. I want to commend him for it, but surely, after looking at the recommendations of the interim report, on pages 73 and 74, if he doesn't agree with that, I suggest to you, quite frankly, that he must have made up his mind to an alternative policy. And that is the only thing we want to know. And that should be spelled out in the Act.

Now, as my honourable friend, my impatient honourable friend, the Honourable the First Minister refers to secondary grants, yes, those are provided by regulations. But, I also want to suggest to him - he's been in this House for some considerable time, and whenever there was a change contemplated, a change in grants contemplated, under the regulations, what did the Minister do? In his statement to the House, he indicated the amount. That has not been done in this case. And, with all due deference Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is in a position to indicate to the House, even if he wants to keep up the regulation, he is in a position to now -- now Mr. Chairman, to suggest to the House what he proposes to do. What is the government's alternative policy to the recommendations of the Royal Commission?

MR. F. L. JOBIN (Flin Flon): .....the matter of teachers' salaries and leaving them to regulations? I think it's regrettable

MR. JOBIN (Continued)

from one aspect that they were left to regulations, regrettable inasmuch as and having been in committee, inasmuch as the teachers' society did not have the opportunity -- I think they could have if they had availed themselves of it -- but they expressed the opinion that they didn't have the opportunity to talk upon salaries, because that was being left to regulations. Now, I think that the committee would not have objected if they had expressed their opinions on this particular matter. Because they didn't, and because teachers in my own constituency have asked me to mention this, I would like to point out some of the things that should have been discussed in committee, so that we, the legislators could have paid some attention to it. I know that the Minister will set the regulations on the salary schedule, but he'll do it after the teachers make representation to him, after the trustees make representation to him. But I suggest to this House, it would have been much better had it been in the Act so that we could have debated the pros and the cons. The way it's going to end up now is that the Minister and his colleagues will decide. But, I think we could have arrived at a better solution had we discussed the matter of the salary range, at least in the committee stage.

Now, some of the things that have been brought to my attention, and the honourable member from Burrows raised some of these here about ten days ago, the one consideration in the table referred to on page 73 (a) talks about present experience counts 50% of merit here completed to a maximum of 5 years. Teachers wonder, those teachers with twenty years experience, they ask, "what's going to happen to me. Do I start off at the maximum at the 5 year level?" These things weren't asked in the committee, but they are the concern of teachers. That is, a teacher with not much experience, where does he fit into the new salary schedule?

The other matter that has been raised, I've seen reports of it in the paper, but we didn't have the chance to debate it actually, is this matter of the variance in salary schedule between the elementary and the secondary teacher, of the same academic standing. Some teachers, at least, object as well to the dependent allowance, between the elementary and the secondary level. Others too, we know, again from the press, oppose as being impractical the general principle of merit rating. Others it is true, think that merit rating is good, if a good system can be brought out to bring this into operation. Teachers again -- and we didn't hear this, and yet this is to be left to regulations, teachers wonder why, the Royal Commission in their schedule on page 73 and 74 should give more attention -- more provision beyond the two years of faculty. You'll notice in the schedules on page 72 and 73, two years of faculty is the maximum on which merit rating -- or on which salaries can be based. That is, two years of faculty, plus whatever years of University they have.

And the final observation is that the teachers in my area -- my constituency complain about is this matter of tenure. And while I don't think that anything can be done about this without changing the Statutes, regulations may be able to bring about this recommendation contained on page 75 of the report, and that concerns tenure. Under that, any teacher can be bumped, if a teacher with

MR. JOBIN (Continued)

higher qualifications comes along. That's the pure and simple truth of the matter. And, I think teachers generally think that a teacher that's been teaching this year, or just the last two or three years deserves to be bumped, if they don't keep improving their standards. But, my group of teachers wonder about that particular teacher that's been in the service for 30 years, that just can't improve their standards. Are we surely by regulations, we're not going to permit the bumping of a teacher that has been in the service for so many years? Bump the young ones that should be improving, but let's not in regulations--and I'm not suggesting that you're going to--but this report suggests that you do. So because the teachers didn't say these things, and I'm not speaking for the Teachers' Society as a whole, but because they didn't say these in committee, because it wasn't in the bill, I at least can say them on behalf of the Teachers' Society of Flin Flon.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not just too certain whether the honourable member for Flin Flon desires an answer from me on the points that he has raised, and I have no desire to not take the House into my confidence. I could though, say a few things on--as I've already indicated that the grants proposed will follow by and large those recommended in the interim report.

With respect to the grants toward teachers' salaries, they will not be as large as the grants recommended by the report, although the difference will not be too substantial.

I noticed that the other day I was reported as saying we were not going to have merit rating. Actually, I didn't think I said that, it was--one of the few occasions when I made a somewhat, I thought, innocuous statement, but the fact of the matter is that we do not propose to tie merit rating to the scale of grants. I make it clear, however, that I feel definitely that merit rating will eventually have to become part of the plan, and my hope is that we will, and I perhaps should correct another statement that was made, I don't propose to ask the Teachers' Society what they think about merit rating. I'm going to ask the Teachers' Society to work with the Trustees Association and the Department of Education to evolve what will be an acceptable system of merit rating, but for the present, we are not tying the grants to a system of merit rating.

The schedule, when adopted, will include the principle of a variation between grants payable in respect of persons teaching in elementary schools and secondary schools. I know now that that idea will not be approved by the Manitoba Teachers' Society; I have assured them that they will have an opportunity to make their views on that as well as other matters known, and there'll be no desire to keep it a secret and they will have an opportunity to express their opinion. However, I think that the recommendations of the interim report have considerable force, in that, they point out that this particular type of grant, of making a differentiation between the grant that is paid to a teacher with a certain experience and training - if teaching in an elementary school and if teaching in a secondary school, there should be a difference, and it's based on the theory, at least, that this method will assist in having the qualified secondary school teachers teaching in our secondary schools.

MR. McLEAN (Continued)

The fact of the matter is that our great difficulty at the moment is not so much in obtaining teachers for elementary schools, but there is a very serious shortage of qualified teachers for the secondary schools. And, this idea is based on the theory that it will assist in getting the qualified secondary teachers in to the secondary schools.

Now, the experience--a year from now, or two years from now, we will be much better able to say whether this--whether in actual fact that is the result. We are, however, adopting it because it is the recommendation of the interim report.

I may say to the committee that we are eliminating from the grant schedule, the recommendation with respect to dependents' allowances. I understand that the best thinking is that that is not in keeping with modern views on things of this sort, and so that that part will not form part of the grant schedule.

Then finally I think the matter of tenure is covered by Section 7 of the bill, particularly sub-section 2, and certainly that is there to provide that teachers will continue to have the same rights, and of course the matter of tenure is protected by other legislation, as you indicated in the--as the honourable member for Flin Flon indicated.

I think that that is perhaps, may be some explanation, it may be of some assistance to the committee in considering how the grant schedule will look or what it will look like, when it is actually made.

MR. JOBIN: ....the matter of tenure - where did you say that was covered, please?

MR. McLEAN: In Section 7, it's on page 42 of the printed bill. Although that's not the sole protection of course, the protection actually comes in, now I'm not certain what the exact name of that Statute is, where tenure of teachers is protected, and this section is designed to just simply ensure that the rights and--that are accrued to any individual teacher by reason of other laws and existing contracts will continue under these division plans, without any interruption.

MR. BEND: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister just one question. I notice he said that it was his plan not to embody the recommendation of the commission with respect to dependents' allowances. Now, does that account for the variation....that your mentioning that the grant will not be quite as high as recommended. Is that the reduction?

MR. McLEAN: Well, it is one of the reductions, it's not the sole reduction. We've scaled it down a bit in some other spots, or propose to scale it down a bit in some other places.

MR. BEND: ....the reduction is greater - the overall reduction is greater than that amount?

MR. McLEAN: That is correct, yes.

MR. MILLER: ....just refer to the question raised by the honourable the member for Flin Flon. Section 363, provides for bargaining rights and tenure and so forth.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): .....in view of the comments of the honourable member for -- I'm sorry I don't know the constituency .....St. John's. He was speaking mainly on the matter of the-- what you might call the inducement grant to larger high schools. And, I don't understand the amendment as referring to that. It seems to me the amendment merely refers to specifying in the bill, that matter that the government will pay a fixed percentage. I just wanted to clear that up, if, because I'm sure he left the impression with the committee--the impression he left with me was that the main purpose of the amendment was to do away with that section and that's certainly not my impression, not what I voted on.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I didn't want to speak twice, and so while speaking of the amendment I made some comments about the suggestion which the honourable Leader of the Opposition made about the flat grant. Certainly I understand the inducement, but I wanted to speak only once and I used that opportunity. I understand very well what the honourable member was suggesting.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker--Mr. Chairman, I was the one who first instituted the error because I should not have spoken on both matters at the one time but I was trying to save time and so I made the remarks while I was speaking. But actually, of course, the amendment as I think, all the members are aware now, the amendment deals only with clause b of subsection 1 of 482 and just strikes out the operative part that deals with regulation says. The other part I should have waited to speak on later. I am sorry if I led my honourable friend from St. John's into an error in that regard because he certainly was in an error in his argument.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When a member who has been in the House for 23 years admits error, it is encouraging to the new members that come along. In fact, I corrected something here, the name and seconder, the men concerned was getting mixed up on their constituencies so I checked that up with the clerk to make sure. Now are you ready for the amendment? The amendment is as follows: Moved by the honourable member from Lakeside, seconded by the honourable member from Rhineland that the words "such amounts as may be prescribed in the regulation not exceeding" be struck out of lines 5 and 6 of clause b of subsection 1 of section 42.

MR. McLEAN: Should we not deal with "a" first - this is a proposed amendment to "b". We haven't passed clause "a" yet.

MR. ROBLIN: ....the whole section, Sir, or do we have to start from the beginning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we've moved along with the -- getting

down here with the discussion so that's why the honourable member from Lakeside slipped along to "b" which I though was going to be all right. Subsection 1 clause a ....

MR. PREFONTAINE: .....the official name of the Leader of the Opposition in this House should be the Member for Lakeside?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I stand corrected, the Leader of the Opposition...

MR. PREFONTAINE: But his official title here is not the member for Lakeside, it is the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PREFONTAINE: And I think the motion should read moved by the Leader of the Opposition not by the member from Lakeside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, we're getting it right now.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I used to say when I was occupying the place across the way where my honourable friend the First Minister sits now, I used to say when some of these arguments came up about whether the correct title for the head of the government in a province was Premier or Prime Minister, I used to say that I didn't care which they called me as long as they called me either one long enough. But now that the string has temporarily run out I can say that I don't mind the least little bit the way in which I am referred to here. Sometimes we refer to one another in uncomplimentary terms but, as a matter of fact, I understand that the way I presented the motion, however, is correct because when I write in the names I write my name and the name of the seconder not the constituencies, so in case they think I have been compounding the error I want to put that straight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (a) passed as amended; clause (b) was amended.....

MR. CAMPBELL: That's where the amendment comes in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, but, it was amended before by--after the word "mentioned but subject to such a .....

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, but I think if you put the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition now we can vote on that and then return to the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I didn't want any confusion when we came to the other in thinking that it was this one that was amended. The amendment moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the member from Rhineland that the words "such amounts as may be prescribed in the regulation not exceeding" be struck out of lines 5 and 6 of clause b of subsection 1 of section 482. Are you ready for the question? Those in favor of the amendment

please signify.

The clerk counted 19 in favor and 26 opposed.  
Reading of the bill was continued and read to sub-section 3.

MR. TEILLET: Sir, are we still on 482, (ix)?

MR. ROBLIN: No, we passed that.

MR. TEILLET: I was waiting for the Chairman to call the schedule a, b, c, etc., under "ix" here, and the amendments I have in my hand.

MR. ROBLIN: We just passed "ix" as amended, therefore it is not necessary to call the sections.

MR. TEILLET: Because I did want to say something about that schedule.

MR. ROBLIN: I think there would be no objection, Mr. Chairman if my honourable friend would wish to speak now, and even though it's passed we'll reconsider it.

MR. TEILLET: Thank you Mr. Premier. I am referring particularly to "h", the 75%, and the reason I bring this up at this time is that in committee the other day there happened to be a little confusion at that time and I think the Minister himself felt somewhat lost in the melee of amendments that were surrounding him at that time and I didn't get a chance to voice my opinions, so that I would like to take the opportunity of doing it now. That particular section the Government had previously, or in the printed Bill under "d", applied a rate of 80% for twelve rooms or more. Now I do want to make a plea here for a return to that amount. Firstly, I don't think it was given sufficient consideration in committee and I think the area of the province which is most likely to be affected by the twelve room class group - class of school, is the suburbs and sometimes I am tempted to call them the orphans of the Province of Manitoba. We have in the City of Winnipeg two very powerful daily newspapers; we have in rural Manitoba a very, very strongly and well-organized voice to speak for those sectors: whereas in the suburbs, though we do have some very excellent and very vocal weeklies, their influence does not extend very much beyond their boundaries, so that very often the voice of the suburbs is lost and I think that is where the school population problem is most acute.

I think it was the Premier, the other day, who called it - I think I had heard the expression somewhere else, but I believe it was he who used the expression that the school population of the suburbs is explosive and I believe that to be true. You have there, in the main, a population which is younger than I think you would find anywhere else in the province, all with growing children. They have had to go to those areas because it is easier to buy homes - the new homes, because of financing, the

greater ease of financing. They require houses of five or six rooms. Their taxes are probably the highest that you find anywhere, some of them in some areas running very nearly to \$500.00. Now, those are the people that are in the greatest difficulty. They are the people who would benefit very greatly from that clause because I don't know of any schools that have been built in those areas recently that don't come up to this 12, 14 and 16 room grouping. There, 12 rooms is not abnormal and although 5%, the difference between 75% and 80% may not necessarily mean a great deal to many people, and I doubt if it would mean too great an amount in the entire sums of money for education, I do suggest that it could mean a great deal to those areas, and I do think that is where you will find that clause to apply with greater effect than anywhere else.

I suspected the other day that the suggestion had some sympathy from the Premier. I think he was quite sympathetic to the idea and I do appeal to the Minister now, and to the House, to consider this very seriously. It's areas like the suburbs of Winnipeg, like the city from which the Honourable Minister of Education comes from, the city of Portage la Prairie - those would be affected, but primarily these large suburbs, explosive suburbs around the City of Winnipeg who have had so much trouble, so much difficulty in this sense. Now unfortunately, I must confess Mr. Chairman, that I do not have - I would like to propose an amendment - I do not have the consent - I haven't consulted our group on this question and I have some serious doubts that I would have their entire support, but with your permission I would like to propose an amendment to that clause to the effect that that figure be returned to 80%. I therefore move, seconded by the honourable member for Ste. Rose, that the word "seventy-five" in the first line of item "h" of sub-clause ix of clause b subsection 1 of section 482, I suppose I should state in the proposed amendment, that the word "eighty" be substituted therefore.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have his opinions on this, but we have already passed this sub-clause.

MR. ROBLIN: Whether or not, I must confess I haven't the reference at my finger tips, but is it out of order or is it in order? It is a financial matter my honourable friend is proposing here, and while I believe he is entitled to reduce sums, I don't believe he is entitled to increase them.

Now we could ask the clerk to check. I may be misinformed on that, but at first thought I'd just say that it is out of order on that ground.

MR. TEILLET: Well, might I word this then, Mr. Chairman, "that the House give consideration, or the Government give consideration to the advisability of". Would that look after that?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm not clear. I must confess - this is always a tricky point. I know that in resolutions 'give consideration to the advisability of', clears the thing. Whether



it does in this particular instance I'm not clear, and my impression is, it does not clear it, but I would be willing certainly to listen to any opinion there might be on that. Perhaps the Clerk would look it up, and find out whether we are right or wrong on it, and get it straight.

MR. TEILLET: Mr. Chairman, I think I would be quite satisfied to accept a ruling of the Chair on this. I don't know - I certainly would like the opportunity of bringing it before the House, on the other hand of a vote from the House, but on the other hand, if I am out of order, I will accept the ruling from the Chair.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C.(Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, while the Clerk is looking up his ruling on this particular point, and subject to whatever ruling the Clerk may give, and subject to whatever disposition the Committee may make, I would like to support the honourable member for St. Boniface in his submission to the Committee. I have in my own constituency - now just to give the Committee an idea of what this 5% is going to mean. I have in my own constituency one school, the construction of which will start early in April next year. That school is going to cost \$320,000.00. Now 5% means \$16,000.00 to that district - well 5% more. And I feel too, Mr. Chairman, that we're perhaps getting away from the inducement and I don't urge the financial inducement as the only consideration for adopting the recommendations of the Royal Commission. I think the primary inducement is the benefit to the children. But I do say this, that people are practical, and the financial inducement is going to be a big consideration in whatever decision they make in forming those larger groups. And I would urge the Government, if it can find a way of rechanging this back to 80% --to change it.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment briefly on that also. It seems to me that one of the more important aspects of this Bill was that those clauses which were dealing with the percentage grants for construction, inducing the areas to build bigger schools, and I think that we were pretty well all in agreement that there are certain inherent advantages in having larger schools. And it seems to me that with the amendment now before us that we are getting away from that. I would merely like to emphasize along with the Member for Selkirk that the Minister should try and find some way to get back to the original.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, just one thing so I won't have to correct Hansard tomorrow. I don't want anybody accusing me of coming from Portage la Prairie. That's a fighting accusation where I come from. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think, to set the records straight, you will recall we had considerable discussion on this point when in the special committee, and I brought in for the committee's consideration, a schedule which now forms part of the - which is the amendment. But you will also recall that I said to the Committee that so far as the Government was

concerned, we were prepared to stay with the grant schedule we had in the original bill, up to 80%, or, if the Committee preferred, we would adopt the other schedule which goes to 75%. And it was the decision of the Committee to adopt that schedule, and that's where we are.

Now, we had these discussions and I'm assuming that everyone was bearing in mind the alternatives. I appreciate the argument made, very forcibly by some, that if you make any difference, that is any difference between 40%, which is the basic grant, and any larger amount, of course you appear to be inducing or encouraging people to build larger schools. And there are those here who don't feel that's a good thing. So that if it was apparently the opinion of the Committee that 75% graduated as we have it in this scale, was a fair proposal to not make the inducement too great, and yet at the same time to put it on a fair basis as schools moved up from 4 to 5 and so on up to 12 rooms. Now I'm rather inclined, perhaps, to say that we should stay with the schedule the committee agreed on, although I was willing and the Government was willing to have adopted the other schedule, in fact that was the one we put forward, and I so stated to the Committee.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I would like to direct a question to the Minister. If this amendment that has been just proposed was passed, would it affect the other - it wouldn't affect the others in any way would it?

MR. McLEAN: No, this has only to do with construction grants for high schools.

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, what I meant to say, would it affect all the rest of the schools under the construction grants?

MR. McLEAN: Oh, well, I'm sorry I'm--that's up to the Committee. I assume that you want to--we went to some trouble to work out this scale which seemed to be fair and not give an undue preference merely because you moved up to the next bracket so to speak. And the - if you change the top amount, then you would possibly wish to change all of the from 'a' to 'h', but....

MR. TEILLET: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly the purpose of the ...Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman is ready to rule now and we can hear what the ruling is and see where we go from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Private members may introduce resolutions that do not directly involve the expenditure of public money and have no operative effect, but simply express an abstract opinion on a matter which may necessitate a future grant.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't know. Would that be your opinion, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I - I, that's my opinion - that's my decision on the matter. It's quite out of order now we've passed this.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I - if we refer to our rules, or the appendix thereto, the wording of, on page 62, is the same as the Chairman read, and then it goes on--"the following phraseology could be considered as abstract in dealing with expenditure of public money". In the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the advisability of..

MR. ROBLIN: I'll admit this is always a difficult point to decide, but it seems to me that if the honourable member's resolution was put and carried, that it isn't any abstract resolution at all. It's a positive part of the bill and will have an effect on the resolute in that way. And I think, I must confess, I'm not considering the merits of the case because they've been expressed by the Minister. We've been through that argument - I won't repeat it, but I do really think that it is out of order and the Chairman has ruled in that way and if the Committee would like to vote, we could decide what we think. But I think it's out of order.

MR. TEILLET: I asked it simply to clear the matter. I accept the Chair's ruling in this question, and I will withdraw the amendment, and would, if I may just continue for a second, appeal to the Minister of Education to reconsider this portion for the next session of the House. I would want to express my regrets to him if I did actually say - I certainly had no intention of placing the honourable minister in Portage la Prairie, and for the sake of Hansard, I will repeat what I thought I had said, - "the honourable minister's city as well as Portage la Prairie.

MR. CAMPBELL: On the point of order, I think that the decision is quite O.K. here, but inasmuch as Chairman's decisions like Speaker's decisions, become to some extent a precedent, and as least the same Chairman would feel that he was bound by them later on, I think we should be clear on what we want to do in this matter. Now, I agree completely with the First Minister that it is not within the competence of a private member to move a vote, a motion or a resolution that will increase or require expenditures by the Crown. But- and to the extent that the honourable member would try to put 80 in instead of 75, then I would think that this is out of order. But on the other hand so long as the honourable member was prepared - and I know that that couldn't be done with regard to this particular bill in this way - but so long as he is prepared to move at some other and appropriate time, the abstract resolution saying that the Government should consider the advisability of doing it, then I'm sure that I would contend that that would be in order. Quite frankly, I don't see how it could be introduced at this stage.

MR. ROBLIN: I've said, and there's certainly no intention

on my part, and I'm sure none on the part of the Chairman to abrogate in any way our customary procedure of introducing so-called abstract resolutions.

The remainder of the Bill was passed and allowed to stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 8, an Act to provide assistance to farmers in establishing, developing and operating their farm.

Mr. Chairman reads Bill section by section and the comments and amendments follow.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, were there any major amendments made this morning that were not contained on the mimeographed sheets that we got from the Minister that might be advisable either to spell out at the time we come to them?

MR. ROBLIN: I just don't get what you mean by 'major ones'. I don't think the word 'major ones' --If there is any doubt, we'll spell them out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 2 D, E, as amended.

MR. CAMPBELL: Just to be clear, Mr. Chairman, would you indicate the nature of the amendment?

MR. WILLIS: If I may, 'D' is, a farmer means a person whose principal occupation is farming. Then 'E', farming includes the tillage of the soil, stock-raising, dairying, poultry raising, agriculture and fur ranching.

MR. CAMPBELL: Those two replace the present (i) and (ii) do they?

MR. WILLIS: Yes. The first one defining the farmer is 'D' the next one is 'E'. Yes, under 2. That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 4, Sub-section 1.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to suggest here which I think will be acceptable to the House. It follows the discussions which we had before. Strike out after the word Governor-General in line 3 and insert the words "two of whom shall be representatives of recognized farm organizations". The whole thing will then read, "The organization established under Section 3 shall consist of five persons appointed by order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, two of whom shall be representatives of recognized farm organizations and three of whom may - I should emphasize that - may be members of the Civil Service of the Government of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sub-section 3.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, before that is

passed, finally passed, the difference that I see in this one and the amendment that was proposed in the committee, special committee, which I do not have a copy at the moment, would be that this one (interjection) I think the other one said two of whom would be nominated by ...

MR. WILLIS: Yes, that's slightly different in that respect. Our plans have followed the usual one whereby they would probably give us three names from which we would select one.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't know what my colleagues think about that. As far as I'm concerned, I think perhaps that's a pretty fair compromise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 7, clause 'f', as amended.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: Could you give me a definition of livestock in the Bill? It seems to me the purchase of livestock-- Could we get a definition of livestock?

MR. WILLIS: ...Our amendment that we leave it exactly the way it is in the Act originally. 'The purchase of livestock'. The purchase of livestock. Then, I think that will cover all the suggestions which were made; breeding stock is out; basic herd is out; just livestock. I think that will cover all the objections which were made.

MR. MOLGAT: The amendment as presented in this amendment is amended again back to the original bill?

MR. WILLIS: It's cancelled and we go back to the original as printed which says the Purchase of Livestock. I think that will cover all the objections made.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I thought we have an amendment in the bill as it ...

MR. WILLIS: We had an amendment which was offered in committee which was withdrawn and now you have just as it was before - Section (f) is four words - The Purchase of Livestock.

MR. M.N.HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, .....to the committee wasn't withdrawn in the committee: what the Honourable Minister I understand is saying is that he himself has put it back to the original - not on the advice of the committee.

MR. WILLIS: I thought it was withdrawn in Committee but if I am mistaken there, I'd be very happy to move that now - that the amendment be withdrawn and that we follow the original, which I think will satisfy everyone.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think it goes back to this fact, doesn't it, that looking back at 2 (d) and (e) that there is

a definition, doesn't (e) give a definition of Livestock?

MR. WILLIS: (f) gave a definition of livestock and (f) was this - the purchase of basic herd livestock - that is to say livestock to be kept and used primarily for breeding purposes and not solely for finishing for sale. Now there were objections to that and it is now our wish - I thought it was mentioned this morning - that we go back to the original, just as it was, which will cover all the arguments I think in regard to stock for finishing and for fattening and basic herd - just to leave it - The Purchase of Livestock.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this will be helpful or not but it may be. In the amendment to Section 2, I believe it's the new (e) in the definition of farming - maybe sets out what livestock is intended to be and if that is correct, then the Minister would be right in retaining the original section that we're on, but I'd like to have that amendment (e) read to see if I'm correct in the interpretation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Definition (e) eh?

MR. WILLIS: Stock raising is included there . Farming includes the tillage of the soil, stock raising, dairy, etc.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I got the Minister such a short time ago suddenly re-considering Section 2, and when we got down to (d) the Minister gave two sections there (d) and (e) that now take the place of 'D' (i) and (ii) and I thought that-- and I-- are now I think called (d) and (e) and I thought that (e) gave a definition of livestock. Is that not correct?

MR. WILLIS: .....No, it's not correct. No, it gives the definition of farming which includes livestock.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, is it right that up to date, we have no definition of livestock in the Bill...?

A MEMBER: That's right, that's why I brought this up.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would suggest that we should ---.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: Mr. Chairman, we intended to move that in the Committee, but we had passed over it this morning or the other day without my notice, and we intended to move, that in the committee we define 'livestock'; because unless you define 'livestock' it isn't --- We have a definition of farming, yes, that includes some of these things, but not a definition of 'livestock', and it was pointed out in committee the other day we have 'livestock' defined in many different ways in other bills.

MR. ROBLIN: Why don't we just add it to this 'F' here; the purchase of livestock included? And then give the definition.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: Yes, you can do it that way.

MR. ROBLIN: What is the definition?

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: Well, we'd have the same things included in farming.

MR. ROBLIN: Well would you write it down and we can consider it.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): In the Act respecting livestock and livestock products, it definitely defines livestock and this is what it says. "Livestock means horses, cattle, sheep, swine, live poultry and bees." I think the honourable minister has a copy of that Act there. I think that that definition would be ....

MR. MOLGAT: It isn't though because we have included fur ranching in the definition of farming. This doesn't include fur bearing animals. Apart from that I think it covers everything.

MR. ROBLIN: I understand my honourable friend's writing out a definition over there. We can wait for him. Would it meet the wish of the committee if we were just to proceed for awhile and that will give you ample time? ...Yes? Then we'll go on and then we'll come back to this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "H" as amended.

MR. CAMPBELL: What is the amendment? I've....

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . purposes related to establishment and development of the land and to the farming operations of the borrower as approved by the directors, including the word "and" to the farming operations following the word "land" - striking out 'and operation' at the beginning of the second line - strike out 'operation' - than Development of the lands and to the farming operation of the borrower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (c)

MR. CAMPBELL: Was there an amendment here, Mr. Chairman? Is the amendment the one that .....?

MR. WILLIS: It's all just about the chattel mortgages, etc.

MR. CAMPBELL: But is it exactly ..was the amendment adopted in the committee this morning? I'm sorry that once again I had to leave early, for a meeting. It was a non-political meeting, but I had other commitments.

MR. WILLIS: I was supposed to go to the same place.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I noticed that my honourable friend didn't show the same interest in the meeting that I did. I

forgive him though, he's very busy.

MR. WILLIS: I can read that for you now if you want me to. Bus-section 7 - For the purpose for which the monies or any of the monies are loaned is the purchase of livestock and other chattels or both; in addition to being secured by a mortgage on land as provided by Clause (b) the monies loaned (i) shall be secured by a first chattel mortgage (a) on the livestock so purchased a natural increase; (b) on the other chattels so purchased and on chattels other than livestock thereafter acquired by the borrower or (c) about such livestock and increase and such other chattel purchaser thereafter acquired and (ii) may if the manager so requires be secured by a chattel mortgage subject to the basic herd livestock or other chattels or both owned by the borrower at the time the loan is made as the manager may designate. That should be ----basic herd livestock should be just livestock because now that's the definition of it. So we would strike out just the two words 'basic herd'. Then it would be "on such of the livestock or other chattels or both ". That's the amendment which was approved in committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I had been in looking this amendment over this morning and it seems to me that will all respect that this is considerably worse than the sub-section we were amending. Because what we were objecting to there, was that the land had to be encumbered for the loan on livestock. Now, as I read this one, it not only encumbers the land but it also can encumber - it must encumber the land and can encumber the other livestock and even other chattels. Surely, I think that one should be reconsidered, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WILLIS: Members of the committee will correct me if I am wrong, but I think there was a motion moved this morning to have it on chattels alone, which was turned down.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well if that motion has already been moved and defeated then--then was there a motion with regard to other chattels in addition to the ones covered by the mortgage being included and their increase?

MR. WILLIS: I don't know the exact wording of that but the general trend was that it was to cover livestock or and chattels only. In other words, doing away with the necessity which is there now of having a mortgage on land.

MR. CAMPBELL: That one was defeated?

MR. WILLIS: That one was defeated this morning.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then, I should not move that one again, but on the other hand there's another principle involved, I think, which is perhaps equally important, and that is that under this one as I read it, the other chattels in addition to those covered by the loan can be encumbered.



MR. WILLIS: This is to cover the purchase of machinery.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, but this is .....the two are included?

MR. WILLIS: That's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: And the purpose for which the money is loaned, or any of the monies are loaned, the purchase of livestock or other chattels or both, in addition to being secured by a mortgage on land provided in clause (b), the money loaned shall be secured by a first chattel mortgage; then (a) on the livestock so purchased and the natural increase thereof. I would certainly not object to that. Then (b) on other chattels so purchased - chattels other than livestock thereafter acquired .....

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition will just consider this situation, he'll see why this might be desirable. It's possible that the first chattel mortgage might be traded in on something else or some transaction or that sort takes place, in which one item is substituted for another. If that should happen, it would be fair I think that the lending organization should have some hold on that second chattel because otherwise, as far as I know, in the legal line of things it wouldn't have that claim at all, but you can easily visualize that this sort of thing could happen in good faith, and it's the kind of provision that I think we could well make room for.

MR. CAMPBELL: ....such a situation might arise with machinery, let us say. I would not think that could arise with livestock.

MR. ROBLIN: The cow is sold and the progeny are there.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, but that's already covered by the first one. My honourable friend was not talking about sale, he was talking about--about traded in for something else.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, the same argument applies to both.

MR. CAMPBELL: Not in the practical sense, I'm sure. But then, going on from there, then the second part, may, if the manager so requires, be secured by a chattel mortgage on such of the then 'basic herd' is struck out and 'livestock' substituted, secured in the chattel mortgage on such of the livestock or other chattels or both, owned by the board at the time the loan is made, that the manager may designate.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of it is this. That it was thought that the man who was going to borrow the money should be able to use as security both the livestock he has now and the machinery he has now. He should be able to use too, as security, the livestock perhaps which he is going to buy with the loan, the machinery which he is going to buy with

the loan. This, in effect, increases the possibility of his security and helps him, in our opinion, to get a larger loan.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, that doesn't explain all of the security that is asked for under these clauses. In addition to what the Honourable Minister has mentioned, they also ask for security on any chattels or livestock that this borrower may purchase any time in the future. And I think that that particular provision there is pretty drastic, and I don't recall having seen it anywhere in my practice of drawing up a chattel mortgage, when you are taking a chattel mortgage on property which the borrower may acquire some day in the future. I am quite in agreement with all that the Honourable Minister just mentioned, the increase in livestock, the livestock that he purchases with the money that he borrows, and the implements he purchases with the money that he borrows. That is perfectly all right, but when you are asking the borrower to give you security on anything he may purchase after he has executed the mortgage and not with the monies that he obtained under the loan ...

MR. WILLIS: One of the main purposes, too, Mr. Chairman, which we had intended was that where a man has machinery on which there is a chattel mortgage, he has it 2 or 3 years and he wants to turn it in on another new outfit, that the chattel mortgage should have as security that new replacement. That, I think, is important; otherwise, if you don't have it, if you don't permit that, you find the man with an entirely new outfit of machinery, which is completely unencumbered, but you have a chattel mortgage which doesn't have assets.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: But this does not confine it even to that type machinery. You go further than that in this amendment.

MR. W.B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, this is a very common type of conveyancing. If a merchant gives a chattel mortgage on his stock, it covers the goods that come in from time to time, and a chattel mortgage on increase of livestock is very, very common practice.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That isn't the point of argument.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's not the section that is being discussed at the moment. So far as that one is concerned, I have no objections to that one, but if the honourable gentleman will look at (b). On the other chattels so purchased and on chattels other than livestock, thereafter acquired by the borrower.

MR. WILLIS: New machinery.

MR. CAMPBELL: How are they going to, in practice, keep that up? However, it has been considered and I have no amendment to move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section F, G, H, I as amended.

MR. WILLIS: 60 years instead of 50 - a lot of good men around about that age.

MR. CAMPBELL: That still leaves you and me out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subsection 1; 4 as amended, for the purposes of this act, and 5, leaving out the words "commercial current value".

MR. CAMPBELL: As far as 4 is concerned, I would ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that 4 is ....

MR. WILLIS: Strike out the word "agricultural" then add on the end of the act and then it will read, last line "its value for the purposes of this act", which was considered to make it much wider.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sub-section 8 as amended.

MR. CAMPBELL: What is the amendment in 8 ?

MR. WILLIS: That's the one you have on your desk, mimeographed with regard to the rate of interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is "interest on loans shall not be compounded".

MR. WILLIS: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sub-section 10 as amended.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, did we do sub-section 9 - 1,2,3, separately? In 3 there is an amendment is there not?

MR. WILLIS: We strike out the question "or if the security depreciates in value". That's out.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, didn't we agree to leave that in, and add instead, "through any fault or negligence on the part of the borrower" ?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, that's right. 9 as amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 11.

MR. CAMPBELL: Which one, Mr. Chairman, is Section 11? It seems to me that we added some sub-sections here or changed....

MR. WILLIS: It says 'Printed'. 11 is as printed, but 10 has two sections.

MR. CAMPBELL: 10 has an extra section added.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 11 passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Section 14.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are there any amendments - Could we have the amendments in 14, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, in 2 in 14 "approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council" striking out the words "the Minister in writing".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 16, sub-section 3 as amended.

MR. WILLIS: There's a special amendment there. I move it, seconded by the Minister of Education. Propose amendment of sub-section 3 of Section 16 of Bill No.8, The Agricultural Credit Act, that all the words in the ninth line of sub-section 3 of Section 16 of the bill be struck out and the following words substituted therefore: "in the trust and special division of the consolidated fund and used for the benefit of the corporation" merely a treasury adjustment.

MR. ROBLIN: That's what I undertook to bring in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? Section 20.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would like to ask the circumstances under which the Minister thinks that Section 20 would become operative.

MR. WILLIS: It appears in there because I went down to Ottawa and had an interview with the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Harkness, and I asked him about their plans as to the enlargement of the Farm Loans Act and whether it was going to come about. He said, "It may, but my advice to you is to include a clause in yours which would permit you to co-operate with us should we decide to come forward with it". I discussed with him the wording of the clause and this results from that conversation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say that surely if the Federal Department of Agriculture, the Federal Government decide to expand or modernize their Farm Loans Act, surely, they won't be loaning money to the provincial funds, under the Farm Loans Act.

MR. ROBLIN: You can't tell.

MR. WILLIS: This is along the general lines suggested to me by the Federal Minister, that's all I can say.

MR. ROBLIN: Now we go back to paragraph "F".

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we put a definition clause in Section 2 of the bill, which would define livestock as follows: "Livestock means horses, cattle, sheep, swine, goats, live poultry, bees and fur breeding stock". I think that covers the field.

MR. WILLIS: That's agreeable to us. Some complaints say we didn't include white mice, but don't listen to them.

MR. ROBLIN: No, let's be clear about this. I think the amendment that's before us is an amendment to paragraph, to Section 2 of the Act. And I think you had better put the question on paragraph 7 F, and then we'll be sure that we have it right.

MR. WILLIS: It says just the purchase of livestock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ....then we add this in Section 2 of the Act to the definition of 'livestock'.

MR. WILLIS: Livestock, and then you refer to it in 7 F where you say just the purchase of livestock, which is the original wording.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, would the Minister explain now under the definition of livestock we have bee-keeping or bees rather, and fur bearing animals. Now, what would be the acreage requirement applicable there? Would the acreage requirement still be 50 acres or...

MR. WILLIS: It's wiped out.

MR. SCHREYER: The acreage requirement then only applies to market gardeners, is that correct?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before the Act is finally passed and I perhaps missed it when we were going through it in committee as a whole. Was there an amendment moved regarding the interest rate? Did it remain at 1%? 1% above the cost to the province? Was there an amendment moved on that?

MR. WILLIS: -And defeated.

MR. CAMPBELL: Was the amendment (Interjection) ... I had intended to say in the special committee dealing with the question of interest, I think I just should put on record that the Farmers Union Local of Mather have wired me - this came some time ago and I intended to present it at the committee, because when they showed interest enough to wire on it, I think it deserves to be noted - saying: "Mather Local of Manitoba Farmers Union Local 178 wishes to express their opinion on Government Farm Loan policy. We suggest no farmer can pay 6% interest at current prices, suggest 2%. May be of some help to the farmers. Signed, George Finton". I simply record that because they took the trouble to send it in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Preamble. Title ....Bill be reported. Will you rise to report?

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. McLEAN: Sir, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare, that Bill No.2, an act to amend the Public Schools Act, be now read a third time and passed.

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

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Bill No.8, an act to provide assistance to farmers in establishing, developing and operating their farms, be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable, the Minister of Agriculture, seconded by the Honourable, the Minister of Education, that bill No. 8, an act to provide assistance to farmers in establishing, developing and operating their farms be now read a third time and passed. Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't rise to oppose the motion and not to speak on it either, simply to ask a question that I neglected to ask in the Committee of the Whole today, and perhaps as the question applies to both bills no.2 and no.8, perhaps the First Minister would wish to answer. That is, I notice that both of those - I must apologize, I asked this question before and I've forgotten the answer - both of them I notice come into effect on proclamation rather than assent. Would the First Minister inform me once again as to the reason for these bills being by proclamation rather than by royal assent, and inasmuch as they are by proclamation, would he indicate to the House when it is the intention to proclaim them.

MR. ROBLIN: Bill No.2, it comes into effect when it receives the royal assent. Bill No.8 may be delayed a little while because there are certain administrative and procedural matters that will have to be put entrain before we would wish to proclaim the bill. Our intention is, though, is to proclaim it just as soon as we possibly can get those preliminary arrangements completed.

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

The Committee of Supply.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable, the Minister of Agriculture, that Mister Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House do now resolve itself into a committee of supply and the Honourable Member for St. Matthewstake the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are resuming the debate on Resolution 3 on Capital Supply.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the Committee how much of the work is left on the completion of that section of road on the perimeter route from Waverley Street to Oak Bluff. I was over it a few weeks ago and it was, I thought, practically completed at that time, but I notice an item in these estimates for the completion of the concrete pavement and I wonder if that pavement won't likely be completed this fall.

MR. WILLIS: It may be but I couldn't give any definite assurance in regards to it, the latest report I've got.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in looking over some of these items, and I thought I heard the Minister say yesterday, that there was nothing in these estimates that there had been money provided for in this current year; it would be completed now. There is an item there, Mr. Chairman, that I think possibly if the weather holds for a few days will be completed, and I haven't had time to go over these too carefully but I notice that on highway 24, a bridge there, for next year's program. Well, I know, Mr. Chairman, that there was money voted for it in this past year's program. Now, it seems to me that there are one or two items that I can pick out like that; there may be a good many other items in this program that money was voted for last year, and I would like to have from the Minister, if it was possible to have, and I know he can't give any details at all, but a rough breakdown of what is in this program that was in last year's program.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister to build two roads that would touch the constituency of Carillon, the extension of 23 highway from LaRoche to No. 12, and also mentioned the Mississippi Parkway. In order of priority I would think that the highway which will help very much to develop the dairy area up and around Grunthal should come first.

HON. MARCEL BOULIC (Cypress): Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to thank the Honourable Minister for the prompt action that was taken on the Carberry Access road. On the accidents that have happened in Carberry, as the member for Gladstone mentioned last night, about a month ago after the last fatal accident, I contacted the Department of Public Works and they will have some kind of an investigation. It is surprising that on one of the straightest stretches of road so many accidents seem to happen. There is much heavier traffic a little further west coming out of Shilo, and you never hear of any fatal accidents there, but at the Carberry corner a number of people have died through accidents this summer. The honourable member from Gladstone also mentioned the Carberry-Neepawa Road. I am sure that when our plan comes out that the Minister will take into consideration that road which is much needed.

I also notice that the Minister invited some of the Members

from the other side of the House to see him after the show. I hope I can see him after the show too, because we need very badly a bridge on the Assiniboine, north of Treherne. I was quite happy to see that work will be done on 13 and 34 highways, 34 highway, that section, that 18 miles is mostly, is practically all in the Leader of the Opposition's constituency, but is of great service to my constituency.

Now, the Honourable Member from Rhineland seems to have been quite shocked when the Minister unwrapped his road program, but as you know, being in the Cabinet, I knew of some roads that were going to be on and you can just imagine my consternation when I found out--I listened to him and I didn't hear anything about one of the very important roads in Manitoba. I read this program and it wasn't there either. And I must praise the Press because they have been accused on different occasions of not reporting the news correctly. But I can assure you, Mr. Minister, that they have saved the day in my case because this morning I found that nine miles of road from No.2 highway through Notre Dame is included. Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I presume the Honourable the Minister is going to answer the point that was raised by my colleague, the member for Minnedosa re the Waverley Street-Oak Bluff. I think he asked the question with regard to that.

MR. B. CORBETT ( Swan River): I was somewhat surprised, after the Minister of Public Works, the Honourable Minister of Public Works had been congratulated by all the members in the Opposition on how well he had done for them, to hear the honourable member for Cypress get up and chide him a little bit. As far as I'm concerned, up in our country we have, I have no particular interest in roads because our constituency happens to lie, doesn't lie on east and west highway but it lies on the north and south main entrances into the north country and, naturally, we get all our roads fixed up without any trouble at all. And I wish to congratulate the Minister on his very fine program and I hope that no more of our side will get up and claim they are being short-changed. Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Today I asked the honourable minister of Agriculture a question in connection with access roads. I wonder if he would be kind enough to answer that? Oh, I have yourself and ten other boys to answer that.

MR. WILLIS: First on the list is the Member for Rhineland. As far as the access roads are concerned each one of them is treated on its merits and we are in favour of them and it's just the danger element which I spoke about there before.

MR. MILLER: May I interject here? What I asked was whether or not any monies that are, whether the new policy applies to the program that had already been approved but where the money has not been expended and cannot be expended this year, the vote expires and whether they will be treated on the same basis as he proposed to treat others under the new program.



MR. WILLIS: The answer is yes.

MR. MILLER: ...Fine.

MR. WILLIS: The Member for Inkster spoke about the possibility of building roads with government equipment, and we did have some when I was here previously but when I came back it had gone. And the policy was changed. We had the idea at that time that with some government equipment you could do a number of the smaller jobs which you probably didn't want to let out on contract. And in addition to that, having government equipment was a check on the cost of building roads because if you build them yourself you can see relatively as to whether you are getting good value from the contractors but I was succeeded by a complete private enterpriser and, in the meantime, apparently that equipment was disposed of and now we don't have any at the moment and we haven't any established policy to get any at the moment.

MR. CAMPBELL: That ...is the Minister saying that's completely true?

MR. WILLIS: Well, to the best of my knowledge. I inquired about it and I said: "What happened to that equipment?" and they said: "Well it was sold in the meantime." I still think, of course, we have some equipment but not the bigger equipment which was..We had two outfits then that could go out and build any kind of a road, but I think no longer...

MR. CAMPBELL: I think the statement our honourable friend was making indicated that all of it was gone.

MR. WILLIS: It's not important but we had, if my information is correct and I think it is, I inquired about it, Mr. Strang was here at that time and he was handling our outfit. We would go out and build a five mile stretch at that time which apparently is not being done at the present. I'm subject to correction but that, I inquired when I returned and that was what I was told.

The member for St. Boniface spoke in regard to the need of bridges and I agree with him entirely that they are needed, in particular I think, that there are at least two bridges pretty badly needed at the present time and certainly we're not over-looking them and I would hope that they would come along in due course. ...I hope not. (In reply to some member's comment).

The Member for Logan I am glad is back again. May I pause to congratulate him on the greatest victory, I think, that there ever has been in Civic elections in the City of Winnipeg ..... Pardon?

MR. JOBIN: Polish, polish, polish.

MR. WILLIS: And as he has indicated very clearly that he isn't a member of any party and there is no apple polishing, although I see opposite me experts in that profession.

So I do say to the Member for Logan that he, too, has had a

hand in bridge building and I'm glad for his sake that the Disraeli Bridge is on the way with an assist from the previous government and an assist from this government, so this is, as I see it, a complete coalition for the building of the Disraeli Bridge.

The Honourable Member was inquiring in regard to the question of salt and all the trouble they had with it and now we have chloride here but I think it would be correct to say that they were using sodium chloride whereas we are using calcium chloride and that that's not nearly as damaging as the other is. Sodium chloride, if they keep away from that, why they will probably not be in trouble and just use calcium chloride instead.

The honourable members spoke about the question of repairs to asphalt and concrete highways. It would be my opinion that you have much less on country highways. May I say, that so far as highways are concerned, while 75 is an excellent highway, it will be a much better highway than it ever was when we give it an asphalt covering. Then you will have what, in my opinion, is pretty well the ideal highway. It will have the concrete for the solid base, it will have the asphalt for the smooth top and then you have what should be the perfect road and although 75 is good, it should be soon much better. ....I beg your pardon? ..

MR. LUCKO: .....on the top?

MR. CAMPBELL: .....is not on this program is it?

MR. WILLIS: No it isn't. No. After blacktop it is sheer delight. That's what comes after it ...

The Honourable member for Carillon spoke in regard to election pledges and I noticed that one of the other members said afterwards that he was on the road to oblivion. But, of course, that's just the idea of the member from this side of the House. The honourable member for Carillon spoke about the question of ---this was an election program. Well, I'm certain that his party is an expert in that regard because if you'll examine the expenditures every year, you can-you don't need to enquire when the elections were held, you get the expenditures. You get the expenditures and you'll see that nice big bulge every time. Just at election time,...and a ....

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, we have .....in past year.

MR. WILLIS: No, but the big bulge always comes at election time compared with the other years surrounding it and if you watch it....

MR. CAMPBELL: You go back and check it.

MR. WILLIS: I am. I did.

MR. CAMPBELL: Not if .....

MR. WILLIS: That's the question.

MR. PREFONTAINE: My reference was to the timing of the program...

MR. WILLIS: In contrast to the timing, we have timed it because we thought that you honourable members opposite would have the courage to throw us out and if you did..of the great necessity of roads, and we were conscious of the feelings of the people of Manitoba and consequently, we put on this program in case you threw us into the ash heap.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has made one statement here that I agree with. I ...

MR. WILLIS: Thank goodness for that.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't know whether I think the Leader should take him up on that.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that point came in..

MR. WILLIS: The program of course, which you have now in the fall and the member for Carillon asked why we had it now, was so that they could start on the work. There is an additional feature which was not previously mentioned which is of importance. If a contractor can get a contract now, in the fall, he can completely finance his operations because if he has a contract the bank will finance him, the machinery company will finance him, and he is well on his way. Which wouldn't otherwise be the case because he could do nothing until he gets the contract. After he gets the contract he has to scramble for cash in order to carry out that contract and get his money.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I would like to ask a question. Will the contractor be pleased to pay, will he pay interest for six months for nothing?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sure my honourable friend really knows the answer to that question is "no".

MR. WILLIS: I think that's the complete answer for it. That's what enables him to buy it and take delivery and he, in the spring, can start working immediately. ....if I understood the member for Carillon correctly he asked me if we had plans for the building of No.23 east from where it is now. Was that your question?

MR. PREFONTAINE: From LaRochelle, yes.

MR. WILLIS: Yes. East of LaRochelle. There are no immediate plans in that regard.

Then the Honourable Member spoke about the Mississippi Parkway and I should like, I'm glad to be able to say a word in regard to it. Mississippi Parkway should come to Manitoba in the south-eastern portion. While the exact location is not yet

confirmed, it will be in that general direction there and proceed north. As some of the members may not know, the State of Minnesota is most anxious in regards to this, because they have a large territory of land there, probably a hundred square miles which is entirely surrounded by the Lake of the Woods and they can't even get to that territory now except over water. This will, in effect, give Minnesota an entrance to their own property which is quite a large track through Manitoba. And they have agreed to pay fifty percent of the cost of this highway within Manitoba in order that they may get to their own territory, the north-west angle. Then we would expect to build that north again from there to Falcon Lake.

There is another important feature in regard to it, I think, is that as far as the province of Ontario is concerned, it opens up for them a large and beautiful beach there which was not previously accessible and which will now become accessible through the Mississippi Parkway. The planning, much of the planning has been going on now for two or three years in regard to the Parkway and the previous government had the first hand in that, and it has continued from there. We had an important meeting there at .....about three weeks ago, and the Governor was there. Governor Freeman was there and he expressed his interest in regard to the Parkway and he said they were in deadly earnest and they wanted to do it as soon as possible. They had approval of the National Federal Government in regards to it. They have permitted them to spend money outside of the United States on this highway within the Province of Manitoba and while we haven't completed the surveys within the Province of Manitoba, I expressed the opinion that Manitoba was ready, willing and able to cooperate with the State of Minnesota in building this highway in Manitoba which will open up to us a large tourist trade in that area, which will open up to the State of Minnesota again an entrance to their own north-west angle, which will open up for the province of Ontario a large and beautiful beach, a section which should become an excellent summer resort and where, no doubt, many of our people will go instead of going to Kenora because it is much closer. And so the Mississippi Parkway is an important venture in the building of roads and it is a great example of the friendship between our two countries, that we can cooperate in building this highway which is beneficial for the people of Minnesota, Manitoba and Ontario.

The Member for Burrows got a little off the road there yesterday, and he got into the question of coalition a bit and I thought at the same time it must have been very difficult for them in that group not to accept the offers which had been made by the other party.

The Lac du Bonnet Member pointed out that No.59 highway is most dangerous as far as gravel trucks and school children are concerned. May I say to him that we will definitely have a good look at that and very soon because it is a matter of great importance and I thank him for bringing it to my attention. I think it is a good idea and I'm hopeful that we may be helpful.

I wish to thank the Member for Gimli for his kindly remarks in regard to that part of the country and as the Icelanders and the Irish were brought up very close together as the previous

member pointed out, that they didn't put swords with each other at times across the bay; that we are very close, and therefore I'm happy that he is pleased with the programming in that area.

The member for Minnedosa has asked the question as to how much of this present estimate was in the previous estimate. I can't be entirely accurate in regards to that but I asked the Deputy Minister and he said "none". Now, I would like to double-check that but in many cases, in many cases there are roads in here which were built, some cases they got a double try but in many cases these roads now are a continuation and a seal coat. But, I would like to check particularly on the bridge which, that you mention on No.34 because I don't have definite information on that individual item. 24? In any event, the program is almost entirely new and if there is, if there are one or two items there, why I wouldn't deny that although I don't have accurate information in regard to what was on the previous program and which was carried forward. But almost entirely it is a new program although in many cases it's an extension, of course, of the other program.

MR. TRAPP: Mr. Chairman, there is one question. I was very interested in the reference made by the Honourable Minister in regard to the Mississippi Parkway development. I was interested to hear that he said that there was a fine beach in Ontario which will be developed by this roadway plan into that area. I'm wondering and I'm asking this just for information purposes as to whether the Ontario people, who will locate, who will develop that area in Ontario will use our Manitoba road in connection, as an access to that area, and as to whether Ontario will contribute anything towards the construction of that road to that beach? I would also like to know where that beach is located because I happen to know that there are very few ways that one can get into that certain section without going through Manitoba.

MR. SWAILES: I was very much surprised indeed to learn that the Department was lacking up-to-date heavy road building equipment. It's my impression that the Department had a fairly complete line of road equipment two or three years ago and it seems to me to be a fundamental necessity for the Department to have some up-to-date heavy equipment so that work could be done on the road by the Department itself to check, not only on costs and on the quality of work being done by contractors, but also on the problems that are encountered in road building over different types of country and, I think, that it would be desirable for the Department to acquire some up-to-date road building machinery with which they would be able to construct any kind of road. With the huge program that is lying ahead of the Department there is no doubt that such equipment could be kept in full use and full benefit could be obtained from it before it was worn out.

MR. CAMPBELL: In regard to the remarks that have just been made by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I would think that it would be helpful if the Minister would bring in at the evening.

session, if he hasn't got it now, a list of the equipment that the Department has. My recollection is quite clear that there is some very expensive and, I would think, modern machinery there as well, up-to-date as my honourable friend calls it. But, I don't think I would want to agree with my honourable friend too far that the Department would likely get back into an extensive road building program. I think the purpose is the one suggested by the Minister of enough to keep themselves well informed by actual practice of just how expensive some of these construction projects are, including the laying of surface, and I am quite sure that that feature has been kept in mind. I'm sure also that my honourable friend much as he would like to see the Government doing practically all the work, he'll find that in the last year or two at least, that the highways branch has been able to get work done more cheaply than they could do it themselves because the contractors have been very, very anxious to get work and good contractors too, and have been tendering very low.

Now, Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that the Minister bring in a list of the equipment that they have there because, I agree, this is an important question. I think it would be better if the Minister would perhaps answer these different questions one at a time but apparently he prefers to take them in groups.

So, I would like to ask him about the Minnesota Parkway as well. I presume it is agreed between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba that they will share in the building of that road. I expect there has been no changes in policy in that regard--that I don't know, because I had to be absent last evening. I don't know whether the Minister reported on the road that some articles in the paper seem to suggest was going to be projected away on to the North country. Has a report been made to the House on that particular one? Now, even though it is not included here I think the members of the committee should have the facts with regard to any program of that kind that is contemplated.

Then I would like to return to this question of some of the work on the Trans Canada perimeter route, and especially the parts that are some of the Trans Canada highway itself that I thought were in this year's program, but they seem to be on our list here again today. Surely, the Trans Canada highway from the Seine River to the present Trans Canada has been under construction, yet I see it here graded--for grading and gravelling. Surely St. Mary's Road to the Red River is included in the same contract which is presently in progress out here at the southern limits of the city. As my colleagues said, I haven't seen it for some little time but the progress that was being made at that time would indicate to me that that must be nearly completed, if not completed. And I would think, the same would apply to Red River to Waverley Street. In total, it seems to me, that a great deal of this program was actually provided for in this year--in the program for this year, outlined by the previous government - and they had the money authorized for it as well. Could the Minister give us something more definite with regard to that situation?

MR. TEILLET: ...Sir, if the Minister would indicate to us the road referred to by the honourable the Provincial Secretary, I don't seem to locate it here.

MR. WILLIS: .....to go the other way. The road indicated by the Provincial Secretary is the last item on there. It says, it should say, without looking at it - Highway No. 2 south to Notre Dame de Lourdes.

In regard to the road mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. It was included in the program, and I must say that I've not yet been able to find out how it got lost temporarily, but it was approved and has been approved for a month, at least.... Yes. But, in regard to the roads mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition I would rather consult with the engineers--bring them in a statement in regard to that and, I think, that would be much more satisfactory; and we will also look at the question of machinery, because I just made a casual inquiry in regard to that and got the casual answer which I mentioned there. Beg your pardon? ...I don't get all those asides of yours.

MR. GREENLAY:.....some equipment with the province's name on it going around.

MR. WILLIS: I'm sorry,...I'll have to ask you again. What was it you said?

MR. GREENLAY: Mr. Chairman, I said that I see considerable equipment moving around the Province with the province's name on it.

MR. WILLIS: Oh, that's fine. That might be maintenance equipment, but we will get at least the facts with regard to that.

The First Minister mentioned the share as far as the Mississippi Parkway is concerned, and he was down there and I think, made the original arrangements, and there has been no change since that time. But there has been definite assurance from the people of Minnesota that it is their desire to pay 50-percent of the cost, and that we will plan the road together, and that it will be a joint venture; and they've had engineers up there just recently, within the last two weeks, to check it over, because I understand that the terrain is a little difficult in places and they have to pick and choose where the road is to go.

The member for Assiniboia made a recommendation with regard to equipment, and I would be glad to look into that.

For the benefit of the member for Lac du Bonnet, and for any of the members, they can see the whole picture on our own map as far as the Mississippi Parkway is concerned, in effect. In other words, if you look at our own road map, you'll see the north-west angle, that portion of Minnesota and ours. We have a north-west angle forest reserve just along side and it is the intention of the people of Minnesota to build their road north from Warroad. And again, the exact location is not clear, but you will keep in mind that their purpose is to get to that north-west angle. It's a matter of getting the proper road through there to the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods. Then when you go just north of that again you see Shoal Lake, which is the Ontario Lake. They have to go, I should judge, several miles across to Shoal

Lake to get to that beach on the west side, and I'm informed that it's a very good beach, and that it isn't too far across there to Falcon Lake. So, the road which would be built - Mississippi Parkway - would serve the north west angle, go north to the north-west angle about 30 miles, which would serve the people of Minnesota, and then go north again fairly well in that line which would to a degree, serve Shoal Lake, although they would have to build their road in. Ontario would have to build their road in to Shoal Lake then it would hook up some place near Falcon Lake, north of that again. It makes a -- I think it will become a tourist mecca down there because there are good lakes. I think there will be a sense of curiosity if nothing else, by the people of Minnesota, that they should go and visit this part of Minnesota that lies --that they have to go through Manitoba to visit, and I think they will be up there in very large numbers, and it's a good thing for Manitoba - it's a good thing for Minnesota - and a good thing for Ontario.

And that being so, I would expect that as soon as possible, it would be completed and we'd get the great benefits from it. And I don't think that anyone would say that this is a wrong thing to do but rather that it is a new and exciting idea as far as tourist traffic is concerned and the result of it would be that we'd get more Ontario people in Manitoba and more people from Minnesota in Manitoba and it should be all for the good of Manitoba.

MR. GREENLAY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if any attention is being given in the planning of this road north from the boundary, from north of Warroads where it goes up to Falcon Lake, - is any attention being given to making an access road to our own beach on the Lake of the Woods? When I'm referring to Buffalo Point- Buffalo Point - I don't know whether very many members know or not, we have a very nice piece of country which sticks out into the Lake of the Woods. There's a very nice beach around it. I have visited it and there were some negotiations going on with regard to making it available for settlement. Now I know that in times of high water, there was some difficulty of access. There was about a quarter of a mile which was fairly boggy but we were told by engineers that investigated, that there was a hard sub-soil that could be used to put up a grade across that low spot and certainly I think that some attention should be paid to it because it's a very lovely piece of country and a very lovely beach is around it. It's on the Lake of the Woods. I believe that it is all included in an Indian Reserve, but it is hardly ever used as such and from some casual preliminary enquiries, we were given to understand that it would not be impossible to have that turned over to the Province for use as a resort area. It is a very lovely spot, a lovely beach. We landed there and did look it over and did do some investigation with regard to making it available, as I say. Now I wonder if any plans are being made to see that there is an access road made to this point?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, the more the honourable minister explains this program, the more confusing the program



becomes. On picking up the program here, I see it's headed "Province of Manitoba Proposed Highway Program for 1959 and 1960". Now, just a moment ago, he stressed unequivocally that that was a new program. And he put that stress on the word "new". Now, if we look at the subdivisions of that particular program, we find that it is divided into four columns - Highway, Mileage, Location, Nature of Work. Now, since it's a new program I think it's right to assume that the mileages given here are to be interpreted as the number of miles that are still to be completed in the various projects set out in this program. Now it would appear from what we have heard so far, in this House, that some of these mileages are inaccurate. Some of these mileages, as an example of one, and there are many, the mileage given for Foxwarren to Russell is 20.1 miles. My information is, and I think it is correct, that a contract has been let on this 20.1 miles, that if the construction is not completed, it is just about complete, and I say to the Honourable Minister that that shouldn't read 20.1 miles, but it should show the actual mileage that there is still to do under this program - if he wants it to be a new program. And I think you could go right through this whole program and find out that the mileage given in the sheets that are before us, far exceeds the actual mileage that is going to be undertaken in this new program. And I believe, in fairness to the Members here, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister should take any and all of the items shown on this list that have been partially completed, and point it out to the Members of the House, that in the Foxwarren-Russell 20.1 miles, there is only a matter of another two or three miles to go, if any. I think that is only right. I don't think that I'm asking for too much. And I'm quite sure that the Honourable Minister could obtain that information for us.

Now, there's one other thing that I'm not quite clear on, namely, Mr. Chairman, that if this is all a new program, and that they intend to spend 33 million dollars in the completion of this new program, and if it is shown that this is not all a new program, is it correct to deduce that the 33 million dollars which we are appropriating should be reduced proportionately to the reduction in this mileage? And if so, if so, why is the Government asking for 33 million dollars?

Now, just one other question on the matter of access roads. When the Honourable Minister first got up to speak, he said they would build access roads to all towns that have been by-passed by our highways. He later qualified this statement and he said it wouldn't be all roads. If the distance was too great, then the access roads would not be built. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, as to what distance he is prepared to go in the building of these access roads? Is it a mile? Two Miles? Three miles? What distance does he consider is the appropriate distance from the highway to the village, town or city? And what type of an access program has he in mind as to distance.

MR. TRAPP: I also have asked a number of questions yesterday to which I have not received an answer yet. I think the Honourable Minister certainly has had the time to look the

answers up and in view of what the Honourable Member from Ethelbert has said, about mileages being on this program that were contemplated, the construction of which was contemplated this past season, I think it would be in the interests of the Member for Brokenhead and myself, if we were told as to whether this item - No.4 East to Victoria Beach, 53 miles - if that is the program or is the item that was completed this year or whether that is something new to be done on that road? I think it is quite important that we know that. Our people back home will read the article in the paper and they'll say, what is this Government trying to do, are they going to put another coat on there, or what are they planning to do? I think that that is something that we are entitled to know.

There is also this other question that I asked sometime - I asked twice, and that was where this location of five miles was to P.T.H. No.12 South - where that location is. I see that there is planned 22 miles of construction from Lockport to Beausejour on the No.4 East, and then I see No.4 West, P.T.H. No.12. To my way of thinking that means that there'll be a construction of five miles paralleling one another. Five miles of highway being built, one mile apart, for a stretch of five miles. That's how it seems to me. I would like a clarification. I think that our people in that area would want a clarification on that statement.

MR. WILLIS: If I might deal in the same order, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, if I may say so to him, has made the same speech twice here. And also I thought we had agreed that he would come to see me in regard to it, so that we could go over it in detail. If he didn't agree, his head was nodding anyway and therefore I think that's the better method to do it. And we'll be glad to give him all the information that he wants. He's entirely right that he's entitled to know and we won't hold it back from him at all, and we'll be happy to get this information for him and if he desires to do so, if I'm a little too busy, he can go in and see the Chief Engineer anytime. He's in the gallery now. He is within sound of my voice. Or if he can go and see the Deputy Minister, he can do that. He is here. If he will go and see the Office Engineer, Mr. McKenzie, he can get the information from anyone of these three men.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: .....if the Minister intends to build two highways, paralleling one another by a mile.

MR. WILLIS: Well, it's a little unusual but I don't know the circumstances in regard to it and we'll get that information as well. Now, I'll be happy to bring down the information for the Member for Ethelbert in regard to these mileages. I can only say to him that while he says the mileages are wrong, they are the mileages which I got from the Chief Engineer of the Department, and I should think that he would know the mileages, even although the Honourable Member says he is wrong. And I'll bet my money on the Chief Engineer. And I haven't checked them myself - I didn't go and drive them. They appeared on here, and we discussed them, and they were passed, and therefore I

think they are correct. Certainly we're not trying to fool anybody in regard to this program. It is - there are the mileages, and as given to me by the engineering section, and at this moment I'll be very happy to stand behind them because I think they are accurate. There is no reason why they should be inaccurate. They have had no instructions from me which would tend to make them inaccurate, and I think likely they are correct.

I do know that in a number of cases, Members here have mentioned that - well this was done before - but when they look at the details, they find out this is a seal coat, or this is an oil treatment on a road that was built before. And I know some of the Members withdrew their questions on that basis, because they discovered at a later date that they were wrong and that the engineers were right. All this information is available. The Member for Ethelbert said, "in fairness to the Members". Of course, in fairness to the Members, they are entitled to all this information. We're not withholding any of it, and if you are in a hurry in regard to it, I'll be happy to have you go and see the Deputy Minister, or the Chief Engineer, or the Office Engineer in regard to your mileages, which you speak about. They set the mileages, you can get the answer in regard to that.

Now the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, says that we've had lots of time in regard to this. Well, I left this building last night after midnight. The first appointment this morning was at 8:30, and then I went from there into the Agricultural Committee. I was in there all the time. Today I was able to have lunch. Yesterday I was unable to have lunch, because I didn't have time. And then we come directly in here. So that I must say to him, that I have been reasonably busy since 7 o'clock this morning, and that I haven't been able to get all the details in regard to this road, but I'm now pointing out to him where he can get them and I say the same to the Member for Ethelbert. They're available. They are exactly the same as was given to me. There were no instructions in regard to any part of it, and I believe they're accurate.

In regard to the Member for Portage, who spoke about Buffalo Point, and made a very good point about it, I think. We have investigated it somewhat, and we get the information that it is a fine beach, but that to approach it by road is difficult because there is very heavy muskeg there. We realize that if we can build a road in there it would be a very fine thing, and I would think it would be an access road from the Mississippi Parkway and might easily, for us in Manitoba, be a very fine place for camping and a summer resort. So that we might have three of them right along the same road; one owned by Manitoba, one owned by Minnesota, and one owned by Ontario. All on the same road. And people could pay their money and take their choice, and I think it forms an interesting future as far as that part of the country is concerned, and if these people come there and spend their money there, it will be helpful to that part of the country which needs an assist very badly.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the engineers of the Department of Public Works. I know most of them personally and I certainly don't like to see them

saddled with the blame for any errors in this program. However, in fairness to the engineers, the Honourable Minister and myself, I do not think it would be too difficult for him to obtain any answer to one question - an answer to be given to us tonight. Take the road which I referred to- Foxwarren to Russell, 20.1 miles. Would the Honourable Minister be kind enough to find out from his engineers, how much of this 20.1 miles is completed, partially completed, and all the details on this one project. He didn't give me an answer to my question on access roads.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was mentioning that he has been very busy, and hasn't been able to give us answers and I certainly sympathize with him. We agree, we've been very busy too. I would merely like to remind him that the pace of this matter is settled by his friend the First Minister and not by ourselves. So on that matter I think he should speak to him in that regard.

Yesterday in the presentation, the Minister spoke to us about the roads in Manitoba that were not properly built, weren't built up to proper standards in the best, and had been breaking down. Now, I'm sure all of us are agreed that we don't want to see situations like that. If it has happened in the past, we don't want to see it happen again. Now he gave us as an example yesterday, the highway from Headingley to Portage la Prairie. Now with all due respect, that highway having been built in 1935, and merely as a comparison for example, being older than a certain Member of this House, I really feel that it isn't quite the proper comparison that we would need to judge on the standards of the highways built by the Government which went out on the 16th of June. But I would appreciate it in that regard, if he would undertake to give the House a list of the roads that have been surveyed, which he told us has been done and found unsatisfactory. I think that would be very useful to the Members in this discussion. I think, furthermore, that if it could be added in there, the year in which those roads were built, because there are factors as he will recall, of, oh- temperature and climate to affect these things. And at the same time, the mileage of course involved and the expenditure required for the construction of these various items. Now I realize that may be a fair amount, but after all he did say that that survey had been undertaken, that he had obtained the information, and I presume it's all together in the files of the department.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that this is probably the proper note on which I should suggest the Committee rise and report and we'll discuss it later. We can't get any sillier, I don't think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, The committee of supply has considered certain resolutions and would like to report the same.

DR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, does the Leader of the House intend us to continue with the committee immediately we reconvene?

MR. ROBLIN: I think so, Mr. Speaker, we'll follow the usual Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker read the motion and after a voice vote declared the House adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.