

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my right where there are some 75 Grade 8 students from Lord Kitchener School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Pauls, Mr. Lebedeff and Mrs. Hatchen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Kildonan. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, and particularly in the presence of the young folk in the gallery, I am happy to draw to the attention of the House that it was 95 years ago this date that the Manitoba Legislature had its first sitting, which means of course five years from today we will be celebrating our centenary, or at least the 100th year of the sitting of this Legislature. I thought this was worthy of note to the House, and I thank Radio Station CJOB for informing me accordingly.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an Order of the House, No. 2, on the motion of the Honourable Member from Radisson.

MR. PAULLEY: Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister can indicate when he will be in a position to answer the brief of the Citizens Committee of Windsor and Niakwa Parks.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I think that the basic documents upon which my answer will rest are contained in the material that was just tabled, and I have asked my office to send them an acknowledgment of their communication, which I trust has been done, and I hope to be replying to it in a little while. But in view of the fact that the Minister has taken the steps that I consider necessary to deal with this matter, I do not accord the reply quite the priority that it had before, particularly in view of other pressing business at the moment.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may further address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education, I refer to a radio commentary made this morning by the Chairman of the St. Boniface School District which indicated - at least my interpretation of it was that the School Board are satisfied that the procedure that they were using originally before the Minister's statement is exactly the same now as it was then. I wonder if the Minister may have heard the comment or if he has any comment on that remark.

MR. JOHNSON: I haven't heard the radio comment but I think I dealt with that last night, Madam Speaker, in saying that -- in the material that was tabled you will note that in the circular letter which the Board sent out to the district, I noticed that they said this course is open to all regardless of ethnic background, as we had said, but the description of the course very definitely limited it to people of French origin. This is where the conflict I think has been so far as I am concerned. This is where I had a misunderstanding, and I understand from the letter they have written to me that they acknowledge this point. I think this was the difficulty as I understood it. I discussed this with the Board. I said it appeared we were both trying to say the same thing but in effect we weren't - it was in conflict one with the other.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Further to my question of last Thursday in regard to the situation of free dialing between Steinbach and the Grunthal area, I wonder if the Minister has anything more to add to that.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I am happy to be able to advise the honourable member that the Telephones have advised me that this was now possible and arrangements are being made. A date will be set shortly when this service will be operating.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Is it true that Monoca A. G. is a subsidiary of the Columbia Cellulose Corporation of America?

MR. ROBLIN: I think my honourable friend asked me about the corporate affiliations of Monoca the other day. I do not think that those are matters in which I am an expert.

MR. GUTTORMSON, Is the First Minister suggesting he has no knowledge of the firm's background to which The Manitoba Development Fund is going to loan substantial sums of money?

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend knows more than I do.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam, with leave of the House, I would ask to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: With leave of the House, may I have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, could I have this matter stand also?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, may I also have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): May I have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): May I have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, in anticipation of a government statement on this matter, may I have it stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur. The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, may I also have the indulgence of this House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this stand please, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I was certain that I would have at least an hour to prepare myself, but I'll take a chance without the preparation. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan,

WHEREAS full co-operation between the general public and law enforcement officers is both desirable and necessary; and

WHEREAS law enforcement officers are empowered to instruct citizens to assist them in the conduct of their duties;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Provincial Government give consideration to the advisability of paying compensation to citizens suffering loss, property damage or injury while engaged in assisting law enforcement officers;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a special committee of the Legislature be formed to investigate the full extent of social responsibility towards victims of criminal activity.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, you will note that the preamble deals only with the first resolution, and I would hope that the prayer for giving consideration to the advisability will apply to the second portion of the resolution as well, just so that there should not be something improper in the drawing of the second resolution. If necessary it could be amended, but it seems to me it ought to cover.

As you will note from reading the resolution, I tackled the problem in two ways. The problem of course is the problem of persons who suffer damage due to actions of a criminal nature, but the first portion of the resolution deals to those who are called upon to assist police officers and who are injured and should be compensated, which I think that should be done and that is the purpose of this resolution, that that principle be accepted. The second portion of the resolution is one where I don't pretend to know the answers, but I do suggest that there is a problem and that there should be an attitude by society in respect of people who do suffer as a result of criminal action - criminal violence, and that there should be a study, because since I admit I do not know the answer, I suggest that we seek out the solution once we establish and agree that there is a problem.

Now dealing first with the first portion which is that of compensating citizens who suffer loss while engaged in assisting law enforcement officers, I would point out that to my knowledge there is no present method whereby such people can be compensated. They of course have a cause of action against whoever causes the damage, the criminal involved, and we can well imagine that the opportunities of being paid the damages suffered are remote. He may be caught, he may be put in jail; he may not be caught, and in either case the opportunity for obtaining satisfactory compensation is lost.

I made enquiries from the Chief of the Winnipeg Police Force as to his reaction to my proposal, and I have a letter from him which I propose to read. It's dated February 23 and addressed to me, and reads as follows: "With reference to your phone call of February 22, please be advised that our record system does not record names of any persons who have been injured whilst assisting police. I have made enquiries amongst the senior officers and no one can remember an incident of this kind. As you probably know, we appeal to the public to assist us, and I am sure you have read where a great deal of criticism has been directed to the public when it is made known that they have stood around and made no effort to assist a policeman in trouble. We have received assistance from the citizens of our city voluntarily, and as you know, they can be compelled by law to assist if a policeman asks them, Section 110 (b) of the Criminal Code of Canada. You mentioned that you were giving thoughts to suggesting that a law be passed that would enable people who were injured whilst assisting a police officer to receive some compensation. I certainly am in favour of this, possibly for selfish reasons, as it would give a measure of protection to anyone who might be injured whilst assisting us and could possibly cause people to assist us more readily than now. Yours truly, George Blow, Chief Constable."

Now when I deal with the second portion of my resolution I will refer to the fact that that portion would include the damages to persons who are injured whilst assisting a police officer, whether they do it voluntarily or they do it as a result of a command of the police officer, and I propose to leave that section as it is because I think it speaks for itself. The fact that, as the Chief says, the senior officers in his department do not remember such an incident, would

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) indicate firstly that it's probably pretty rare - possibly because the assistance to the police by civilians is pretty rare - but in any event, I think it would indicate that there can not be any substantial cost involved in undertaking this responsibility.

Now I'm really not concerned with cost, I'm concerned with the principle and I think that the principle should be accepted, providing of course it doesn't run away with itself. Well the manner in which this procedure would be established could ensure that there should not be fraudulent or exaggerated claims but that there be a proper method of assessing the damages such as we now have with, let's say, Workmen's Compensation.

I didn't know, Madam Speaker, how a police officer himself is compensated for damages, and I made enquiries and was informed that the police officer is protected under the same Workmen's Compensation Act as applies to other persons. The fact of course that his occupation is dangerous and that when he is injured it's not just an accident but very often a deliberate act of a criminal, I think should actually remove the policeman from the protection of The Workmen's Compensation Act and put him under the protection of some method whereby his loss could be - I want to use the words "more fairly assessed," because if you are injured in an industrial accident while doing your work there is sometimes your own negligence that might be involved or negligence of a co-worker, but not a deliberate act, and even if a policeman is injured and on compensation, he is only entitled to - is it two-thirds of his salary -- (Interjection) -- 75 percent of his salary up to a ceiling, and of course he is not compensated for loss of potential promotions in his job.

I'll leave that aspect now and deal with what I think is a much more interesting and challenging concept, and that is the one that I have already enunciated, damages to victims of criminal acts. I would start -- I have a volume of paper here, Madam Speaker, which I do not propose to read, but I would indicate that I learned that the Attorney-General of the State of New York, The Honourable Mr. Leskowitz, has had a committee studying this problem. I have been in correspondence with him and his secretary and have recently received a letter which I don't have before me, but which reads in effect that the committee is about ready to make its report to the State Legislature, and as soon as it does, he will send a copy of the report to me.

But I did receive certain other bits of information. I have a letter from the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Australia which is a short letter and reads as follows: "Your letter addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives has been forwarded to me for attention. The State of Western Australia has legislated to compensate civilians injured whilst assisting police. Apart from this limited provision, neither the Commonwealth nor the States have legislated to provide compensation to victims of criminal activities." So they already have the type of legislation which I propose in the first portion of my resolution; they have not dealt with the second one, at least they have not brought in any legislation on the second portion.

The material that I received from England however is much more interesting and valuable for this House to consider. I'll start with reading what is called a "Command Paper" issued from the Home Office by the Secretary of State on March, 1964, wherein he sets out the government's proposal in connection with compensation for victims of crimes of violence, and I want to read one paragraph which indicates the approach taken by the government. "The government accept the principle that the victims of crimes of violence should be eligible for some compensation for personal injury at the public expense, and propose to make arrangements for this purpose as soon as possible. In considering what these arrangements should be, it is important to bear in mind that a state compensation scheme of this kind will be a new departure.

"Until the coming into force on January 1, 1964, of the New Zealand Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, no other country in the world had a scheme of compensation of the type that has been discussed in this country during the past few years. There is thus virtually no previous experience on which to draw in assessing how a compensation scheme would work. The number of crimes of violence reported to the police is known. Many of these however are not the brutal assaults on strangers that should certainly lead to compensation, but arise out of brawls or family disputes where the victim may have been as much to blame as the aggressor. It is impossible to forecast with any assurance, therefore, how many persons would apply for compensation if there were a scheme, or in how many of these cases the payment out of public funds would be justified. There must certainly be safeguards to ensure that, so far as possible, public money is not wasted on fraudulent or unmerited applications."

Now the letter enclosing the documents is a lengthy letter. It's dated March 7, 1966, and I'll only read short excerpts from it. The letter states firstly, "I should first make it clear that the compensation scheme administered by this Board is non-statutory. The reason for this

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) is that the government of the day decided in 1964 that an experimental and ex gratia scheme in the first instance would be more flexible than legislation, and that the operation of such a scheme would provide experience on which, in due course, comprehensive and clear legislation could be phrased. "

Now one of the White Papers which I received and which is dated June, 1961, sets out in great detail the background, the effect of it, and the conclusion, and dealing with eligibility for compensation, points out various factors involving eligibility. One would be the dependence on criminal proceedings, or at least they go on to say that a criminal assault is reported to the police and acted on in some way. Restrictions to genuine and deserving victims. Character of the claimant and his partial responsibility for what occurred. Special relationship between the offender and the victim, and there they speak of the possibility of domestic crime. Fraudulence and exaggerated claims. They deal with compensation for the dependents of persons killed, and then they deal with certain nationality and residential qualifications which they recommend. Now it's a valuable document and one which I think is worthy by Committee of this House.

I also have a pamphlet prepared by the government in order to inform people of the compensation scheme, and I'll only read what they state as to whom can claim. They state, "If you sustain personal injury on or after August 1, 1964, directly attributable to criminal offence, or when trying to prevent someone from committing a crime, or when trying to arrest a suspected offender, or when helping the police to do either of these things, then you can apply to the Board for compensation." Then they go on to indicate the methods used.

Now the method involves a Board of three people who acquire all the information they need in whatever manner they feel it necessary, and they then consider the case individually and decide either: (a) to disallow the application if one of the conditions of the scheme has not been satisfied; or (b) that the application is within the scheme but that the victim is partly to blame; or (c) that the application is within the scheme and the applicant is blameless; or (d) that the matter can only be properly determined at a hearing at which witnesses can be examined and cross-examined and refer to a hearing before three other members of the Board for that purpose.

Then they deal with the manner in which compensation is assessed and where compensation may be reduced because of a percentage of blame attaching to the applicant. Then the applicant is notified of the recommendation, and if he accepts it, that's the end of that, and if he doesn't he may appeal to a Board. The letter concludes with the statement that it was generally accepted that an experimental scheme was right initially, and at this time it is too early to conclude that there has been sufficient experience on which comprehensive legislation could be drafted. Then some statistics dealing with the first 18 months of the scheme indicate that a total of 2,489 applications were made. Total compensation paid in that 18-month period was 339,405 pounds which I believe is something under one million dollars, and that is for all of the British Isles and if it has a -- well it certainly has a population in excess of 50 million, so that with Manitoba's population of one million we could start putting this in proper perspective.

There are other factors of course which would be involved and that is the crime rate in England as compared with here; the dispersion of our community as compared with the congestion there; but at one-fiftieth of the damages, some \$20,000 over 18 months would indicate that if there were the same proportion of claims and extent of damages, it could be a matter of \$13,500 to \$14,000 per year here. But that's conjecture and that's something that I think should be studied.

The principle is not new. It is clear that when we have Workmen's Compensation we recognize a form of insurance for damages. In our own Unsatisfied Judgment Fund we make sure that a person who is injured because of fault of another, but not criminal fault, civil fault in a car accident, there should be a fund set aside raised out of the revenue from licences to provide for payment of the damages which are assessed as being properly payable. Well certainly it seems to me that where we protect the motorist or the person injured from a motorist's negligence, we should certainly protect an individual who is injured because of a crime, and I would suggest that we ought to start our studies now. There is all the information available from England; there must be some information available from New Zealand - and I didn't try for that because I wasn't aware of it but the British White Paper indicates that that was instituted prior to the one in England; the information from Australia should be of interest; and I know that we will be getting a very comprehensive report prepared by the Committee of the Attorney-General of New York.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) So that what I'm saying is not revolutionary at all. I'm saying that there is a need and the need should be studied. There ought to be some form to compensate for the need, and the manner and the extent should be studied. I feel that this is a field for legislators to accept as their responsibility, and on that basis I urge that the government do consider the advisability of establishing this committee and giving it all the powers and the funds that are necessary for this committee to be able to study this problem and come back to the Legislature with a recommendation which would, after having been studied carefully and studied the problem, would be of value to us in determining what is fair, reasonable and proper under the circumstances that I have outlined.

The largest portion of the documents that I have received are a large number of case histories, and certainly I don't think it should be necessary to spell out and start reading from case histories. They deal mainly with assaults, mainly people who have been attacked - the term I think would be mugged. They deal with a certain - well offences of a more serious nature, murder and manslaughter - murder rather - involved in commission of a crime. They deal with rape and they deal with all the various types of damages which are suffered by people who might be involved as a result of criminal activities of others. These too, I think, are worthy of study and I do urge the House to accept the principle of the resolution.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I don't think that this resolution which we have each year should be stood, although I expected a little more time - getting through nine pages of the Order Paper in some ten minutes.

Madam Speaker, I must first congratulate the Honourable Member for Elmwood in making his resolution brief and to the point. I listened with considerable interest to the debates in the past, to the words supporting the resolution by the Honourable Member for Elmwood on Friday. I think problems of labour are problems that we should try to see the other man's point of view, I think in many cases the compromise that we're looking for with the interest primarily of labour. This is why I support and would do everything I can to help the Woods Committee which is doing just that.

With that thought in mind, I listened to the words of the Honourable Member for Elmwood in supporting his resolution. It seemed to me, whether he gave the impression intentionally or by accident, that he is confusing the minimum wage with that of an apprentice wage. Members will recall that apprentices up to fairly recent history, and in some cases now, have been an exchange between a technical skill and a wage, or perhaps not a wage in some cases were paid to get the apprentice training. This in the past has been a bit of confusion. We've entered another confusion, confusion between the minimum wage and apprenticeship wage; a minimum wage and a fair wage; and a minimum wage and a going wage. They are quite different, I would submit, Madam Speaker, and I think this has created some of the problems.

What I think the honourable member meant to say, and probably did say and I did not understand, was that by increasing the minimum wage one increases the other wages, therefore adds prosperity by putting more money into workers' pockets, and by doing so create a greater demand for goods and increases the prosperity. If that philosophy is correct, then why stop at a \$1.50? Why not make our economy twice as good by making it \$3.00? So therefore, in fact, this has no basis. If this were true, then the economic problems of some of the African countries, those undeveloped and rapidly developing countries could be solved by this method. Of course, it is not true.

The minimum wage is designed in order to help that worker who, through no fault of his own, has not the skill and the ability to demand a higher wage. In other words, his fair wage is so low that we feel a man is entitled, by being employed, to get so much an hour. This is a minimum wage - a rock bottom wage.

Now who does this affect? The majority of people are fortunate enough to have skills by which they can demand and get higher wages. They are getting fair wages or going wages. It is that minority, that marginal labourer, that marginal employee, who unfortunately is in this marginal group, and is defended by government legislation in that he shall not be paid less than the minimum wage. I sincerely hope, Madam Speaker, that we can improve our skills to a

(MR. STANES cont'd.) certain extent that we can be in a position that we will have few or none in the situation of a minimum wage. This is an ideal state but we're a long way from it. The Premier said on Wednesday night, and he was endorsed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood in his speech on Friday, that what we're looking for is an area of higher wages and lower costs of living. I agree, but I submit that we will not get this by means of increasing the minimum wage.

Just look for a moment, Madam Speaker, to what might happen. By increasing the minimum wage to whatever you wish, see what happens in industry, bearing in mind that we're speaking of the marginal labourer, the marginal employee, the person who is handicapped in some form or another. We'll say he's working in a plant and he's getting \$1.00 - \$1.25 an hour. To increase that man's wages beyond his worth to that company, the company can either increase his wages by taking the wages of his higher skilled men and therefore his total cost will be the same, but obviously of course the higher paid men, the higher skilled men will not stay with him so he will lose them and he will finish up by going broke, and then there is now no employer. So there's no money and this is a welfare.

Let's take the situation where he decides, as often happens to overcome this problem by mechanizing. This is what is happening in our industry. We have a number of cases - one I can think of right now - Manitoba Rolling Mills at Selkirk are going through a very large mechanization plan, and the reason for doing that is to lower their labour cost per product and in doing so they are demanding higher skills. With the men with the higher skills getting more pay, where is the marginal worker, the man supported with the minimum wage? He has no job. And so whichever way you go about it, the marginal man is not helped by increasing his minimum wage.

Some unions I've heard have said a person who cannot pay a good salary to everybody he employs should be forced into bankruptcy. Well I'm afraid I cannot support that statement because a company must make a profit in order to stay in business. There is nothing wrong with making a profit. By a company making too small a profit or an excess profit, bankruptcy is the ultimate and therefore the employer disappears and no job for the employees. This is no way to help the marginal employee, this marginal man, the man supported by the minimum wage. So I cannot go along with the thought that unless an employer pays a substantial salary he should be forced into bankruptcy.

Madam Speaker, one can go on in considerable length on this subject but ultimately the answer to a better economy, to what we are striving for - which is a higher pay, lower cost area - is through improving the skills and reducing the number of people who have to be safeguarded by a minimum wage. We all know what is going on at the moment. I think the Vocational School is a tremendous step forward. Unfortunately, you can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink. But there is opportunities available to these people and through education we can improve that man's skills. With the advent of increased automation, machines and so on, their skills perhaps become a little more limited and perhaps easier trainable than they would be in the hand skills.

So I submit that we cannot improve our economy by increasing the minimum wage. It's a fool's paradise going in that direction. The correct direction is to reduce the number of people who we are trying to safeguard a minimum wage, and I hope that we can live long enough to see no need for any minimum wage.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PATRICK: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Minister, would the House allow this to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, if at times my speech seems to be a little frivolous, I want to assure you that it's not the subject matter itself that is causing this but possibly some of the arguments and the debate that has been used when this subject matter has been discussed. I think I'd like to say first of all that a voting age is an arbitrary line that has to be drawn, and when we do this we always have some on the wrong side of the line that shouldn't be there and some under the line who shouldn't be there; and when one uses these particular cases to debate the general arbitrary line, one can really get some ridiculous arguments and analogies and I'd like to touch on some of these first that have been raised in the past.

I remember two years ago the member for Burrows in talking on this matter went to great length to tell us of the maturity and the intellectual capacity of his 18-year old son, and when he was finished, I thought he'd made a very excellent case and a very good job of disproving the laws of genetics and heredity, but I couldn't really make it apply to all the 18-year olds in Manitoba.

Then the member for Assiniboia the other day listed a few reasons why 18-year olds should be allowed to vote and I'm going to run through this. First of all, he mentioned the ability to have babies. Well, I don't know whether it was old age or a short memory that made him stop at 18 or not. I don't know why he didn't get down to 15, 16 and 14, and make just as good a case for them having the vote as the 18-year olds from this argument. His next list was to make pills. I don't know whether that was a misquote in Hansard or not. I couldn't think of what else would fit in and I assume he must have meant make pills, and if it means that he can get a job with a chemist manufacturing pills - I suppose he can - but it would be under pretty strict supervision -- (Interjection) -- And he can take them, yes.

Then he went down, Madam Speaker, to the fact that 18-year olds can count down missiles, and I have a great deal of hesitation in accepting this argument because I very much doubt that 18-year olds are given this responsibility. I think they find that more often they are very highly trained and competent scientists with a great deal of experience. It takes a lot more than the ability to count from 19 to zero backwards to handle a count-down of missiles.

The athletic life that he mentioned as a qualification for voting, I'm glad it's not in because a few of us like myself would never have made it and most of us would cease to qualify at a very early age due to various conditions, and I'm not going to mention what they are.

Then he got on to 18-year olds flying jets, that this is a reason why 18-year olds should be allowed to vote. Well, I'd like to speak with a little more experience in this regard because I have done a lot of flying and flying instruction, and while people might start their training at 18, some aspects of it, in very rare cases they go through quite an intensive training program and usually they are 20 years of age, very rarely 19 possibly, but only after a result of very intensive training and under very careful supervision are they ever allowed to fly jets. I don't think this argument holds up too well as a qualification for voting. -- (Interjection) -- What was that? I'm going.

Then he comes down to military service, and once again, Madam Speaker, I want to speak with the use of a little bit of personal experience because I think this is quite often more an appeal to people's emotions - if you're old enough to fight for the country, you're old enough to vote for it. I still can't draw the analogy here because quite often the requirements of a military service, particularly at the lower age level, is the physical development and maturity to be able to stand the rigors of the life and enough maturity to be able to accept the discipline of the life, and I don't really see where these two matters are qualifications to vote as such.

As I say, Madam Speaker, I think these are all false analogies when it comes to really debating the topic of the age of voting, because to carry on in this manner, I could ask the honourable members why they have always missed a very excellent analogy, if they think this type is of value, and that is we have 16-year olds driving high powered cars - four, five, six, seven, eight thousand dollars worth on our streets. We give them the opportunity to risk life and limb, theirs and ours, and I think if this analogy they have been using was going to hold true, this would be a very good case for saying that these people of sixteen should be allowed to vote, but they've never used that one yet.

I think, Madam Speaker, to put the debate in a general situation, which is where I think it has to rest, one can say that in today's society more 18-year olds than ever before are staying at home under parental home supervision getting their education. I think this is a factor of our social life, and I think that we also have to say that the years from 18 to 21 result in much intellectual and personality development of the individual. Regardless of what level he starts from

(MR. ALEXANDER cont'd.) and what level he gets up, you will always find exceptions where you can say that some 16-year old is more mature and more developed and more able to vote than a 25 or a 35 or a 45 year old. But this doesn't help us too much when we have the responsibility of setting one arbitrary condition on some particular point of the age scale.

I think, Madam Speaker, that there has been no unanimity in this matter amongst our young people themselves. The young parliaments that have debated this issue have come out with some very spirited debates. Sometimes it is passed; sometimes it is not passed. I know at the United College young parliament this year it wasn't on the agenda, and I know from talking to some of the people at the university that there are pros and cons on the matter. Some of them feel quite strongly that at 18 years old they haven't got the responsibility and they don't want it particularly. Then you find others who do want it, but there is a division of opinion and there is no unanimity amongst the young people.

So I think on the whole, Madam Speaker, and in a general way, that a case can be made for retaining our voting age of 21. I also think this case can be reconsidered if the Federal Government changes its regulations. We could then consider the advisability of having a uniform age for provincial and federal franchise privileges, but I think until that time does come that we in Manitoba should maintain our present 21 years old before people are allowed to vote.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, may I ask for this Order to stand, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside:

"WHEREAS the Government of the Province of Manitoba is responsible, through the Manitoba Hydro, for the development and distribution of almost all electrical energy outside of the City of Winnipeg; and

WHEREAS there are areas in Northern Manitoba such as The Pas, Churchill, Cranberry Portage, Bakers Narrows, etc., where the principle of equalized rates is not being applied, and where residents must pay higher rates for their electricity;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government of Manitoba to equalize rates in all areas served by the Manitoba Hydro, to provide these northern areas with the same rates as in the remainder of the province.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, this is the third year in a row which I have introduced this resolution in almost the identical wording that I have here. I am encouraged to bring it in again this year, because while the government has consistently voted against it, I have found that very gradually they are moving towards the principle of my resolution, and that is the equalization of rates.

This year they have announced that they are going to reduce the rates somewhat in the north, and I say to them, why not do the whole thing now. This is what we have been telling the government now for three years, that there is an unfairness here in the structure; and every year we've had the same reply from the government, "Well, the costs are higher for producing the power in those areas, and therefore we cannot reduce the rates." Yet by the same token they have told us that they are already subsidizing those areas, that in fact -- when speaking last year, the Honourable Member for Brandon, who is a member of the Hydro Commission, told us -- and I think they were subsidizing it then to the extent of \$190,000.

Well, they may be able to determine precisely for those areas what the subsidy is, because they are operated through diesel plants in most cases and you can tell exactly what the revenue is. But if you were to isolate certain sections of the southern system, Madam Speaker, where there are at present areas very far away from the centre of generation, and if you were to charge those areas all the costs of transmission, I think you could likely prove that there are areas in the southern part where subsidy is being paid as well, because we've accepted as a matter of principle, when the Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Power Commission went into

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) the rural electricification program after the war, it was accepted as a matter of principle that there would be a uniform rate for those areas served by what is known as the southern system.

So you find that whether a man lives ten miles away from the generating plants on the Winnipeg River, or right next door to the steam plant at Selkirk, or right next door to the one in Brandon, or up in Ethelbert or Swan River or Mafeking, where he is two or three hundred miles away from the generating station, he still pays the same basic rate. This has been an accepted principle and I think it is a sound principle insofar as the development of the province, but because the northern areas are not served by wire, because they are not part and parcel, that is of the connection, and they are served individually by diesel plants, we say to them, "No, you have to pay a higher rate." Surely within the southern system now, by the equalization principle, we are in fact subsidizing certain sections of the southern system by comparison to others. What my resolution says, is let us give the whole of the province the same basic rate.

The government has in fact accepted the principle of my resolution I suppose by gradually reducing the rates, but why they are not prepared to do it all at once and why they were not prepared to do it two years ago or three years ago when I first introduced the resolution, is beyond me, Madam Speaker, because I cannot see how you can make a legitimate case for discrimination against those areas, particularly when you consider that those areas are already faced with higher costs in any case. By and large, the cost of living in northern Manitoba is substantially higher than the cost of living in southern Manitoba, and here we have a government service supplied to the people of the province by the people of the province and we are charging these people, who are already faced with higher other costs, we're charging them a still higher cost on this particular service which is a government supplied service.

In addition to having to pay more for the service, they are also bigger consumers by and large, because for any of them who use heating to any extent by electricity, quite obviously there is an extra charge during the wintertime. Certainly their days are much shorter than ours - it is offset somewhat in the summer, but their winter days are very much longer - so the electrical consumption is higher. So surely from the standpoint of need, the need is there.

In encouraging northern development, I think that this is one of the factors we have to look at, that wherever possible we should tend to reduce the cost of living in northern Manitoba and encourage people to go there. I think we'll have to take more steps in other fields in the future if we are going to develop our north fully. Certainly the Russians are far ahead of us now in incentives to people to settle in the northern parts of their country, and they are having some notable success in developing large cities in their far northern areas. We, I know, are not prepared in a free society to go as far as they are, but surely where we have mechanisms within our control such as this one, then we should take advantage of them.

Well then can the government say, "Well, your request in principle is reasonable but the cost is prohibitive." Can they say that? I cannot see on what basis, Madam Speaker, this would be effective, because when you look at the consumption in the northern areas as compared to the total consumption in the province, the northern consumption is really negligible. If you take it over the years - I've gone back here to 1961 and 1962 - when you look at those figures, you can see that the total generation and purchase of power by the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board in the year 1961-62 was 4,222 million kilowatt hours - 4,222 million hours - and the northern amount in that was 17 million, 17 million as against 4,222 million, a percentage of less than one-half of one percent. The following year the percentage went up a little wee bit to about one-half of one percent. In 1963-64, again roughly one-half of one percent. The latest figure I have is for the year ending March 31, 1965, and this isn't broken down in as much detail as in the past - the report only now the northern diesel - but the total northern diesel production in millions of kilowatt hours is 30, and the over-all generation and purchase of the whole of the system - everything in the system - was 5,259. So 30 as against 5,259, just a little over one-half of one percent.

Now surely to bring these people, when they represent such a very small percentage of the total production of the power system, surely to bring them in line with the rest of the province isn't an impossibility. Surely when you're dealing with those sort of figures you can't say, "Well, the cost is prohibitive." If it represented 10 percent of the system's production or a larger figure, you could say, "Well, this means a loss in dollars, it means too much of a load on the over-all system," but for one-half of one percent, I cannot see how this can be considered to be something that cannot be handled within the regular costs of the system without

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) necessitating an increase in the over-all rates.

So, Madam Speaker, I would ask the government not to amend my resolution as they have every year so far. Let us proceed and accept it as it stands, make the equalization now rather than drag this matter out and do it by bits and pieces; let us give the people in northern Manitoba the opportunity to share the same low rates as the balance of the province shares, and let us make one uniform rate right across the Province of Manitoba.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, one can find little fault with the way this resolution has been presented by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition or in any of the facts and statements that have been made in previous years in connection with the same resolution that has appeared on the Order Paper certainly every year since I have been here.

It's just a matter of six or seven years ago that Hydro purchased the generating plant that was owned by the Town of The Pas, and at that time the rates were very high. The rates were substantially higher than what they are now and the Hydro, from the time that they took it over, began a gradual and businesslike approach in reducing those rates to those that would be closer to the prevailing country rates for Hydro in the other parts of Manitoba, and in the three years - this is the third one that I have had the honour of being the Minister in charge of Public Utilities - in each one of those years, 1964, 1965 and this year, there has been a reduction in the rates in The Pas until now there is only one more reduction to go until the rates in The Pas will be the same as they are in the other parts of rural Manitoba.

There is a suggestion that the government is directing the Hydro in matters of rates. I think the honourable member knows that the matter of rates, the establishment of rates are first of all - when there is a reduction - in the hands of the Hydro itself, and there is no interference on the part of the government on the question of whether rates should be raised or whether they should be lowered. In the matter of raising rates there is a procedure through the Public Utilities Board which investigates the matter fairly completely and then makes its decision and then the Hydro abides by it.

Although the percent of power consumed in The Pas area, or in the whole northern area, is relatively small by comparison to the consumption in total for the Province of Manitoba, the loss on the generation of power in The Pas area itself looms very large by comparison to any - either direct loss that can be ascertained, or indirect loss such as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition suggested, that it might be possible that losses in some widely scattered southern areas are greater, but it can't be determined unless you took an arbitrary figure on cost of transmission and the like. But I believe that even if this could be done, the direct loss of the generating power by diesel equipment in a location like The Pas can be shown to be substantially greater than anywhere else in the Province of Manitoba, and this loss had to be taken into the Hydro general operating income on a gradual basis. It was not thought feasible by those who direct the policies of the Hydro to take the jump all at once and the people in The Pas now know exactly when the rate is going to be the same as the rest of Manitoba.

I think that the disadvantage all these years of having to labour under costs in the north that are higher than in the south is something that has received the prime attention of the government, and within a short period not only will the Hydro cost be reduced but everything else that the government has a direct interest in. I need only refer to a recent reduction in the long distance telephone rates from the southern part of Manitoba to the north and vice versa, where a reduction in the amount of a minimum of \$157,000 a year was made by the Telephone System.

It is not for the basic disagreement in the idea of the resolution that I am going to find myself having to vote against it, it is more because of the suggestions within the resolution itself that this government in effect set a rate and direct the Hydro as to what that rate should be.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question? Is it not correct at the moment that Flin Flon, which is served by the company power, is getting cheaper rates than not only the surrounding areas but even cheaper rates than the rest of Manitoba - the southern area?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I haven't got the Flin Flon rates in front of me, but generally speaking, a cross-section, if you take all of the rates that are being offered in the Flin Flon area, that's for all types of services, I think - and I'll check this information today - that the rate over-all would be very close to the same as the rural rates in southern Manitoba. There is hardly any difference, and in the last few months there was a suggestion on the part of the company that operates the power rates that there be an increase, and it was only after an effort on behalf of the citizens of Flin Flon that that rate was not proceeded with - or the

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) application to have the rate increased proceeded with.

The situation in Flin Flon of course is entirely different than all other areas in The Pas, because Flin Flon is a company town and the power is supplied by the company that operates the mill, and I would think that the comparison, although it can be made, is really not a fair comparison, but when the rate comes down in The Pas, it certainly will be very very close to the rate in Flin Flon provided the rate in Flin Flon stays the same.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, possibly I should just say a word on this subject now that it's been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I would like to just point out that when he had some responsibility for the management of Hydro in the Province of Manitoba, he and the party that he represented, they said at that time that the rates of 20 cents per kilowatt hour in the first group and 10 cents at the second step for the people at Churchill was good enough for the people of Churchill. They were quite content that the people of Churchill had a fair and reasonable and an equitable rate at that figure. They were quite content to say that the people of Cranberry Portage - thank you - were doing very well when the rate was 10 cents a kilowatt hour. They were quite content to leave northern Manitoba without the services of Manitoba Hydro. They made no effort to my knowledge to try to give any kind of service in northern Manitoba. It was only when the Town of The Pas came cap-in-hand to the then Government of Manitoba and Manitoba Hydro at that time and asked them to take over service did they finally agree to provide service, but mark you, with no assurance at all that the rates would be reduced. In fact, there was every indication given at that time that the rates would remain substantially higher than they were in the southern part of the province then.

But where was their concern for the people of the north at that time? I think they had very little concern. They had very little concern with trying to extend power to the Indian and Metis people of the province living in isolated and remote sections. I think it's great credit to the Manitoba Hydro and to the government who have taken some initiative in this regard to try to take steps to provide this very valuable service to the people in remote parts of the province, at rates that are not substantially out of line with the benefits that the people are receiving.

So I'm glad to see that he's finally taking a more serious interest in the people of northern Manitoba. Ten times the rate of the City of Winnipeg was good enough for the people of Cranberry Portage; good enough for the people of Churchill when he had the responsibility, but today of course things have changed and now everyone should have the benefits of the best possible rates, and I don't argue with this proposition. I think that we should give the best possible rates we can to the people of the north, but I did want to point out that when he had the responsibility things were quite different, and I didn't hear him raising his voice at that time in support of the people of northern Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: May I ask the honourable member a question? Could I ask him a question? Could he tell me when I had the responsibility for northern rates or for

MR. CARROLL: I'll be very happy to tell him, Madam Chairman. I recall not many years ago when he pointed at one of our backbenchers over here and said he, as a member of the backbench and a member of the Conservative caucus, had the responsibility for government policy. All I'm saying here is that when he was a member of the backbench of that government, he had responsibility then to direct his attention to policies which would extend service at reasonable rates to the people of northern Manitoba. I point this out because he himself was the one who said that backbenchers did have responsibilities for government policy.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question of the Minister, Madam Speaker, is he in favour of equal rates in The Pas with the remainder of the province?

MR. CARROLL: Madam Chairman, I'm in favour of the policy that has been enunciated in this House and which will result in equalized rates in a very short period of time.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeah, when?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I was wondering if my honourable friend might permit another question? Was he sitting on this side of the House when my honourable friend was sitting on the other side of the House?

MR. CARROLL: I would have thought the member for Gladstone might have known that, Madam Chairman.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I did know it, but he inferred that he was sitting here.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member from Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia;

WHEREAS a planned grid of Provincial Highways is essential to the development and economy of the Province; and

WHEREAS tourism and trade would benefit greatly by a North-South Highway in the south central section of Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba give urgent consideration to the construction of a Highway from Windygates, Manitoba to Portage la Prairie, Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, you may wonder why I use this method to bring to the attention of the Minister and the government the need for a highway in this area. It had been suggested a few years ago I believe by one of the members that all members of this House must act as ombudsman for their constituents, and from time to time they should feel free to bring any matter to the attention of the House, and I use this method to bring the importance of this matter to the people -- how important it is to the people in the south central section of Manitoba that this road be so constructed.

Perhaps a second reason for this method of approach is the fact that I had the honour in 1963 to propose a resolution to develop the No. 1 Highway West from Winnipeg to Portage into a divided four-lane highway, and after two tries of using this approach, the government saw fit to accept the suggestion and proceeded in that manner two years after the first proposal.

I would like to remind the Minister - although I see he's not in his seat, but he will be reading Hansard - of the widespread interest that has been shown in the St. Claude area and south from there right down to the border and even our American friends as far south as Langford, North Dakota, on the American No. 1 Highway, are intensely interested into this direct approach into Manitoba and into the resort lands around the Lake Manitoba.

If I could remind the House, in the winter of 1963 there was a meeting held at St. Claude where over 400 people attended. I believe that some honourable members on the opposite side were in attendance at that meeting and they would recall vividly the interest that was shown at that meeting, the sole purpose of the meeting being to promote and discuss ways and means of having this highway come to fruition. The Minister will recall that Portage la Prairie Council, the Council of the Rural Municipality of Portage, various Chambers of Commerce in the area, all the municipal people of the St. Claude area and south from there, were all for this and they had made representations at various times to this government to take this action.

I cannot justify my request on the basis of traffic counts because this information has been denied. However, I am making one more request for a traffic count on this road with the hopes that the Minister will reconsider and give this information. Perhaps the argument may be used when the amendment comes; as I suppose it will, that the government cannot afford to do everything at this time and they must use some method of priorities. I would be willing to listen to this, but I would like to remind the members on the opposite side that the Minister of Highways, when he was in Portage at a meeting in 1964, promised this highway. He didn't give a date, but he said that the work would be done. So I'm asking the Minister to move this work up so that it can be done this summer. With regard to cost, part of the road is already there. It's a matter of up-grading what is there and joining onto what is there and improving the existing roads.

I have here a copy of an Order for Return that was just received the other day on the request of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, and it is a question to do with the large number of signs advertising the Honourable Minister of Public Works on No. 1 Highway between Portage and Winnipeg. There are 18 signs on this highway. Two of them are 44 feet by 10 feet and the information provided here shows that these two signs cost the taxpayers of Manitoba \$3,000 a year to maintain in position. There are 16 other signs on this short stretch of road, making a total of 18 signs altogether. The other sixteen signs average about \$470 each or a total of \$7,414.

Now if the Minister of Highways sees fit to use this method of promoting his name at a cost of over \$10,000 for one short section of highway, surely he has the money to carry out some highway construction. I would ask him to use the money that he is using in this manner, to use it in roads where there is a desire and a need to be filled, and I ask support for this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 43. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan) presented Bill No. 52, an Act to incorporate St. Paul's College and St. Paul's High School, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MILLS: Madam Speaker, the members will notice in the preamble that St. Paul's College was first incorporated in 1931. The proposed bill separates the college now from the high school as the members of the faculty feel it is expedient and desirable to separate the two schools into two schools of learning. In the future, the university will be called St. Paul's College and the High School will be called St. Paul's High School.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 60, an Act respecting Transfer of present and prospective assets and liabilities of the University of Manitoba Foundation to the Winnipeg Foundation, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, the title of the bill pretty well sets out the purpose of the bill, the transfer of the present and prospective assets and liabilities of the University of Manitoba Foundation to the Winnipeg Foundation. You will note that the assets are not very large. They are listed in the bill. There are no liabilities and the foundation hasn't been very active.

It is felt by the Board of Trustees of the Foundation that the need for the Foundation has pretty much ceased to exist as there are numerous available sources for funds to enable students to take university training, including of course the vastly increased government assistance. So this money will be transferred to the Winnipeg Foundation, this Foundation to be used for the same purposes as was provided in the Act incorporating the University of Manitoba Foundation. The purposes are very broad. They will enable the Foundation to use the income from the fund for any purposes in connection with the University of Manitoba.

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

MR. PATRICK presented Bill No. 61, an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate "Grace Hospital," for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, this bill is asking for permissive legislation. Grace Hospital started out as a Maternity Hospital; today it is a general hospital. There is two locations to the Hospital so the Salvation Army is asking for legislation that they could own land and issue debentures similar to what other hospitals can do.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 45. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Swan River, may we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 40. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, the bill that is before us is to set up an association of psychologists, and we note from the bill that this is going to be a profession and it's going to be more or less a closed shop as far as the association is concerned and its membership. When it's going into effect, all those that are practising in the profession now won't be members as of right. However, later on we find that the association will set up its own by-laws and will be admitting members as they may well please.

The powers that are handed over to this society are indeed very wide, and as far as this Assembly - once the bill is in effect - will have no say in the matter at all. The regulations that will be set up will have to be concurred in or the university will be consulted in this instance. But that too is a private institution to which we give grants but have very little say.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

The bill sets out in subsection (5) those persons that may become members, and I would like to know from the honourable member that is sponsoring the bill, how many are presently practising and how many will be admitted as of right at that date; and how many, if any, will not be included - whether all of them will be included. They have a right to be included, but whether the applications are there that all of them will be included.

I think the powers are really too wide because we presently know that in the medical profession that we receive no reports in our department - reports on the profession. We don't know the number of medical doctors practising in Manitoba today; we don't know the number that were admitted during the past year; how many are in training and what the needs are. Should there be more doctors licensed? What is the situation? We feel that there is a shortage because our rural centres are definitely complaining that they are not getting the necessary medical staff. Certainly this House should have some say in these matters, and I think the program should be stepped up.

But here we're now creating another such profession where we will have no say later on, once it's established. The matters that are applying to the medical profession will apply to this group. We note that in Section 10, while I do not want to go into particular sections, that here they're speaking of two years' professional experience will be required. Then in Section 11 they are talking of classes of non-registered practitioners. Just what is meant by all these -- what are their intents? What do they intend to do once the bill is established, and those who are presently practising will be members, what is their intent? Will these members in the future have to serve as interns for a couple of years and will there be severe restrictions placed on people that want to be admitted in future years? I think these are some of the questions that should be answered. I feel that the powers are too wide, and that the House, this Assembly should have some say in its future activities if the restrictions are going to be so severe.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PETERS presented Bill No. 63, an Act to amend The Labour Relations Act (2), for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, the main objection to Section 46 (a) of The Labour Relations Act is that it is discriminatory in imposing a particular type of association on trade unions and employees organizations which is not imposed on any other group in the community. Our democratic way of life prides itself in permitting groups or individuals freedom of choice of association. Each group or individual is entitled to select that type of association which he or she desires provided it is lawful.

Madam Speaker, apart from Section 46 (a) of The Labour Relations Act, which deals only with trade unions and employees organizations, any other group may choose to associate in any such manner that it sees fit. Section 46 (a) requires certain select groups to assume corporate status. The assumption of corporate status by trade unions is not legally necessary nor morally acceptable. Prior to the enactment of Section 46 (a), numerous legal actions were commenced against trade unions either by suing them through representatives, or the action was directly founded on The Labour Relations Act.

Madam Speaker, Section 46 (a) of The Labour Relations Act was brought in after the Brandon strike when everybody was heated up; labour was upset; the unions were upset; the government was upset; and the government saw fit to bring in this section of The Labour Relations Act. We at that time had stated that they were rushing into this and we fought it to the last ditch to no avail. Now, Madam Speaker, I don't think it is proper for this to be imposed on trade unions and employees organizations. It's not forced on anyone else. The Minister may tell me that unions are better off under this Section 46 (a) than they are under the Common Law. Well if he was to talk to the people in the trade unions, they would tell him that they would like to go back to the Common Law. They'll take their chances. They'll be more satisfied, and I think if the Minister would have paid attention to what we had told him at the time - and we aren't the only ones that said it, there was a Professor McDowell of Brandon College that didn't agree with what was recommended in the Tritschler Report. He said that the strike

(MR. PETERS cont'd.) had nothing to do with unions and why they should have their legal status changed.

Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the government always pretends they want to help out trade unions, but what do they do when unions come to see them and present their annual briefs? It is not very much that they pay attention to them. I think, Madam Speaker, it is time that we should let this bill go to second reading and let the people again present their views, because I think as it stands now, and as I stated before, if the Minister will listen to the trade unions they will tell him that they would much rather be under the Common Law.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. continued on next page

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) presented Bill No. 64, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2) for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I also have been surprised at the rate of speed which we have proceeded with through the Order Paper today, and I think it is probably a good thing that I haven't had too long a period to prepare too long a speech. This afternoon I don't intend, therefore, to make a long speech. I would sooner let other people that are more qualified and that have the gift of making themselves understood, a little better than I talk on this subject. I do intend, though, to try to be honest and open on the subject and I would like to explain exactly what I wish to accomplish with this bill and also what I would consider a fair compromise, and I would also briefly attack directly what I feel will be the main objections to this resolution or this principle.

Now, first of all, I hope that the Minister of Education is in the same frame of mind as he was yesterday. I think that he was very fair, that he understood the problems probably better than anyone of those who have talked on the subject, in the House anyway, before yesterday. I think that we all agree now that the trouble that we have had lately on another subject, on this Windsor Park schools, would not have happened if we had voted in favour of a certain resolution in 1963. Well this is water under the bridge. I think that this has been rectified, but I think that we should keep this in mind when we discuss this other bill that we have in front of us that I'm introducing now.

What I'm actually interested in, Madam Speaker, is to see the principle, a certain principle adopted in this House. The principle of biculturalism - bilingualism I should say. Now I know that this cannot happen from one day to another, and I think that this will take quite a while. But I think that this is the proper way to start this, to recognize and to approve a principle, and then even if it takes 2, 3, 5 or 10 years, I think we will be on the right track if the members in this House can approve a certain principle, and I think that there'll be less of this battle that we have had on this subject here in Manitoba. I think that once the principle has been approved, I think that we could leave this, instead of rushing into a program, I think that we could leave this to the administrators, to people that are qualified to look into these things, and that could be brought in gradually. I wouldn't object at all if the Government - and both the Minister of Education could discuss this with me, members of the Cabinet and members on the other side - the Government would at least allow this to go to second reading. The principle would be that we recognize (and this is all it is) bilingualism here in Manitoba, and by some of the things that were said by the members opposite us and not only in this House, I think that we pretty well all agree with this principle. Now the way that this is going to be administered, how it is going to be done, maybe we don't agree and this might take awhile, as I've said, before we set up a program which would be acceptable to all.

Now if the Government would only, at least, let this go for second reading, where we can have certain representation. Now the Government might feel then that first of all there is not the necessary teachers for French to go into this program too fast and too strongly. The Government might recommend that now that we have this thing set up that we have Français, that those that are qualified to take Français could maybe use French as a teaching language for Social Studies. Now would that be asking too much, Madam Speaker? And I think that this would be recognizing a very important principle. I think that this would tend to unite the people of Manitoba, and we wouldn't have to face this at the last minute and feel that politically this might be dynamite. This would give an education to the people of Manitoba, and this is what I'm asking, if it can go at least to second reading, and even if the Government want to water it down because I think it will have to. I think it's impossible to start right now because of the lack of teachers. But we have to make a start, Madam Speaker, and this is all I ask.

I think that this would really be working for unity and I think it would be the best Centennial project that Manitoba could have, by giving this leadership, even though it might be very little. Even if this year we only adopt the principle, if we only accept this principle, and if we leave in the Act -- I'm not too familiar with this, but the last clause usually of this Act will come into effect at a certain time, or when the Government decides. I'd be ready to go along with this. It's just that we take a little step; well it would be a big step as far as the principle is concerned, and I think that can be done. I can't see any reason why that can't be done. Then we would know that the people of Manitoba and the representatives agree with this principle. Then we would go ahead. We would have a reason then to develop these French teachers because we know that they would be needed. And one thing, we could educate the people during that time.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... I think that this is exactly what I would like to see, Madam Speaker.

Now let me quote from people that I think are respected in this field, and I think that this will express my feelings more. First of all, I'd like to quote from the Free Press of October 4th an article quoting Premier Lesage: "Quebec Premier Jean Lesage told a gathering of French-speaking university graduates here Saturday that French language education is virtually the only thing that can save French-Canadian minorities outside of Quebec," and this is why the French-Canadian minority feel that this is so important. "This French language speech stressing throughout that Canada needs the contribution of its French element everywhere in Canada, not only in Quebec, for its own survival, was frequently interrupted by applause of the audience. When the Quebec premier had spoken he received a seven minutes' standing ovation." This was right here in Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. "From his tour of British Columbia and the three prairie provinces he had drawn the conclusion that assimilation of French minorities in these areas is inevitable unless instruction in their mother language is readily available to the children of these communities, the Premier said. But according to Mr. Lesage, the least Quebec can do is set an example with its own system of education, and when Quebecers hear of the difficulties encountered by certain French minorities in the west, they might think their institutions are over-generous to the English Canadian there, he said."

And this is something that some of the people of Quebec are starting to think, and we're shocked when we read in the papers that they want, maybe subscribe to what is done in other provinces. Unilingual, so that Quebec could be unilingual. We think this is a step backwards, and it would be a very bad step, and I'm sure this is not going to happen, but you can just imagine those people out there thinking of the way the minority here in Manitoba is treated, how they would feel. They might say, "Well, if it's good enough for the people out there, it's good enough for the minority here." But when we read of this we think, oh, these people are separatists, they're this and they're that. Who are the true separatists, Madam Speaker?

Now, let's go back, move to another province a little closer to us, where now it's an English-speaking premier and a member of a different party who speaks, and I'd like to quote a bit from the Tribune of December 25th: "Premier Robarts of Ontario says it is impractical to conceive that bilingualism can be achieved in Canada with any degree of rapidity," and this is what I said earlier. I understand that and I accept this.

"Mr. Robarts said his government isn't satisfied with the opportunities afforded Ontario's French-speaking minority to attend French schools and pursue their own culture," - and they are doing very much more than we are doing here, and this is the land where the people were so much against the French people - the province that was anti-French if anything. See how it is changing; and I keep on with Mr. Robarts: "Over the years we have developed French schools," he says, "where instruction is done in French. Perhaps we haven't gone as far as we might though." I know that things have changed and they already have these schools, so you see how far behind we are, Madam Speaker. "I remember even in my own experience as a politician being violently criticized for some attitudes that I had taken towards the teaching of French in Ontario. Now these attitudes in my mind are disappearing" -- this is Mr. Robarts speaking again. "They've disappeared in my lifetime and in my experience at least they've diminished, and I say this to illustrate the fact that I think there are a great many people in Ontario who want their children to be bilingual. I want my children to speak French," said Mr. Robarts.

"Mr. Robarts said he detects an increasing desire amongst Ontario residents to become bilingual, and this certainly is strong amongst English-speaking residents of this province." Well, now we have the two First Ministers of the largest provinces in Canada, and this is what they feel, and this is how they talk publicly.

Now let's bring an Independent into the picture. "Dr. Jones who teaches at the university here, born in the U. S., praised the Canadian concept of nationalism, unity and diversity which foster traditional cultural ties while remaining united as a nation as well as the development of a single nation. The melting pot theory in Canada, he said, would not work" - and this is important, this is it - "because five million Frenchmen don't melt. I think that this is the important thing. "We must have unity with diversity in Canada," Dr. Jones told delegates, "and we must realize that we all have the right to retain our own culture and our own language. This does not just happen, we must work for it."

Madam Speaker, this is what I'm asking, this bill, that we work for these things, even if we just approve this, approve the principle. Even if we take one, two or three years to even

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... start. I think that we could start. As I said, it would be easy. We have -- and this is clear in our minds now since yesterday, and just because the Minister of Education was fair enough, had enough courage to correct something that was wrong, I think that it is clear now. We know what this Français is. It's not only for the French, for those whose mother tongue is French, it's for those that are qualified, and we could use the same thing, the people that are ready for this, and the people that wished this. This is another important point. Nobody's trying to force anything on anybody. These people -- and I'm sure we would have many, many English-speaking people that would like to take advantage of this and maybe take social studies in French, and this is the best way to learn a language.

Now, what are the objections? Well, let's be frank. Sometimes we don't want to mention these things, but politically -- you hear of a lot of things politically: "This would be political suicide" and so on, and we've heard this about this. We've heard it because for one thing the Ukrainians here in Manitoba were more numerous than the French-speaking people, and that's true, and it was felt at the time that they would never go along with this. Well, let's find out. This is an article from Tim Creary that appeared in the Tribune of October 4th. "The Quebec leader found full support for the agreement" - this was when Mr. Lesage was here - "at a meeting in Winnipeg with members of the Canadian Ethnic Press Federation, grouping representatives of German, Ukrainian, Polish, Icelandic, Swedish and Danish papers in Canada. The two-point agreement... the simple recognition that the goals of French Canadians and of the ethnic minorities are not mutually exclusive. The points are: (1) French and English as Canada's two official languages should be languages of instruction in the schools wherever the French or English communities are large enough to warrant classes in their own language." This is what the Ukrainian, the Polish and so on, their official representative thinks. "(2) The language of the ethnic minorities should be recognized as curriculum subjects of instruction from the beginning of the elementary level wherever ethnic groups have large enough communities to warrant it." In other words, you can teach other languages when there is enough people that are interested.

"This is more than I expected," said Lesage after his meeting with leaders of the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee, representing 29 Canadian Ukrainian groups. Chief representatives of the UCC were Monseigneur Wasykushnir, President, Senator Paul Yuzyk and John Synchron, First Vice-President. Senator Yuzyk said the agreement embodied the recognition of both bilingualism and multiculturalism," and I think that the majority of well-thinking and fair people of all groups want these two things recognized. "These are compatible and desirable for the development of the Canadian nation," said the Senator, who was appointed to the Red Chamber by former Prime Minister Diefenbaker. "We consider that as one of the founding groups the French are entitled to have French taught and used as a teaching language. The Ukrainians wish to have their language as a subject of instruction, not as a language of instruction in other subjects."

This is the only difference. This is the only thing that the French people as a founding race ask. These people, through the Senator, agreed with this.

So -- here a little further in this article, "All through the west Lesage has hammered away on the subject of French schooling rights. Everywhere he has been... the major objection that other ethnic groups, especially the Ukrainians, would not accept anything for the French that they could not have for themselves." And I think that this was one of the stumbling blocks, one of the objections - that the Ukrainians would never go for it, or the other group would never go for it, and we can see now that this is no longer true, if it ever was. Therefore I don't think that politically this would be dangerous, especially if you did this gradually, as I mentioned. Accept the principle now, maybe start with some people, social studies and so on, and even if it took ten years, I don't think this would be too difficult.

Now does that mean, Madam Speaker, that I feel that oh, everybody will be in favour of this? No, I don't. I'll read a letter that appeared in the Free Press. In Letters to the Editor, on February 26, 1966, you'll see the way some people think. "Sir: According to the February 15th issue of the Free Press, Mr. Laurent Desjardins tabled a resolution in the Manitoba Legislature that French be made an optional language of instruction in Manitoba schools. This business of bilingualism and biculturalism has gone quite far enough. When English is rapidly becoming the world language and people in more and more countries are adopting English as their second language, what will Canada gain by preserving French-speaking communities or by forcing French on other Canadians?" Now that was never suggested. "This is not doing the French communities any good and so much harm in the rest of Canada. It took two world wars

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... and a lot of hard work to bring all people of Canada to live together in harmony. Most have accepted the English language as No. 1, with other languages, customs and traditions being preserved at their own expense. Others should follow this instead of continuously demanding more public funds. The expression, 'the two founding races' is nonsense. It is only the Indians who are the real founding race and we choose to ignore them and others and give credit only to the English and the French. We are insulting those Canadians who are not any of these origins but who did and are doing their share to build this nation and make this a good place to live in. Either we will be fair to everybody and allow each and every ethnic group the same language privileges in schools and in government or we will forget this nonsense; ignore the few noisy individuals and what they stand for and get on with more important things. We will never have complete bilingualism or multilingualism in Canada, and if our politicians would stop wasting their time and our money on things which tend to divide us we would be much better off." I don't think there's any point in giving the name of who wrote this. If anybody wants it, it was February 26th in the Free Press.

Yes, there's some people that will object to this; some people through ignorance. And when I'm talking about ignorance I mean lack of knowledge. For instance, maybe these people, feeling that's something that we're trying to force something on anybody, and that has never been, never been the intention of anyone to force a language. The only thing we're asking is that wherever there's enough people that these people will have a chance to use either of the official languages of Canada as a language of instruction, only for those that want it. Some people don't care about it, and as Professor Jones said, "You will not melt five million Frenchmen." I think that if we did this, if we showed the leadership, I think that Manitoba would have an awful lot to offer for the unity of Manitoba, and as I said, especially if we could have this ready for 1967.

Now, Madam Speaker, we will have to face certain people that don't want this. There are fanatics on each side, both sides of any question, and those people are the ones that usually hurt these causes or hurt the unity. But I think that we've been hearing a lot of "let's get together and let's work for Canada." Well, I would like with this bill, and I think this is the best way, for the people of Manitoba to show that they are Canadian first, not Manitobans, because as Canadians in Canada we believe in the two languages, and this is the best way. If not, if we say "let them join us," we are separatists, that's what we're saying. If they don't want to take this they know what they can do.

Well, Madam Speaker, I think that I've said enough. There's no point repeating everything that was said last year. I hope that the members opposite from us, all the members of this House, because this is a private bill, but especially the Minister of Education, realize and understand what I'm trying to do with this. It's nothing that'll embarrass anybody, the same as that bill in 1963 wasn't meant to embarrass anybody, and it could be very very easy to let this bill go for second reading to approve - nothing else, it's all it does - the principle which, informing the House, the wish that -- there'll be some amendments, letting this approve the principle of bilingualism here in Manitoba. Everybody has been paying it lip service; let's do something concrete on this. Let this go to second reading and then let's say, "All right, we approve the principle. We'll start slowly but at least we'll start."

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I was very pleased to hear the calm and dispassionate manner with which the Honourable Member from St. Boniface dealt with this subject. I was hoping when I first saw this bill on the Order Paper that he would not deal with it in the way in which he dealt with it last year in closing the debate. I intend in the course of my remarks to refer briefly to some of the things he said last year in introducing his bill, but I would hope that we might all forget some of the statements which he made when he closed the debate. And I would hope that the honourable member when he closes the debate this year, Madam Speaker, would point out to me and any others who care to speak on this bill, where we are wrong, where he thinks we really do not have an understanding of what he and others like him are trying to get at with this sort of legislation. I would hope that he would do that. I would appreciate that sort of comment. I will try in the course of my remarks to keep them in the same calm manner in which the Honourable Member for St. Boniface did his previously.

I would like to start out by reading -- I don't want to read all of it because it's quite lengthy, but I certainly think that members might well read this article which appeared, I think it was on the editorial page of the Tribune. It's by a James Gray and it has a by-line from Calgary, and I'll read only the last two paragraphs. This is dealing with a situation that arose in Saskatoon with respect to parents keeping children away from school where there was a

(MR. GROVES cont'd)... controversy over English versus French. I'm not familiar with that situation, but this writer is attempting to go into the background of this thing. He ends up by saying this: "Time and intransigence took care of the problem and everybody learned English eventually, but if French also had been recognized as a language of instruction, the uproar among the more numerous Germans, Ukrainians and Scandinavians can well be imagined. 'Why,' they would have demanded, 'is French permitted when nobody speaks French?' The question would have echoed and re-echoed across the hustings, in provincial elections, in all the foreign-born areas, and few would have listened to historical answers. Today, almost everybody on the prairies speaks English - 3,100,000 out of a population of 3,180,000. There are 48,000 who speak neither English nor French, and the percentage of the population which speaks French and English has remained unchanged for many years. But the percentage which speaks French alone has been declining and now numbers only 17,000. Fully one-fifth of the ethnic French on the prairies no longer speak French. In all Saskatchewan only 3,800 speak only French.

"In recent years, the idea of being able to speak a second language is undoubtedly growing on the prairies. There has been little opposition against the introduction of French in the primary grades, but there is widespread agitation against the acceptance of French as the only second language. The Ukrainians, Germans and Scandinavians who outnumber the French are now in full cry for recognition of their languages. The crowning irony in the west is that it is the vilified les Anglais who are most firmly disposed to learning French. Les Anglais, even with the Scots and Irish included, still make up a bare third of the population of the prairie. The significant fact, however, involves neither ethnic origins nor language spoken. It is that in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the divisions between the people that settled the country are rapidly fading out. There are fewer and fewer hyphenates and more and more Canadians." Madam Speaker, I think that the message from that article is one to which we might well all give some serious consideration.

Now with respect to my own views on the matter which the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has raised. I think we have to remember that there 220 million some odd people in North America north of the Mexican boundary, where the predominant language of business, of government, and social intercourse is English, and anybody who lives in this vast area who hasn't got an adequate command of the English language is, in my opinion, very much restricted in opportunity.

Some months ago there was a man from Alberta who was appointed the president I think it was of the Shell Oil Company of New Jersey, or Standard Oil of New Jersey. Now surely one couldn't think that this could happen to this Canadian if he had only a command of the French language. I agree that it could have happened if the man was completely bilingual but it seems to me that if we were to yield to the sort of pressure that is being put upon us now in pressing the point that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is pressing, that we would not necessarily graduate from schools in areas where the population is predominantly French-speaking, people who were bilingual, but rather there would be the tendency, particularly in the province of Quebec if we're speaking of it nationally, and in areas where there are large settlements of French Canadians, to be graduating people from these schools who have a good command of only the French language and perhaps such a poor command of the English language that the doors of opportunity such as were open to the gentleman to which I just referred, might be closed to them. Their opportunity might be limited to their own French-speaking community, and at the most if they were born and educated in this way in the province of Quebec, their opportunity would be confined to the borders of the province of Quebec.

I think that this is a serious handicap when we remember that there are 220 million people north of the Mexican border where the predominant language is English, if we take lightly the handicap that might be imposed on boys and girls coming from schools in areas without a proper command of the English language. Does the Honourable Member for St. Boniface or any other member of this House, for example, think for a moment that all of the potential for development and opportunity that is available today in Latin America is open to anyone who does not have a good command of the Spanish language? I say no, Madam Speaker. These opportunities are not open to persons who do not speak Spanish fluently, nor are all the opportunities in North America available to those who do not have a good command of the English language. Many of these doors to opportunity are closed to those who cannot cope with the English language.

The honourable member last year in the course of his remarks said that "Education in

(MR. GROVES cont'd)... French is the key to the survival of the French Canadian culture. If this culture is to be preserved in Manitoba, the young French Canadian student will have to learn this maternal tongue in a proper atmosphere, in a French Canadian atmosphere. It is only then that better French will be spoken by the French Canadians of Manitoba." I ask the Honourable Member, and in some ways I agree with what he says, that is he prepared to do this, if it's true, as I have said, even if it's at the expense of restricting the future of these French Canadian children who are going to under his proposal be brought up and educated solely in a French language and French cultural background.

I want to point out again, Madam Speaker, as I did earlier, that my argument fails completely if graduates from schools in which the teaching language is French and where instruction is done entirely in the French language, if these graduates come forth from these schools completely bilingual. I'm not however convinced, Madam Speaker, at the moment that this will be the case, and in this event I maintain that they are seriously handicapping and closing doors of opportunity that may well be open to these students otherwise. We as legislators shouldn't take lightly the responsibility which rests on our shoulders of preparing our young people to compete with others on this continent, and we should not allow people to influence us into policies that will restrict the opportunities that are now open to them. We should not allow, Madam Speaker, walls to be built around our young people in the name and for the sake of preserving a culture that will close in their faces doors of unlocked, unlimited opportunity now open to them.

I think back, Madam Speaker, to my own classroom in high school. There were 40 boys in this class. Of those 40 people only 12 remained in Winnipeg, 8 are in other parts of Canada, and 20 are in the United States and other foreign countries. Now I think - and I invite the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to correct me if I'm wrong - that if we 40 boys had graduated from a school in a predominantly French Canadian community in this province, where the teaching was entirely in the French language, and we graduated, as I think we would have - and again I invite the Honourable Member to correct me - with a good knowledge of the French language and not a good knowledge of the English language, I would venture to say that the 40 boys who served in this class would either all still be practising their profession or doing business in the community in which they were educated or within the boundaries of the province of Quebec, and the unlimited opportunities that have opened themselves up particularly to the 20 that are now living in the U.S. and in foreign countries, would not have been open to them.

I think that French Canadians are right when they say that they are denied opportunities open to Canadians of other ethnic groups. This is because I think that they refuse to recognize that you cannot in an area so large as North America expect equal opportunities to those who insist that we create small islands of non-English-speaking people in little corners of this province where opportunities are limited because of language handicaps. We see this going on, Madam Speaker, in the Civil Service in Ottawa, and I have no disparaging remarks to make about the French Canadian people in our National Civil Service, and I do not say that those who occupy positions in the government service and in government agencies such as Canadian National Railways, CBC, Air Canada, are not qualified to hold these positions. But I do say that the government at Ottawa and the management of these government agencies are being subjected to very real pressure from French Canadians from the province of Quebec and from other parts of Canada, to take people into these services because of their ability to speak French or to be bilingual. This is most unfair, Madam Speaker, to areas such as ours in Manitoba where opportunities for non-French-speaking Canadians to properly learn the French language are almost completely non-existent, and will not be helped by the proposal that the Honourable Member of St. Boniface makes.

Again referring to what he said last year when he introduced this bill, he said, "The French Canadians of Manitoba are worried. They are afraid that under the present system they stand to lose both their language and their specific culture." Then he goes on to say, "The French Canadians are convinced that the only result that can be achieved by this measure is the preservation of the French language from total extinction." I don't believe this to be the case, Madam Speaker. This has not happened to other ethnic groups in the province, nor will it happen to the French language or the French culture, even without the measure that has been proposed by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. We need only look at small countries such as Holland and Denmark. These countries are interested in preserving their national language, and they're interested in preserving their national culture, but they also realize that they are a small island surrounded by countries that offer the unlimited opportunities

(MR. GROVES cont'd)... for advancement that their young people want and need. So they encourage in their education policies a knowledge of the languages of Germany, France and Great Britain, the large and influential countries by which they are surrounded and by which they are so greatly influenced.

Canada and North America are far different now than they were at the time of Confederation. Times change, Madam Speaker, and unless we want to be left behind, we must change with the times. A hundred years ago, transportation alone restricted opportunity, restricted us to live within our own little communities. Transportation and communication are no barriers now to opportunity and we should not allow language to restrict the future of one segment of our young population. Preservation of a language or a culture are assets to our country - to any country - and I am not entirely in agreement with the melting-pot theory that they have in the United States.

However, I do sincerely believe that to carry this too far, we will seriously impair the future of some of our young people, our young people that will be graduating from schools where they are taught solely in a language other than the predominant language that's used in the North American continent in business, education and other matters. This in turn, I think, would result in certain justified feelings of resentment to the balance of the North American area, which in turn can only result in the restricting of opportunities and pent-up emotions on little islands of French language and French culture on this vast sea of English-speaking North America.

The Honourable Member -- I'm not going to deal with this but I would refer the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and others to the Census of Canada for 1961 in which it gives the figures for people of French background who are bilingual and those who do no longer speak the French language and those who speak the French language only. I would also refer him to a very interesting article by Professor Jean Guy Vaillancourt, a Professor of Sociology of St. Boniface College, which article appeared in the newspaper, *La Liberté et La Patriote*, of the 8th of April, 1965.

Madam Speaker, the honourable member closed his remarks with a brief reference to the situation in Windsor Park School which the Minister dealt with yesterday, and I would close with just a very few remarks on the same situation. I say that the School Board and the French teachers in the proposed new school in Windsor Park have an opportunity that no other school division in this province has, to show what can be done in helping people who are interested to become bilingual and to help solve some of these French-English problems which we have been reading so much about lately. They have this opportunity to open up the doors of their new school when it's built to those young children of non-French background whose parents are willing to send them to this school to learn the French language and to graduate from Grade 11, perhaps completely bilingual.

So the opportunity is there for the School Board and the teachers in St. Boniface to show what can be done in cementing the good relations that should exist between peoples of two languages and two cultures living closely together in a small community. And I do hope, Madam Speaker, that those members of the St. Boniface School Board will grasp at this opportunity and will show us the leadership that they only at the moment are capable of showing, to help solve this very difficult problem. There's no reason, Madam Speaker, why it cannot be done. There is no reason, in my opinion, why English-speaking boys and girls cannot be taken into a school such as the one that is being built in St. Boniface.

In fact I'll go further than that, in my opinion there is no reason why English-speaking children couldn't be taken in and taught French, taught in the French language in this country, not only in the Province of Quebec, provided there was the will on the part of the French-speaking School Board and the French-speaking teachers to do it, because I can speak from personal experience of a young girl who moved into our community three years ago from Hungary who couldn't speak - neither she nor any member of her family could speak one word of the English language. She went into Grade 4 in Windsor School in St. Vital in the same room as my daughter. That girl, in addition to picking up a working knowledge of the English language, also passed Grade 4 and passed into Grade 5 in the few months that she was in that school. And how did she do it? By applying herself, and because of the interest that the children in the school and the people in the community, and particularly the teachers in that school, took in making sure that she was going to learn the language in which she was going to have to write her examinations and make her way. That girl, subsequently after spending three years in that school went - I think she went to Germany - but she left this country after

(MR. GROVES cont'd)... three years with a good command of the English language.

I would suggest that particularly in Manitoba and in the western provinces that if possible, if we are really serious, to put our children into schools, and with the co-operation of the French societies that are interested in preserving the French language and those teachers that are capable of teaching it, producing from our school boys and girls that are bilingual and where they will have opportunities after leaving school to retain their competence in the French language.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member would permit a question?

MR. GROVES: Sure.

MR. DESJARDINS: Did I understand the Honourable Member from St. Vital right when he asked if a class that had studied in the predominantly French area could do as well as this graduating class? Would that be the question that he asked?

MR. GROVES: Well I think I said that if the 40 persons that were in my class in high school had been born and educated in Manitoba in a community that was predominantly French and were taught in school in the French language and graduated from school with a good command of the French language but without a good command of the English language, the opportunities that were in fact open to these graduates -- opportunities that were open would not have been open had they studied under those circumstances.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if I can be permitted another question then from the Honourable Member, I am sure he is not suggesting that I think they should learn only French. If he is interested, would he be interested in asking, for instance, Judge Alfred Monnin how his graduating class made out?

MR. GROVES: Well I think I said twice in the course of my remarks, Madam Speaker, that my arguments do not hold water if boys and girls graduated from schools where the teaching is done in the French language, in fact graduated completely bilingual. In other words, competent in both languages.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is my Bill suggesting anything else?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 32 (c) --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we finished last night, I asked a couple of questions of the Minister in connection with the Council for Higher Learning, the personnel of the Committee and also what is envisioned in the expenditure of \$25,000.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, \$8,000 is being budgeted for purchasing books and travel; also for consultants who may be called in and asked to a certain job; salaries of the Senior Officer I to act as executive to the Council, a Research Assistant and a Clerk Stenographer. The composition of the Council: the Chairman is Mr. A. Searle Leach; the University of Manitoba representatives are Dr. Saunderson, Dr. Funt - he's Dean of Graduate Studies; Dr. Neilson, Dean of Dentistry; Dr. Sibley, Dean of Arts and Science; Dr. Lees, Department of Microbiology; Dr. Currie, The Board of Governors; Mr. G. Richardson, Board of Governors; Mr. A. R. Tucker, Board of Governors; representing Brandon College, Dr. Robins, President; St. Boniface College, Honourable Justice A.M. Monnin; St. John's College, Mr. Desmond Smith; United College, Dr. Lockhart; St. Paul's College, Reverend Father Burke-Gaffney, Director; and the Provincial Government are Mr. Scott Bateman, Mr. W. F. Beech, the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. The acting Secretary has been Mr. Davies or Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of curriculum, and I would like to get a little staff for the Council. I hope he will be relieved of these extra duties.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd):

The Council is divided into two main bodies, the Arts and Science Council and the other courses, and the representatives that I have just named are serving on each Council. The affiliated colleges were most interested in Arts and Science which concerns them mostly, and their representatives are all in this Arts and Science Council. I believe the terms of reference have been distributed. If further terms are required, if you would like copies of them, I could arrange for them.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): I don't know whether to raise the point under this item. It has to do with the training of registered nurses. Does the Minister wish to have it raised under this item, or should I wait until we deal with vocational education?

MR. JOHNSON: I think it could be debated under vocational education, although it's really a general subject. It doesn't come under the university budget.

MR. FROESE: Well maybe I should deal with it now. I would like to know from the Minister just what contribution the government is making toward the training of registered nurses in Manitoba, and whether the assistance that we do give, whether it goes to the hospitals alone or whether we're also giving the nurses something for the period that they're in training. After all, they spend three years before they are entitled to be registered as a registered nurse, and they're doing a lot of work voluntarily. Certainly we would all agree that nurses that go in for this should be devoted to the cause and should contribute some of their work voluntarily, but I think we're asking too much and that as a result we do not train sufficient numbers to meet the need. There's a great shortage of trained and registered nurses in Manitoba, and I think something should be done in this direction. If I'm correct, in the not too distant past some contribution was given - financial assistance was given to nurses in training. However, I find that, at least in some hospitals today, this is no longer the case, that they're not getting anything. Just when was this practise discontinued? I don't see anything in connection with nurses training in either the Education Department report nor in the Department of Health report, and I think something should be mentioned in these reports on this whole matter of training of registered nurses and that we do receive more information on this matter. I hope the Minister gives us this information and I would like to see also that something is given to these nurses who spend three years of their time without any remuneration whatever. These people are doing a lot of work and making a sacrifice in order to get into this profession, if you can call it that, so they are definitely entitled to some remuneration in my opinion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the only thing in the education estimates is that they are subject to student loans under the Canada Student Loan Plan. They can receive loans during training and there's a small amount that has been made available through federal sources towards bursaries which we administer through the vocational vote in this estimate, and I think the rest of the questions can best be asked of the Minister of Health who has under . . . because other than this the Department of Education has no direct contact except much discussion concerning their academic standards re the entrance into nursing.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the matter of universities, I would like to say a few words about Brandon College, which is one of the items under this one. I think this college has been developing very well in the past few years. It's been expanding its courses and I believe doing an excellent job for the people of western Manitoba in particular to whom it is more accessible. One of the difficulties in Manitoba is the concentration in Winnipeg, and for students in rural Manitoba in particular the big cost of attending university is not really the tuition, it's the cost of boarding when they are at the university, and by having an institution in Brandon it certainly helps in further areas of the province. I realize that our population structure doesn't permit us having a university in every corner but as far as possible I think this diversification is in the interests of Manitoba.

There's been some talk about Brandon being made into a regular university, probably with the name the University of Western Manitoba. This seems to me to be a sound forward step. I wonder if the Minister could indicate the intentions of the government in this regard, whether we may expect the University of Western Manitoba to be so named and established in Brandon?

MR. JOHNSON: I can't answer the Honourable Member at this time. I can just indicate that in the past year we are bringing Brandon College into fiscal alignment with that of the university. These estimates in the past have always been for a period of time I think from June until the following April - anyway, it was mixed up; and we have I think a special warrant that will probably be coming forward because extra monies were required this year to bring Brandon

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... College into fiscal alignment. This vote here is to bring them from the 1st of April of this coming year to the following April. The whole matter has been referred to the Council of Higher Learning and I felt that it was judicious as this body was sitting and examining the whole field of post-secondary education, that any step along the line of creating any university at this time should await their deliberations and possibly an interim report. In the meantime, the Brandon College is being brought into fiscal alignment and a bill will be presented to the Legislature shortly for your consideration concerning the establishment of the governing body. That's about all I can say at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, now this matter is a very important one and I would just like to say a few more words on it. The University of Manitoba apparently has been losing a fair amount of its staff; at least there has been some concern expressed by people as to the loss of staff at the University and what is happening insofar as that institution. I wonder if the Minister could give us any information as to what is happening in that regard, and what is the status of our university in comparison to other universities across Canada. Are the universities in Canada in fact rated? Is there a means of establishing which universities have top rating? Are comparable measurements that can be made? I appreciate very much that the university must be an independent body not dominated from a political standpoint, and yet it is extremely important to the people of Manitoba if we are going to invest, say, large sums in the university, that we have the assurance that the university is in fact providing the very finest in education that is possible, and I believe the people of Manitoba should know how the university in fact rates by comparison to other universities across Canada. Are we keeping up to those others? Are we proceeding along in our developments, and are we particularly keeping our standards up to those of the other provinces and the other universities in Canada?

MR. JOHNSON: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the University of Manitoba as a member of the Canadian Council on Universities enjoys equal status with other universities across the country. I think my honourable friend is aware of the very high regard that the Rockefeller people hold the Manitoba Medical College, and have for years. The School of Architecture and School of Interior Design, for example, is the only one in the west. And I think when you break it down into faculties and examine them there are standards which are certainly comparable anywhere. In fact, I think, as I indicated earlier in the debate, our university people are constantly looking at their standards in relation to other universities across the country, and of course we enjoy a very high standard and at the same time I think the university is showing a very realistic appraisal of itself on a constant basis, and some very top people are in our university.

I can share with the committee that two of the major increases this year are: (a) the student enrollment which is up 29 percent, quite apart from the 600 odd first year teacher trainees on the site this year, and the president considers that in a year or two a very high rate will continue. Secondly, the other big increase here is salary to remain competitive with other universities, especially across western Canada, and this is a real competition to keep top people. I have before me a list which indicates that the scales across Manitoba for professors, associates and assistants is most comparable - almost identical in the three western provinces. This will be the challenge in the province to keep top people on the teaching staff, and at the same time, of course, the university here is looking at the use of television in the classroom. In certain faculties this can be utilized more than others. It's a costly business but I think gives a better usage of senior staff.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister then is quite satisfied that the status of the university is being maintained and our standards are being kept up, and he's satisfied with the progress that's being made. I gather that is his answer. Is there then anything to this matter of the loss of staff which I hear about? I have no precise information. I have the odd name but no . . . information if this is a fact or not. Is it in fact a major practise?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm advised that by keeping with the increases the university will be getting this year, they will be able to retain staff. I think the more highly qualified people are these days, the more mobile they are, and there's a constant competition amongst all the universities across Canada for top people. I would hope that we could hold our own especially with all the other wonderful things that are in Manitoba to attract staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) -- passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have been wanting to ask on the university items a question that I suppose deals with university administration rather than governmental, but what is the arrangement that's made when the government asks one of the professors or doctors at

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... the university to sit on a Royal Commission, or to undertake some assignment as one of the resolutions told us a few days ago one was being asked to do now? They are paid remuneration, an honorarium, and expenses by the government. Does the university give them free time for that kind of work? One of them that I have in mind occupied quite a period of time. Does the government under those circumstances deal directly with the professor or doctor involved, or does it deal with the Senate or with the President, or what arrangements are made? And does this in fact amount to an increase in salary for that year or two of that particular individual who is chosen to sit on a royal commission or advise the government in some other way?

MR. JOHNSON: the honourable member with respect to royal commissions, I know that, for example in obtaining the services of a professor of mathematics to put on a special maths program on TV or to do some work for us, he is reimbursed and suitable time is arranged by the department with the university authorities. In other cases we have felt we should have the view of a professor of a department, or the head. The Dean of that faculty is contacted and asked if this can be done, and remuneration is arranged in the full knowledge of the university.

With respect to royal commissions the honourable gentleman probably knows more about that than I do. I only know that the payment of royal commissioners of course is public knowledge and standard and I am sure before asking a professor to serve any great time on a commission that would take him away from his teaching duties, it would be something that would have to be cleared with the president or the Board of Governors.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister is probably correct in saying that I knew more about this than he did at one time. I knew more about what was done at one time, but I don't know more about what is done now than my honourable friend does, and I may have used the wrong term when I said "royal commission." I guess any commission that's appointed by the government directly is a royal commission, and I was thinking particularly of the Michener Commission where a prominent member of the university staff sat for some length of time and received quite a definite honorarium or expenses or both. Similarly, I know of one who was mentioned in a debate just a few days ago who has now been asked to undertake a particular assignment. Does this amount with salary increase or does it not?

MR. JOHNSON: No, I believe in each case, the ones I know of, the professor concerned has had to make arrangements with the university staff to have substitution and so on, and of course many professors are engaged, as you can see, on the Council of Higher Learning. There's no remuneration there. Again, on the Articulation Committee, the powers now are as the professors give us; during summer months they are paid of course for extra seminars and instructional services, but in all cases I believe they're under the authority of their Dean or head of their department in making sure the student load is carried. And I think of course this use of our university people in community problems brings our people more closely together.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite aware of the fact that there's a major contribution made by members of the staff in the way of voluntary assistance. That's correct, and I agree with the Minister that it is entirely desirable. My questions had to do entirely with the ones who were paid substantial sums of money.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, last night the newspapers reported a study has been made about university governments, and the headline was that unless the students were given a share in university government that there would be -- I believe it went so far as to say, "rebellion". I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the intention of the government is in this regard. A recent issue of the Manitoban - this is the one dated February 23rd - has a letter in it from one of the officials of the university, and the headline that The Manitoban puts on it is "Students are Here to Learn, not Plan University." The study that has been conducted - and I think this is not a Canadian study, it's an overall study of universities - indicates that students should participate in the government of the university. Has the government any plans to change the structure of the Board of Governors? There is at the moment in any case strong controversy going on regarding the election of one of the alumni members. I wonder if the Minister has given this any consideration?

MR. JOHNSON: We're anxiously looking forward to the report of Sir James Duff and I forget the name of the other chap, who are carrying out a study of this matter. Until that time we have - I have no comment at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) -- passed. Resolution 32 --passed. Resolution No. 33 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of Teacher Training. Now that the course is out at the University, I would like to know from the Minister what the intentions are in melding this course in with the whole of the university structure. I would hope that the intention is in fact that as far as possible the courses that would be taken by the students would be in conjunction with the other faculties at the university. In other words, if it is a course that falls under the Department of Arts and Science, that rather than segregating the students off into strictly teacher training, that it would be preferable to have them mix in with the balance of the university and use the general facilities of the university wherever this can be done. I think there would be an advantage in this in having them be really more part of the university and sharing more in the university life as well as the other facilities that exist there, rather than segregating them strictly into a teacher training group. The more that they can participate, I think, in the university proper the more advantage they will get out of it. This makes me wonder too about the specific - which I understand the government will proceed with - that is, of providing fee tuition for those who are attending Teacher College. I think we have to do something to increase the number of teachers, those going to Teacher Training. On the other hand, if we do it strictly for one group, are we not in fact possibly setting up a situation where people will take that course because it happens that the tuition is free, not necessarily because they are mainly interested in being teachers or strictly qualified to be teachers, but because there is a financial incentive to do so. Should we not be looking then at making other arrangements for all the courses rather than for one course alone?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, very quickly, Mr. Chairman, I think the very nature of Education 1A Pedagogy, the idea of moving out to the University was of course to expose the students to the university atmosphere and so on. You have the Faculty of Education right abutting and part of the building where we have the 800 students. It would do well for the members of the House, if any of them wish to go out and see this wonderful facility, to do so. The very nature of the pedagogical course or of the teaching course in 1A, and I think as far as I can understand at the present time, limits them -- they don't go over to different faculties so much now. Of course in Education 1A -- in 1, that's a different matter -- at the graduate level. Of course our whole objective in forming the Teacher Education Committee is to have this Committee design a two-year program which would in effect be one year of professional training, I believe, and one year which would count toward a degree, in which case as you -- I think the pedagogical aspects of education are centred in the education faculty building. That's where the heads of the departments will be and so on. But I would hope that first they will take possibly psychology and other subjects in other faculties, the very thing the honourable member is talking about. I think we'll better achieve that when we get to the two-year program, and our Education Committee are working with the university people as to what is the best method of moving into this two-year program.

We have the responsibility, as my honourable friend knows, of staffing the schools of Manitoba. We have to find lots of good people, and the incentive this year in offering to pay the fees is definitely an incentive to get young people into the teaching profession where we're going to need a great deal of them in the years ahead. We haven't got the same degree of responsibility for staffing Westinghouse, but we do have to staff the schools of Manitoba, and I think this is the reason we have chosen as a recruitment incentive, to be very blunt about it, to get on with the job of finding as many good people as we can to bring into the teaching profession at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is it correct that the new facility, the Teacher Training at the university site has been built without an auditorium and without facilities for physical training, which were at the old Teachers College?

MR. JOHNSON: I think the honourable member knows the facilities, the general facilities of the university were to be used by our students and to teach Education 1A, on that site. The university I think requires more gymnastic space. Three things have happened I think: (1) Phys-Ed went in to a full-time basis; secondly, the tremendous increase in enrollment which wasn't quite expected by them or the University Board of Governors, I understand. The university have this under advisement. There is, I think, a real need for more physical education facilities because of these other matters. If the member has been out recently he'll see the very excellent swimming pool that's just been opened in the past year, but I would say frankly there is need for more gymnasium space for the whole university body.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . Physical Education one of the courses that is given at the Teachers College? Is physical education one of the courses given at the Teachers College which we

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... expect our teachers to be teaching? Should there not then have been physical education facilities at the Teachers College?

MR. JOHNSON: Not necessarily. I think they should be part of the university complex. Let's hope they integrate them out there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) passed; (c) passed; Resolution No. 33 -- passed. Resolution No. 34....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if before going into this we might cease for the time being.

MR. EVANS: 5:30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.