

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

Before we proceed, I wonder if I may take a moment of the House's time and direct your attention to the gallery, particularly my gallery where we have a group of young ladies who will be representing Western Canada during the next six months at Expo '67 in Montreal.

These young ladies represent a total group of sixteen, four from each of the four western provinces, and have been selected to act as hostesses at the Western Canada Pavilion. These young ladies are all bilingual and have been chosen on the basis of their intelligence, general knowledge, poise and personality. I would like to draw to the attention of the Honourable Members the attractive uniforms being worn by these young ladies today. These outfits were designed and contributed by the Manitoba Garment Industry.

I should like to go a step further and name these young ladies and from where they hail. From British Columbia Miss Denise Lagasse of Dawson Creek; Alberta, Miss Dee Comeau of Calgary; Miss Cecil Danais of Calgary; Miss Ilonka Halpern of Edmonton; and from Saskatchewan Miss Bernice Bast of Sedley, Miss Leslie Early of Saskatoon; and Manitoba, Miss Pat Friesen of Westwood, Miss Lorraine Garand of St. Boniface, and Miss Mary Campbell of Stonewall. I am sure the Honourable Members of the Assembly would want me to convey to you their good wishes for every success in your important individual assignments in the interests of the people of Western Canada. It is therefore a pleasure, on behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, to welcome you all here today.

I might take another moment - we have forty students of Grade 11 standing, from the Vincent Massey School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Little and Mr. Boughen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon. We also have 100 students of Grade 9 standing, from St. Joseph's Academy. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Sturk, Miss Gaborieau and Miss Thibeault. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I wonder if the Honourable Member for St. Boniface might not express welcome in their mother tongue on my behalf.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Monsieur le Président, je vous remerci de me donner cette chance de souhaiter la bienvenue en deuxième langue officielle du paye à 100 jeunes filles élèves de l'académie St. Joseph du grade 9 accompagnées de Mademoiselle Gaborieau et Madame Sturk et Madame ... J'espère qu'elles jouiront de leurs après midi. J'aimerais aussi prendre cette occasion pour souhaiter la bienvenue aux jeunes filles comme vous dites bilingue qui représenteront l'ouest du paye pour cette année durant les mois prochains.

TRANSLATION: Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to welcome in the 2nd official language of our country, 100 young ladies, students from the St. Joseph's Academy, grade nine accompanied by Miss Gaborieau, Mrs. Sturk and Mrs. ... I hope they will enjoy their afternoon. I would also like to welcome the young ladies, as you would say, bilingual, who will represent the western part of our country, for this year, during the next months.

MR. SPEAKER: And to those students from Brandon, and as well from St. Boniface, on behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

Orders of the Day.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, QC (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might address a question to the Minister of Education, with whom and with whose Leader I attended the opening of the R. B. Russell Vocational School an hour ago. Will this school be available to students from the school divisions outside of the City of Winnipeg as a matter of right, or will the school divisions be charged the cost by the School Division of Winnipeg?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): The plan is, Mr. Speaker, that the Winnipeg School Division will operate this school of 700 student capacity, with 200

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).... coming from the suburbs as it opens, and the Department is working out the details of how this is going to be shared - that is on operating costs - at the present time.

I might just say while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, that we have also had a meeting with the eleven divisions within the Metro area, with respect to matters of policy with respect to the operation of that school, and my Deputy will be meeting with the superintendents over the next few weeks to work out details. When they are available I could make them known to the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: are there special grants that will be available outside of the usual grants because of the fact that it is a school to service the Metropolitan area?

MR. JOHNSON: Well these are matters we're working on at the present time, but they'll get the usual grants towards the operation of this school. I think the Honourable Member is mentioning any special grants in case their operating costs are over and above the normal pattern. This is something we are going to have to examine as we go along. It's a new program.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to that: Is this the policy or the practice that will be followed in rural divisions too, where technical vocational schools will be constructed and one division will be in charge of the administration and the others will just send their children to that school?

MR. JOHNSON: It may well be that as we -- these group divisions, we'll have to group divisions into regions for the purposes of vocational and other special educational needs, and the idea was - and this is again something we're exploring with the Metro boards and could well apply on regions in the rural areas in the future, namely that of having a cooperative arrangement between the divisions within a region to run it over the whole area. We may possibly need some amendments to the statute in the future as we work out details, but at the moment with this school in Winnipeg it will be run in a cooperative way until we do work out a positive plan. In the rural areas, of course, the idea would be that each division would have representation on the regional vocational school board, and they would run it over the entire region.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and in the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Health, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. In view of the statement made by the Provincial Treasurer yesterday that hospitals will be paying the sales tax, is it the intention of the government to give the hospitals a chance to re-submit their budgets, this time taking into consideration the sales tax?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, there already exists a full machinery for the hospitals to use in any instance where their costs exceed their estimates.

MR. DESJARDINS: A subsequent question then. Will this be treated as a deficit then?

MR. ROBLIN: I can add nothing to my previous statement.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Has the Minister been able to arrive at any changes in the regulations pertaining to the Legislative complex, and in particular to the curfew that has been adopted by Regulation 21/67?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, QC (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, there is no curfew. The regulations are under consideration.

MR. PAULLEY: ... supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can my honourable friend indicate whether or not there may be changes in the regulations and curfew before the tourist season starts?

MR. McLEAN: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I'm unable to anticipate what may be decided with respect to changes in the regulations.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. There has been some talk lately in the City of Winnipeg, and some action taken in regard to establishing a Montessori Method school. I would like to know whether there is any official or declared interest on the part of the Department in establishing a Montessori school in the province?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. DOERN: May I ask a supplementary question? Have you conducted any research on this type of operation or on the feasibility of establishing one?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe there is research going back to the Egyptians. I'll look it up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Could we have a full report?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity again this year, on behalf of the Winter Fair Board, to invite the members to Brandon. As all members know, there was some doubt as to whether we were going but I think we must thank the Member for Virden for the extra pressure he put upon us the other day that we attend. I believe the Honourable Attorney-General will announce to the House following my invitation the arrangements that will be made. I think it will be -- even those who drive up in their own cars, who live in that end of the province, will be able to arrive there in time for the 5:00 o'clock dinner for the exhibitors of the First All-Canada Centennial Steer Show reception, which will be held in the Armouries which is immediately west of the arena in which the Winter Fair is held. I would like also to extend a personal invitation to members, if they find time a little heavy on their hands and no place to wash up, to make my house available to them and they'd be very welcome and time during the day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has a reply to the question I put to him yesterday. I put a question to him yesterday which he said he would take as notice, with respect to the advertisement calling for applicants for supervisors of cooperatives.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I have forwarded that request to my department for further information on it. I'll pass it on to the Member either privately or in the House.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question - I presume it should go to the Minister of Education, although I'm not sure. Those people who are on pre-vocational re-training courses get their cheques from which department?

MR. JOHNSON: After April 1st from Federal Manpower.

MR. MOLGAT: So far, then, who has been responsible?

MR. JOHNSON: We have been responsible for issuing the cheques up until the change-over, until they assumed this responsibility directly.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving complaints that the cheques do not come out regularly, that in a number of cases cheques were to be handed out by the teachers in the classrooms every second Friday and that in a number of cases this has not been happening. I am told that as of last Friday, for example, some forces at HMCS Chippawa did not receive their cheques and in spite of many phone calls are unable to get any answer from any department advising them when they will get them. Has the Minister received any such complaints and to whom are such complaints to go?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, We have dealt with this at least two or three times during the session. I made a full statement on it earlier. In brief, the cheques are issued by our department through the Accountant. Mr. Mitchell at MIT, I believe, is in charge of it. We have to make out the cheques when the student comes into the course. If there's absenteeism for other than illness, we are not able to give the cheque out when pay day comes because there have been missed days, and we tried to work an arrangement with the Comptroller to overcome this by giving the cheque and claiming reimbursement. It was impossible under our agreement and the way we were operating the Comptroller wouldn't accept it, so there are those who come to pay day who have been absent three or four days and have not notified the department that they've been away sick, and when they're absent like this we simply can't issue the cheque; it has to go back in and be re-issued and this does cause some delays. Any specific cases like this, they can contact Mr. Dalton in my office or Mr. Mitchell at the MIT, and in every case that I've looked it up it has been due to a failure of the trainee, if he was sick, to notify us or there had been absenteeism for which there was no explanation and which made it impossible to pay the person for non-attendance.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his reply. The complaint I have had is not from someone who is absent. He assured me that he had been present at all times but that he did not get the cheque. So Mr. Dalton is the man to contact, is that correct?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, QC (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, following upon the kind invitation of the Honourable Member for Brandon, I understand that arrangements have been agreed upon by members of the various Parties in the House whereby, by leave, on Friday we would sit at 9:30 in the morning to discuss, first of all, Private Members' business for the first hour and a half, and then at 11 o'clock we would move into government business from 11:00 until 12:30, and if that arrangement has support on all sides of the House

(MR. LYON cont'd). . . . and we could have that indication now, then we could adopt that procedure for Friday's sitting, adjourning at 12:30 to leave for Brandon.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, this meets with our approval.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): . . . with us, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: . . . in agreement with it, thanks.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this item appears Committee of the Whole House on the Order Paper, but with the permission of the honourable members opposite I would ask that it not be called at this time because this is Private Members Day and because this matter, the location of this item on the Order Paper, is going to come under discussion, at the Rules Committee which will be meeting before too long, and if we have their concurrence we would prefer not to call it right now and call it this evening.

MR. MOLGAT: I understand you're . . . to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, but in the circumstances we will be prepared to accept this pressing, urgent request.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable Attorney-General's tears have moved me to agree with him.

MR. FROESE: Yes, I'm quite in agreement.

MR. LYON: I'm serious in saying, of course, Mr. Speaker, that we do have to have leave because the rules provide for the order to be as it is. The next item that I would bring to the attention of the House with respect to Private Members' resolutions is that there apparently has been discussion among the Whips concerning a resolution sponsored by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews which is found on Page 16 of the Order Paper, relative to the Centennial celebration taking place in Nebraska, and I understand there has been some agreement whereby this resolution might be brought forward to be discussed before a certain representative from Nebraska comes to Manitoba. This is what my information is. If the House is agreeable we could ask Mr. Speaker to do that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this matter was still under discussion for something about ten days or two weeks hence. Is that not correct?

MR. LYON: That's fine. If it's not resolved then we would ask Mr. Speaker just to call the resolutions in their regular order.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday, when I was speaking to this amendment I said that the amendment was misrepresenting the resolution and that it was actually, and I used the words "chopping it up, butchering it" - and I still am of that opinion. I'll just recap briefly then go on with what I was discussing last week.

First of all, I had given some definition of automation; I had discussed some myths in respect to automation; and all of these intimated that there was more than just technological change involved in respect to automation. Let me give you a few examples of automation and whether these are just technological. First of all, I have one here. It used to take the Ford Motor Company 24 hours to produce an engine block from rough casting; with automation it takes 14 1/2 minutes. In 1908 it took a skilled sheet metal man eight hours to form the upper half of a fuel tank; with automatic stamping machine it now takes 20 seconds. North American Aviation Company has a mill which automatically carves a one-piece wing for an F11 Super-Saver out of solid metal in 3 1/2 hours, an operation that formerly took 60 hours. In a Chicago radio plant 1,000 radios a day are now assembled by two men, where 200 men had been required before automation. The Dupont Company, using a computer at MIT, solved in 13 hours a chemical problem that would have required one man working 40 hours a week for 20 years to do the arithmetic alone. At Princeton University an electronic computer works out weather prediction in three hours that would take one man with an adding machine 300 years. And there are many more of these. In fact, even in Winnipeg we have an experiment that was in Saturday's paper, and this is in respect to the Post Office where they are using different kinds of inks which will be recognized by a computer so that mail can be sorted automatically - no more people involved in sorting mail.

Now these are just a few of the experiments, a few of the automation examples that I wanted to give you, and I would imagine there are very very many more that we could think of

(MR. FOX cont'd)... in the communications fields, what we are doing in regard to Telex and in reproducing papers of one kind or another, instantaneously almost. These are just a few that I can think of offhand. There are many other areas. In my own industry at one time they used to say that you could never replace a man and a knife. Today I know that this is being done. You take two electronic probes, you put them on each end of the carcass, and the machine automatically carves it up into the various sections, the loin, the ham, the shoulder, the belly, and everything is just cut and it goes off down the processing line into its various areas.

And this is happening not only in industry, this is happening in banking institutions; this is happening in every field that we can think of; and this may be technological to some extent but I think it also has social implications as well. It means that people's lives, their way of living, is affected tremendously, not just that it may be better but it also may be worse. This is the reason why the resolution says we have to look at this. We just can't casually accept that it's been a technological change and that we have to live with it. I think if we are in this Legislature to do work for Manitobans then we must look at these areas and see what we can do.

Now what would this Automation Committee look at? For instance, it would look at how it would affect industry ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would remind the honourable gentlemen that the Honourable Member for Kildonan has the floor and there's far too much discussion going on.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How would it affect industry? Well, first of all, you would have to have a look at whether the competition process would be affected by automation, whether centralization of industry would take place. Decentralization may be a better answer; we don't know. At first when computers were produced they were strictly the real large ones which could only handle things on a large basis and consequently they were too expensive, but today there are computers that can be rented, there are smaller computers which can be used in a smaller area, and the work that they can do if they are programmed properly is tremendous. So, therefore, we can decentralize as well.

Another area that has to be checked in respect to industry is: how does this affect management? Does computerization of industry affect middle management, top management? How will they make decisions? I have read an article where they have called this "business of regression analysis" and in this article it states that middle management will just be done away with; it's not necessary. The various factors are put in at the small local concern and it goes by electronic computer to the headquarters and there it's disseminated through a larger computer, decisions are handed right down, and no-one has to worry about in-between. There is just no need for middle management.

The same thing applies to banking. A tremendous amount of our banking system today has gone into computerization. No more are there as many clerks as we used to have. Certainly we still have the tellers but even those may disappear at a later date. We are into the system of credit cards today and it's been mooted in some articles already that there may come a day when we may never see a dollar any more; we will work everything on a credit card system. You will have automatic banking through a computerized system which involves all the supermarkets, involves your bank, involves your place of work, the government where you have to pay your income tax - everything will be computerized and all you do is stick your card in wherever you go and it tells you whether you have anything left or not.

Now this is possibly going a long way into the future but we may have to look at this, and I think the time to do it is now, not when it's here already when it may be too late to change the forces that have been put into production.

There will also be study for this committee as to how it will affect labour. What will happen to the labour as we see it today, the organizations at present? Will they still be present 20 years from now, ten years from now or 50 years from now? This is a countervailing force that has given us a balance in respect to industrial relations. If we eliminate this, how will it affect our society?

Computerization, automation of industry may very well do this. If we have the work force shifted out of an area where they are organized and the new areas don't lend themselves to organized labour, what will happen if we do not have this countervailing force? These are some of the implications. How will collective bargaining take place when you do not have organized labour? What will we do with our labour? How will we get the feeling of what these people require in respect to their income? How do we adjudicate what is fair, what isn't fair, when there are no more labour organizations? How do we retrain people of the labour force?

(MR FOX cont'd)... These are some of the areas that we have to discuss. Mobility of the labour force has to be envisaged, and of course during this transition period, if it is to take place, how do we take care of our labour force?

In respect of the social sciences that this committee could look at, Mr. Speaker. There are very many areas that the computer affects us. We can simulate processes of our society but if they are not properly programmed then we will not get the proper answers out of them. It is true that possibly at the present time we do not know how to program these computers properly. To what degree do you say that small marginal area is relative to another area, and if you do not give it its proper factor will it over-emphasize this in the computer process as it goes along? This is one area that we have to look into.

I mentioned last Friday that doctors' diagnostic services are being used in respect of computers already, also that law is being done the same way - sort of an automatic law clerk. You put in all the decisions that have been taken in respect to various cases and if you come up to a similar case well then you put the various propositions into the program and the computer goes through its memory banks and comes up with a solution. Now is this a good way of looking at our legal system? Should we have it at all? It's being done now. This is another area that we have to consider.

We have to consider the concepts in respect to work and leisure in our social sciences. Are we of necessity always going to have to work to earn a living, or if we have a completely automated age will there only be some that will be doing what we call useful work today? Will our puritanical concepts go on into automation or do we have to have another look at our values in respect to automation. The values that we had a hundred years ago, today are slowly disappearing. Some of them are still with us but will they be valid fifty or a hundred years from now or even ten years from now? These are some of the things that automation may bring upon us.

Let's consider education. In the automated age how do we look at education? Will the kind of education that we have today be sufficient? Will we have different methodology? Will we have different techniques? Will we be doing it with individuals or shall we be doing it through TV and through other processes? Will the education that we do today - the system that we have today - will it provide the necessary training for our people for a lifetime? I understand that an engineer that gets his training today, after about five years he has to have a refresher because his skills have become obsolescent. We may have to have a different concept of education. We may have to have a continuous concept of learning. We may have to decide that people will have to periodically, every ten years or so, go back to school. We'll have to figure out ways and means of supporting them if they have to do this in order to earn a livelihood. All these are just a few of the things that I envisage that automation can bring upon us.

There is also the business of where does government fit into this business of automation. It, in my estimation, will have to provide leadership; it will have to be the cohesive force which will set up, and this is one reason why this resolution was brought on the floor of this Assembly, that we have a means of doing and looking at this thing and providing the leadership that is necessary. We just can't let things happen of their own accord and hope for the best. I think if we are a civilized society we must plan some of the things that are coming. We must try to avoid problems, try to ameliorate distress, and try to get the best out of our society, and therefore we must look at what is coming in the future.

In respect to automation I mentioned the fact that possibly we may get into the age of where we will be doing things by credit card completely. There is also the business of getting our information services computerized. Now here we enter another area of danger. I think we may possibly have to look to see if there isn't some invasion of personal privacy when you have everything on computer. In fact, I would just like to bring in a bit that I read in respect to automation and personal privacy and freedom. "One of the social implications of automation in the form of computers is in the area of personal privacy and freedom. Computers in unscrupulous hands have a tremendous potential as privacy invaders with malicious intent. Individuals will find it increasingly difficult to restrict access to or to protect information about themselves and their activities and records. Government legislation is already overdue on the kinds of personal data which should not be programmed into any computer's memory, on the kinds of collaboration between computers and those who control them which would not be allowed under restrictions needed, on the dissemination of legally stored information and on the penalties for breaking such laws."

(MR. FOX cont'd).....

Now when you have a person's complete history - and as I mentioned there was law, there was medical services, there's his income tax registration. There is also -- at birth he is now, I believe, put on a punch tape, and as you progress through life all these things are eventually, through one way or another, when you get into buying things you get put on credit tapes and so on. All these things are very personal and if the computers and the wisdom of those who are operating them collaborate, then there may be an invasion of privacy, that a person's private life may not be private any more because everyone has access to this at this stage. So these are just a few of the areas where government can get in, Mr. Speaker, and it also must at the same time plan for progress and if there's to be a transition period it must try to ameliorate this distress, if there's going to be any, to get the most, the best out of the essence of automation. As I said, it must provide the leadership in this area.

There's one other aspect about automation which government must look at, and that is, if we are going to become a very progressive society and it's going to increase our standard of living tremendously - and I hope it does and I'm sure that it can - then we must also have another look at ourselves and our position in the world in respect to other countries. Where do we stand with all this extra wealth that we can possibly create? How do we go about aiding other people, or don't we? On what basis? And this opens up another tremendous area of debate. So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members, that this is a tremendous area, this business of automation. It's not just a technological change or something that can be handled in a one-day conference.

Now I would just like to refer to Doctor Porter who is a person that is quite knowledgeable in this area and what he has to say in respect to automation. He says, "I believe top management through lack of knowledge is far more scared of automation and its impact on management process than the labour unions are. The manager who has little knowledge of his tools, for example electronic computers, and how they should be used, is doomed to failure sooner or later. 2. Probably fewer than 300 people in Canada today understand in depth the scientific principles of automation and how it is likely to evolve in the future, and perhaps an equal number are studying in depth the economic and sociological implications of technological change. Of these 600 or so scientists, engineers and social scientists, I venture to estimate that perhaps 400 are in the universities, 150 are in government service, and the remaining 50 are in industry. Large sectors of the Canadian industry have failed to recognize the importance of having scientific and engineering research and development facilities on Canadian soil. The lack of research facilities and the associated encouragement of young scientists will have an increasing deleterious influence on our productive capacity and on our ability to maintain adequate levels of employment. The problem is aggravated by large foreign-owned organizations who carry out their entire research programs abroad, and who attract some of the highest qualified Canadian university graduates to their laboratories on foreign soil. The year of scientific management has dawned, and most important, computers will be increasingly involved in the decision-making process." And this is just one further reason why we should look at this question in depth.

I would just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by quoting a poem by Edna St. Vincent Millay, which has a direct relevance to this question that I've been discussing up until now, and which the amendment tries to maim by deleting most of the context of the resolution. But before I read it let me say that I believe when you consider that first machines replaced muscles, then later displaced minds, and now in turn are displacing other machines, one is a trifle staggered at the complexity of the problem and that it cannot be adequately covered in a one-day conference.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the honourable gentleman to tell him he has still four minutes.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I shall be finished by then. Now this poem, and I think it is well worth listening to - it's very short but it does put it into context:

"Upon this gifted age in its dark hour, falls from the sky a meteoric shower of facts. They lie unquestioned, uncombined. Wisdom enough to teach us of our ills is daily spun, but there exists no loom to weave it into fabric," and I think this is what we do when we try to bring in an amendment like this. We try to create no loom to weave the fabric of facts that may be available to us.

Let me end with a statement by an eminent Professor of Economics, Director of Industrial Relations at Queen's University. He's been associated in industrial relations work for a

(MR. FOX cont'd).... long time. He is assisting the Federal Government - he's just been retained by them. He's also retained by our own Provincial Government in industrial relations work, Doctor Woods. And this is what he has to say. Doctor Woods says: "There is probably no contemporary subject about which there is such a great deal of confusion and so many differences of opinion as automation. In large part these differences stem from two main causes. First, the fact that very little is known about it or about its various impacts. We still have no good quantitative measures of the extent and significance of automation; example: its effect upon employment, unemployment, upon output, prices and wages, etc. Secondly, the fact that it has generally had different effects on different groups and areas in our society. While we may know little about the specifics of automation there is a growing consensus that this is a most significant development in terms of its economic and social implications. Its application has been extended widely and rapidly in recent years. Its potentials for the future are enormous. Its impact runs broad and deep. It has implications for every segment of society."

And I think on that note, Mr. Chairman, I must say for that reason I cannot support this amendment. Thank you.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

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

NAYS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 30; Nays 25.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate standing in my name. On Tuesday, the 28th of March, the amendment of the First Minister to the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface as amended, was dealt with and carried. This is recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of that day. When the question was put to adopt the main motion as amended the Honourable Member for St. Boniface closed the debate. At its conclusion the Chair again put the question. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party requested the Speaker to read the main motion as amended. This was done. Points of order were raised by several members as to whether the operative part of the main motion should be incorporated in the motion that I had already read. At this point I informed the House that I would take the matter under consideration and report.

I believe the amendment as such was acceptable by the House, by the fact of the continuing debate. I further suggest that the amendment did not contemplate a combination of the operative part of the main motion and that of the amendment. In my opinion, the motion as amended, as I read it on Tuesday the 28th day of March, is the question before the House.

In order that there will be no mistake I will read that question again: WHEREAS the status of youth in modern society is a matter of concern to this House; and

WHEREAS the legal voting age at the federal, provincial and local levels should be reviewed before the next provincial election; and

WHEREAS a common electoral franchise is desirable; and

WHEREAS an improvement in education for democracy should be sought;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking the agreement of the Government of Canada to reduce the legal voting age to 18 years, or such other age under 21 as may be deemed appropriate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking such improvements in education for democracy through the public school system as will better prepare youth for the franchise; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the Status of Youth in Manitoba, with particular reference to the legal responsibilities and rights.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to you and I thank you for the consideration that you have given to the points raised by myself and other members in the House, I regretfully have to challenge your ruling on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: The question is now: Shall the Speaker's ruling be sustained?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Shall the Chair be sustained?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Order please.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

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

NAYS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 30; Nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt at this time just that the record may be straight, I believe you said that you declared the motion lost. I believe you were sustained in your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Leader of the New Democratic Party for his kindness toward the Chair. So I must correct that by saying that I declare the Chair sustained.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I think that's a good idea, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Froese, Green, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mesdame Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak, and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 42; Nays, 14.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the reason that I decided to participate in this debate is because I have been for some years paying rather close attention to the reports of the Auditor-General of Canada. I must confess that during the years that I was burdened with the responsibility of office, I just didn't find or take the time to study those reports in the way that I have done more recently, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that these reports should really be not only recommended but compulsory reading for members of the Legislative Assembly and particularly for members of the government of the day, because I think they perform a most important service. And because I have been reading these reports assiduously for the last few years, I have been struck by the quantity of advice, points of advice and criticism, that the Auditor-General points out mainly to the government at Ottawa. It's true that some of them impinge upon the Civil Service directly and some of them upon various boards and commissions, but mainly to the government of the day because it's their

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... responsibility to guard against these errors and omissions or to correct them when they have been found, and I have found that regardless of which party has been in office in Ottawa, that the Auditor-General continues to point out these various sins of omission and commission, and unfortunately to get less action upon his report than I would think to be deserved. This always interests me - and I don't think there's any great distinction to be drawn between the governments of the two different parties in this regard - this interests me because it is true that governments will make mistakes; civil servants will make mistakes; boards and commissions will make mistakes. It's human, I suppose, to make some mistakes but it is hard to understand that after those mistakes have been drawn rather forcibly to the attention of the government, board, commission, etc., that they will not only fail to remedy them but in many cases apparently completely ignore them and in some cases at least go on making the same mistake.

Now it is because, as I understand it, because of the fact that this group feels that it would be to the advantage of the Province of Manitoba to have an officer - and I will call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the wording of the resolution which makes it plain that this is an officer - an officer - singular - known as the Auditor-General of Manitoba, that it would be to the advantage of the province to have such an officer to do the type of thing, the one type of thing that the Auditor-General does in the federal sphere that the Comptroller-General does not do here. Now I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I completely agree with what the Leader of our Party and the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre have said with regard to the good job that the Comptroller-General does. I have nothing but agreement with that part of the remarks. But when the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre goes on to suggest that we are proposing a duplication by suggesting that an officer be appointed as Auditor-General, that we're proposing a duplication, my understanding is that what we are proposing is an officer - and I admit that he will have to have some staff - but he will not have to and there is no intention whatever that he should or would duplicate the work that the Comptroller-General does, but that he would carry on and do the things that the Auditor-General does in the federal sphere which the Comptroller-General does not do here. And I pay tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the thoughtful speech that my honourable friend the Member for Winnipeg Centre delivered, because he had evidently done some research and some work on it and I want to quote from it. It begins on page 2027 of the Hansard of March 28th, and my honourable friend the Member for Winnipeg Centre quotes a portion of the resolution and says:

"The resolution before us proposes the appointment of an Auditor-General for, among other reasons, that at the federal level," and here he quotes, and I quote, "it has proved of great benefit in controlling waste in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer." That's the end of the quote, and then my honourable friend the Member for Winnipeg Centre said, "This is not true, Mr. Speaker." This is not true, Mr. Speaker. Continuing to quote from him, "It has not been substantiated. The federal Auditor-General has not been of great benefit in controlling waste in government, nor has he provided savings to the taxpayer."

Mr. Speaker, with all respect I say to my honourable friend in just as positive language as he used in saying this is not true, I say to my honourable friend he does not know that this is not true. He is correct, quite correct in saying that it has not been substantiated that the Auditor-General has been of great benefit in controlling waste in government nor has he provided savings to the taxpayer, and my honourable friend quite properly goes on after that to say that year after year in his report he continues to make numerous suggestions about improvements and he continues to point out many cases where extravagance or waste or even worse has occurred but, Mr. Speaker, this does not prove that the Auditor-General's work has not saved some money. Is it not at least reasonable to assume, Mr. Speaker, even though we must acknowledge the fact that the governments, both Liberal and Conservative, who have been in office in Ottawa have been very, very slow to implement the suggestions that have been made, even though we emphasize the fact that year after year there are many, many errors pointed out to them, but isn't it still true that likely in implementing some of the changes that they made - and both governments have implemented some of them - that implementing some of those changes, that they have saved some money? I'm prepared to admit that I can't prove it but I think it's a logical assumption. Isn't it reasonable to believe that by the very fact that these practices have been exposed that there's been at least a tendency on the part of the government that seems to be so backward about doing as much as the honourable member, and I would think should be done about them, that even so, that they have likely done something. And so my submission would be that when my honourable friend says of my Leader, "This is

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).... not true, " that he is much more wrong in saying that it is not true because he can't prove that either. I would think that the likelihood is that it has made administration considerably better in Ottawa just because of these many errors and omissions and malpractices having been exposed - and they are exposed.

And then my honourable friend, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, says on the next page, and here I'm reading from his speech, Mr. Speaker, Page 2028: "I do not feel that it would be in the best interests of Manitoba to have a report similar to the report of the Auditor-General at Ottawa issued here, as it would tend to downgrade' in the eyes of the public the Civil Service of this province of whom we are all justifiably proud." Well now, Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend really saying by that statement that if an Auditor-General or any other officer found some of these malpractices, or where the legislative authority had been exceeded, or any of these other hundred and one cases that the Auditor-General at Ottawa points out, had occurred in Manitoba that it would not be in the public interest to expose them? I say it would, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact, this is one of the compelling reasons, I think, that we should have this area of responsibility covered in this province. This is no criticism of the work that the Comptroller-General and his staff are doing. They have a job to do but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that their job is completed by the pre-audit that my honourable friend rightly speaks of, by this pre-audit and making sure that the expenditure that is proposed by the government of the day is covered by legislative authority for spending that money, and if that requirement is met then the Comptroller-General has nothing to do with the waste or extravagance, and Mr. Chairman, I am sure that waste, extravagance, inefficiency do exist at times with this government as well as the one at Ottawa.

In spite of the fact that I am so interested in the Auditor-General's reports, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time to read from them at length. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has said very properly that a large number of errors and omissions are listed here year after year, a large number of criticisms are made, a large number of cases are pointed out where ministers, civil servants, boards, commissions, military authorities, and practically the whole gamut of the public service have in one way or another exceeded their authority, or duplicated one another's work, or wasted money, and the number of them is simply legion.

I hold in my hand what I believe is the second last annual report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965. I made a rough, not an actual account of the listing here. They're headed: "Comments on expenditure and revenue transactions", and they are all, to one degree or another, a criticism of either the practice or the policy. And in this one -- there are roughly one hundred in number, some of them for minor amounts, some of them not particularly dealing with waste and extravagance of money but just the exceeding of authority in some various ways. And this is, I think, one of the main points at issue here, that no matter how good - and the setup is good in Manitoba for what it is doing - but no matter how perfectly their conditions are met by the Comptroller-General's Branch they still do not have the authority or the responsibility to do this job that the Auditor-General does here, and far from agreeing with my honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre that this is not in the public interest, I think this is the one way, the main way to correct inefficiency and extravagances and mistakes both by the government and by the Civil Service; and the Civil Service, regardless of the high regard in which they are properly held, when they make mistakes they should be exposed, Mr. Speaker. They certainly should. And far from downgrading - these are the government itself or the Civil Service in the eyes of the public - this would be the best thing for the Civil Service itself to have those who do not maintain their high standard exposed to the public.

I am reading on Page 209 of this second last report, the 1965 year, from the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, because the Auditor-General's report is referred to the Public Accounts Committee, and this is a portion of their report which is carried on Page 209. And here is what the Public Accounts Committee says. I don't want to take it out of context, so I'll have to go right back to the beginning of the paragraph. This goes back to Page 208: "Findings of the Royal Commission on Government Organization." Now my honourable friend, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, referred to the fact, he referred to it as though it were a weakness of the Auditor-General that so many of these deficiencies had been found by the Royal Commission on Government Organizations, and that so few of them had been corrected, but I suggest to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility is the government's. It's the government that made the mistake, or the civil servants or the board or commission,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).... that made the mistake and it's because they have not acted along the lines suggested by the Auditor-General that has continued them.

So here's what they say in this report: "The Auditor-General referred to the numerous and widespread findings made public in 1962 and 1963 by this Royal Commission as a result of its examination into the organization and methods of operation of departments and agencies of the government. He reminded the Commons that where administrative action has caused or contributed to waste the public money it is his duty to report such cases as he considers should be brought to the notice of the House. This is what we should have. He pointed out that while some instances came to his attention directly during the course of his audit work, others are indirectly brought to light by action on the part of the administration itself in the course of examining its own operations, as for example through the medium of internal auditing. By the same token, he considers it to be his duty to study reports by or for the management of departments and agencies as are by law available to him, directed toward the saving of public money, by the elimination of wasteful practices and unnecessary or uneconomical operations. To the extent that such reports correctly indicate where and how savings could be made, the Auditor-General considers he has a responsibility to Parliament to follow through all such cases and ascertain what action has been or will be taken toward achieving such savings." I interpolate, Mr. Speaker. This is his job.

And continuing: - "Or if no action is to be taken, to inquire why on the other hand he does not conceive it to be his responsibility to assess the practicability of any specific recommendations made because in his view the decision with respect to the extent of which or the way in which such recommendations can and will be implemented, must always be the sole responsibility of management."

Now there's much more that I recommend to the members of the House in regard to this report, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is the kind of thing that is needed in this province. This is the difference between the Auditor-General's responsibility and authority and that of the Comptroller-General. This is an area that is not assigned to our Comptroller-General. It's true he has the pre-audit system and it's excellent, but so long as the money has been provided by this House, and so long as the expenditure, no matter how inefficient or how wasteful it may be, is available within the terms of the resolution passed by this House, the Comptroller-General can't say the government nay.

My honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre says quite properly, quite properly, that there's a responsibility of management here, and so there is, of course, but management is not too proud, whether it be our government or anybody else, of pointing out its own mistakes or omissions, and we need somebody; we need a watchdog; and that's the function that's needed here.

Now when my honourable friend speaks of duplication there would be no sense, none whatever and it's not suggested in this resolution, that this officer to be appointed would even attempt to duplicate the work of the Comptroller-General. He would have a different function altogether but he would have the function that is outlined here to check up on the efficiency with which the government is operated, and the boards and commissions as well.

I must mention just a few, and here I'm taking the later report, the one that I believe is current now for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1966, and again, I haven't counted them, Mr. Speaker, but I would judge that there are perhaps a hundred or maybe more of suggestions here, practically all critical, and again I say to the honourable members of the House, if they can find time it certainly is a rewarding experience to leaf through this report. Let me list just a few of them, Mr. Speaker. They're contained in the very opening of this report:

"The Prairie Farm Emergency Fund." He finds discrepancies there, and as you know there was a Royal Commission inquired into the Prairie Farm Assistance Plan some time ago, and certainly some, if not improprieties at least some very doubtful practices were uncovered by that Royal Commission.

"Improper Charge to 1965-66 Appropriations. Cost of unused plans for grain elevator extension at Prince Rupert, B.C." - and I think it's most helpful, Mr. Speaker, I think it's most helpful when the Auditor-General puts his finger on a case like this and points out where some plans that never even were used cost the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba a good many thousands of dollars. Maybe it isn't very much, Mr. Speaker, in the billions of dollars that the Government of Canada spends now, but the principle is just the same whether it be a lot or a little.

And here's one that should interest a lot of us: "Salaries and wages paid for work not

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).... performed," and that is given on Page No. 25, and I think I should -- starting at Item No. 55, "Salaries and wages paid for work not performed," and he mentions, Mr. Speaker, that in his 1965 report reference was made to a special study of the payrolls of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which indicated that payments amounting to approximately \$450,000 had been made to employees for scheduled hours during daily or weekly tours of duty which were in excess of the actual hours of attendance, and there's quite a full discussion.

Here's what I might refer to as a pregnant sentence which occurs frequently through the report: "There has been no change in the situation during the past year," and Mr. Speaker, this is not the Auditor-General's fault that there's been no change; it's the government's fault, no matter what government is in office. It's the government's fault if there's been no change, and that's what this report says.

And so, all along the line you can pick them out by the dozen here if you want to and I'm not going to call attention to many of them. "Errors in public service superannuation account pension and contribution calculation." Errors in calculation. A tremendous fund. "Department of External Affairs missions abroad." He comments on the junkets that some civil servants have provided themselves with - and it's time somebody did, Mr. Speaker. "Payments of additional remuneration to employees." This is in addition to the other one that I read about the CBC.

And this one: "Living allowances to federally-appointed judges." Now this has been before him in both of these volumes and I don't know how many preceding these - certainly one - where the Auditor-General has found it necessary to point out to the government of the day that they are actually violating their own statute, Mr. Speaker, when they provide federally-appointed judges with living allowances which are so high as to, in his opinion, constitute remuneration, and as I understand it the Judges Act says that they are not to receive extra remuneration. Well, when they appoint judges they get around that by providing them with very handsome living allowances, and the Comptroller-General, for at least these two, in these two reports, has been commenting on the fact that this has been taken advantage of by some of the judges, and he quite properly, in my opinion, points out that the Federal Government itself should not connive with the judges in evading the terms of their own Act, and goodness knows it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the judges get enough of a salary now - and they tell me it's going to be increased again - that they could live within the terms of the Act. And I'm not going to weary the House with many more quotations from this report. Many, many more could be given and to me they are very pertinent, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that similar conditions of inefficiency, waste and extravagance - not all of them intentional although some of these that are pointed out are undoubtedly intentional - but that similar instances exist with this government. No question at all. And the resolution mentions the fact that government having grown so much larger here in this province - and it certainly has grown a great deal larger, the expenditures are so much greater in the more recent years - that there is more need than ever before for an officer of this kind, and when my honourable friend from Winnipeg Center tries to urge that this would be duplication, let me remind him once again that the operative part of this resolution calls for the House to continue to press for the establishment of an officer, not a department, known as the Auditor-General, and it gives the type of things that he would have the authority to do.

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor-General in Canada has the authority that is contained in the Act, Financial Responsibility Act or some such name as that, that gives him the authority that notwithstanding any other Act - they made that all-inclusive - notwithstanding any other Act, that the Auditor-General has the complete authority to investigate all departments, all boards, all commissions, everybody; and if my honourable friend who wants to be political about a matter of this kind wants to say to me, yes and he once uncovered during the time of the Liberal administration some horses on the military payroll, I would be constrained to reply that yes, this is true, and he also uncovered during the time of the Conservative administration the case of where the Minister, in clear defiance of the Act itself, had prevented the Auditor-General from getting the files from the Income Tax Department because, it was suggested at least, that some Members of the House of Commons were named therein as being delinquent in their tax returns. So I'm not trying to make any comparison between the virtues or sins of the respective governments. Government is so big in Canada now and it's so big in Manitoba now that it needs a watch dog and we need one here, and I suggest that we would be well advised to consider the passing of this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. We are waiting for some more information before we carry on. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to have leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Logan, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think the House would like to ask my indulgence to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to give quite a lengthy speech here but I am going to make it as short as possible because time is flying and we have got other matters to consider just as well, although this is a very important subject that we are presently discussing.

The idea of community colleges is not a new one. Many people have been discussing it for many years and many groups have been discussing this, and I would say right at the beginning that the idea is not only a good one but is also a very important one, and it would be just as important in my estimation as any of those others in the educational field, such as day nurseries that have been brought up in here, kindergartens, unitary school districts that have been discussed fully, secondary school divisions and vocational schools.

We in Manitoba have initiated all these projects, all these good projects I would say, but I am sorry to say that most of these projects, if not all, are still on the ground floor level. By that I mean that these projects are at present not working properly or not working as well as we in this House would like to see them work. Nothing really has been finalized to the extent that we can say we have something really worthwhile now. There is a lot of study on all these different projects to be made yet. Take for instance the day nurseries. This is still in its - what shall we say - cocoon stage. We have been discussing it here but it has been shelved for the time being by the government amendment, so that hasn't been fully discussed or realized or implemented. Take the kindergarten training. We know it's worthwhile, it's desirable, but outside the larger centres like the City of Winnipeg and probably a few other centres, the kindergarten idea or the principle of that has not even taken on in most of the rural areas. Maybe after these unitary school divisions are organized properly we probably will have kindergarten classes in the rural areas as well.

What about the unitary school divisions in Manitoba? These, unfortunately, received a serious setback on March 10th and I would say that it's in a state of chaos at the present time and it will be very difficult to resolve what should be done at the present time. We have several school districts who chose to stay as they were and it poses quite a problem, not only for those people who refused or who elected to stay out, but also for the rest of the Province of Manitoba, for the people, for the children, for the Department of Education, and I would say the Legislators here in the House; so it's far from being satisfactory at the present time.

Now, the secondary school divisions; a lot has been said about that. True, in many areas these secondary school divisions almost work perfectly and I refer to the larger areas, urban areas. I said "almost perfectly." We would like to say they are very expensive, cost a lot of money, but at least the results are good; but in rural areas these conditions are far from being satisfactory yet, and all of us know that.

Mention has been made that there were too many small high schools; they cost a lot of money; and even last week the Manitoba Teachers Society made the statement that many of these schools, especially in the rural areas, are not well planned for the work that is to be

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) performed in these schools.

Another question in the secondary school divisions is this, that many of these school divisions have not been properly set up as far as boundaries exist. Some revision may have to be made. What about vocational schools? Now the efforts in this field are also far from satisfactory. We know that the government has been dragging its feet in recent years - the last few years. Even now, there seems to be no action, not very much anyway. The matter of sites has not been decided locations of the district, and this still seems to be or is in the hands of a very questionable and unpopular Boundaries Commission. Nothing has been actually finalized; none of these projects are working perfectly at the present time; and as I said before, all these projects are desirable but it will take a lot of work, a tremendous amount of work and a tremendous amount of money to put these in fair shape even, not even thinking of good shape or perfect shape. And here we try to saddle our people with some new projects before really investigating the facts that these new projects would have on education, the facts on the people or the ratepayers' ability to pay. I think that one should stop and think because we may come to a point where we will be overloading the taxpayer and overloading all of us in Manitoba. And as I said, we've got a multitude of projects and not one of these projects is working perfectly yet. The people of Manitoba, as I said, have to pay for these and it is difficult at the present time just to make a decision.

The resolution in itself is not very precise. Some questions should be asked and I listened to the honourable member who introduced this. He even asked a number of questions, but I agree with the principle of the resolution and in my opinion the principle of the resolution simply states that it would be desirable, and the honourable member makes this statement that it would be desirable to investigate, although the resolution says, "Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a system of community colleges," yet on Page 1794 in Hansard he concludes his speech by saying, "I would like to see the government investigate this." And I'll agree with the honourable member as far as this goes in this respect, that somebody should investigate; whether it should be the government or some committee, it's a different matter.

The word "investigate" to me suggests a study of need, a study of costs and a study of location. Now who is going to do it? Is it going to be this Boundaries Commission that has been set up? No reference is made to that and I myself would not wish the Boundaries Commission because I presume that its terms of reference is to set locations and so on. Would it be the government, the Cabinet Ministers to investigate. We have experienced during the last nine years how this government investigates things, important matters, and that is by appointing a committee or a commission to study and a lot of these commissions are not very active. Now we have the latest example, as I mentioned before, the vocational school sites was dropped into the lap of the Boundaries Commission and they say that they may take four years before they come with some recommendations. And day nurseries - we have a resolution before us right now. It is being referred for further study. Therefore I'm going to try to be helpful, not just because I wish to be so, but I really think and believe that the suggestion I am about to give is a proper one.

As you all know that recently we set up a Council of Higher Learning. This council is supposed to study the question of higher learning and report its findings and make recommendations. I propose that we should put this council to work on this: consider the advisability of establishing community colleges in certain areas of Manitoba. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word 'and' in the fifth line thereof and substituting therefor the following: "Whereas the growth of the economic and social potential of Manitoba is closely related to the development of a high quality post-secondary education complex; and Whereas a proper closely co-ordinated post-secondary educational plan is urgently required in this province; and Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the members of this House, the educational community and the public at large, be constantly informed of present and future needs; and Whereas it is vital that the Government of Manitoba in no way impinge upon the traditional academic freedom enjoyed by the post-secondary education committee; Therefore Be It Resolved that the Council of Higher Learning be constituted by legislative enactment as an organization responsible directly to the Manitoba Legislature. 2. That sufficient government assistance and research facilities be provided to permit the Council to fulfill the following functions:

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.)

(a) Study the requirements of post-secondary education in this province with particular attention to the possibility of establishing junior colleges at desirable points throughout the province.

(b) Undertake a continuing evaluation of the needs of universities, technical institutes and all post-secondary education.

(c) To review the annual budgetary requirements of all post-secondary institutions in Manitoba for the presentation of an annual recommendation to this House. In no way should the foregoing limit the generality of the council's scope.

3. That the council be comprised of representatives from the community appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and of representatives from all sectors of the post-secondary education community whose selection shall be by the members of that community.

4. That the council avail itself for presentations from interested members of the public on matters within its terms of reference.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that I will take this matter under advisement. I thank the honourable gentleman for his patience. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

. continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I at the offset express my appreciation to the members of the House for allowing this matter to stand on the Order Paper for such a long time. I had one or two reasons for doing so. One was because of the fact that this matter had been referred to the Interstate Commerce Association Organization in the United States - rather the Federal Power Commission of United States. It was referred to them way back last January for their consideration and I was awaiting with interest a report from that body as to whether they would permit the extension of the building of the line in United States or not because of the fact that so many people here in Canada viewed the urgent necessity of processing the pipe line because of the need and for that reason were suggesting that the pipe line should be under construction post haste, but of course it's very obvious and very evident that such is not the case at all insofar as the construction in United States is concerned as opposed to some of the views of members of this House and other jurisdictions who have taken part in consideration of this very important matter.

I was very interested the other day, Mr. Speaker, to hear the contribution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk - and I am sorry he's not in his seat at the present time because I normally don't refer to people unless they are present - but my honourable friend suggested that my colleague, the Member for Burrows, should withdraw this matter and this resolution because he should, in the opinion of the Member for Selkirk, look at this matter objectively and without partisanship and if we in this corner were to do this then the next step of course would be that my colleague from Burrows should withdraw this resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Member for Selkirk and the other members in this House no matter what their political affiliations may be, we have no intention of withdrawing this resolution at all because we feel that somewhere in Canada today there should be individuals of political parties or otherwise that are more concerned with protecting the resources of Canada than there are at the present time. And to acquiesce to the suggestion of the Member for Selkirk, in my opinion, would be for us to agree with the contentions of some that we in Canada because of our size or because of our resources should be prepared and willing and ready to give control over a large portion of our natural resources which we still have within our own boundaries to a foreign country. So I say to my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk we have no intention whatsoever of withdrawing this resolution. And I suggest also to my friend the Member for Selkirk that he should look at the history of debates on this and related matters of the past because there have been some you know, Mr. Speaker, in this Dominion of ours, of political parties other than our own, who have suggested that we should be prepared to place a price if necessary on retaining within Canada control over its destiny, control over its resources.

You know, Mr. Speaker, back in 1956 a great debate took place in Ottawa on the question of building the original line and it's quite interesting to read some of the quotations from that debate and also some of the quotations of great Canadians. We are this year as we are all well aware celebrating the hundredth centennial of our nation. Not so very long ago we paid tribute to one of the founding fathers of Confederation, Sir John A. Macdonald. They had a debate back in 1880, Mr. Speaker, on the question of the transcontinental railway which I suggest parallels the proposition that we have before us this year in connection with the Trans Canada Pipe Line, and I would like to quote what Sir John A. Macdonald had to say in the debate in 1880. I quote: "I can trust to the intelligence of the House and to the patriotism of this country. I can trust not only to the patriotism but to the common sense of this country to carry out an arrangement which will give us all we want, which will satisfy all the loyal, legitimate aspirations, which will give us a great, united, rich and improving developing Canada instead of making us a contributory to American laws, to American rail lines." Because at that time, Mr. Speaker, it was rail lines he was considering so I would use the words to American gas companies, to American bondage, to American trades and to all the little tricks and big tricks that American gas companies are addicted to. Not my words. Sir John A. Macdonald, one of the founders of this nation of ours away back in 1880 on a similar debate.

At the present time in Canada there appears to be raging quite a battle to see who will be the Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada and one of the aspirants of that job is a fellow by the name of E. Davey Fulton. He had something to say too insofar as Canada is concerned and the protection of Canadian rights in the debates of 1956. And on April 17th of 1956 in the debate on the budget in the House of Commons of that year Mr. Fulton had this to say: "I refer to the issue presented by the increasing measure of control and domination of the Canadian economy by the United States interests. In those spheres the government's so derelict in its

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) duty to give lead to reach a decision and then take the necessary action to remedy the situation as it is in this particular sphere. The present trend which we see unfolding before us in Canada is a trend which if allowed to continue will lead to complete outside domination. Certainly one of the more important segments of our economy and probably of all the important segments of our economy state as a fact if this process is allowed to continue and if it is carried to its logical and ultimate conclusion the seriousness of the situation will be revealed." And he goes on, "History shows us that economic domination if not resisted, if not altered, inevitably leads to a process of absorption to ultimate political domination as well. So the trend we now see unrolling before us in Canada as we analyze the situation and the lack of action on the part of this government to deal with it is a trend which he evokes a most stringent criticism of the government because it results in developments which will work to the detriment of Canadian workmen, which work to the detriment of Canadian business, which in the long run must inevitably work to the detriment of Canadian political integrity itself". End of quote of E. Davey Fulton, the man who I indicated a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, aspires to the leadership of the great Conservative Party of Canada - the exact reverse concept as suggested by my honourable friend the Member for Roblin when he spoke in this debate a few days ago.

There were other political parties too, Mr. Speaker, that had some viewpoint on Canadianism, in particular in respect of gas lines, and on May 17, 1956, a gentleman by the name of C. D. Howe took part in the debate in Ottawa in reference to the building of the pipe line in Canada, and I want to quote what that honourable gentleman said at that time: "There is a price on Canadian nationhood which we always looked" - excuse me - I restate the quote; "There is a price on Canadian nationhood. If we always looked for the cheapest way of doing things here in Canada it might have been another state in the United States, that there very likely would not have been any Canada. From Confederation the people of Canada have been very jealous about accepting any monetary advantage that would in any way jeopardize the control by Canada over its natural resources". End of quote of C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, if I remember correctly in 1956.

And further on the same day Mr. Howe had this to say - and he was referring to the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He says that "In the CPR Canadians own about 11 percent of the stock". He says that "there is no doubt that the railway is controlled by Canada because the railway is located in Canada, it is subject to Canadian law, subject to regulation by the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada". And what is the proposition that we have before us today and what would be the reverse effect if we adopt or do not protest the building of a secondary major trunk line of the Trans Canada Pipe Line in the United States, because the pipe line would be located outside of Canada, it would not be subject to Canadian law and it would be subject to the regulations of an agency of a country not our own. And that I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the proposition contained in the resolution proposed by my colleague.

What did my honourable friend from Roblin have to say in this debate? How did he differ from John A. Macdonald and Davey Fulton and others? Whereas Macdonald and Fulton were endeavouring to reclaim for Canada control over its resources or its developments, my honourable friend the Member for Roblin - I'm quoting from Page 1080 of February 14th, which incidently was of course St. Valentine's Day when all was love and kisses, my honourable friend says, "I stand as a Conservative who supports corporate capitalism". Sir John A. Macdonald stood as a Conservative supporting Canadianism and the people of Canada. Then my honourable friend the Member for Roblin went on to suggest by implication that because of a resolution similar to that proposed by my colleague that we were supporting Russianism and Socialism. I say to my honourable friend, don't confuse the two; there is no comparison between one who desires as a Canadian to have control over Canadian industries and resources. There's a different concept completely.

And may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if perchance that back in 1880 Sir John A. Macdonald was a Socialist or a Communist because he said, "Let us retain control in Canada of our railway system", then Mr. Speaker I'm a communist, I'm a socialist, because I associate myself in this with John A. Macdonald. And if perchance, Mr. Speaker, that because he said the same thing in '56, and I'm referring to C. D. Howe, that there is a price for Canadian nationhood and that we should be prepared to pay a part of that price locally, which I ascribe to; and if ascribing to the words of C. D. Howe in 1956 we both are communists or socialists then I accept this. So I say to my honourable friend that if we believe in Canadianism, if in this matter we believe the line should be located in Canada and continued under Canadian control albeit costs us a few bucks more, but as C. D. Howe said, "what's a million if the price is

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . Canadian nationhood."

I say my honourable friend should take another look at what he had to say. My honourable friend on Page 1081 states, "if we were to follow the advice of my honourable friend from Burrows, I suppose we would possibly build a wall around our country and try to live within that wall". How ridiculous a statement. We have no desire to build a wall around Canada. If we have resources that can be used by other nations and they need them we have no objection to allowing their export or supplying them with them providing it's not to the detriment of Canada. We pride ourselves, without any wall being around us, on being the bread basket of Canada - of the world, I mean. There's no wall there. I sometimes wonder whether there isn't sort of an imaginary wall because we don't do all that we should.

Then my honourable friend goes on and says: "We must, I think, get out and sell Canada, not only the products we have in our forests or our mines or our farms but we must take a great initiative with our secondary product of industry. In this case surplus secondary product, natural gas".

I say to my honourable friend, no objections at all to exporting natural gas, but if we're going to have a link between segments of Canada or parts of Canada in our natural gas lines, the control of that line and the building of that line should be contained in Canada. It's all very fine, as some suggest, that it'll be a 50-50 proposition the building of the line through the States and that Canada because of the 50-50 control over the stock in the line will have control, but I don't have to say I don't think in this House, Mr. Speaker, that controls change, I don't have to remind members of the House where there have been international agreements or undertaking between ourselves and our sister country to the south of us that eventually have proved adversely beneficial to Canada. I don't have to remind this House I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when Ford of Canada attempted to enter into an agreement for the sale of Ford motor cars built in Canada to Red China the head office in United States snapped its fingers and said "no"; and I suggest a similar control could take place over the pipe line branch through United States. Are we alone in this contention? Is it only New Democrats that are concerned with the possibility of giving away control over the second or twin line of the gas line? It's not so at all.

I would suggest that the Canadian Lakehead Industrial Commission Incorporated of Fort William and Port Arthur are not a New Democratic organization but they protest and protest very very firmly and vigorously to the government of Canada to build the pipe line in Canada itself. What do they say about the disadvantages of the US route? First, the initial and economic loss to Canada of the expenditure on wages and materials would be enormous. Just the other day we got a report on the unemployment situation in Canada which indicated - I trust only spasmodically or seasonably - but an increase from about four percent to 5.3 percent of the employment force in Canada unemployed. Secondly, this organization says that Canada would lose the economic benefits accruing from the operation and maintenance for all time of the line which would be built in United States. Thirdly, Canada would lose the personal and corporate taxes on the construction operation and maintenance. Fourthly, Canada would not collect the 50 percent corporation tax on that major part of the profitable operation lying within the United States. Fifth, Canada would not have complete control over a tremendously important but not unlimited resource, natural gas. Sixth, there would be no assurance of adequate supplies of natural gas for the great mines of the future that will surely be developed in the Precambrian Shield lying north of the Great Lakes.

Seventh, it is psychologically important for Canada to be in control of the tools with which its industrial development will be shaped; having to depend on United States avenue for the transmission of a natural resource from one part of our country to another must deny to Canadians a sense of dynamic teamwork that comes from pulling together. It will further delay the time when Canadians will realize with reason that they belong to a truly great nation. Canada has reached its present state of political unity and economic strength through persevering in the establishment of east-west communication routes despite the most formidable of geographical barriers and economic problems. It would have been on many occasions far easier to detour to the south, but Canada would not have become the nation she is today if there had been yielding to such temptations. Our motto, "From sea to sea" does not include any postscript saying "Except when it's not handy".

This was the price and this is the price that Canada has paid for nationhood as the communication or the pamphlet of the Lakehead Industrial Commission illustrates, Mr. Speaker. It would have been far easier for Canada in the building of its Trans Canada, Trans National railway

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . lines to have gone south, to get north, or to get west. The Fathers of Confederation, the politicians - or should I call them Socialists of our early days - said we have something here in Canada and we should retain control over our resources and the destiny of our country.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate, I can appreciate the fact it may cost us a little bit more to build a line, a twin line through the United States; I can say it might look a little more glamorous. It may be that construction costs are a little less, that if construction ever starts on the line in United States it may take a little less time than building it in Canada due to the terrain, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the line has not commenced to be built because an agency of United States are sitting back considering whether or not it should be built under the proposition of the Trans Canada lines and others, should be warning enough in itself to indicate the type of control under which the line will operate if it is built. Because surely, Mr. Speaker, if there's hesitancy in the start, if in the construction of the line we have to at the offset rely on American domination or a commission of United States government to decide whether or not, or when, if at all, the line should be commenced to be built, surely this control will extend to the line after it is built, and this is why the resolution as proposed by my honourable colleague from Burrows should not be withdrawn and this is the reason I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should give consideration to requesting the Federal authority to ask them to go back to their position of August of a year ago.

Again I want to refer to the remarks of C. D. Howe back in '56: "There is a price on Canadian nationhood. If we always looked for the cheapest way of doing things here in Canada it might have been another state in the United States, that there very likely would not have been a Canada."

I think Mr. Speaker that in this year of Confederation when we pride ourselves on being Canadians, it may be well to look back to John A. Macdonald of 1880 and even "what's a million," C. D. Howe of 1956.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker I wish to move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan the debate be adjourned. Unless someone else wishes to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Burrows have a motion?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I move the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, the proposition put forward by this resolution is that the House regrets that the government has failed to provide for the necessary hospital personnel to use to full capacity the present hospital facilities, let alone providing for the staffing of the projected new hospitals.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the government hasn't provided the necessary hospital personnel, but Mr. Speaker, we are living in a free society and in this society if hospital personnel, nurses, wish to go to another part of the country, wish to go to another country to do some of their work for additional experience, or the purpose of travelling, or if they wish to get married and stop work, we cannot stop them. This is a free country and we simply cannot lay down the law to say that you must work in this hospital and do this work. However, the government has taken many steps to relieve the shortage of hospital personnel and it should be commended for its work.

In recent years there has been an increase each year in the number of registered nurses employed in hospitals in Manitoba. Between 1959 and 1965 the number of hours of registered nursing care has been increased by 45%. The number of active licenced practical nurses increased from 1,075 in 1961 to 1,553 in 1965. In 1964, 75 practical nurses graduated from the Manitoba Technical Institute and now this year 300 practical nurses will graduate from the Institute and an additional 50 will graduate from the school conducted by the Sisters of Charity.

Many students are taking courses as lab and X-ray technicians at the Manitoba Institute of Technology. In January there were 105 students enrolled in the nine month laboratory technicians course and on the 7th of last month there was an item in the Winnipeg Free Press setting out that the Canadian Society of Radiological Technicians Manitoba Division had just graduated 76 technicians, the largest class in its history. Others will be graduated later in the year. In 1961 there were 53 therapists employed in Manitoba. In July of 1966 there were 135 therapists employed in hospitals in Manitoba. Medical social workers have increased from

(MR. COWAN, cont'd) 16 full-time and 1 part-time in 1961 to 31 full-time and 3 part-time in 1966. Public Health nurses have almost filled all the positions available and open in Manitoba. On December 31st, 1965, Public Health nurses filled 290 of the 302 positions for Public Health Nurses in Manitoba.

The Government took prompt action last spring when it received an interim report from the Minister of Health's Committee on the supply of nurses, recommending that additional nurses take university courses. Many bursaries are now available which were not available formerly and although the committee set a target of 25 nurses to take post-graduate courses leading to a Bachelor of Nursing degree some 52 students are now enrolled in that course.

Another indication of the work the government has been doing is the publication a few weeks ago of this report of the Minister of Health's Committee on the supply of nurses. The government has been doing a great deal to help with the supply of hospital personnel in this province in recent years. The Committee which drew up this report consisted of some twelve persons, well qualified persons representing many different organizations in this province, most of them being doctors and nurses. The report consists of 207 pages and I have read the report and found it a most interesting and excellent document and the members of the committee are to be commended for the work that they have done. There are some 71 recommendations and only about 15 of the recommendations involve the government directly. It is a report with which all members should become familiar. I think its most important recommendation is the recommendation that the three-year registered nurses diploma course be changed to a two-year diploma course. The advantages of this shorter course will be many and it should certainly result in an increased number of nurses in Manitoba. The two year course would mean a more attractive course to prospective nurses because they could complete the course in two years instead of three years. The students now spend considerable time serving meals, tidying rooms and other tasks which can be done by persons who are not nurses and they would not have to do this work if they took this shorter course.

Today senior students may be given responsibilities where there is no supervisor immediately available but if students take this shorter course they will be under constant supervision when they are doing hospital work, when they are taking training in the hospital. The object is to have a student looking after 3 or 4 patients and every five students will be supervised by a qualified registered nurse so that the students will receive extra good instruction and the qualified nurse will be there in an emergency if one should arise with which the student cannot cope.

While the new course will be more expensive to the students for they will have to pay for their board and room, yet for those students who have their homes in Winnipeg or in Brandon, where it is hoped to establish the courses, those students will be able to live at home and so keep down the cost of the course as far as they are concerned.

It would seem that the first course might very well be started at the Winnipeg General Hospital where we have a students residence, classrooms, the Winnipeg General Hospital beside the residence, Childrens Hospital, the Rehabilitation Hospital and the Cancer Clinic and other places in that immediate vicinity where instruction could be very well given to the students. The report proposes that the tuition be free as in the faculty of education. I think we should consider this carefully and I think we should consider the main purpose of having additional students trained in Manitoba and that is to have an additional supply of nurses in Manitoba. When some nurses graduate they get married and don't go ahead with any nursing work. Others graduate and leave the province to work at other places and if we simply graduate a larger number of nurses it does not necessarily mean that the supply of nurses will be increased in this province. So I would suggest that this objective of increasing the number of workers who would stay in Manitoba might be accomplished if instead of the tuition fees being free that the nurses be required to take a loan from the school for the amount of the tuition fees and if the graduate works in Manitoba for say one year within the following eighteen months after graduation and say a second year within perhaps three years after graduation then all the loan would be forgiven. Taxpayers would then receive some benefit from the money they pay out for the nurses' education and the nurses will benefit because of the course that they have received and the good wages that they will be able to earn following their graduation.

It is recognized by all that a changeover from the three-year diploma course to the two-year course must be accomplished on a gradual basis because of the work that the students who are now taking the three-year course do in the hospitals. It is estimated that at the present

(MR. COWAN, cont'd) time the nursing students in Manitoba in the seven hospital schools are doing the work of 164 registered nurses and 118 practical nurses.

The report also proposes that the course of practical nurses should be decreased from twelve months to eight months -- to an eight-month course for licenced nursing assistants, by reducing the amount of the work they do in hospitals during their course. This shorter course should also encourage more men and women to take a course as a licenced nursing assistant and so increase the supply of practical nurses and orderlies.

The Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses should be commended and encouraged in the work that they are doing to encourage high school graduates to become nurses. We could help by encouraging high schools to have a representative of the Registered Nurses Association speak to the older high school girls in the communities in which we live. We and others could help in other ways to increase the supplies of nurses. Most of our prospective nurses and teachers are girls who are grade 12 graduates and the larger the number that take up teaching the fewer there will be available for nurse's training. We ourselves, our school boards and our Manitoba Teachers' Society should be doing what we can and adopting policies which will reduce the demand for teachers. A few years ago classes of over 40 students were common. Today there are few classrooms of 40 students or more. I don't know if as a result education of our children has been improved. In any event classes are smaller than they were years ago. A few years ago I was on a quick tour of Winnipeg schools, and I remember being introduced to one vocational course in one of the high schools where the class consisted of five pupils. It seems to me that classroom lessons, lessons with audio-visual aids could perhaps very well be given to a larger number of students.

The Manitoba Teachers' Society is a well informed group and has in the past been doing much to help the teachers and perhaps their aid or assistance could be enlisted to try to help the taxpayers and to try and help cut down on the number of teachers we require in Manitoba so that more of the students will be available to take up nurse's training. The school trustees should also be enlisted in this regard so that we might have their help to try and reduce the number of teachers that are employed throughout the province. Recently the government announced an aid program which provides for substantial teachers' salaries and in spite of the large grants to be given throughout the province we find our school trustees still offering higher rates of pay than set out in the very generous grant schedule of this province. We should ask our trustees to help us in this regard. Education is important but the health needs of our population are also important. What will be gained if we have large numbers of teachers who provide the children with a good education if we have not got nurses to keep the children and the rest of our population in good health? Although additional steps can be taken with the help of many to increase the supply of hospital personnel, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba has taken many steps to improve the supply of hospital personnel as I pointed out earlier. The study which is the report of the Minister of Health's Committee on the Supply of Nurses should result in an increase in the number of registered nurses in this province, and increase in the number of practical nurses, laboratory technicians, therapists and others.

This House should not be passing a resolution regretting that the government has not provided the necessary hospital personnel but it should be passing a resolution commending the government for the action that it has taken in recent years in this regard. Thank you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing the debate unless there's somebody else that wishes to speak on this. Mr. Speaker, I did not believe for a minute that this resolution would be accepted by the Minister and I could understand when he says, "I'm sorry that I couldn't go along with the resolution." This government then -- you might ask why did I bring this resolution. It certainly wasn't to embarrass the government. Then why? Well I think that it is quite important that this matter should receive the proper consideration. I think that we should have the members of this House consider the problems that will increase alarmingly with the construction of new beds and also the advent of compulsory Medicare.

Now I did expect though the Minister to attempt to defend the government and I was quite disappointed because I found him rather weaker than usual. He certainly wasn't speaking like somebody that was convinced. And the second speaker of the government, well him I don't understand at all. He started by telling me that, like the Minister, joining the Minister, that there's no such a thing as shortage of nurses but he wants more nurses. It's not the government's fault. There's only sixteen resolutions I think that he said or fifteen recommendations in this book that deals with the government, then he brings in programs. All the new programs -- he must be the Deputy Minister of Health because the Minister of Health has never given us

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) any indication of what we might expect from him and we asked him this during the debate on the estimates of his Department.

Now the Minister stated that the study of registered nurses shortage was initiated immediately after the receipt of the Willard Report. Well this is not quite right. The part dealing with the hospital personnel of the Willard Report was received on June 17th, 1963. The Minister's Committee on Supply of Nurses was appointed only on December, 1965. This is not immediately. This is not immediately, and this was after --(Interjection)-- yes, this could be a definition of "soon", especially the "soon" from this Minister. But I don't think that this is immediately. This is two and a half years later in fact, Mr. Speaker. Another thing, this report should have been ready by April, 1966, according to the Minister. This is what the Minister told us at the time and I have the different documentation here if he wished to be reminded of his own words. But we received this on November 18th, 1966, this report that the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre spoke so much about. Well this was certainly a little too late to do much in this Session so we'll probably lose another year.

Now mind you the government was warned by the members of this Party for many years that we would have a shortage of nurses and the staff of hospitals and so on; that we would be faced with critical shortage. We did not need the Willard Report, the Willard Commission or even the royal commission or the Minister's Committee to tell us that something should be done. I think that we should have started before. Now anyone should know that if you're going to build more hospitals then you must staff these hospitals. It would be kind of ridiculous to build buildings with nobody taking care of these buildings and if you get better and more extensive care then you must have more personnel. These things were obvious even without any committee, anybody having to tell us this.

Now the government has placed high priority in construction of beds after receiving the Willard Report, the erection of walls and so on; but what about the service? The government did nothing about this and this is what this resolution is all about. I think that we will not achieve anything if we don't recognize first of all that there is something wrong and the Minister will not admit that there is a shortage of nurses, or anybody else. In his speech on this resolution he said that wasn't the case at all. The Minister also said, "Well the Willard Report did not seem too concerned over the shortage," but I think that he misses the point completely. Now the first part of the Willard Report stressed that many more beds should be needed and many more beds were approved. As I say they did some work on this part. But no provisions were made for added personnel needed to staff these beds. We are counting -- what are we going to do when this new Grace Hospital opens. Take the nurses and the staff from the old Grace Hospital. What are we going to do then? It's a new hospital. Maybe the nurses from some other hospital will want to go in a brand new hospital. But we'll be in trouble there too. No allowance for the increased number of personnel needed to give added and better service in this progressive society of ours. Nothing was done for this.

Now the Minister denies that there is a shortage of nurses, not only denies that it's the government's fault but he says there's no such a thing as a shortage of nurses here. This is what he said in his speech. Now it stands to reason, Mr. Speaker, that if there isn't any shortage no effort will be made to remedy a shortage, and as I say I don't understand my honourable friend that just spoke because he said there's no shortage but then he's selling us all kinds of ideas how to stop the shortage. So I say that we must convince the government that there is a shortage and this is the reason for this resolution. This I intended to do with this resolution. Mind you I have many quotes, I did a lot of work after making this resolution, but I certainly don't intend to read everything that I have. It would take too long. But I'd like to quote some from the Minister's own Committee. First I would like to read from Hansard, February 3rd, 1967, from the Minister on page 769 and this is what he says, this is his speech on this debate, his contribution to this debate, and I quote the Minister: "So that leaves one hospital, the Winnipeg General, and the Winnipeg General have 61 beds closed at the present time. But when you say that the Winnipeg General has 61 beds closed at the present time you must also recognize that during this past period the Winnipeg General Hospital has opened a 172-bed wing which had to be staffed and it has also opened up a new Intensive Care wing which had to be staffed and in intensive care wings that's where you do use a maximum number of health personnel. So when you look at 61 beds closed you must compare that in relation to 172 beds, new beds, that have been opened, the renovation and the staff that has been required for the new Intensive Care wing." This is what the Minister said. Well I agree with this, I agree with this and this is the very point that I wish to make in this resolution. The opening of new

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) and progressive facilities, the building of more beds will require more personnel and we haven't got it. This is exactly what he's saying and this is in the debate to prove that there's no such a thing as a shortage of personnel in the hospitals.

The statement of the Minister is doing nothing else but proving my point. Actually he was speaking in favour of this resolution. He was admitting that this was the case. Now he maintains that very few beds have been closed because of shortage of nurses, but is this factual? Is this really factual? First of all - he was speaking in December - this is the best time as far as nurses; this is the best time of the year. Will he be able to make the same statement a little later on in the spring or in summer when the married women with children in school wish to leave on a holiday, when the single girls feel that they should be travelling - and like the Honourable Minister said, we can't stop them - will he be able to say the same thing? Because this is when the nurses are usually lacking, when there's a critical shortage.

Now we've had a shortage for a number of years and the Minister says this does not exist. I will not, as I say, read everything but I'll just quote some of the headings and if I'm challenged or if I'm asked to read, I will. Here's one: "Nurses shortage here termed alarming, acute. Doctor Bradley." "Nurse shortage hits hospital," and then they go on - all the different hospitals. Right, is it only the Greater Winnipeg area? "Portage Hospital Board prepares nursing brief. Trained nurses shortage a concern." And I didn't write this. This is my honourable friend that works for the newspaper, I don't. "Nursing shortage critical. Holland suggests male nurses to solve shortage." "Nurses lack reduces use of wards." There's no shortage. "Doctors fear traffic jams in hospital." And of course this is -- one on the hospitals much is cut down and so on. Now I could go on, and at first I had intended to read this but I think that it would be only repetitious. I'm sure that the Minister knows that he's wrong; he knows that there is a shortage. --(Interjection)-- Yes, and now Medicare; this will make it a lot worse.

There was an ad in the - it's funny that people that have a -- there is an ad from the General Hospital: "Nurse lack reduces use of wards." They had to pay to put this in the paper. "Will you help?" You would love to but you've been away from nursing too long. Don't let that worry you," and so on. You see this is all about trying to get more nurses. This is good; I'm not ridiculing this. I think this is good but it's not good if there's no such a thing as a shortage of nurses - it's kind of ridiculous.

Now certain enquiries that I've made have brought out the following facts. The Minister said there's only one ward that the shortage of nurses -- all you need, he said, (and this was supposed to be real good,) was 61 beds were left open. Now many hospitals, instead of closing wards, close a few beds in each of the wards. The Minister didn't say anything about that. They stretch it; they stretch it. They have to do it because they will not, they will not - should I say they will not be in line for grants, so they'll stretch it. Now beds have not been closed because the hospitals want to qualify for per diem grants, but the nurses are taken from other wards, the stretch, and the students are made to work harder and longer hours. The personnel of the hospital is stretched to a breaking point and the service is definitely suffering and the administrators of every single hospital will tell you the same thing.

My honourable friend today told us about the students and so on. For years I've been telling the now and the then Minister of Health that they were using the students, using them to subsidize the Plan. The Minister at one time said this is required, they need so many hours. I checked and they worked many more hours on the wards than the Minister was admitting. They were working nights. What are you going to learn working nights - for students who need their rest and to study. This is what they have been doing, and my honourable friend was telling me a while ago and I witnessed this myself, that we've had shifts in the largest hospital and some of the largest, that the head nurse on the ward was a student nurse. Mind you, as I say, they're giving excellent service. They're cheerful and everything, but this is not -- they're there to study; they're there to learn. Much work has been passed on to practical nurses, the aides, to students, to orderlies, but some of this work these people are not trained for this, and this requires an awful lot of supervision and this is quite frustrating. As one of the administrators was telling me, we need fewer Chiefs but more Indians, and this is not meant as any discrimination. I'm just quoting from somebody that mentioned this to me. I remember somebody that made a statement like this and it backfired and I want to make sure.

Now does the Minister still insist that there is no shortage after this? While taking part in this debate the Minister stated very clearly that there was a shortage of only 375 nurses according to this report. I don't think that he read this too closely. There are quite a few things

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) that we could read in this report and I had the different pages that I was going to quote from it, I'll skip quite a few - especially in view of the fact that my honourable friend knew this report. On Page 37 you'll see Table 8, Anticipated Demand for Registered Nurses 1966-1971. Registered Nurse work force December 1965, 3,047. Unfilled positions, 1966 hospital budgets, 472. Replacement of student service time, 164. This is the course that he's talking about - we haven't started this course. . . . Let's not kid ourselves. Staffing additional beds coming into service (to 1970 494-- nurses that you need for these beds. Staffing of new services and improvement of service, 1,000. Development of mental health program, 187. Additional staff for personal care homes, 75. Additional staff for Public Health and Home Nursing Services, 110. Registered Nurse work force in 1971, 5,549 - we've got 3,000. This is the start. And they're not talking about Medicare in this at all.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the honourable gentleman it's about three minutes to the half hour.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, when - thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I will take a little longer than this; I'll keep on until you stop and send us for dinner and then I'll start next Thursday I guess.

Then on Page 39, "Attrition Rate." There is one final consideration. If we have fallen short in the procurement of new nurses how have we fared in keeping the ones we have? The Survey Board warned that the low attrition rate of 11 percent annually in effect from 1958 to 1960 would not continue . . ." this is what the Board said . . ."but would gradually rise to a level of 14 percent for the period of 1966 to 1970." It'll be worse, they're saying. "In this particular, unfortunately, the Survey Board's predictions appear not to have been exaggerated."

Well, Mr. Speaker, how can the government do anything to provide the necessary personnel when it does not even recognize that a shortage exists, and this is what the Minister was quite emphatic in denying that there was a shortage. This is the reasons for my resolution because for years during the estimates I've been talking about this in this House, and well, my views were always laughed at and now we're in, I think we could practically use the word 'critical'.

Now can the government do anything to remedy this? My honourable friend says that it's not up to the government. Well he said this then he denied that by telling us what the government should do. Now the main reason for the nurses leaving the job is job dissatisfaction. This is one of the reasons, and of course this is a vicious circle, Sir, because of the lack of nurses and the long hours that they have to do will certainly not help to have them satisfied in their work, and the low salaries have been responsible for the high turnover also.

Now maybe we should read again from the report, and I'm reading the Nursing Personnel Problems from the report that my honourable friend was quoting so much from. This is not my report - it's the Minister's report. "In a previous section of this report we noted the high percentage of nurses who each year give up their vacation permanently or temporarily or who leave the province. The Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses has set this figure at 14 percent. It may, in fact, be going higher. To the extent that this annual loss is due to unsatisfactory working conditions, remedial action should be taken. A reduction of only one percent in the annual attrition rate would have the same effect as adding another school of nursing with a capacity exceeding that of the Children's Hospital School." This would be quite an improvement. "It is the nature of things that a lot of nurses get married, become pregnant or succumb to wanderlust. This, however, does not explain the high turnover of nurses in hospitals employment . . ." My friend doesn't agree with this. Well it's been a long time -- "which is averaging 50 percent annually but at least one large hospital was reporting 90 percent. This is comparable to industries employing unskilled or low-skill female labour. Large offices with predominantly female . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Please . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I've got two lines here left -- "turnover of 30 percent to 35 percent annually while school boards this year reported changes in 17 percent of their teaching positions. I'll continue later.

MR. SPEAKER: It's now 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.