

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Special Committee in the House on dental services. On behalf of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. CLERK: Your special committee on dental services beg leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Fox as Chairman. The quorum was set at five members.

Hon. Mr. Cherniack outlined the work of the previous Special Committee of the House constituted to examine, investigate, inquire into, and report on all matters relating to the determination of the proper role to be filled by dental technicians, denturists, and other persons providing dental services.

Hon. Mr. Cherniack suggested that the Committee correspond with organizations visited by the previous Committee to up-date the material now on file with the Committee, and that the material from the previous Committee be made available to this Committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have with us 120 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing of the Vita Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Matichuk, Mrs. Derewianchuk and Mrs. Ostrowsky. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. I wonder whether he could indicate to the House whether he's in agreement with the statement made by Dr. A. O. Schmidt, President of the Manitoba Medical Association, that the increased use of medical services is going to raise the cost of the medical aid in the province?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health & Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know whether the honourable member is quoting Dr. Schmidt?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to an article in the paper. It's not referred to as a quotation, although part of the article I'm assuming he suggested. Certainly in terms of the other statements that are quoted, it would be indicative of the fact that medical care services are going to be raised.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated on previous occasions that the increased medical services which will be made available primarily to people who were not covered under a medical plan previously, will certainly mean that the amount of monies paid for these services would be increased.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. I wonder if the Honourable Minister in the next road project that he will be announcing to the House, if before then he would give careful consideration to the improvement of Highway 201, normally known as the Morden-Sprague Highway, from Ridgeville corner to Vita.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked a question of the Honourable Minister of Transportation, which he answered last night in the affirmative and in reading my paper today I find out that outside the House, Deputy Transport Minister L. N. Blackman said no decision had been made on the license plates issue.

Could the Minister of Transportation please clarify this for me.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement that will be of interest to the members of this House as it involves a long standing member of the House - my predecessor from the constituency of Selkirk, Mr. T. P. Hillhouse who represented his riding well and ably from 1950 to 1969, and was well noted for his original thoughts and debate in this House.

There will be a testimonial called the "T. P. Hillhouse Night" -- I've been asked to pass this on to you -- October 20th, at 7:30 in the Selkirk Memorial Hall. It's hoped that as many representatives of this House as possible will be in attendance at that testimonial.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the House Leader. I'm wondering what House rules and procedure that we'll follow this Thanksgiving weekend?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my answer to my honourable friend is that I hope we will not be here on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister relative to recent widespread publicity on the subject of the building of a possible convention centre in downtown Winnipeg, and ask him whether there's a specific government position that he can articulate on that matter at this time.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier and Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, that question I will turn over to my colleague the Minister of Finance, who has taken a very close interest in the matter.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we, that is a group of us, have been studying the feasibility of the convention centre. It seems to be a desirable type of facility for the centre core of Winnipeg. On the other hand, it is clear that a convention centre does not bring back money in itself to pay for its own capital investment, or indeed there is some question as to whether it would pay for its annual upkeep. But certainly it would be of beneficial nature to the commercial industrial community of Greater Winnipeg and through it to the economy of Manitoba.

The proposal has been made and is being studied. We still don't have any concrete proposals as to cost or nature or extent of the building. We are considering this, and at the same time and to refer to statements made by the Member for Assiniboia - in and out of the House - we have not been put under any pressure for the decision because indeed we are informed that the other proposed participants in the Centerpoint development are still conducting their own feasibility studies. So that I can report to those members interested that both they and we are continuing the respective studies that have to be made before a decision is arrived at. And we also have the desire and the intention of discussing this matter with both the City of Winnipeg and the Metropolitan Corporation, because they too, would have an even more intense interest in it. We want to discuss the role that they will play.

It should be obvious to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that there has been little opportunity for us in the last couple of weeks to do anything in that regard; but we do propose to proceed just as soon as we can and have the time to do exactly what I have described.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his full report.

Can the Minister say whether in his view the projected Centerpoint complex really hinges upon the construction of such a convention centre. Is it absolutely integral and vital to that complex.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, personally it is my view that the complex itself is vital before

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) we even talk about a convention centre. In other words, we certainly wouldn't be considering it if not in the light of all of it.

The indications so far are that some or one of the participants considers it very important, others have not indicated that it is vital. It depends on the nature of the service that they intend to perform in that centre. But certainly it is recognized that it would be an important part of the final decision of all participants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Due to the Honourable Leader of the House saying that we expect to be out of here this week, and the remark that I got from the Minister of Agriculture yesterday that it was a matter of policy, I would like to ask him if it is not advisable to have a meeting of the agricultural committee during this session.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): If it is advisable, Mr. Speaker, I will advise the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I would like to congratulate Mr. Garry Enns, a second year university arts student at the University of Manitoba, on being elected President of the Manitoba Association of Students. Mr. Enns won the presidency after a secret vote by the MAS executive Monday night, and he defeated Mr. Harkishan Bhagat. It's also quoted that Mr. Enns in his capacity as President will give priority to the restructuring of MAS and to satisfy the needs of the students to make them aware of MAS and he said he favours a total non-violence program for student demands.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland could indicate to the House the relationship, if any, to the Honourable Member for Lakeside?

MR. FROESE: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question. I could say though that Mr. Enns is a former teacher in my area and therefore I know him personally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. I wonder can he inform me, so that I may inform my constituents, whether or not the construction on Highway No. 6 between Lake Francis and Woodlands will be completed this fall?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the honourable member that I refuse to answer his question.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, not a supplementary question because of course the Minister doesn't have to answer any questions. I did ask the Minister on another point some time ago about the dairy situation at Headingley Jail, and I wonder has the Minister had an opportunity of checking into that matter for me.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member must be psychic. I have received an answer from our department. His question dealt with whether or not there was a policy of phasing-out institutional farms, and I don't intend to read the entire procedure except to say that the present policy involves the phasing-out of the institutional farms in various steps.

With regard to the status of certain equipment and procedure, the situation at Headingley is that regular checks are made by the health inspector. Regular checks are made by the health inspector. A recent check revealed faulty operation of a thermometer recorder in the cooling tank; two faulty plates in the cooler; a leaking tap on the cooler; storage tank in the kitchen was too small and the use of cans for milk in the kitchen was inadvisable. Some milk cans were old and rusted and some questions were raised about technique in pasteurizing. The matter was looked into by the Superintendent and the Direction of Correction, and action has gone forward as follows: "The new recorder is on order; the plates were ordered and should be installed shortly; a new tap was ordered; a new tank was ordered; the cans were emptied as soon as possible and removed; milk cans have been replaced; and the technique with regard to pasteurizing has been observed and appears to be okay.

The conditions reported could have been a potential health hazard, however there was no evidence that any health problem actually occurred. In any case, the corrective action has been accomplished and is proceeding in all the other areas.

MR. ENNS: I wish to thank the Minister for his answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Honourable First Minister. Could the Honourable First Minister use his good offices to ascertain for me and the people of Manitoba whether or not new licence plates will be issued next year?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to look into it for the honourable member and consult with the Minister of Transport, who I'm sure has the information.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I would like to bring to the attention of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who asked a previous question, that it would appear from the reply given by my colleague the Minister of Health that this government is going to be taking the government out of state farming even though the previous Conservative administration wasn't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Finance. Some days ago some concern was expressed in the House about the effect on Manitoba of the rise in the German mark, and the Minister indicated at that time that if there had been borrowings that he would consider this very serious indeed, and he was to check on it. Has he a report to make to the House?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: When will the report be made, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CHERNIACK: I thought the question was has he reported it to the House, and if that was the question my answer was yes, Mr. Speaker. It should be on record in Hansard. If my honourable friend can't locate it, I'll be glad to try and locate it for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I might say I have an answer to another question, but while I'm on my feet, now that the First Minister has sort of brought it to my attention that we're going out of state farming, I think we'll have to look back at the policy and see whether that's right.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the questions that some persistent backbenchers have been asking regarding the Concordia Hospital, my information is that the architect is completing the preparation of schematic drawings for the new hospital. The architect's current schedule for the project provides for calling for tenders in February, 1971, and having construction completed by October, 1973. At this time we believe that this schedule maybe overly conservative - it's a bad word - and that it should be possible to have construction completed by either late 1972 or early 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I was also asked by the Honourable the Member for River Heights concerning the amount of doctor accounts that had been paid as at a particular date. The corporation is currently following the practice established by MMS prior to April 1st, 1969, for the payment of medical claims. All claims received by the tenth of a given month are processed and paid by the 15th of the next following month, that is to say that the July claims received up to the tenth of August would be paid by September 15th. Because of the administrative problems involved in processing the large number of claims for opt-out doctors in the early months of the plan, substantial numbers of claims were not processed at the time payments would normally be made. However, substantially all April to July claims received by August 10th were paid by September 15th. This is the date that I was trying to bring to the attention of the honourable members, that as of September 15th we felt that all the April to July claims received by August 10th were paid.

A review of the medical claims paid on September 15th confirms this statement, inasmuch as payments to doctors - \$2,977,378, and patients - \$1,456,570, totalled \$4,433,948, an increase of approximately \$1.2 million from the previous month as reported in the September 10th memo re Order of the House to the Member for Emerson. So that is the up-to-date figure that my honourable friend requested.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure both the First Minister and the Minister of Health and Social Services would agree with me that farming, or state farming that involved forced labour is something we should get out of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister of Health and Social Services for the answer he provided on Concordia Hospital. Although I did not ask the question at this Session, I did ask for it in May and I didn't receive a reply until now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface. -- I'm sorry, for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I also wish to thank the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. The only thing I hope that he will . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I wish to thank the Minister for giving the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I have a question to direct to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services. Is it still the policy of the government that automobiles used by health units outside the Greater Winnipeg area, that these cars must be serviced in the Winnipeg area?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's my understanding of the policy and it's presently being looked into.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is there a change considered?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is being looked into because of the anomalies that have been brought to our attention, and we certainly think in terms of possibly accepting lower bids, especially if they're from Altona, Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, with the wonderful looking audience present from rural Manitoba, I'm prompted to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it the intention of this government to continue with daylight saving time as enacted by the previous government, or can we expect some change of policy with respect to its current application to the rural areas of Manitoba?

MR. PAWLEY: I have a feeling that in view of the largeness of the audience the honourable member hopes that I step right into a puddle of water.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister and ask him if he is going hunting new trade and business opportunities in the north central United States tonight and tomorrow as originally scheduled.

MR. SCHREYER: That's correct, Mr. Speaker. The schedule has been consolidated a bit but the calls are pretty much the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I would like to ask the Minister of Cultural Affairs if he is in a position now to confirm that members of the Royal Family will be visiting us next year, and if so, which members.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, royalty will be visiting Manitoba next year. I'm not in a position to say which members of which family.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I think that I should make another statement. A short time ago questions were raised about political infiltration of our schools. I have some tangible evidence of that. The Charleswood Collegiate has a class, or several classes who are involved in procedures of government. They have their elected bodies. The government is the Conservative Party, the Official Opposition is made up of what they call NDP, the N. D. P. Party. The interesting things to me is that the Leader of the Official Opposition, his name happens to be David Petursson; he's my grandson. In the Dieppe School in Charleswood there is also some political activity and they're having an election, although the opposing parties do not bear any names, but the one young student, Mark Petursson, is running for the presidency of the school.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Finance - I believe that is the correct office it should go to. As many people know, the City of St. James-Assiniboia have been pleading with many other people in Winnipeg for a long time to have Metro put a bus route to the Grace Hospital. Now in view of the grants made by the provincial government to the Metro Transit, would the Minister, or could the Minister of Finance use his good offices to help this situation in any way, shape or form because winter is coming.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy if the honourable member would meet with me privately and we can discuss more fully just in what way he feels my good offices could be used.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I asked the Minister

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) of Health and Social Services a question in respect to the status, or if there is any changes contemplated by the government in respect to Marymount School.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll have an answer for my honourable friend either tonight or tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. The previous government some years ago had commissioned Mr. Arpin to bring in a report on organized crime in Manitoba. Could the Minister tell us when he could table this report or when he expects the report to be made? I might say this has no connection with the resolution by my honourable friend for Elmwood.

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): I've made enquiry into this rather interesting matter. I haven't seen a bill, I haven't seen anything formal, any correspondence in connection with it. I assume that there's something on the files somewhere. Mr. Arpin, I understand, was anxious to meet with me some time. I've received no call or letter from him but I understand that there are copies of this report somewhere. In due course I expect to hear from someone on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I just want to advise the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party that if Mr. Arpin should wish to visit with me I'd be quite happy to see him as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, a supplementary question to the Attorney-General. Did you contact Mr. Arpin and ask him concerning this matter?

MR. MACKLING: I have seen - in answer to my learned friend and my honourable friend - I have seen Mr. Arpin occasionally and he hasn't broached the subject to me formally or informally, although there has been ample opportunity for that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplemental question to my first one to the Minister. Could the Minister advise us whether Mr. Arpin has been paid any money or any fee for his work so far?

MR. MACKLING: . . . the totality of payment to Mr. Arpin. I assume he has received payment from time to time, because as I understand it he was employed by the former government on a number of occasions. But actual monies paid, I have no particular knowledge at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not wanting to suggest that there's any relationship between the two matters, but the name having come up, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether he's been served a subpoena yet?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I noticed in today's paper that the Prime Minister of Canada has been served with a subpoena. I haven't had that distinct honour bestowed upon me yet, but if it were to appear I would, as a Canadian citizen, be honoured to receive it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, early this morning the First Minister took a question as notice from someone here that had to do with Highway 59, the closing off of the old 59. All I can say is that it's a serious matter and we're looking into it. I can't give any answer because it's a problem that goes back some considerable time with various people involved. All I can report is we're looking into it and I hope that by the weekend we could have some type of report to give to the House.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the Attorney-General. Has he any correspondence or any documents, are any existing that would in effect assure us that Mr. Arpin was asked to prepare a report on the crime situation here? And on a question of privilege, if I may, Mr. Speaker, continue. I remember a resolution that I made in this House. The then Attorney-General said that he had named Mr. Arpin to be the liaison between the R.C.M.P. and the government in this matter, but I don't remember anything about a commission to make any report at all.

MR. MACKLING: I, at this time, have nothing very much further to add to what I've already indicated, that this did seem to be a rather secretive matter. I haven't had any formal information as to the nature of this report or anything that I should be doing with it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' resolutions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I emphasized the other day, of course the government-- this afternoon is Private Member's resolutions. I have had however some representations from both sides of the House as to the advisability as to whether or not the private members may be prepared to proceed with the bill dealing with the lottery. If there is, it will require consent to the changing of the Order Paper. This of course is up to the individual members of the Assembly as to whether or not they would be prepared to continue the discussion on Bill 40. I only raise it as a proposition for consideration of the Assembly, and again I want to emphasize the government has no control over the proceedings at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there consent?

MR. FROESE: I would have no objection as long as there are not members that are absent now and that if this matter should come to a vote and would then be disqualified.

MR. PAULLEY: Well if my honourable friend has no objections and there are no objections, we possibly could proceed with this. As far as the point raised by my honourable friend, the rules of the House do make provision for the continuance of Private Members' resolutions in any case.

PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, Bill No. 40. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, "I am no orator" -- I'm going to read it, I'm going to read from a brief note. It says: "I'm no orator for I have neither wit nor words nor worth nor actions nor utterances, nor the power of speech to stir men's blood. I only speak right on. I tell you that's what you yourself do know." So be it with regards to lotteries. It may come as a surprise but I'm speaking against the motion. I make no moral judgment on lotteries, I think that's each individual's right to decide his own morality. But I raise the point that human beings are what human beings have become, and someone has to start somewhere if we are going to change humanity.

Now I can add nothing more to this debate than was mentioned by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. So with what he said I would just add "Amen" to it, because in disagreement with the Honourable Member from River Heights, I think debate is the offering of some contribution to the swaying of opinion, and I hope over the next few years, when this government brings forth its policy, to enter debates with some contribution other than just the brief remarks that I want to make this afternoon with regard to this.

But I will just sum up the way I feel about things such as lotteries, is I don't think that we should condone as a government or as a legislative body the enshrinement of human effort, if you will, anything which contributes to human beings being placed in a comparable position to a bunch of greyhounds chasing a rabbit around a track.

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

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the debate on this particular resolution has been a very interesting one and it was made doubly so last night by the contribution of the Minister of Health and Welfare, and it is in relation to some of the remarks that he made that I want to discuss this matter this afternoon.

But first of all, let us look at the legislation that was passed by the House of Commons earlier this year dealing with the subject matter of lotteries and amendments to the Criminal Code. The amendment that was passed in Ottawa dealt with three separate subjects. First of all, the provision that the federal and provincial governments would be authorized to hold lotteries if they so choose. Secondly, that charitable organizations and church organizations would be allowed to hold lotteries with specific limitations. The prize to be offered would total no more than \$100 and the tickets that would be sold would be no more than 50 cents each. Private individuals would also be licensed by the provincial government in order that they could hold lotteries as well. And then of course the one dealing with agricultural societies and fairs.

The legislation that was passed in Ottawa was pretty much enabling legislation insofar as the provinces were concerned and it provides that the provincial government can, either as a government by themselves or in cooperation with other provincial governments, establish lottery schemes. It was interesting during the course of that debate in the House of Commons to read the viewpoint expressed by the various members of the House at that time. I don't want

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)to take up the time of the House to outline the positions taken by various members, but I think there is one member in particular who spoke on this matter whose views should be made known in this House. I am sure that my honourable friends opposite would be interested in hearing those views. -- (Interjection) -- I haven't mentioned his name yet; I never thought you'd ask. The member's name of course is one that is well known to this Chamber and particularly well known to my honourable friends opposite, Mr. Stanley Knowles, and he said on April 21st on Page 7775 of Hansard - and I want to quote his words because I think that the members of the House will be very interested in hearing the position that Mr. Knowles took on that occasion.

I'm not going to read the entire speech but I do want to read some excerpts from it, and I'm not trying to take anything out of context, I just simply want to put on record some of the views that he expressed relating to the particular bill that is before the House at the present time. He says: "However, Mr. Speaker, there are two things provided in Clause 13 that many of us in the House of Commons do not like, and I make the strongest appeal I can to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Turner, to reconsider his position. The two things I refer to are the authority that is provided on the one hand for the Federal Government to conduct lotteries, and the authority provided on the other hand for the provincial governments also to conduct lotteries."

And then he goes on to say this. This is at 8:30 p.m. In the House of Commons they indicate the time that the speeches are made, and I think it's perhaps a measure that could be adopted here so we can very quickly find the contributions of the Minister of Health and Welfare which are always useful to the members of this House. "In our view, state lotteries are nothing more than a form of taxation. In fact the one widespread lottery under public auspices being held in this country at the time is called a voluntary tax. The thing that is wrong about lotteries as a form of taxation is that it is the most regressive form that could be imagined." And I'm coming to the assistance of the Minister of Health and Welfare, because I feel that his arguments of last night should be reinforced by some of the more reactionary members of that side of the House. "That is saying something in this House of Commons because this government has done very well in dreaming up regressive forms of taxation." I should have left that out because I don't think it has any place here. "I think one of the worst we ever have had is the two percent social development tax that is being collected even though Parliament has not approved it. But lotteries are even worse than that," says Mr. Knowles. "When lotteries are used by governments, federal, provincial or even municipal for that matter, for the purpose of raising taxes, there is no relationship whatsoever to the ability of people to pay. In fact," - and this is the point that was made by my honourable colleague from Pembina, and I'm sure it was on the strength of the contribution of the Honourable Member from Pembina that prompted the Minister of Health and Welfare to get up and make his remarks last night when he indicated that in the bill that was before the House he saw nothing at all that could be interpreted as an ability to pay. "In fact" - and I go on - "In fact those who are the least able to pay are those who are enticed by the possibility of winning a prize. They are the people who can least afford to lose their money in this way and they are the ones who lose the most."

Now that is Mr. Knowles' contribution, and he goes on to reinforce his arguments further by reading a letter that he had received from one of the church organizations in the constituency of my honourable friend from Charleswood. I won't go on to put those things on the record because my honourable members can look it up, and I recommend honourable members opposite to do a little bit of looking into the records of Hansard and reading that contribution by Mr. Knowles because I think it brings the issue very squarely into focus.

My personal view is very much similar to that expressed by Mr. Knowles. There is no hope and there is no point in us attempting to -- I think it would be wrong for us to do so because in many cases the local organizations, charitable, church organizations, find this a convenient way of raising money for their local projects, and in many cases it's the only way that they can raise money. So the amendment to the Criminal Code dealing with that particular aspect of lotteries was one that I welcomed, because I as a member of the House of Commons on a number of occasions had to deal with the particular problem of representing people who found themselves afoul of the law on this particular section of the Criminal Code, and it seemed to me that it was a very stupid law and I'm glad to see that it has been changed.

But the question that Mr. Knowles raised, the one which permits the provincial

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) government and the federal government to engage in lotteries, is one that raises another point altogether and is the one in essence, although the House Leader and my honourable friend from Elmwood may argue otherwise, it is in essence the argument that Stanley Knowles raised in the House of Commons, and I happen to agree with that point of view. I happen to agree, without admitting in any way at all that I subscribe to his philosophical political views, I happen to agree with that point of view.

But it has brought into focus something that we have been observing on the other side of the House on a number of occasions, and that is the particular political category that honourable members opposite are going to be placing themselves in. We've thought on occasion that the Minister of Health and Welfare and the Member for Crescentwood had views philosophically that were somewhat different from some of his colleagues. We have seen the Premier of the province, who expresses a philosophical outlook on the country's management, as somewhat different from that as expressed by the Minister of Health and Welfare. He calls himself a social democrat, not a socialist, and to many of us we have been wondering just what will be the outcome. The Minister of Health and Welfare is a purist, he has purged himself from all of the other philosophical outlooks and concentrated solely on the one that he believes in most, and I give him credit for being honest in that regard, and the same with the Member for Crescentwood for not trying to mislead anybody.

But these others, these political acrobats -- (Interjection) -- these political acrobats, if my honourable member didn't hear me correctly, who are not quite sure where they stand philosophically but they know this much, they know that they want to stay in power so they do the things that politicians who want to stay in power comes by naturally. So we are watching this philosophical argument develop and we can't help but wonder what the outcome will be. We accept the fact that the Member for Crescentwood and the Minister of Health and Welfare have, as I say, purged themselves of any impurities in their beliefs. They are free of what the Premier said the other day, social pollution; their thoughts are pure. But it's going to be a rather interesting thing to watch. I couldn't possibly use my own words adequately to describe the situation, so I thought perhaps that there's always a . . .

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. JORGENSON: Yes.

MR. GREEN: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is speaking on a bill which I spoke on the other day, and in view of the fact that his opinion appears to be exactly the same as mine was, does he regard himself as a purist too, and in the same category?

MR. JORGENSON: I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that without subscribing to the philosophical views of . . .

MR. GREEN: We're speaking on this bill. I take it that the member is speaking to the point of the resolution before us. I assume that he's in order.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, of course I'm a purist, but I find it difficult to use my own language in attempting to describe the situation that I see opposite, so I've borrowed from Shakespeare and I'm sure that honourable members opposite will recognize the words of Hamlet in his famous soliloquy. And I want to apologize to the bard himself for rearranging some of the words that Hamlet used, and also I want to apologize to the many very famous actors who portrayed this role because I am sure that I could never do justice to it. But it goes something like this: "To be or not to be, that is the question. Whether 'tis nobler of the party to suffer the slings and arrows of outright socialism or to take arms against the sea of trouble-makers, and by opposing end it. To vote, to defeat, no more, and by a defeat to say we end the regimentation and the thousand natural shocks that the economy would fall heir to. 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished. To vote, to defeat, or to remain social democrats, aye, there's the rub, for in that war of ballots, what results may come when they have shuffled off this deceptive name must give them pause. There is a respect that makes travesty of such a political philosophy, for who would bear the democrats if they became socialists, their arrogance in power, the death of freedom, the laws of force, the insolence in office and the spurns of investment capital from abroad, when they themselves but make this troublesome Melvin Watkins disappear with a vote. Who would Gonick support? To grunt and sweat under a weary life, but that the dread of something after dissolution, the next election from whose wars some will not return, puzzles the will and makes them rather fare those ills they have than fly to others that they know not of."

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)

This resolution, or this Bill, Mr. Chairman, is going to separate the men from the boys on the other side. It will be interesting to see where they will vote on this particular resolution. Are they going to support the Minister of Health and Welfare and Stanley Knowles, or are they going to allow their philosophical approach to politics to become diluted?

MR. GREEN: Again I'd like to ask the honourable member a question. It would appear to me that many of the members who have spoken from that side of the House are going to support what the Member for Crescentwood said and what I said on this Bill. Will that separate them as being in the Socialist camp?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I'm talking about honourable members opposite who -- (Interjection) -- I'm talking about honourable members opposite who have attempted -- we've never pretended to take a uniform position on anything on this side of the House.

MR. GREEN: You've never pretended to . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: We're individualists and we're Conservatives, but honourable members opposite, including the Liberal Democrat who has subscribed to most of the views that are expressed by the party opposite, it will be interesting to see just where they stand on this particular issue and we await with eagerness the outcome of the voting.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal-Democrat would like to answer the Diefenbaker Conservative, because there is no doubt that he's following the great Diefenbaker in this field.

Now, I realize how difficult it was for the last speaker to bring this about, to read the composition that he has. He spent an awful lot of time getting this ready and after all he had to tell us this afternoon. Now he was told repeatedly that this is a free vote, but this is not good enough for him. He's talking about standing on his own two feet but he said very little of what he's going to do himself on this Bill. He said very little. He told us about some of the things and he wanted to make sure we hadn't lost the idea that he had sat in Ottawa for a while and what happened in Ottawa, and he wants to know about a division here.

MR. GREEN: He said he's voting with me.

MR. DESJARDINS: He says he's voting for you? Well, I'm saying I'm not voting with you and I'm saying I'm not voting with the Diefenbaker Conservative. I feel that somebody that's talking about freedom, I don't quarrel with anybody that has spoken on this if they do it sincerely. If they feel that this is wrong, well all right, they should vote against it. They should vote against it. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Oh well, I'll read Hansard and I'll hope that you did mention that at the top, that you were sincere, because sometimes I wonder, and seeing I wasn't in the House I want to make sure that this is one of your sincere speeches.

Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, I'd like to say that it has certainly been made very clear that it is a free vote. I don't agree with the Member from Morris nor with Mr. Stanley Knowles, that because a certain group of people that cannot afford it will buy the tickets that it should be ruled out, because if I followed this line of thought we'd close the beer parlours, because I think a percentage of the people that are there are people that shouldn't be there. The vendors would be closed. All the liquor stores would be closed, because I think there's some people that should not buy liquor that are buying liquor. And the cigarettes the same thing. Fairly soon we'd have no freedom, and this is a man who's talking about standing up for the freedom of the individual. This is a man who says that the people must be free and the government should not interfere, and today he's saying he agrees with this philosophy that you shouldn't allow this, and the only point that he mentioned was because some people will buy tickets who should not buy tickets. This is the main thing.

Now they're saying - I think the Honourable Member for Morris also said that it's a form of tax. Well, it's a revenue. It's not something that is sponsored by the government. This was mentioned many times, but the legislation has to come from the government to allow this and I think this is all that the bill does. It's something that the corporation, the Centennial Corporation is suggesting. Nobody has to buy tickets on this, where taxes you have to pay, and if he wants to compare that with the Medicare premiums I think he's absolutely wrong. I don't think anybody has ever been jailed for not buying tickets, and some of the members of this House cannot say the same thing about not collecting sales tax, so I don't think you can compare the two at all, Mr. Speaker.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

Now some of the members have stated that, well maybe it wasn't right and they went along to explain why it wasn't right, but they'll allow it because it's going to be just a one-shot deal. And I think this is wrong. If it's wrong on the second time around it's wrong on the first time around. I'm voting for it, and not on the assumption and on the promise from anybody that this is a one-shot deal. If it's thought that it's a worthy suggestion, a worthy deal to have it for the corporation, it might be that next year somebody would decide that maybe it would be a good deal for the St. Amant Ward for Retarded Children. And I certainly would not oppose it next year for something as worthwhile as helping the retarded children, if I thought it was good enough for the Centennial this year.

So at the invitation of my honourable friend I would like to say that I will support this bill, that I am in favour of it. I respect the others that for some reason or another do not favour it. I recognize that it's a free vote. I know that I will disagree with some of the members from this side and I know that I will agree with some of the members on the opposite side. I don't think it's a time to lecture the people on what they are going to do as a party when it is one of the only, or free bill that we have. As I said when I started, I know the honourable member had his little Shakespeare episode all ready and I realize that he might feel that he might not have too many other occasions to tell us, so we enjoyed it very much but we'll say now let's get down to business and tell us what you are going to do.

Now, as I said, I support it with no strings attached, as far as saying that this is going to be done only for this year, if it's suggested for a worthwhile cause next year. I agree that probably the government should not have taken it upon themselves, let's say that the government will say we'll do it ourselves, the Department of Health and Welfare will run this thing. I don't think that this is right and this is not what is being done now. It is true that it's the Centennial Corporation and the Centennial Corporation receives certainly some help from the government, but I think that the aim of the funds that they are trying to collect now is to be distributed for maybe extras, things that we would not normally get and things that therefore we would not have to raise taxes for.

So I am going to support this bill at this time. I don't see anything wrong. I do not suggest that I'm supporting it only because somebody might have mentioned that this is going to happen this year and never again. I think this would be wrong, and I beg even those that are going to -- I suggest to those that are going to support this bill, or said that they were going to support the bill, that they are wrong in supporting it just because it's going to be the one for this year only. I think that this would be wrong. Now, this is a different matter if they say, well do you suggest that it should be done, everybody should have the right to have these lotteries? I say no, that Manitoba is not that big and it would be quite difficult; I don't think that it would be economical and nothing would be achieved. I think that this is something -- I agree with that part of the bill that decides that it will be restricted to one thing this year, and maybe next year to something else.

So with these very few words I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm going to vote, without strings attached, I am going to vote for this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I had not originally intended to enter this debate but I have had a number of communications from constituents of Brandon West and I'm encouraged to sort of take another look at the bill and to offer my thoughts for what they are worth at this time.

I would first like to commend the Honourable Member from Elmwood for I think his courage in promoting this kind of a money-raising project, and certainly the motives under which he operates at this time are of the highest because he is seeking a way that would be hopefully a painless way of earning funds for the celebration of Manitoba's Centennial.

Historically the idea is by no means new, and I was interested to discover that the earliest references to lotteries were in the times of the Roman emperors when they used them at their festivals and for the entertainment of their guests at various functions. Maybe that's the reason, and perhaps the service clubs of modern day have something in common with the festivals of the Roman emperors in that they use them mostly for the entertainment of their own members and their sales of tickets do not normally go beyond the sphere of the friends and members of the service clubs involved.

But it was in the same country, the country of Italy that I found a most interesting

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) reference to lotteries, and it comes from a very distinguished person in the history of Italy, Count Camillo Benso di Cavour. I'm not sure of my Italian in this respect but Cavour has been at times referred to as the founder of modern Italy, the man who in the 1850's was Premier of Italy and did a great deal to uniting the country in its present day form. It is said that he was approached at one time by one of his ministers who was concerned, as was the premier, with the lack of money for the carrying on of certain government projects and the Minister proposed that they engage in a lottery, whereupon the Premier of Italy gave his Minister a very scholarly lecture on the evils of the project that he was proposing. And he made the point that has been made over and over again in this Legislature, that it was a tax that fell most heavily on those of his people who could least afford to pay or to join in this kind of lottery; it fell upon the very poor people in his community who saw a chance to break the yoke of their poverty. And he ended with a summation that I think you might find interesting. He said in his view, Mr. Speaker, "a lottery is a tax on imbeciles." Now as a sometime-buyer of lottery tickets, Mr. Speaker, albeit with rather indifferent success on my part, I am inclined to accept this judgment of Cavour and to agree that if anyone enters this kind of a gambling device that he is not exercising very intelligent action.

I feel that while the intent of the sponsor was an excellent one, that it would be a mistake for the Province of Manitoba to lend its support and to dignify this kind of a money-raising project with the name Manitoba Centennial Fund. I feel that in the light of history we would not be regarded in very high light if we embarked upon this method of achieving funds for the celebration of our first 100 years as a province.

So I would hope that the members of this Legislature would consider this very seriously and that they would in their good judgment decide that surely there are other ways in which funds can be obtained to celebrate a most important anniversary in our province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Well, Mr. Speaker, after sitting and listening to the many presentations made by the members of this House in regard to the Lottery Act, I would like too to convey to the Member for Elmwood, concur with the comments just made by my colleague the Member for Brandon West, his courage in bringing in this bill as a private member's bill since he is a member of government.

There are a number of things that have entered my mind that I am wondering about so far as this bill is concerned, Mr. Speaker. As you know, the Centennial Corporation is involved in this Bill. It has been operating for a number of years, and I know when I shared the responsibility as a member of government under which this Corporation operated, it did not have to see fit to go to the trouble or seek the support of members of this House for financial support. And I can't help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, as to what the problem really is, as to whether the Corporation has been reduced in the amount of funds that they are now going to get or whether this government is in some small way in some financial difficulties. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, when we have this bill before us, particularly as it comes in in this fashion.

When I think of the great success the Centennial Corporation achieved in celebrating the birthday, the 100th birthday of our nation, I think back of the many celebrations that I participated in as the member representing my constituency, whereby the people felt as though they were citizens of this country, of the constituency and the country - province and the country I should say - and they felt that they were taking part in a sense that made them feel as though they were really celebrating our 100th birthday.

I also think now of the comments made by my colleague from Morris and the comments he quoted by the Honourable Member from Ottawa, Mr. Knowles, and I can't help but agree with some of the comments that were made by him. And then I think that this could be a measure that could be in the form of a tax rather than something that is going to be of benefit to us, because it seems to be human nature, Mr. Speaker, that some of us are inclined to try our chances and we may spend a dollar that probably we just can't afford, and we might spend one dollar and lose it and the temptation is there to spend another and you know what the end results can be. This is one of the things that has entered my mind and I have thought of very seriously insofar as this bill is concerned, because when we think of those things, then think of the relationship that it can have or should have in the minds of some people of celebrating a 100th birthday, I can't feel that the two go hand in hand because of the very results that it may have on some people.

So I become very concerned, Mr. Speaker, as to just why this bill was brought in in this

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) way. I think probably the Member from Elmwood might give us some answers to that because it is rather ambiguous to me. I wonder if it was a matter of money, because the Minister of Cultural Affairs I think did state in his remarks the other day, that supposing now this thing doesn't reach the success and that it doesn't turn out to be a money-making proposition, are we then going to have to support the corporation in the end because of the lack of success. I don't mean to be a pessimist, Mr. Speaker, or say to the honourable members from the government side, but I think we must be realistic about these things. So just in expressing some of these thoughts, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it at that for the present.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for River Heights. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, when I first proposed this resolution the Costing Order referred to in the resolution had been declared by the Railway Transport Commission and it appeared that the matter of rail line abandonment would become imminent. However, as you are aware, an appeal has been taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway and I have in front of me a clipping from today's Globe and Mail which indicates that the Supreme Court of Canada has granted leave to the Canadian Pacific Railway to appeal against the costing order.

The decision means that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to present to the . . . its complaint against the Transport Commission that it unfairly limited the amount of money it can charge as a loss of operation in lines it is required to maintain in the public interest. I understand as well from the questioning of the Attorney-General that Manitoba was represented at the hearing and there is some indication here I think that all the provincial governments were present at the Supreme Court hearing as to whether the appeal would be allowed or not.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, although the question of branch line abandonment has now been postponed for a short period of time, the issue will be before us very soon and once the appeal, the decision on the costing order has been made, even if the Supreme Court does in fact alter the method, the manner in which the costing order is to be undertaken, the communities who are affected will in fact be in the position that they will then be at the crunch - for lack of a better word - at the crunch insofar as rail line abandonment is concerned and the issue will be before them, and in many communities they are going to face real possibility that railway service to the community will in fact be discontinued.

Now in 1966, in September of 1966, 18,000 miles of prairie rail lines were protected against abandonment until January of 1975, and included in that are 50 applications for abandonment in Manitoba. This left 1,850, or about 10 percent, 1,850 miles of unprotected trackage, consisting of 46 applications for abandonment in the prairies, left to the C.P. and C.N., who are now in a position to proceed in this matter as a result of the costing order that has been brought forth by the Railway Transport Commission.

I may say as well, Mr. Speaker, that the government of Manitoba appeared on the costing order and made representation and worked with, I would assume, a great deal of success with the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta in attempting to try and present a prairie point of view. Four hundred and sixty two miles of branch line abandonment are affected in Manitoba, or approximately 30 percent are going to be affected almost immediately; Saskatchewan will account for 48 percent; and the remaining 22 percent is in Alberta. There are 14 applications pending in Manitoba. The costing formula is critical in terms of the economic, social and political impact it will have on many communities in Manitoba.

The costing order for the Railways, as well as for their competitors, will establish how to measure the true cost of moving goods and passengers by rail and will set ground rules for the abandonment of branch lines. And I should indicate as well, Mr. Speaker, that the costing order not only affects the question of rail line abandonment, it also affects the question of passenger discontinuance, because there is an additional costing order that's not referred to in the resolution but nevertheless was decided at that time. It means, as well that the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) government will now have some determination of how the rail subsidies are to be paid and what compensatory rates are to be given. And I suggest as well, Mr. Speaker, for many of the communities who are directly affected, they now face an economic death sentence if the rail line is in fact abandoned. They also face a reprieve if the government will make a decision to allow the line to stay and will subsidize it according to the formula that's now in existence.

A MEMBER: . . . referring to the Federal Government.

MR. SPIVAK: The Federal Government, yes, oh yes. The Provincial Government's responsibility I am going to deal with in this resolution.

Now I am not going to deal with the 50 or so applications which are pretty critical and will occur in 1975, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the manner in which we handle ourselves in this matter now, that is the manner in which the government steps forward to assist in this final determination, can in fact be very important and significant as to the manner in which the 50 applications or so that will be effective in 1975 will occur. The applications that are before us are just as important as the 50 that will be coming up in 1975, but the truth of the matter is this, that the railways are going to be successful in abandoning the rail lines in many of the smaller communities. In fact approximately 100 small communities in Manitoba may very well disappear.

Now I'd like to, if I may, deal with those branch lines that are affected in Manitoba so that the members will have some idea of the subdivisions that are affected, and the areas, and to see the broad way in which this is now covered, even by this small number, relatively small number both in miles and in number of applications that are now before us and now will have to be settled, I would suggest, probably within the next six to eight months.

In Carman, the Roseisle-Notre Dame Junction; in Cabot, the Searle-Cabot; in Carman, between Carman and Roseisle, another rail line abandonment; in Inwood between Grosse Isle and Hodgson; in Wawanesa between Hartney Junction and M and B Junction; in Winnipegosis between Sifton Junction and Winnipegosis; in Ridgeville between South Junction and Ridgeville; in Hartney, between Hartney and Virden; in Neepawa between Muir and Carberry Junction; in Ste. Rose between Ste. Rose and Rorketon; in Pleasant Point, between West Tower and Brandon Junction. Those are C.N. applications for abandonment; and the C.P. applications are in Boissevain, from Boissevain to Lauder; in Carman, Roland to Plum Coulee; in Varcoe from Moore and MacGregor to Wellwood and Moore to Park-Varcoe.

Now in 1964 the Branch Line Association of Manitoba was formed by the rural municipalities and grain elevator companies to fight the CNR and CPR branch line abandonment program, and most of you are aware with the work and the effort of that organization. Mr. James Doak, who now is not a resident of Manitoba, was appointed solicitor and he has made representations on their behalf and he has spoken fairly extensively on this matter. -- (Interjection) Yes, Mr. Doak who was formerly in Virden, I should inform the House Leader, I understand is well. Although he is now living in B. C., he still represents the Branch Line Association.

But I'd like to, if I may refer to a speech that was given by him that appeared in the Manitoba Co-Operator on November 30, 1967, because I think it deals in a very specific way with what the implications of the branch line abandonments mean to Manitoba. I'm quoting now from the article and quoting as well from the statement that he made: "Farmers in areas where rail lines are likely to be abandoned will have to pay nearly three times as much as they now do to take their grain to the nearest elevator, according to the study of the Branch Line Association. These figures take into account greater hauling distances, as certain local elevators are closed up and the need for farmers to buy larger trucks to go to the extra distance."

Now the interesting figure, Mr. Speaker, is on the basis of the 1964 costs. "It will cost the farmer an average of 8.25 percent a bushel to have their grain taken to market instead of the present 2.85 cents or 3 cents, if and when rail lines are abandoned in the area. It will add another \$120 on the average to annual hauling costs of the farmers, and over 10,000 farmers would be affected by the proposed rail line abandonment," which includes the 14 lines that are referred to and the ones that will be abandoned in 1975. "Because 71 percent of the farm trucks in the area affected were found to be 10 years or older and 71 percent were one ton or less capacity, the branch line study estimated that abandonment would mean that two-thirds of the farmers, or approximately 6,000 would have to buy a new truck at an average cost of \$5,000 or a total of an additional \$33 million. Mr. Doak pointed out that about 70 percent of the losses in assessment as a result of rail line abandonment would have to be recouped by the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) municipalities on farm assessments, with about 16 percent of the loss recouped in town assessment. Rail line abandonment would drop the value of farms by an average \$2,000 at lower than 1964 values, and among the 10,000 farmers on proposed lines this would involve a loss of over \$20 million in the market value of Manitoba farms along these lines."

Now the reason for mentioning these figures - and I'm sorry that the First Minister is not present -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I know he's represented but I'm sorry he's not present, that while this is late in the session and we're dealing with this resolution, and while it may seem that the 14 rail line abandonments and the communities affected who are going to have to make the adjustment to the modernization that's taking place in our society and the change that's occurring. With respect to the agricultural community and with respect to what's happening now, the figures and information I've mentioned are very significant and very very important and cannot be ignored.

MR. PAULLEY: We're aware of it.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm glad the House Leader said they are aware of it. Now the question that we're going to ask . . .

MR. PAULLEY: It will not be ignored.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . is what are you going to do about it, because I think the real issue of the resolution -- (Interjection) -- Well, instead of chirping I think I would ask the House Leader to give me an opportunity to explain this. -- (Interjection) -- No, no. I'm suggesting that the issue before us is not the fact, but the issue is what we're going to do about it.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll find out.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, it's very interesting that I'm going to be able to find out because I know what the policy of the government was when we were in power and I may suggest that I will now recommend to the government that a change take place; not because we are now in opposition - and this is very important - but because we've reached a point now, as a result of Mr. Doak leaving this province, and as a result of Mr. Mauro leaving this province, that the expertise that's going to be required to assist the communities in the presentation that must be made before the appropriate bodies on branch line abandonment cannot and will not be made available unless the government is going to be prepared to enter into this in a different manner than it has in the past.

The policy of the government, the policy of the government in the past has been that technical information would be furnished so that those who would be representing the economic interests and municipalities would be in a position to have the availability of government information, access to the information to assist them in the preparation of the brief and the preparation of their case. I suggest now, and I suggest this is the important thing and one of the most important resolutions that we're dealing with - I guess everyone who presents one will say that it's important - but I would say to you, that one of the most important ones for the rural areas of this province and one of the most serious problems will be that the government now assume the responsibility to enter in and assist in the preparation and presentation of the case of the municipality in connection with rail line abandonment.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll find out.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, maybe I will find out and I hope that someone's going to stand up and say that this is going to happen. I really would hope that someone who has an authority, such as the Minister of Transportation or the First Minister, would stand up and say that this will happen. I don't know but I'll wait and see.

MR. PAULLEY: Give us a chance.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm waiting to see, give you a chance. It's very simple. It's a very simple procedure. Now all that has to happen is to someone to stand up and say we accept it. Not only accept it, we are prepared to commit ourselves to do this. If that's the case, then the resolution can be passed with the support of the government and I think all those who represent rural areas will be very happy and all those who represent the areas that are affected by rail line abandonment will be very happy.

So, Mr. Speaker, in this connection I look forward to hearing the representation, and I do not want to hear a presentation that I've heard already from the government when suggestions have been given to this side that that decision is highly meritorious; it may be fairly good but we're still not going to do it. Because I think this is a little bit different. We've already had some evidence in which there is an indication of a policy of the government that I think is not correct, and I must express my disagreement in connection with that because I think it

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) shows a difference in a point of view.

The First Minister in answer to questions of whether the province would be represented before the Interstate Commerce Commission on the discontinuation of the Great Northern rail service between Winnipeg and St. Paul said that he was not prepared to do this because it may affect the pricing of freight rates in connection with the service.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question? Was that not precisely dealing with the abandonment of passenger lines and had no relationship with freight lines and that was the question directed to my Honourable Leader.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that's very interesting because that's exactly what the First Minister said, and I'm suggesting . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Right. Now don't take it out of context.

MR. SPIVAK: No, it's very important, but I'm suggesting that in connection with the discontinuation of the passenger line, he indicated that he did not want to in any way interfere with the freight rate that was available on that line.

MR. PAULLEY: That's not so. He was dealing with the question of passenger lines . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable House Leader can just contain himself just for a few moments. There will be plenty of opportunity for him to enter the debate . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I'm going to.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, and I will listen as I always listen attentively to what he says. But let me just proceed again with what the First Minister said. The First Minister said that Manitoba would not be represented before the Interstate Commerce Commission in connection with the discontinuation of the passenger service by Great Northern Railway, because it may as a result of that presentation, affect the freight rates going to the United States. And I think if that is the policy then there should be no hesitation, absolutely no hesitation in the government standing up and saying we are now prepared to represent the municipalities in connection with rail line abandonment because the question before us is the cost of moving grain to the elevator, the cost of moving to the elevator and — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, look, I am prepared to sit down if the Honourable House Leader wants to have his say, but I really resent the continuous interruption. He may not want to hear what I have to say, that's his choice, but I would like the opportunity of dealing with it because . . .

MR. PAULLEY: We can't help but hear you. Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. May the Honourable Member for River Heights have the opportunity to continue with the debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, surely. I love that fellow. We all love you . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I know you all love me; however, I'm not sure that I want to be loved.

MR. PAULLEY: It's a question of love; not embracing.

MR. SPIVAK: I must say that I disagree, by the way, Mr. Speaker, with the position of the First Minister. I think he's incorrect. I think Manitoba should be represented before the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think passenger service to Manitoba is important because it does affect our tourist business. I wonder really how much of a cost-benefit relationship he understands or figures that he's even looked at in connection with this. I wonder in connection with our Centennial year, whether it is wise to have a discontinuation of the service which will make it really almost impossible to get here by train. I wonder whether that's in the best interest of Manitoba.

But that's another issue and another question. But the passenger discontinuance, which is not part of the resolution, but which occurs at the same time, is important because we also have now another example in which the government seems to sort of take the position that it does not want to get involved in these matters.

We've already had reference to the Campers' Special on the CNR between Winnipeg and Farlane, Ontario. — (Interjection) — No, it's not related to the costing order but there's a principle involved here that is related and I'd like to recite what is actually taking place here.

MR. PAULLEY: The railway have said that there'd be no abandonment next year . . .

MR. SPIVAK: The railway have said there will be no abandonment next year? When did they make that statement?

MR. PAULLEY: About two weeks ago, for the information of my honourable friend.

MR. SPIVAK: That's not the information I have. Well, I must say that if you have that information it would be very interesting to . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Because we inquired.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, if the government's in possession of information that we on this side . . .

MR. PAULLEY: It's public information.

MR. SPIVAK: If the government's in possession of information that we do not have, but the Minister of Transportation has that information, I'd be very interested, - I'd sit down and listen to it. My understanding is there's only a slim chance that rail service will be provided in 1970 - I say a slim chance.

MR. PAULLEY: Carry on.

MR. SPIVAK: Now, here we have a different approach. The railway is abandoning the passenger service and is here prepared to deal in freight and express in the same way as the Great Northern. Now we've already asked in this House, and the Leader of the Liberal Party has asked on a few occasions as to whether the government would be making representation, and I know there have been some discussions, but I don't think there's been any formal representation made to any appropriate body in which the province's position has dealt with this.

There are about 400 families and about 1,500 people who solely depend on reaching their summer camps on this train. I understand that on an average weekend there are more than 300 people travelling. I understand as well that there has been an increasing number of passengers, and most of the people travelling - and the Honourable Minister of Labour should know this - that most of the people travelling or 40 percent are CNR employees, and that they've received a concession from the railway that while they cannot use their pass which allows them free travel, they have been able to pay half-fare. And in addition to that -- (Interjection) -- Well, it's not on the costing order. I'm now trying to recite a specific case and to try to point out the position of the government on this, and I say that if there's going to be consistency of the position of the government on this and on Great Northern, then what likely will happen is that the government is going to fail the rural areas that are really affected by branch line abandonment in the same way as they have failed the people who are affected by this, many of whom, in fact probably the majority of whom are in the constituency that the Honourable House Leader comes from.

MR. PAULLEY: Boy are you going to be in for a surprise.

MR. SPIVAK: I may say as well that the railway claims that in calculating the revenue of the train, it's not a paying proposition, but they write off completely the concession that's given to the employees. And because 40 percent happen to be CNR employees, instead of say, five percent, I do not think that this employee should be penalized. I suggest as well that in what I consider the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I'm retired now.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . difficulty in the government now solving as to who is going to be responsible for rail transportation in this province, because there is, I think, some difficulty at this point because the Minister of Transportation is really not the Minister in charge of rail matters and the Minister of Industry and Commerce hasn't really assumed that responsibility in connection with rail matters. I think as a result of this there has been a tendency to let these things go as really not that important, and I suggest that the discontinuation of the CNR train to Farlane, the problem of not being represented before the Interstate Commerce Commission is indicative of an attitude that must be changed. And I suggest as well, that if we draw the conclusion from the two references that I've referred to already, the likelihood is that the government is going to continue on with the same position, which I think is the incorrect one at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll find out.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'm not interested in finding out, I should tell the House Leader. I'm hoping that those people who are going to be affected find out; because right now they are going to be preparing, and they must prepare for themselves, their presentation on the rail line abandonment; and I suggest as well that there is going to have to be some responsibility assumed and taken by the government in this connection. And I say as well again, that based on the precedents that have been set and the position that has been taken by the First Minister in the two references that I've made, there is a real danger that the government will not assume it's responsibility; and I think the rural area faces real danger, that they are going to be forced to try and argue rail line abandonment without the benefit, support and the strength that the Provincial Government can give them in their arguments, and in this respect that this would be a failure of responsibility and a failure of leadership.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, . . .
 -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'd love to hear your comments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to offer my congratulations to the Honourable Member for River Heights in introducing this legislation because I have been a member of BLAM which is the Branch Line Abandonment of Manitoba for many years under the very careful Chair of Mr. Rene De Pape from, I believe, Somerset. A group of interested citizens who gave a lot of their time freely and willingly to try and discontinue the, we thought, reckless abandonment of the railways in our province. BLAM, the name of the organization, of course, I think as most members know, is supported by donations from the rural municipalities of our province, some government funds were involved and some of our urban societies, such as Brandon and other cities contributed great numbers of dollars and there was private donations towards this organization. Considerable amount of research and paper work has been done over the years to try and prepare a submission to the Board of Transport Commission to prove beyond a shadow of doubt what in our opinion we thought was being very unfair, the approach that has been taken to the abandonment of our lines in this province.

We're most grateful to have had the experience of having Mr. Doak from Virden as the solicitor, ably assisted by Mr. Mauro and others, to guide us as we set up a communication and a way to debate what we thought was an injustice. If the members sometime have the occasion to read the transcript of the presentations that were made to the Board of Transport I am sure you will find it most interesting. You will find that this group broke down a formula which the railways had established under which they were going to abandon the lines of this province and this group proved beyond a shadow of doubt to the Board of Transport Commissioners that the formula was wrong that the railways were using, and they couldn't abandon the lines under that formula and I think members here all know that the abandonment program was postponed until 1975. And now, of course, as the Honourable Member for River Heights has brought to the attention of the House now, it has been before the Supreme Court and the appeal now has been allowed so that the hearing will continue. But over the years, it has been one of great concern, wherein information that was before us, we found that certain branch lines in this province were abandoned for reason of excess costs that were charged to these lines. We found that certain branch lines were paying somebody's salary, certain branch lines in this province where hotel costs were being charged back to those branch lines. This is all in the transcript that Mr. Doak had in his possession and was able to prepare and bring this information before the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Another interesting thing, if I go into an area where I see a line is being abandoned -- you will find, Mr. Speaker, if you were to go across Manitoba and take a look at these lines that are being abandoned, I humbly submit that it's deliberately being abandoned, because the railway no longer cuts the grass, they no longer fix the fences, they no longer maintain the section, it's just a phasing out program. Whether the Board of Transport Commissioners accepts the appeal of those that are being abandoned or not, it's going to happen regardless, because the railways have their minds made up that they are going to abandon, so they don't put ties in any more, they don't cut the grass, they don't fix the fences, so it's going to be one way or the other. But nevertheless if we have to die, we'll die gracefully and I would hope that if in fact we are going to be abandoned by the formula, that the government will get involved such as this resolution has brought to our attention today.

MR. PAULLEY: We won't allow you to die.

MR. McKENZIE: I'm glad to hear the Honourable House Leader saying that he's not going to permit it. I sense a communication that government there might establish. Where I live in the village of Inglis we have a branch line there that's facing an abandonment program but I'm sure if the right people went along, and I think government are the ones that should go, the CNR line that runs through the town of Russell would possibly make an agreement. There's only, I think it's 12 miles that's being abandoned. Possibly the CNR would run up and back. I think government should be involved in that type of a debate and communication with the Board of Transport Commissioners and to support BLAM. As the Honourable Member for River Heights has indicated, Mr. Doak is no longer a citizen of this province. I am not too sure, because I haven't had the occasion or the time to attend any of the meetings of the executive or the BLAM group which meets in Brandon annually in the fall, to see where they stand today; but I humbly submit that the government take a real good look at this resolution

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) and try and help us solve this very, very difficult and serious problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a contribution to this debate by elaborating a little on the problems facing the people who use the Campers' Special to reach their summer homes, but perhaps before I contribute these remarks, we could clarify what I think I heard the Honourable Minister of Labour say, that the Campers' Special will still be running. That's absolute is it?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . according to press releases which are often used in this House, but not on this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in rising on this resolution, I feel that this is the most important resolution facing us in this session. The problem of branch line abandonment is an immediate one, the concern is increasing every day and in order to make this resolution come up as quickly as possible, my remarks are going to be very very brief.

The whole question concerns one-half of my constituency, the northern half of my constituency could be affected completely by this program, and I have to agree that we have to take very strong action in this matter and the most appropriate place is by leadership by the government. I think the government should also be very concerned about this because it was the other day I heard the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources talking about nationalization of the agricultural industry, so I think the government should be very concerned about it.

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

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in the debate although it's been very well covered by the other speakers. I in particular would like to draw your attention to the fact that the farmers are in trouble now and that by branch line abandonment in many cases people's trucking cost will be upped three times. In the case of a farmer that's farming in the neighbourhood of 700 acres and if his yield was 30 bushels to the acre, which isn't very high, he could have 21,000 bushels affected at about 5 cents. It means a lot of money. I would say that if the government would give leadership in this and help to save the farmer this money, it would be a help.

Now I don't want to go on to any length, but things sometimes are misleading. I particularly notice in the press where it talks about farmers' income is up, and we read on in the statistics and they were up; but unless you read down quite a bit further you don't realize that the expenses are up and they are up more in proportion and this ends up with a smaller net income. Being a farmer myself and representing a farming area, I often wish the headlines would carry statements like that farmers' net income is down, because it's your net income that really counts.

I don't think that I would like to take any longer on this. I'm anxious to get on with the work. I only hope that the government are going to support this. I judge by what the House Leader has been indicating from time to time, he is; and if he is I'd be very happy to let this bill be voted on right away.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would take the adjournment.

MR. PATRICK: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. That's fine.

MR. PAULLEY: In all deference to my honourable friend, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that what I have to say further to what I had said earlier will take very long. I indicated then and just to refresh my honourable friends, that I react in this to their over-reaction and their hypersensitivity to a democratic institution, the trade union movement, indicating in an open and democratic way their sympathy and interest in political activity, and being open and outright in their support of the New Democratic Party in some instances. They do this freely and democratically, local by local, and there are decisions arrived at openly, no secrecy; and there has been no one in the opposition who has spoken in favour of this resolution indicated any grievance . . .

MR. HENDERSON: Would you permit a question please?

MR. MACKLING: Certainly.

MR. HENDERSON: You said that this was derived at in a democratic way and at the local level. Now is this a secret ballot that they have at the local level? Is it a secret ballot, this is the question?

MR. MACKLING: I think that's determined, democratically. They can have a secret ballot or they can have an open ballot; that's up to the various unions. You see the unions are democratic, they set their rules and they can vary their rules, and we as a body don't have to force rules down their throat. But my honourable friend would like to do that. He thinks that we have to discipline the trade union movement to be democratic; but they are democratic.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, as a point of order. I wasn't trying to cram anything down anybody's throat; I was asking a question and meant it honestly as to whether it was a secret vote or not.

MR. MACKLING: Well I'm glad to hear that. But the whole purport, the whole purport of the -- (Interjection) -- certainly.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think the Honourable Minister just said that everybody on this side is against unions. This is incorrect. -- (Interjection) -- I thought I heard the Honourable Minister say that everybody on this side is against the unions.

MR. MACKLING: No I said, those who had spoken from that side in support of this resolution, in my opinion, were trying to formulate policies for democratic institutions who are capable of formulating their own policies; and that's in essence what those who support this resolution are endeavouring to do. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? - the amendment - well I'm speaking on the amendment. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. But really no one who has spoken in favour of the principle embodied in this resolution or the amendment, has brought before this House any justification for this resolution. There have been suggestions, innuendoes that there is something unhealthy, something undemocratic, some hurt that would be suffered by someone who opposed the view of the majority in the union. No evidence of this has been brought before this House - some collusion, some hurt that would follow - but there has been no evidence of that at all. There have been suggestions, innuendoes by the Honourable Member from Riel that someone suffers as a consequence of their speaking out in a democratic way opposing, opposing a point of view in respect to -- you can sit down for a moment until I finish my sentence, surely.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): I'm standing on a point of privilege.

MR. MACKLING: All right.

MR. PAULLEY: What's the privilege?

MR. CRAIK: The privilege is that he suggested that I'm bringing in in innuendo, and the basic question that I posed when he brought this up before, and which he's basing his statement on now, is the question I asked then: is it necessary for an individual to come in and identify himself to a government to ask for his human rights.

MR. MACKLING: I didn't detect any point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member from Riel went even further, he went even further - he suggested that there was some unknown person whom we should listen to. When pressed as to who this august person was, he said, well you can speak to me privately. This is the sort of technique -- (Interjection) -- well I don't have to refer to, if you like I can give it to you. Oh yes I can. -- (Interjection) -- Are you concerned about hearing what you said?

MR. CRAIK: Not a bit.

MR. MACKLING: Not a bit, no. Well this is certainly the purport of the honourable member's thinking, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is the thinking of someone who looks upon the trade union movement with suspicious and jealous eyes because this institution, this institution has seen fit to openly and democratically take political action and support a political party which has openly been sympathetic to some of their needs; and this hurts the honourable member and some of his friends.

They don't have any twinges or pangs of conscience about the fact that obviously shareholders, very small shareholders in corporations, may in fact have some of their dividends that they would otherwise receive, being siphoned off quietly and without any regard to their rights, to political parties. No one questions that this has happened, but there is no concern at all by my honourable friends in respect to this. Obviously their thinking is far from fair and democratic. I suggest this resolution and the amendment should be defeated.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question on that last . . . ?

MR. MACKLING: I'll be happy to.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Honourable Attorney-General explain how the position that he's referred to, that a shareholder might find himself in, would compromise that shareholder in terms of his . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member asking for an explanation of something that the Honourable Minister stated or is he suggesting a topic to enable the Minister to continue with his speech?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm asking the Honourable Minister for his thinking on a point at issue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a point that the Honourable Minister had raised in his speech?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

MR. MACKLING: I'll be quite happy to answer that, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the directors or the manager or someone else, having been approached by someone to make some sort of a contribution to one of the political parties -- certainly not the New Democratic Party. I would include -- I don't see the Honourable Member for Rhineland -- but there is record of contributions having been made in substantial form to both the Conservative, the Liberal and Social Credit Parties by corporations. Now I am certain that no individual shareholder was ever asked at the annual meeting to approve of those donations that were made -- and they were made out of the operating profits of the corporation. As a result, the individual shareholder's net returns from which he is paid a dividend, has been reduced. Now that's how an individual shareholder's rights of profit have been taken away, without his consent and without notice to him.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm one of the members that certainly accepts that the unions are democratic. I think that they are just as democratic as, for instance, partisan parties. I think that they can legislate for the good of their members, the good of the trade unions, if they wish, because the members at large are invited to the meetings and also the executive, such as the executive of the political parties, also have a chance to legislate, to recommend certain things and pass certain resolutions.

But after having said this, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I agree with every single word that is in the main motion, I'm not talking about the amendment at this time. I have said this in the past and nothing has happened to change my mind. I agree with the first motion. I'm not talking about the amendment of the Member from Riel. I agree with this because I think in our system the vote is secret and it is every individual's own business and nobody else. This is no reflection on the union at all. I'm talking about the principle that your vote is your own affair. I do not agree with the Honourable Member for Elmwood who says that maybe he should have the guts to say who he votes for, or the courage. That is not anybody's business but your own, and if you want to say that you support a certain political party, it is your business. And we've always, in this democratic government, we've always defended the business of the free vote and we've done everything possible. We've bent over backwards to try to make sure that there's no coercion in the vote, and the Honourable Member for Elmwood was pretty close to suggesting that maybe there should in this instance be coercion; I say he was pretty close because he says what the unions find that this is the best way of doing it, and it's clear that it is the best way of doing it because if the members were left free to decide what they were going to do themselves a lot of them would not want to make a contribution to any political party. And I think that this is wrong.

Now he gives an example of the opting in, opting out, and I think they were not examples that should have been used. He talked about the Medicare, and the Medicare there's a different reason; you're opting in or out for one reason, because you want to know where you're going to get your money from, and I think that it is just the intention, it's not more of an opting-in, I think that the doctors have to say they are in or they are out, not only if they are out. And if they're out, if they want to get back in, they have to signify this also.

Then the honourable member mentioned the Book-of-the-Month Club. Well, he forgot to say that, first of all, you order these books and you sign a document saying that you are a member of the Book-of-the-Month Club, so you don't have to re-order every month; you just wait and the day that you don't want any books, or you want to quit, you tell them, "I am no

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) longer interested" and that's it. So those examples are not good at all.

I wanted to make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, what I believe in, because what I said is my own opinion. I believe this is the way it should be if at all possible and I agree with every word that has been said, but I will not vote in favour of this resolution, nor the amendment. I will not vote because I feel that we had a motion that just passed a few days ago, a motion that states that we will have a committee that will look at all these things to see what is right and what is wrong. — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon? I don't think -- you can accuse me of a lot of things but I don't think you can accuse me of that. — (Interjection) -- Yes, my honourable friend and colleague, we're partners in this dictionary and he's going to find out that word.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Only I paid for it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, we're partners, aren't we?

So Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that we have a motion now - not a motion; it's passed and I cannot debate this but I will give my reasons why I'm not supporting this at this time, that we have a committee that will look at all these things. Furthermore, what I said of the trade union and the unions and the secret vote and our system, to me is just as right when we talk about the people and the corporation and the shareholders, and it doesn't matter how much certain members can say, can point the finger at the unions, if they want to be sincere and honest with themselves they've got to say it's exactly the same thing when they talk about trade unions, and I'm very very surprised -- I think that the Member for Assiniboia I'm sure didn't mean what he said because on September 16th, when he brought his amendment, he made certain points. The first point that he made was that the NDP predominantly were in favour of a state and a union, and that the Conservatives were in favour of big business and corporations, but the Liberal was in favour of the individual and this is what counted the most. And then he proceeded to defeat his argument by some of the things he said, and he's waving his head and I'll show him why I say this.

He says, "Now, on the one hand . . ." this is on page 773 - "On the one hand it may be true that the executive of a corporation makes decisions on behalf of the shareholders, but on one hand these shareholders are probably more able people, more educated people," and I'd like to know why this should be mentioned. What difference does it make if they're more educated? And I question this. I question this. A lot of people that are working are also members of the union and they might have shares. There's nobody restricted from having shares, and to say, well, don't put them in the same class because they're more educated, they're more able people, I question that; and that has nothing to do with our system. If you respect somebody's right to a secret vote you respect everybody's right to a secret vote, and I think that this is wrong when you say this. And he says: "If they want to sell their shares, they may do so." What has that got to do with the right to preserve to yourself, to keep to yourself how you're going to vote, who you support? It has nothing to do with it at all.

And further on, the honourable member says, and I say that there's no similarity at all - he's talking about the union and the corporations - "What has a corporation got to do with a trade union in this province?" I say to the honourable member, nothing! But we're not discussing trade unions; we're discussing the right to secrecy, the right to vote, the right to keep to yourself who you're going to support. That's what we're discussing and it is exactly the same thing. — (Interjection) -- Oh, now that's another good point. He says, do two wrongs make a right? No, two wrongs don't make a right, but when we stand up in this House and say, "Protect this right; protect it," and when we say "We of a certain party are interested in the individual," that is certainly a wrong to make laws to hold down a certain group and say, well, you might be right, but two wrongs doesn't make a right so we'll let these fellows do what they want. These laws have to be, especially for somebody that states publicly, "I am interested in people." Well, I say to the honourable member; prove it, and enact legislation that will be the same for all the people, that we will not make one for the less educated, the less able people, and another one for the others. I don't believe in that at all, Mr. Speaker. It's true that he said this, what has a corporation got to do with this? "You know, if one is wrong, should we say then what's good for one is good for the other and the two of them may be wrong?" Well, I don't follow this line at all.

He mentioned something about the same individual that's depending on his bread and butter at that place, talking about working for the union, well, it's a little different when a man is

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) part of a corporation. That's right. Is it right that because one depends on . . . for his bread and butter that he should have a different say in the matter of his vote? Well, is it right then to say that one that doesn't depend on this should not be controlled the same way? How can the honourable member say the union members should not -- they should have a chance to vote. It's up to them to decide who they're going to vote for, who they're going to support, but then to say that somebody, because they have shares, it's not the same thing at all. It is practically ridiculous. You can have somebody that has . . .

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, would the member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I will.

MR. PATRICK: Can a shareholder -- what's stopping a shareholder from selling his shares in any corporation? Is there anything stopping him?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, not a thing.

MR. PATRICK: All right. Would you suggest, on the other hand, that an employee that works for any corporation, that he should, if he can't opt out he should quit his job. Is this what you're suggesting?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I'm not suggesting that at all. I am suggesting, I said that I agreed with every word that was said in the original motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, another subsequent question. But this is exactly why the employee's afraid because he's afraid of retaliation and this is the reason why he's afraid to opt out. Is this not true?

MR. DESJARDINS: I can't do the thinking for my honourable friend, not more than I can for the members of the union, and I don't care if he's afraid or if he's not afraid. This is not what I'm defending. I'm defending the right to a secret ballot. I'm defending the right for a person to decide if he's going to make public or keep it to himself as to what party that he supports. This is what I'm defending. You can't twist the things when you're talking about different people.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, one more question. Is my amendment not suggesting a secret ballot? This is what I'm suggesting by my amendment.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, if my honourable friend is suggesting a secret ballot then we'll come back to his amendment, but for one group only. That's the whole nature of my argument here this afternoon. He's restricting this to the trade unions and he's not saying anything about the people that have shares in different corporations.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, one more question.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my friend's questions are not really taking on the atmosphere of being argumentative debate . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I welcome these questions . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I know you do but I'm looking after the proceedings . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Member for St. Boniface might be allowed to . . .

MR. PATRICK: . . . perhaps the honourable member and maybe I'll agree with him, why doesn't he amend, make a sub-amendment to the amendment and maybe I'll agree with him. If you want to bring in the corporations I may agree. I'm sure you're intelligent enough to bring in a sub-amendment.

MR. DESJARDINS: I always thought the honourable member thought me intelligent and I'm pleased that he says so publicly, and I would like to say to my honourable friend that I will not bring in an amendment and I stated why; because I feel that we've already passed a resolution where it won't be a debate between he and I any more but a committee will study this question, exactly this. And with your permission, Mr. Speaker, because it has something to do with it, I'll read -- although it has been passed -- I'll read part, only part of this motion that was carried unanimously in this House: "That the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie be amended by deleting all the words after the word 'Whereas' . . . the cost of election for political parties and their candidates for public office is increasing; Whereas it is essential under a democratic system of government that there should be full and plain disclosure about the sources of funds by which election expenses are defrayed and about the practices followed in raising such funds; Whereas it is essential and logical that the financial affairs of public parties should be public knowledge; Be It Therefore Resolved . . ." and so on . . . "we set up a committee to look after this." So this is the only reason. I'm not going back on my word.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) .

I agree with what was said in the main motion but I would say, let's study it, let's deal, when we're dealing with the rights of individuals, let's deal with all the individuals, and to say that a man could sell his shares, that doesn't mean a thing. He's still entitled to the right. He can say the same thing; he could be afraid of maybe of advancement or something; he could be afraid and say, well, I'll let it go. If a man is willing to make a contribution, he makes it himself. Nobody else. Even if it's the union or a corporation. My point is we've got to treat everybody the same. Either we let it go the way it is, if we want to look at it - I know it's going to be hard to legislate on this but I certainly will not be party to a resolution that will just put the spotlight on something that might be wrong with one section of our community and forget about the other people and the only reason for that is that they might be a little more educated or more able, because I don't buy this at all, Mr. Speaker. So I hope I've answered my honourable friend. This is the reason why I will not support his amendment.

Now besides that, I said that I was in favour of the resolution but I'm certainly not in favour of the amendment at all. At all. Because he's expecting, he's asking for a referendum. What is a referendum? What is a referendum but a vote and then the majority will decide anyway, and I maintain that this right is the right of the individual, that he doesn't come as part and parcel of something. And if all the members here say, well, we want to support the NDP Party and we want to contribute, and I say no, I don't say that we're -- I'm part of this and I'm going to support the NDP Party because it is my decision to make, and if all the House decides we're going to support a certain party and if I say no, well it's "no" because this is my right. This is right and this is the fundamental of democracy, I think that this is the right thing; but I will not say it is the right of me if I'm a certain level, if I'm a working stiff running around with my lunch pail, but if I'm sitting down in a big office, and I have shares and so on, well then, I'm too smart; I'm going to make my own decision; it doesn't matter. Because this way we are - I don't know if we realize this - but we are talking in favour of certain parties, it would seem to me. And if we're just dealing with the rights of individuals, everybody's going to be treated the same.

Now I said that I wan't in favour of the amendment and this is the reason. We're asking for a referendum. Well, if we have a referendum, the fair way to have a referendum, why should they start to say: "Do you opt in? Why do you favour only the New Democratic Party? Why don't you say this is something that you do every year? We're going to decide now to let you have a chance to suggest who you want to support, which political party you want to support." And you might ask -- (Interjection) -- Well, you're taking it for granted that it's the New Democratic Party because I've never heard of any other parties being supported by the union in this forum so therefore you'd have to say 80 percent was a certain party, another five percent, and you'd have to do this if you want to do it right. -- (Interjection) -- You have what?

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): . . . men supporting me.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, they don't know you too well. That's because they thought you'd be the Speaker.

No, I have no doubt, I have no doubt that my honourable friend -- and I don't like this idea that a certain group will support only a certain party, and I hope that he has, and I hope that this party has some businessmen supporting them also because if this is not the case it's not going to be good for Manitoba and it's not going to be good for our citizens.

But then another thing; the member said, Well, if there's 80 percent, they'll take 80 percent of the money and give this to a party and then the other will go to charity. But if I don't want to support a union, am I going to be forced into a certain charity? The charity might be something that I don't believe in at all. It might be - yes, it might be for the Member for Swan River - so I think this is individual. I think that it is the individual's right and I think that if we're going to bring in things like this - and I agree with the member again - but I'm sure that he's not serious when he says this doesn't apply to other people, just to the people working that are in unions, because I cannot see where anybody has said anything that would make me believe that. And I think if we're going to bring this in, if we're going to bring things like this in the open, well let's bring it in the open and I wish that we - and I'm not suggesting that anybody has - but I hope that there's not going to be any hypocrisy here.

If we're going to look at this let's be ready. If we're going to have a committee that's going to look at kickbacks and is going to look at union dues, we're going to do it and we're going to do it the right way, and when somebody outside the House suggests that he's going to

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) sue the Premier because of the word "kickback", to me that's ridiculous. Call it what you want. These people are maybe a little too intelligent to have a real kickback but I say that the lawyer that said publicly that he's going to sue the First Minister, I say that very few, very few citizens of Manitoba received more - and I'm not suggesting he's in here . . . earn it, but received more from the former government than this gentleman. And I'm also saying that very few, if any, gave more to this party, I'm sure. Is that kickback? It's absolutely right. And I'm not suggesting that it's wrong, but let's study all these things. Let's not play on words. I happen to think it's going to be one of the problems I think it's going to be very very difficult to come in with something perfect. Maybe the only way if we do this would be equal time, equal money for the different parties, and maybe the taxpayers will have to give a certain amount to all the parties. That might be the only decent way of doing it. It might be the only decent way, because we can argue so many things. Well, I'm ready to listen, I'm ready to listen, and I say that technically I agree, or in principle I agree with the motion, not with the amendment but with the motion of the Honourable Member from Riel, but I say to him, that's 50 percent of it. Take the word "union" out and leave it for all the people and I'll support you 100 percent. And as I said that technically -- I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that you've erred in letting this motion go. This is not the point at all. But we've already accepted another amendment and I think technically this is out of order. We're not going to decide something, just take a little group, put the spotlight on it and decide what we're going to do with unions, and then have a committee that'll study the whole question. This would be ridiculous. So although I wanted to say openly that I agree with these words, I think that's only half of it. I will not support it because I think there's only one way we're going to get to the bottom of this, one way that we're going to be fair with everybody, one way that we're going to respect all the individuals in Manitoba, and that is to let this committee study this question once and for all. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: It's a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. It's regarding Hansard and the copy that came out. It's relating to Monday; it's No. 57 from 9:30 in the morning, and refers to a remark that was made from the Honourable Member from Radisson at the time when Mr. Spivak was speaking. Now I don't think it was intentional at all by any of the people who did the work . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Is this on this resolution or . . .

MR. HENDERSON: No it's not on the resolution.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well that should come before the Orders of the Day, shouldn't it, not in the middle of a debate?

MR. HENDERSON: If it's a point of privilege it can be raised at any time.

MR. DESJARDINS: About Hansard? I don't know what the honourable member's point of privilege is.

MR. BILTON: Maybe I could speak to the honourable member in this matter. It's his newness to the House and I don't think he realizes that he'll have another opportunity to speak of the matter that he's discussing.

MR. HENDERSON: I really don't know and I'm happy to take . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the honourable member will have an opportunity to have the matter attended to that he is complaining of. The Honourable Member for Riel has a question.

MR. CRAIK: Well I was going to ask the Member for St. Boniface if he would permit a question regarding his remarks. I think he has indicated he would. But the basic question is: does he not see any difference between an investor who invests his money . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Honourable Member for Riel - and I must draw this matter to the attention of honourable members - he is well aware what the rule is governing questions, and if he has a question calling for an explanation of some comment made by the honourable member which he misunderstood or did not hear, he is at liberty to ask such a question, but not an argumentative question.

MR. CRAIK: No, I don't think it's argumentative. We wouldn't argue.

MR. SPEAKER: Nor is he at liberty to suggest topics to the honourable member to enable him to make a second speech. The honourable member knows that the rules allow him to make only one speech.

MR. CRAIK: Would he not agree that there is a difference between donations on the basis as a condition of employment versus donations on the basis of some lesser return on his investment on a speculative basis, which is the difference between what this motion is, which deals with the human rights involved in employment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making a speech?

MR. CRAIK: Well it's not -- most of his speech dwelt on this and implied that they were directly analogous -- the investor and the employee. I am asking would he not agree that there is a difference between being an employee where his donation is a condition of employment unless he chooses otherwise, and an investor who puts his money some place speculating on a return?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all you should know that he could never pick an argument with me if he tried. You know me better than that. But in answer to his question, sure I agree. I certainly do agree that it's a little different, but the member has missed my point. I am talking about, what we are supposed to do now is the secrecy of the vote -- the ballot, for any reason. My honourable friend is suggesting that if a person opts out or doesn't want to give any donation, that he'll lose his job, and I'm not sure; this has not been proven. This has not been proven, and you might have on the same thing -- and I don't care about the reason. I don't think that you have to have a reason. This is my point. I don't think that you have to have a reason to say, "I'm not going to tell you who I'm going to vote for because this is my business, not yours, and it's not because I'm afraid that I'm going to get fired, it's because I don't want to tell you. It's none of your damn business." All right. Well if you agree, you've answered your question. Right?

MR. CRAIK: No, I'm asking you if there isn't a difference?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well you've answered your question. If you agree it is the right -- you might have a situation where I might work and I'm afraid, let's say that, if we can keep this, let this go on, that I'm contributing to the NDP, but then I've got shares in a certain corporation and the manager -- usually that's the way it's done, only the manager decides to send \$100.00 to the Conservative Party. I'm working against myself. I'm supporting with my wages, they're taxing me to support the NDP and then I'm taking -- some of the money from the corporation that I own is going to pay for the Conservatives, so the point is I want to be the one who is going to decide who I am going to support, who I am going to vote for, if I am going to make a contribution, how much it is going to be, and who I'm going to make it to.

This is all I want and I don't care if I'm doing it as a member of a union, or if I'm doing it as a shareholder in a company. It's still my right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the resolution proposed by the Member for Riel and the amendment proposed by the Member for Assiniboia, I must commend the Member from St. Boniface for his personal presentation in one aspect of the argument, but I think more pertinent perhaps is the remarks made by the Member from Riel the other day when he spoke on his own resolution, and he mentioned at that time, that, if I can recall his words correctly, "the flap that was put up on this side of the House had obviously indicated that the resolution had struck at the Achilles heel of the party on this side."

Now I must say that if the Achilles heel of the party is the protection of the individual rights, then I say certainly he has struck at the tendons in my ankle, and that I must say that this resolution, I feel, is the most insidious intrusion on the private rights of an individual to organize himself into a union to further his own economic interests and, if necessary, his own political interests. It is, I think, my position in this House that I like to take a position that is neither doctrinaire nor ideological and, as the members from the Liberal Party are so fond of saying, they sit in that part of the House which is neither too far to the right nor too far to the left, and I might point out to them that where I'm positioned in this House I am no further to the left than they are to the right. So, with this relatively undoctinaire approach, I would like to make a few points on the resolution.

I think that many of the analogies that so far have been presented to us are not particularly pertinent. It makes no difference really whether it's a member of a private corporation or a member of a union who wishes to in some way contribute to a political party. It is his right to do so as an individual, it is his right to do so as a member of an organization. What I think is most pertinent to this resolution is really what John Kenneth Galbraith has called the countervailing power. We have large corporations, we have large governments, and I think

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) we have large unions. If those unions feel that they must enter in some way into the political arena, it is their right to do so, just as it is the right of, say, International Nickel to support some other political party in this country.

The issue of union check-off came up in a slightly different form about 60 years ago in England. At that time a judgment was handed out by the Lords, and I wish to quote. I found the other day that one can quote for 39 1/2 minutes after a few preliminary remarks.) "In December 1909, the Law Lords emerged with what was afterwards known as the Osborne Judgment. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Service, they maintained, must not use its funds for political objects. It must not levy contributions from its members for the purpose of supporting the Labour Party."

That was the judgment in 1909 and I must admit the resolution before us today attempts by slightly different means of achieving the same purpose. And I think that the amendment really, I suppose, within the orders of the House, cannot alter that intention. And in relationship to the amendment, I would like to quote further from this book. The author points out that because of the Osborne Judgment, because of the attack of the Lords on the organized union movement, that the union men might have expected the Liberal Party to be roused to action, and the author says that the Osborne Judgment was expected to get action from the Liberals, "for here in this judgment, enhanced by the lordly city of legal hairs, was a heavy, brutal and unprincipled assault of capital upon labour, and the Liberals were traditionally the friends of labour. In fact, a considerable majority of trade unionists still voted for them at the polls, but it was all very strange. The Osborne Judgment did not send the Liberals into action. On the contrary, they seemed to avoid it as though the trade unions had fallen among thieves and they had no choice but to pass by on the other side." Well, I think that author, George Dangerfield-- and I should point out for the benefit of the one Liberal left, the title of the book is *The Strange Death of Liberal England*.

Now, I would not normally have spoken on this resolution. As I've said, I think it is an insidious attack on the right of private individuals to organize themselves for any purpose that they wish to, but a constituent of mine, several constituents, as a matter of fact, but not all of them directly contacted me, relative to a matter concerned with one of the major economic objectives of the Labour movement. And I must say that, because I see the resolution as an attack on the countervailing power provided by the Labour movement, that I really think, Mr. Speaker, the matter raised by the constituent must be mentioned by me and I believe too that it must be in order.

I think that the organized labour movement is designed to protect the individual worker from the attacks that may be levied on him by individuals who are not particularly in support of the working man, and I think that the unions, and to a certain extent some political parties, try to protect the employable people of this province from the results of the attitudes expressed by certain individuals representing the Chamber of Commerce before the Minimum Wages Board. And I must mention here an article in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of September 27th which reports a brief presented by one Henry Bloy, chairman of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of the Chamber's president Mr. David Rothstein. This presentation maintained - and I must confess a certain incredible disbelief when I read it - this brief maintained that people earning \$1.25 basically and in effect are people "incapable of competing on equal terms with able-bodied and mentally alert persons." Now that to me, Sir, is nothing short of another insidious attack on people who attempt to find an honest living in this city, and I think that the resolution as proposed here would perhaps prevent an individual like myself from standing up here and representing that constituent and that working person from this kind of insinuation on their character and mentality, and I must say, Sir, that I resent it. I resent it almost as much as I resented the medical care premium that was put into force by the previous government, a medical care premium which I tell you now reduced some people who had made their contribution to this province and to this country, to the state where they had to live on bread and soup, and I visited many constituents who were on that diet as a result of the onerous, unjust, unbearable premium imposed by the Conservative Government that was last in office. And I think Mr. Speaker, that I must, out of compassion and not out of dogma, reject this resolution for what I have already called it, and with that I would like to conclude by saying that I think it is beneath contempt and certainly I'll vote against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. TURNBULL: . . . not provocative.

MR. EINARSON: Well Mr. Speaker, in view of the comment that the speaker just made, does he really think that the difference of \$100.00 that they are not paying, as a family paying towards Medicare, is going to improve his bread and soup that much better?

MR. TURNBULL: I tell you that I met many constituents in that position, and my constituency, I tell you now, is not one that is considered to be in an area that is somewhat deprived in Manitoba. It is, according to Shaun Herron and I am sure you would accept his opinion, a middle-class enclave, but there are people there who have been retired for ten years who were literally reduced to the point where they were going to have to give up their home and seek some kind of second-rate accommodation because of the medical care premium imposed by you people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: . . . permit a question, and it won't be on Medicare? Does the honourable member see anything in the resolution that actually restricts the democratic right of the union member, or in fact the union itself?

MR. TURNBULL: I think I have dealt with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that 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 Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Member for Souris-Killarney, could we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, but if anyone else wants to speak at this time it is quite all right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to at this time make a few brief comments on the resolution and the amendment. I realize that I must speak to the amendment. However, I'd just like to comment that the amendment does not negate in any way matters introduced in the main resolution; it simply elaborates on the particular resolution.

The resolution and the amendment both confirm the conviction that the monarchical form of government that we have now in the province is at the moment the best that we can have. This form of government of course has evolved over the many years to the position it takes today from a position that the monarch held, one of strength and one of control. I for one don't of course, believe in the divine right of the ruler, but I am prepared to support both the amendment and the resolution because I think that the monarchical form of government as we have it has some historical and practical value.

The BNA Act, as we have it today, is not all-inclusive and certainly should not be considered as a written constitution for any country. I think that the BNA Act, as is well known, leaves many items which fall in the areas of constitutional matters to the discretion of people in government and especially that of the ruling monarch, or his or her representatives. I think it's befitting that the head of a country, be it head in terms of government or a figurative head, be a man or a woman. I think that a good number of critics have suggested that the present form of government for some reason ought to be changed. I'd like to say that I'm not opposed at all to looking at possible changes but I question sometimes the motives for which people want to make these certain changes.

Changes are not inevitable and certainly can be constructive. We have examples of changes in this particular respect in several countries within the Commonwealth. We have Rhodesia and India for two examples; I believe South Africa as well, who do not recognize the Queen as the sovereign monarch of their country but they state clearly their positions and state why. If we are to make changes, I believe that changes should be made with the natural process of evolution. I think to make changes by removing what is here today, is not constructive if it is not made by introducing something in its place. I think that the evolution is fine if it is replaced by something that is more satisfactory, and I for one do not quarrel with methods

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) or introduction of new systems. I am all for looking at progressive measures.

There's another matter, however, that is introduced in the amendment, and that is the matter of bilingualism and multi-culturalism, a matter which to me is very interesting. I, like many others, believe that bilingualism as legislated by the Federal Government in the recent while, is a progressive and constructive step for Canadians. Unfortunately, I cannot agree that it is desirable to have such things legislated. It's unfortunate that this kind of thing might be necessary. I'm happy to say, however, that I am optimistic that people today are much better disposed to learn about other cultures and to appreciate the value of other cultures. I want to compliment the member who introduced the resolution in stating not only French and English should be considered but that the mosaic, the number of other people of various racial origins, should be considered as well.

We are more appreciative today of cultural values because we have a greater understanding and a greater appreciation of the various groups. I think too that we are less suspicious, because of more understanding, of the motives involved in the introduction of legislation or matters which are inter-cultural. I detect in the amendment, however, a bit of - I wouldn't say an insult - however, an injury to the past government. I realize that there might be many matters with which I am not familiar and which might play an important role in formulating the amendment by the member who introduced it. I would like to say, however, that in the democratic system such as ours, our minority groups ought to be represented. I think our system of government provides for representation, not only of minority groups, but representation of different occupations, different professions, different walks of life, different regions, and not only of people but areas and things. If, in the past, the governments have not been responsive to certain minority groups, I think sometimes that these same minority groups are a little bit at fault. I think that minority groups ought to seek to influence government rather than at times dictate from a distance what government should do.

In becoming a member of this House, in attempting it the first time and in succeeding the second time, it was my objective to be of influence as much as I could in the direction that I thought a political party or even a government should go. There is a French saying which is attributed not only I think to French, I think that it holds true of many factors. The saying is: "Si nous voulons du Français, c'est a nous d'en mêtre." If one is to be represented in government, it is up to himself to make the effort to be represented.

There's another saying which I think is equally appropriate. That one says: "Les absents ont toujours tort." That is: "Those who are not represented are always at fault."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to terminate by saying that I'm quite prepared to support both the amendment and the resolution.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the last speaker, please? The last speaker suggested that maybe the motion wasn't quite - I don't know - he took the former government to task, or it wasn't quite fair for the former government or something to that effect, it was injurious; and I wonder if -- I hope that the member would not leave us with this. I would like him to point out in which way, because I happen to be the member that moved this resolution and I thought I had explained quite fully what I was after and that I wanted this to be kept above partisan politics, and I would like to see where I erred.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, maybe I read more into the amendment than there really is. Might I just comment in answer, and I'm not going around the question. I'd like to comment that several statements made by the present First Minister are quite favourable to minority groups and especially those of French origin, but in the amendment the specific mention of "under the present leadership" to me meant the present leadership but not the past, and if I misinterpreted your motive in wording it this way, I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, would the previous speaker submit to two questions? -- (Interjection) -- Can I have leave? I've been asked to ask the questions in French. I'll say them in French and in English.

Monsieur le président, ou serait la langue française ou la langue anglaise si ce n'était du pouvoir de législation? (Where could we stand, how will you preserve or assure the right of the other linguistic groups in our province without legislation?) That's the first question. And how would the English language be today in Manitoba without legislation if we look back at 1870?

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I might have been misunderstood when I made those comments with reference to legislation. I'm saying that it's unfortunate that matters of this kind don't simply evolve. It's unfortunate that we don't somehow stimulate enough interest in our population so that, for example, the non-French become very interested in learning French for its cultural value rather than for political reasons, and that's why I say, Sir, that although I might recognize the necessity of the legislation, I at the same time feel it's a bit regrettable that we have to have legislation.

MR. D ESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit another question? I imagine Mr. Speaker, that in answer to my question the honourable member was referring to the third "Whereas" where I say "and Whereas the present government of Manitoba, by announcing . . ." Well, would my honourable friend then indicate if he read the original motion of his Leader who stated in his third "Whereas", "And whereas the present government of Manitoba, by announcing . . ." and would you please read the rest?

MR. GIRARD: I'm sorry. I had not concentrated on the -- I was speaking to the amendment so therefore I had neglected the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party, as amended. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is not in the House. May we have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest and approval to the comments that were made by the Honourable Member for The Pas in connection with this resolution. His suggestions regarding the problems involved in the education of the culturally different, which was a term he preferred to use rather than the culturally deprived, have merit. The elimination of the IQ test, the establishment of a university program on Indian Education, the revision of history textbooks, the recruitment of teachers from minority groups, the involvement of parents in the educational process, these specific proposals are certainly worthy of further study and in this regard the member's suggested amendment calling for an investigation of methods with which the problems of the culturally different can be more directly dealt with than in the existing system, is certainly in order.

However, this amendment, worthy as it is in its own context, misdirects what I feel to be the real intention of the original resolution. Indeed, the honourable member indicated already that his remarks that he was making were not clear as to what the resolution and even my previous comments on the subject set out to accomplish. So, in the very brief time that's left to me this afternoon, I would like to clarify what I feel is probably the single greatest problem in our educational system today.

In Winnipeg there are some 25,000 citizens of Indian-Metis descent, that is in Greater Winnipeg. This substantial minority group, which is approximately one in twenty in the city's population, exists for the most part in situations that border on slum conditions at best, and although I accept the honourable member's preference for the term "culturally different" there must be surely agreement that these people are deprived, if not culturally, deprived in housing, deprived in clothing, deprived in health care, and in some cases deprived of rights and fundamental freedoms and dignity by the discrimination of the community at large. Integral to this deplorable situation is the lack of adequate educational system - for it really is education that I feel can provide today the most effective tool to combat this social problem in the future.

Now, the increasing numbers of this group in Winnipeg in the next few years could easily reach a one in ten population ratio, which is a ratio that many of you are familiar with exists in the United States, and Winnipeg has really truly become the largest reserve in North America. And it's not out of place to suggest that the incidence of crime and violence incurred in such unattended circumstances of the dispossessed will rise proportionately with their numbers, and certainly our situation is nowhere near as critical as the American one but it is comparable, and we should feel no reassurance in the fact that we do not share the American extremes. The fact is that we do have as potentially a dangerous a problem here in Greater Winnipeg, and the educational system, as I mentioned, is one of the most effective instruments that government can employ to reduce the dimensions of this already serious social situation.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) And certainly further study, as the amendment suggested, is needed but there are, I believe, known methods capable of coping with this problem and more-over capable of beginning to cope with it effectively and immediately; that is, while longer range studies are conducted.

Let me comment briefly on some things that could be done in Winnipeg. The idea of an experimental school need not and should not, for reasons I'll mention later, be run along the lines of the present residential school operations. There are, however, physical plants in the core area - that is between Main Street and Arlington, between Portage and the north end - which with some modifications could be adapted to handle children from pre-nursery age through the junior high level in a specialized educational program. The emphasis would be on language arts, mathematics and Indian and Metis history, and the ultimate goal would be to enable the child, by the time he reached the seventh grade, to demonstrate an ability to communicate verbally, to read and write and calculate with a degree of proficiency which will allow his entry into the regular school system.

There should be stress on native cultural values, which could be taught by a comparative method, so that the child would gain an appreciation of his own culture and where it is reinforced by or reinforces other cultures of the society. A vocabulary build-up would be emphasized, perhaps through what is referred to as a "grocery store technique" with which many of you, I'm sure, are familiar, whereby a child will learn to identify numerous objects brought into the classrooms which would never appear in most of the dispossessed households. The stress on the elements of language arts, mathematics and Indian history should place the native child on a par with other children at the seventh grade level although he did not experience a regular, middle class, Anglo Saxon-oriented elementary school program. Then, upon entering the regular school system at the junior high level, he would have the necessary skill to study with any child in the system.

Now, along with the academic aspects of his education, there should be a concentrated attempt to teach a handicraft program in the experimental schools. There are three main reasons for this program. Firstly, there would be a carry-over of handicraft skills into the vocational school system. The highly dexterous labour force and tremendous contribution to Japanese economic society in electronics and other items that could be referred to, serve as an example. Secondly, a handicraft program would encourage the revival of Indian art and artifacts which in turn would generate an active pride in the system, and this undoubtedly would be a great social gain. And thirdly, a handicraft program could be used as a vehicle to reinforce the teaching of language and mathematics skills. The combination of specialized academic and handicraft sections would comprise the educational aspect of the experimental schools, but in addition to the learning environment, it would probably be necessary to provide meals, clothing and in some cases even roofs for the children in order that they are able to take full advantage of the school. It might even prove necessary and desirable to attach cottage industries to these schools to provide work for the mothers while the children are in school, and naturally this entire program would involve great subsidization. But is it not better to subsidize in such a positive way than to subsidize through welfare?

Let me now turn to the situation on the reserves themselves and make one simple recommendation as to a possible direction for a different approach to native education. It seems to me that a couple of occupational workshops could be established on each reserve, where welding, carpentry and masonry could be taught. I mentioned last night that I believe that the problems of the native people and their involvement, the native children, their training and their skills, should be something that should come up before the Standing Committee on Economic Development and I insist again that this is something that is worthy of consideration, and one of the items I am mentioning should be considered along these lines. The students could be moved, not into residential schools, which past experience has shown to be unsatisfactory, but into other Indian families similar to an exchange program except the government would pay board and room costs to the host family, so if a boy wanted to take welding and it was not taught on his reserve, he could move to another reserve to study while remaining within the Indian community.

In a very brief form I have attempted to clarify what I believe was the intention of the resolution of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The nature of the experimental system of which I speak would not have to be restricted to Indian and Metis children but to any children from the hard core dispossessed areas of the city. Some of these suggestions are

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) radical in nature, many of them are expensive in cost. All, however, are feasible recommendations, capable I believe of providing immediate direction in the specific critical problems of educating the dispossessed, or deprived - whichever you prefer - which in turn could effectively lead to the alleviation of the increasingly serious social problem.

I believe that the original resolution is worthy of support. I believe that the amendment is also worthy of support, but I suggest as well, whether we support this resolution and show our affirmation of the principles involved, that the government must act now, for this problem is upon us and I suggest is one of the main, if not the main problem that we have to deal with in our society today.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I would just like to ask the last speaker a question, if he wouldn't mind. I didn't hear all of it, but I heard enough of it. Was that not more doctrinaire than practical?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants me to try and present a doctrinaire philosophy I will. No. This is a very practical thing. I have referred to very practical situations and I think that any of the honourable members who have not had the opportunity of travelling through the area and examining the situation that now exists in the core of Greater Winnipeg should do so, and if they feel that the suggestions that are coming from this side are doctrinaire, they are mistaken. They are very practical. They deal with the very immediate problem that is facing us and which must be identified and brought forward so that there in fact can be solutions undertaken.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BEARD: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in rising at this time to close the debate on the resolution, I would intend to review briefly the reasons for introducing this resolution and also to comment in equally brief form on the contributions that were made to the debate by the Honourable Member from Kildonan and also the Honourable Member from The Pas.

It was explained at the time of the introduction that the reason for introducing the resolution was simply and very briefly that technology has out-paced the law in the protection of the rights of individuals in our society, that it has come about that electronic surveillance has reached such a degree of perfection and the devices that are offered are so easily available and so easily operated, that the rights of the individual are being seriously encroached upon. We are considering really a basic human right and, as such, I thought in the beginning that there might be some common enthusiasm in the Legislature for this kind of legislation and I feel that from the comments that have been made, although they have been somewhat brief, that there is indeed a general approval of the intent. The basic human right that concerns us has been defined by Louis Brandeis, the late Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, as the right of the individual to determine to what extent his thoughts, sentiments and emotions shall be communicated to others.

In asking the government to consider the enactment of legislation in this field, there is only one real concern and that would be the danger perhaps of providing a protective umbrella for those individuals in our society who are bent on operations which are outside the law. I would feel that in our zeal for protecting the rights of the individual, protecting his privacy, that we must have care for the need of law enforcement in the area of crime detection. So, with this reservation, we must ensure that the right to invade, the right to use electronic surveillance for purposes of law enforcement, would be still available to those enforcement agencies, but that the decision to use or not to use would have to be carefully guarded and perhaps should be the function of the Attorney-General in the province and the federal Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable member at this point. It is now 5:30 and perhaps he could conclude his remarks when this matter next appears on the Order Paper.

MR. PAULLEY: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, that the House do now adjourn until 8:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Tuesday night.