

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 19, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act. (Second Reading Wednesday next) (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Burrows) introduced Bill No. 16, an Act to amend The Government Purchases Act; and Bill No. 25, an Act to repeal Certain Acts relating to Certain Corporations.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan) introduced Bill No. 28, an Act to amend The St. James-Assiniboia Charter. (Second Reading Wednesday next)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table the following annual reports: The Milk Control Board of Manitoba for the year ending September 30, 1970; The Manitoba Agricultural Credit and Development Corporation for the year ended March 31, 1970; The Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the year ending March 1970; The Co-operative and Credit Union Services Branch which includes the report of the Co-operative Promotion Board for the year ended March 31, 1970.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder -- on Page 3 there are listed several Orders for Return which were to be presented today. I wonder if you've overlooked those Orders for Return or was it not your intention to proceed with them today?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I believe, Mr. Speaker, the procedure is that we go through Orders of the Day first and then Orders for Return; and if I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Manitoba Labor-Management Review Committee for the calendar year 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question that I'd like to ask the Minister of Health and Social Development, and the question is: can the Minister confirm that the son of Mr. Blackburn, the Chief Officer of the Auto Insurance Corporation, whose salary is in the neighbourhood of \$25,000, has applied for welfare assistance?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare can investigate this matter and report further to the House.

MR. TOUPIN: I'll take your question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to table a reply to an Order for Return of the House No. 32, dated June 12, 1970, on the motion of the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie. The information was provided to all parties some time ago but under the new rule of the House, Rule No. 101, I am required to file this Return at this time.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. What is the role of Dr. Tulchinsky within the Department of Health and Social Development?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the role of Dr. Ted Tulchinsky is a part-time special consultant to the Minister of Health and Social Development. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to attempt to answer a question that was asked of me the other day by the

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.) Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The question that was asked was pertaining to the Health Resources' program and what part of the federal grants that would be affected by the six months' hoist placed by the Provincial Government. I can inform the honourable member that no funds from the Federal Government are in jeopardy because of the hoist.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. That previous question had been asked by the Member from Riel, I believe. Is Dr. Tulchinsky employed within the Civil Service Act, or outside it?

MR. TOUPIN: Dr. Tulchinsky is a special Consultant. He's not a civil . . .

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I'd like to direct my question, if I may, to the Minister of Railways. I wonder, with the current takeover of the Swan River-The Pas Winnipeg Transportation Company by the Canadian National Railways, will the Minister advise the House if this means early rail abandonment between Dauphin, Swan River and Hudson Bay Junction in favour of the Saskatchewan route from Dauphin?

MR. PAULLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I'll be glad to look into the matter raised by my honourable friend, and may I suggest to him that there is no Minister of Railroads. I am the Commissioner of Railways for Manitoba.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary to the Honourable the Commissioner of Railways. I wonder if, in the event of railway abandonment between Dauphin, Swan River and the Hudson Bay Junction, will the Minister advise what arrangements will be made to handle the grain now processed through the scores of elevators along that route, along with the transportation of livestock and pulpwood?

MR. PAULLEY: May I inform my honourable friend that I cannot answer hypothetical questions.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the federal Agricultural Committee's decision to include livestock in the compulsory marketing board, a category for interprovincial farm trade, does this government support the inclusion of livestock as a commodity in state-controlled marketing and production plans?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the government of Manitoba has made its position quite clear with the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture. On a couple of occasions, they have indicated to them that that type of legislation, which is merely umbrella legislation that allows for the establishment of marketing agencies, should not exempt any grouping from that all-embracing legislation.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I beg to direct a question to the Minister in charge of utilities. I'm wondering if there's going to be any sizeable work force in the Gillam area this coming summer, and can he give us some idea of what will be done on the development of further hydro facilities?

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, if I may -- I believe my honourable friend referred to the Minister in charge of utilities. There are various Ministers charged with the operation of the utilities. For instance, the First Minister is the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation in respect of telephones. The Honourable the First Minister unfortunately is ill and not here. I wonder if my honourable friend would defer his question, as I understood it to refer to Hydro, until the return of the First Minister.

MR. BEARD: I'll withdraw my question.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I have several questions for the Attorney-General. In view of statements quoted in today's Globe and Mail, statements apparently made by Premier Alexander Campbell of Prince Edward Island that the RCMP have files on every rock band on the continent, on every single cabinet minister in Canada, perhaps on every reporter, will the Attorney-General investigate and discover whether the Manitoba RCMP have such files? Secondly, if so, if they do have such files, upon whose information or upon whose instruction did the RCMP act to gather such information? And No. 3, what was the justification . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the member would submit a written question to the Minister. It's pretty lengthy for before Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) the Honourable the Minister of Education. Were any special reports requested or required from the Public Schools Finance Board by the Minister of Education during his term of office, under Section 13(3) of the Public Schools Finance Board?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest that this too was a question for an Order for Return because it's asking for statistical information which the Minister cannot have in his mind.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question's for the Attorney-General and further to the question that was not allowed by the Member from Wellington. I wonder if the Attorney-General can inform the House whether -- well, I'll frame it in another -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I'll frame it as a direct question. I think I have the floor. -- (Interjection) -- When the Speaker recognizes you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I would suggest that both gentlemen are out of order when they're starting to tell me what I should do. -- (interjections) -- Order. -- (Interjections) -- I cannot see that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, why he should want to pursue a question which may take a written reply if the first question was too lengthy. Unless this is brief and to the point, I would like to have him reconsider it. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Is he aware that the RCMP are investigating any member of this present Legislature?

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the RCMP maintain files on a great many subjects. I'm not aware of what those subjects might be in their entirety. I will certainly take the whole question as notice.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Will the members of the Opposition be included in the discussions with the Federal Government on CAE?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we have been endeavouring over the past several days, including all weekend, to arrange a meeting, a preliminary meeting with the responsible Ministers in Ottawa and the President of Air Canada. Our intention is to send a small governmental delegation initially, and we will see what happens thereafter. The answer to your question in brief then is: No, not at this time.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister realize that the First Minister indicated that the members representing St. James-Assiniboa might be included on those discussions?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the previous reply was that consideration would be given to this, and indeed this is being kept in mind and I'm merely talking about an early preliminary meeting which we are still attempting to arrange.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. I wonder whether he can inform the House as to whether there has been a discussion between himself, the members of the RCMP, or members of his staff, with respect to an investigation of any members of the Provincial Legislature.

MR. MACKLING: The answer is "no", Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister in charge of telephones. I'm not quite sure at this moment - is it the Honourable Minister of Tourism? The question is, has there been any change, or is a change being contemplated in the policy re private telephone extension lines in the rural areas, especially business people?

HON. PETER BURTNIK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, that problem has been discussed and at the moment there is no change anticipated. If I got your question correctly, the policy still remains the same except that I do realize that it is a costly proposition and it would not, I don't think, be accepted by the subscribers. I'm not sure if I answered your question correctly or not. Maybe you should repeat it and I'll try it again.

MR. FROESE: Well, if I may clarify my question. Private lines are very costly in rural Manitoba and this is the point that I'm making, whether . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the member making his question . . .

MR. FROESE: Will there be any change in policy? Is there any change contemplated that this might be reduced?

MR. BURTNIK: As I said before, this is something that we've looked at and I'm sure it's been looked at for many years, but at the present time there is no policy on that; it remains the same.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for the Department of Highways for the year 1969-70.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I'd like to give a brief flood situation report in the province. With regard to weather generally, the precipitation which has occurred in the past 24 hours over the Red and Assiniboine River basins ceased this morning but weather forecasts indicate more rainfall is likely within the next few days. It's anticipated that most of this precipitation will occur in the upper or west States portion of the Red River basin and this should not cause problems on the streams in Manitoba as the American portion of the basin has dried considerably over the past week.

Let me briefly refer to the three main river flows: The Red River, Pembina River and Assiniboine River. The Red River dropped approximately one foot over night at all stations above the Floodway inlet. Due to the run-off from the recent rain, the stage in Winnipeg has increased but it is not anticipated that there will be a significant increase in stage in the reach of the river above the Floodway inlet. It is anticipated that the rate of decline will be reduced due to the recent rains.

The Pembina River stage has remained constant over the past five days at the International Boundary but slight increase of flows are anticipated due to the recent precipitation, but no additional breakout is anticipated in the portion of the river between Walthalla and Niche. The other tributaries of the Red River showed slight increase in the past 24 hours but, again, it is not anticipated that flood stages will be reached.

On the Assiniboine River the stages on the main stem of the river continue to fall above Brandon. Increased stages were recorded below Brandon as a result of the precipitation and flows in the order of 10,000 cubic feet per second. So therefore, as a result of precipitation and increased flows, we'll see an increase at Portage within the next 24 hours towards Portage. However, with the operation of the Portage Diversion no flooding is expected in the reach of the river between Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, apparently the hiring of executive staff or the management consultants in this respect, a firm has been hired from Eastern Canada, and the question is this: Can the Minister - I guess it's the Minister of Municipal Affairs - can he tell this House why not a Winnipeg firm was hired instead of an eastern firm as far as the executive staff for the Government Insurance Corporation hiring was concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was certainly a question of policy as to the firm that would be hired. I am very pleased with the work of this particular firm because they meet all the necessary qualifications to do the work assigned to them.

MR. BARKMAN: A supplementary question. Will the Minister explain to this House why persons could apply for this job only through a Mr. O'Hearne in Toronto and not in Winnipeg at all.

MR. PAWLEY: I hear some braying across the way, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is the firm that -- I don't know whether I'm going to be permitted to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- Is it? Mr. Speaker, the firm in question and the reference to the name in question is a consulting firm which has been hired in order to do the consulting work for the Insurance Corporation. Their main office is in the City of Toronto. Applications have been received and many very good applications, may I advise the member in case he's concerned or worried about that aspect, from all across Canada, and they're being closely looked at insofar as these very few key positions are concerned.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does this mean that a comparative and satisfactory firm could not be found in Winnipeg?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that, from our efforts to obtain a proper consulting firm, that this firm met every requirement which we wished to be met. I'm not too certain as to whether we could have found some other particular firm somewhere else, but this firm met every possible requirement. I'm very pleased that their job and the demonstration of this will take place within the next few days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether the Minister can inform us

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) whether anyone has in fact been hired yet, through this firm's effort.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised at this question from the Leader of the Opposition. He knows, of course, that a number of people have been hired to date.

MR. SPIVAK: As a result of this firm's effort - a number of people have been hired as a result of this firm's efforts?

MR. PAWLEY: Individuals have been contacted as a result of this firm's effort. One or two of those, I understand, as a result of their efforts has led to their appointment. It is also my understanding that because of their efforts and work over the last week or two, that several others will be hired within the next week to ten days.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder whether the Minister will inform us whether they are going to be hiring in Regina, Saskatchewan.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . realize that Regina, Saskatchewan had become the Moscow of Canada.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. A list of all reports and studies commissioned by government, its boards, agencies, or commissions, to external consultants.
2. A list of all reports and studies undertaken within the government service since July 15th, 1969.
3. The number of preliminary and/or final reports and studies received in each category to date.
4. The number of reports and studies pending in each category to date. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd let this stand until Private Members' Day.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information relative to the operations of the Welfare Advisory Committee's Appeal Board.

1. The number of appeals it heard since July 15, 1969 to March 31, 1971.
2. The number of appeals it rejected since July 15, 1969 to March 31, 1971.
3. The number of appeals in which its decisions resulted in increased welfare payments.
4. The remuneration paid to the Committee Chairman and to each of its members.
5. The number of members on the committee in 1968, in 1969, and in 1970.

And, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I would like permission or leave to have this former Order for Return withdrawn that's over there on the other page.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return is acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. -- (Interjection) -- This is my error, I'm sorry. I should have introduced the Honourable Minister of Labour. Would you repeat your . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I don't know if this mike is working but anyway, what I want clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, the request of the Honourable Member for Pembina for the withdrawal of the previous Order for Return is agreed upon.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Could we have this matter and the next two items stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: That is, both for the Member for La Verendrye.

Second Reading - Government Bills. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): May I ask that this matter stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BURTONIAK: I ask that the matter stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the Honourable Minister of Finance. The

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. JORGENSEN: You said the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: In the absence of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I wonder if we could have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and if so, that permission be granted.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, I must remind you that if I do not introduce you your mikes are not on, so if you wish your comments to be recorded you'll just have to bear with me till I pronounce your honourable -- areas you come from. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd request that this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates, second reading. On the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Brandon West. (Bill 15)

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is one of the bills which the government side considers to have some urgency about it, and I would like in that respect to acknowledge the explanations of the Honourable the Attorney-General. He has indicated that he would appreciate expeditious treatment of the bill from this side of the House, and in his explanations he has told us that the net revenue which would accrue to the Province of Manitoba from the lotteries activities of the province would be credited to the public purse and would be used for the public purposes of Manitoba. He has also indicated, and the bill states, that when this Act comes into force it will be on a day fixed by proclamation but that Section 12 would be retroactive and will be deemed to have been in force on, from and after the first day of February, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the Attorney-General's explanations and to particularly that point in his remarks where he says, "We have exercised as quickly and as responsibly as we could, the authority that was delegated to us, and we have established a Lotteries Licencing Board and they now are hearing applications in respect to a very large number of organizations who wish to hold lotteries." It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if this Board has in fact been constituted, that the necessity for quick action on this bill, particularly as it affects the section relating to Lotteries Licencing Board, is somewhat superfluous. It would appear to me that the government has proceeded with the appointment of a Lotteries Board without the necessary enabling legislation having been passed, and I would very much appreciate if the Attorney-General, in his summing up, would explain this procedure to the House. It, in my view, is rather an important explanation because if this is the way in which other kinds of legislation and other appointments are to be done, then we are rather wasting our time in dealing with the legislation after the fact. The bill would also provide for the appointment of another commission and has already apparently provided for another board, so that in total the number of boards and commissions that have been established by this government is now increased, or will be shortly increased by one.

The intent of the bill is pretty clear. It's a way of obtaining additional revenue for the Province of Manitoba, a way of increasing the cash flow in our government activities. It would appear from the figures that have been given on the Centennial lotteries, which was held last year, that if this new adventure of the Government of Manitoba is at least equally successful that we will have a cash flow of approximately \$4 million, and I think for the Minister of Finance this would be a rather interesting and entirely useful exercise. If the lotteries were able to operate in the same efficient manner as we are told the Centennial Lottery did - and I'm sure it did - we would expect that about \$1.00 out of every \$5.00 that was taken in would be credited to the public revenues. I would hope that the government would be able to continue to operate at least as efficiently as the Centennial operation was able to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is really most interesting about this whole procedure on Bill 15 is that the members opposite were able to come to agreement, presumably, in caucus that this would be given expeditious treatment and that there would, I presume, be a refraining of the members opposite from participating in a lengthy debate. I think that must have been a very interesting caucus meeting and I could almost anticipate what might have been said by various members opposite, particularly those on the front bench who have made statements on their positions relative to lotteries in the past. There would be no doubt whatever, of

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) course, in how the Minister of Labour would feel about this matter. He would, I expect, have said something like this: "I don't believe in lotteries, period, as a matter of principle, and it doesn't matter a continental to me whether they're under the auspices of an agency, presumably of government, it doesn't matter to me the foundation of the lottery, I am opposed to lotteries and always have been as a matter of principle and conscience." So I hope that the Minister of Labour, even if he isn't going to give that speech again in this House, gave it at least at the caucus meeting on the other side.

I'm sorry that the Minister of Mines and Resources is not here this afternoon because I think I know where he stands and I think I know the kind of speech that he would have made at this caucus meeting.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister without Portfolio) (Elmwood): He's out at the race track.

MR. MCGILL: He would have said something like this: "I am principally opposed to this legislation because it pretends that taxation can be picked up in an easier way than on the basis of which taxation should be levelled, and that is the basis which was introduced in other bills in this Legislature. I'm just as opposed to raising money in this way, if not more so I think, than even the premium system which I have been so much against and which is such an insensible system of raising money. It's probably preferable to raising taxation by means of a lottery.

"Mr. Speaker, lest there be any misunderstanding . . ." - and this is the Minister of Mines and Resources - "this is my only reason for opposing this bill." He's speaking of the Centennial Lotteries Bill. "It constitutes a regressive form of taxation. It's the suggestion that there's an easier way of raising public revenue than by raising it on a sound basis, and it ultimately, Mr. Speaker, although it's thrown out as a one-shot deal, if it is successful in raising money it can lead any government, including a New Democratic Party Government or any other government, to say as well, we need some money; we'd like to raise it on a sound basis, but this is a painless way and let's do it this way." And I am continuing to quote from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. "Well, it's not a painless way, Mr. Speaker, and it's not a sensible way, and for that reason, because it represents in my opinion a regressive form of taxation, I am going to vote against the bill."

Mr. Chairman, I'm just supposing that these speeches were made again in caucus on Bill 15 and I'm hopeful that they'll be made again perhaps in this Legislature, but maybe it isn't possible, for, after having had a taste of honey, after having been hooked on the easy money bill of the Centennial Lottery, maybe principles do change a little bit.

I am rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance, who I see has left the Chamber, was not prepared to make some comments this afternoon. Here I see he has returned and I'm very pleased that he is here because I'm expecting that if he was in on the caucus meeting that arranged to give this bill fast passage, he would have said something like this:

"I want to make it clear that I reject any thought that monies raised by lottery or any other forms of that type should be used for the proper and normal provision of services to the people of Manitoba. I think that it should be raised by taxation in the proper way."

Mr. Speaker, this was the Minister of Finance in the debate on the Centennial Lottery on October 10th, 1969, but he is stating a principle which I presume still exists and which I presume he still supports, that he does not think that monies raised by lottery or any other form should be used for the proper and normal provisions of services to the people of Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, we have had a successful Centennial lottery. Everybody in Manitoba, or most people, seemed to enjoy it. Very few people objected to it on moral grounds and I'm one who must admit that I buy lottery tickets and I have certainly no objection to any kind of lottery on moral grounds, but, Mr. Speaker, I'm inclined to agree with those people who say that this is a form of taxation which weighs most heavily on the people who have the least ability to pay and that it is a regressive form of taxation.

I'm sorry that the First Minister is not here this afternoon because I know that he would have some thoughts about this and he did indicate some of his ideas at the time we debated the original Centennial Lotteries bill, and this is what the First Minister might have said at the caucus meeting opposite when they agreed to give this bill fast passage: "I realize full well that there are some in our society, indeed in this House, who are opposed in principle to the notion of lotteries being used for the purpose of raising revenue for public purposes, and I tend to agree with that position."

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has indicated that while he supported the fun and games idea of a Centennial Lotteries bill on a one-shot basis, he tended to agree with people who took the position that this was not a proper way for a government to raise money for public purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this Bill 15 is of such importance that it does deserve a full and complete inspection by all members of this House. We certainly want to know how everybody feels in this debate; we think it would be a mistake to allow passage of such a bill without hearing the opinions of people not only on this side of the House but on that side of the House, particularly those people who feel as strongly as the Minister of Labour does, the Minister of Mines and Resources does, that this is not a proper way of producing tax revenue for the Province of Manitoba.

I am most anxious to hear from the Minister of Finance because he has stated his principles in respect of this kind of taxation, and I think it is rather appropriate because the Minister of Finance has been indicating to the Honourable Edgar J. Benson what his positions are with respect to the federal taxation programs, and since the Minister of Finance has been kind enough to give me a copy of his letter addressed to the federal Minister of Finance, I think it would be in order for me to quote from the first paragraph. He says: "Dear Mr. Benson: Since the scheduled meeting of Finance Ministers did not take place, I am writing to express deep concern about the forthcoming federal tax legislation which I now understand will be introduced in the House of Commons some time at the end of April or the beginning of May. Recent Federal Government statements appear to place little emphasis on the removal of present regressive features and the need for equity and fairness in our new tax system based on ability to pay."

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance feels that lotteries are regressive, if it's a tax falling heavily on those people who are least able to pay, then I think he first needs to consider that which is going on in his own House before he decides to give advice to the federal Department of Revenue.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I sincerely suggest that we have a full and complete debate of Bill No. 15, the Lotteries Bill. I hope that we will hear from all members opposite, that they will not sit quietly by. They were able and interested enough to take part in the Centennial Lottery debate. We're anxious to hear from them now; we're anxious to hear from the Minister of Labour, from the Minister of Finance, from the Minister of Mines and Resources. Mr. Speaker, let the debate proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney General will be closing debate.

MR. MACKLING: Well I just wanted to ask a question first, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. MACKLING: I just wondered if the honourable member would yield to a question. Will he not yield to a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for Brandon West yield to a question?

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll accept a question from the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: After having spoken for some time, would you now indicate whether you're supporting or not supporting the bill?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking for my position on the matter. The bill, as it's now constituted, I propose not to support.

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

MR. BILTON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Russell, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Bill No. 13)

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I have no objection to the matter standing in the name of the honourable member, but may I respectfully ask that if any other member of the Assembly desires to speak on the bill that that be agreed upon?

MR. PAULLEY: Okay? Agreed?

MRS. TRUEMAN: I have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak but briefly on this bill out of a concern for the urgency that has been indicated by the government that this bill receive early passage by the House. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the intent of the bill is very clear; it is not a very difficult bill to understand. In essence it provides for an increase in financial support long promised and indicated. It was promised last year and, of course, there were promising slogans in the previous administration for many, many years. This government has seen fit as quickly as possible at this session, which was postponed at the urgency of those who insisted there be the by-elections before we went into another Session, and as a result this legislation, necessary in order that the financial arrangements can be confirmed with the municipalities and the school districts, is now before the House.

Mr. Speaker, the government House Leader, the Premier I believe has indicated, certainly the Minister has indicated the urgency of bringing this legislation into third reading and passage by the House in order that those who are awaiting the confirmation of the financial arrangements here will not be frustrated in setting their budgets and getting on with the job of allocating funds in accordance with the new structuring provided by this bill. Now I urge honourable members of the Opposition to recognize that continued delay in the passage of this bill on the basis of a concern only that they reflect further on it, surely might be construed as an attempt to frustrate the government's eagerness that these monies be advanced to the school districts so that the local governments can establish their budgets quickly. It has been indicated that it is imperative that this House deal with this legislation quickly, and I recognize that we are asking for the co-operation of the House but I think that has been the precedent and practice of the House in the past and, Mr. Speaker, I think this government has the right to expect that Her Majesty's loyal Opposition will recognize the same standards that have applied in the past during the history of this House, and proceed with the consideration of this legislation, essentially simple in nature but very very important to the other governments that are involved in the financing of education in this province. It's a matter of crucial importance and I urge that the honourable members give early consideration and agree either to speak or pass this bill without further delay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to enter the debate until I heard the remarks -- (Interjection) -- I have not spoken on this matter. I have not spoken on this bill as far as I know. Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Minister of Education . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the Leader of the Official Opposition spoke on this Friday after the Minister of Labour interceded in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll have to confer with -- Order please -- confer with the Clerk on Votes and Proceedings. I'm informed that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has not spoken. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise because of the remarks made by the Attorney-General. I was not intending to enter the debate at this time although I had intended to enter the debate. I think that I owe an explanation through you, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite and to the people of Manitoba in connection with the remarks that have been made. We come here in sessions to review the spending of the government notwithstanding any promises that were made either prior to the session or during the heat of an election. The truth of the matter is that we have a responsibility to operate properly and deal with the matters before us. I recognize the urgency. I'm also aware of the fact that the Minister of Education has already written the school boards and municipalities indicating that the passage would likely take place before April 30th, and has asked them to in fact not strike their mill rate until this has taken place, or at least to hold it until this bill has been approved one way or the other.

Now, we recognize the urgency of this. We also recognize the necessity of debating this properly. The fact that this is one of a series of eight bills that were referred to us as being urgent by the Minister of Finance prior to their being introduced in the House, or just at the time of introduction, has meant that we have had to examine this as best we can to review the way in which we would proceed in order to try and expedite the matter and to in fact assist the government, along with the execution of our responsibilities. But for the Attorney-General, because of the suggestion or even the implication that the Opposition are in any way delaying,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) may I say this to you, that the chairman of our caucus who happens to be involved in education, happens to be the Member from Emerson, has been absent for the past week and has returned for the first time today. This matter will be discussed by our caucus committee and we will deal with it at that time. We have already had one member, the former Minister of Education, who has entered the debate, and it is our intention to give this the scrutiny that's required.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer back to the Hansards of the year 1966-1967 when the then Member of West Kildonan, in opposition, dealing with the Foundation Program expressed particular concern about the speed, in fact the timing - more importantly the timing - as to when this matter was being discussed. He suggested to discuss this at March 15th was a mistake; it should be discussed at the early part of the year, January 15th or possibly February.

Now, the suggestion of the government that delay in the calling of this session was because of the by-elections, is inconsistent with the statements that were made by the Premier who indicated that he was calling the session and that the by-elections were not a factor. Now, for whatever reasons the government made their decision, whatever reasons the government made their decision to not call the session in the normal period in March is their own, but to implicate the by-elections as being the reason and to now put the additional pressure on this side to deal expeditiously without due debate, is wrong and incorrect.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Foundation principle was a principle introduced by the Progressive-Conservative Party. We're not going to quarrel with that; we welcome that opportunity. But it is better - and again I have to refer to the Member from West Kildonan, or at least the Minister when he was Member for West Kildonan - to indicate it would be better to deal with this when we have the estimates in front of us - this was the position that he mentioned at the time - so that we in effect can deal with the problems of education in dealing with this specific matter, because, Mr. Speaker, it's not just the Foundation Program, it is the matter of the whole financing of education and as to whether in fact we have now reached the point where there should not be serious discussions as to whether it should be taken off the real estate and placed on the Consolidated Fund in another way. And in addition, Mr. Speaker, we have had references to the problem of aid to separate schools. This matter is not resolved. This matter requires additional financing, and I do not think that we can deal with this matter in its entirety without dealing with the whole question of aid to separate schools.

So I suggest to the Honourable Attorney-General that it's our intention, once our caucus committee have met under our chairman who is now back for the first time, and once we have had an opportunity to listen to the people who are involved and to try and receive from them whatever opinions and advice they can give to us, to deal with this as expeditiously as we can in the proper manner, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, I would resent any suggestion at all that this side in any way is delaying something that we know has to . . . -- (Interjection) -- Beg your pardon? You're suggesting we're delaying? Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to you, Mr. Speaker. If the government on the other side thinks that all that is required by the government is to meet and to push through those things that they think are important through some form of rapid passage, then we might as well give up; we might as well allow them to operate without in any way any reference to this side or to this House. It ill behoves the Minister of Education who, several years ago, said specifically that we should not deal with the Foundation Program unless we have the estimates, to suggest to this side that we should be dealing with this matter before the estimates are before us. I suggest to you that the inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, on this particular matter is no different than the inconsistency on the Lottery Act. What we have here is a situation -- it's one thing when you're on this side, it's another thing when you're on the other side. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I know. Let's understand something. That's very interesting, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Education says that if we pass this, this will never happen again. And do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because they've provided in the act for regulations which now can be enacted by the government without direct access to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, this is also one of the principles we want to be concerned about. Are we prepared at this time to allow the government to be given that opportunity to be able to deal with this matter without coming before the Legislature? Surely one fundamental principle evolved through the traditions that we have carried on, and that is the right of this Legislature to deal adequately with the manner in which money is to be allocated out of the Consolidated

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) Fund and which money is to be charged and taxes are to be raised, and in effect the imposition of the Foundation Program, with reference to the 25 per cent, is a tax that will be raised by the municipalities on the real estate assessment for the over-all carrying out of the education program. And, Mr. Speaker, at this point I'm not sure that we are going to be prepared. I'm not suggesting that we're not going to do this but I'm not sure that we're going to be prepared at this time to give the government that carte blanche by allowing the regulations so that the Minister of Education would be right, that it would not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, rapid passage, which is what the honourable members opposite are asking for, whose passage in which the Opposition is prepared to waive its right of debate, we are not

. . .

SOME MEMBERS: Oh no!

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the normal practice has been for bills to have stood during the Speech from the Throne to allow the Throne Speech to continue. I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of members on our side who have not spoken, who have asked and hope that they'll have an opportunity of speaking on the Speech from the Throne, and have every right to expect that. The truth of the matter is this, that in normal practices this is not debated or these matters are not brought up until the Speech from the Throne has been completed, and I suggest to you that there has been an attempt for rapid passage on the part of the government. We have no intention of doing this. We are going to deal with this in a proper manner and, once we've arrived at a conclusion and once we have listened to the people who are concerned and who have arrived at the decision, we will present our position and at that time the Member from Emerson, who is the chairman of our caucus committee, will in fact make that presentation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask a question of the Leader of the Opposition? What was the date of the speech by the Minister of Education back in '66, and when was the bill passed? When did it pass second reading?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'm not sure of the exact debate -- the exact passage of the bill, but I have April 18, 1967.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, one could almost see the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition gearing himself to make this defensive speech which he has just made, bringing in, as he did, the question of separate schools, the question of the entire problem of the financing of education, dealing with the whole formula, appearing almost to be challenging the very Foundation Program itself in formula by suggesting that it be reviewed; and I don't know whether the Opposition is prepared now to withhold the granting of an additional share of the Foundation levy cost by the Provincial Government in order to launch into a full scale debate. There isn't the slightest question in the world that there are many occasions, during this coming session, when we will and should discuss the entire question of the financing of education and where the burden shall fall. The Leader of the Opposition and his group and his chairman, who are studying the question of education, will find a great deal of valuable and worthwhile research material in the speeches by members of this party in opposition, so he doesn't have far to look in order to be able to intelligently propose principles and policies relating to the cost of education.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to take this bill in its own context and, if there are points within the bill which the Opposition objects to such as one of the features raised by the Leader of the Opposition, then this of course is the time to discuss it, but I don't really see that it's necessary to use this bill as the bill under which to discuss all the principles of financing the cost of education, all of the questions as to whether or not there should be contributions to education outside of the public school system or not.

Now, of course, it is possible to discuss it under this bill, but I'm wondering whether this is the only occasion that the Opposition will have. The Leader of the Opposition has been around long enough to learn some things, amongst which are the fact that there will be other occasions. Especially under the estimates will there be every opportunity, and the Leader of the Opposition may not know it but I'll tell him, if he doesn't know it, that when one deals with estimates he can speak more than once on the same question, and now that he knows that, then surely he can recognize that there is a question of timing that is involved.

Now, the question of when the timing should be, is one that all members of this House

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) must consider. The fact is that until this bill is dealt with, the school boards throughout Manitoba, other than those that are not under the unitary system, are unable to complete their final budgeting and it is impossible for the municipalities to set their mill rates - this to me is rather clear - and the fact that the billing may be delayed will not affect the budget of the province or the government of Manitoba but it would affect the budgets of the various municipalities and school boards. It was indicated to us that delays in sending out bills - it's happened before - are costly in terms of the financing, the temporary cash financing that takes place within each municipal government, and the fact that the City of Winnipeg has estimated a figure of a very large amount, or over-all, I was just trying to confirm the amount and I'm told it was quoted at over \$50,000 a week, which is a fantastic sum of money and which I admit surprises me. I didn't think it was that high. But that is a tremendous sum of money and I think that if we can save it we should make the effort.

Now to me it means passage of certain bills, which I discussed with the Leader of the Opposition, I think it was a week ago today, at which time I gave him copies of the bills and indicated why we felt that certain of the bills were urgent (and I thought non-contentious) because I really didn't believe that the Opposition would be opposed to increasing the formula from 70-30 to 75-25. As I say, there may be certain details within the bill that should be reviewed, and I think that should be done, but other than that, the principle itself I don't think is one -- I didn't think was one that would be contentious, but to the extent that I'm wrong, then I wonder at what the Leader of the Opposition said when he said that he wants that we should listen to the people involved. And again I would have thought that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would know that the opportunity for this House, or members of this House, to listen to the people involved is when it reaches the level of the committee, Law Amendments' review, after second reading. That's when the people involved have the opportunity to come to speak to us, or those of us who are on the committee. They certainly can't come into this House and they will be barred from being able to speak to us until after this bill passes second reading, so I think that if the honourable member is anxious that we all have an opportunity to hear from the people involved, then surely that too can be expedited by moving into that area - that is into the area of committee where it can be heard and where an across-the-table discussion can take place to discuss the areas in the bill which are questionable. Certainly one can't do it very much this way because now the Leader of the Opposition is denied the opportunity to debate this again on second reading, as am I, and he is now anxious to interrupt me, and I'll give him the courtesy of doing that.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance would indicate: why don't we eliminate second reading completely and then put it in committee so we can have that kind of discussion?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, again the honourable member seems to be very unfamiliar with procedures around here. The practice is, in case he doesn't know it, that the bill is discussed in principle on second reading, and if passed in principle, then one does move to committee and one does deal with it. He may be interested in knowing - you looked back to 1966; I didn't go back that far - I looked back to 1969, and I find that on March 12, 1969, when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was then a Minister of the Crown - Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act, which I am informed called for an increase in the Foundation grant, was introduced, and on March 20, 1969, the bill received Royal Assent. Now that's not back in second reading - that's Royal Assent, which means it went through debate on second reading, it went to committee, presumably was discussed in committee, presumably was referred back to the House, presumably was taken up in Committee of the Whole, presumably was dealt with on third reading, presumably was passed on third reading, because all these things had to happen before the bill received Royal Assent. -- (Interjection) -- It took ten days - no, eight days, from March 12, 1969 to March 20, 1969.

A MEMBER: . . . we've had a week already?

MR. PAULLEY: We had a responsible Opposition.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this is the information I have before me. I see copy of Orders of the Day of March 12, 1969, under Introduction of Bills, "to ask leave to introduce the following bill - the Honourable Mr. Craik - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act." That's March 12, 1969. Next I have a page out of Votes and Proceedings which doesn't bear a date, but my information - I'm sorry, it's -- no, it doesn't bear a date, but if my information is correct, it was March 20 of 1969, eight days later, when the Speaker reported to the Lieutenant-Governor, and I note this is the only bill reported on so it was considered urgent: "May it

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at a special session, passed a Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act, which in the name of this Assembly I present to Your Honour, and to which bill I respectfully request Your Honour's assent, " -- and the bill received the consent at 9:59 o'clock of that day, a matter of eight days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate the date of the session opening on that particular occasion.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'd just love to be able to give him the answer, but I'm not sure that the date of the opening of the session is what counts, because the fact is the bill could not have been in the hands of the Opposition until after it received first reading, and first reading was given on March 12th, so that the session may have been started months earlier. The fact is, the bill wasn't presented. However, I do know that the estimates themselves were filed the day before, March 11, 1969, so one can guess that the House was in session for some eight working days prior to March 12th. Now that's just speculative on how it would have been.

Now my own thought was, Mr. Speaker, that if the discussion could take place on this, then early next week it could receive second reading and then the committee could meet during the following week and there could be an expeditious handling. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is still possible; it's quite possible that this could be done; and that means that if the estimates is what interest the Opposition, then surely you expect the estimates to be filed tomorrow evening. That is the practice. So that I don't know that anybody on this side said, "Pass the bill today," nor did anybody say, "Pass the bill tomorrow," but certainly, if it could be discussed and I know that other members who are not members of the Official Opposition, that they too could have been discussing it, so that hopefully we could have been in a position to vote on the bill, I would think by Monday, Tuesday -- no, that's -- you know, every day it costs money. Nevertheless there should be adequate debate, and the Opposition party did have this bill in its hands for a week now and I believe that one member spoke. The Honourable Member for Riel, I believe, has already spoken and, as I interpreted what the Honourable the Attorney-General said, was that he hoped there would be expeditious handling of this bill. I think that that is a fair request. I believe that the Opposition will carry it out, so may I come back to saying I wonder at the defensiveness of the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition but, having wondered, I'm prepared to drop it. I'm now informed, for the edification of honourable members, that the 1969 session opened on February 27th, 1969.

MR. SPIVAK: I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Was there any suggestion on our part that we would not proceed expeditiously with the bill?

MR. CHERNIACK: Nor was there any suggestion on our part that the Opposition is planning to obstruct the dealing of this bill.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder whether the Minister of Finance can explain the necessity for both his speech and the speech by the Attorney-General.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, sometimes, not often but sometimes when the Leader of the Opposition speaks in such a manner that I find unacceptable, I assert the right that I do have to speak. I did not find it necessary to adjourn debate in order to prepare for what I had to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the adjournment remain in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge? (Agreed)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Bill No. 14)

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the debate on this particular bill, which also concerns the Public Schools Act and has to do with the matter of allowing school boards, or division boards, to indicate their desire to have a multi-district division changed and that the Minister then can establish a unitary division. We have legislation on the books at the present time which provides for this, probably in a little different way, and I don't know why that is not satisfactory at this time. I notice that there is a change in Section 36, the first part of the bill, and while we're not supposed to refer to the particular sections, I think this is the major change here by way of legislation that is being introduced. Under this bill the majority of boards in charge in a given multi-district division representing 50 percent of the elementary students and 50 percent of the resident electors, if they so desire and if they so indicate this government is willing to establish a unitary division of that particular area.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

Then there is also the alternative of a majority of resident electors in a proposed division to vote. I don't know the demand, how strong the demand has been. The Minister indicated that there were two divisions who would be able to comply and would be able to be established under this legislation before us. I don't see why this government has to maintain the standard that was previously employed in giving the para-grants only to unitary divisions. I think this has been argued before, that the divisions not unitary give just as good service; the teachers are as capable; they're as qualified; they should earn the same amount of money that other divisions are prepared to pay and can pay. Why the distinction? Why must we discriminate so much? And for this government to perpetuate what went on previously, you're not only perpetuating it but you're worsening the situation. The disparity is growing larger under this particular bill and the companion Bill No. 13, and I feel that we should make a change in that regard rather than to bring about this Bill No. 14.

We find that the remote areas are getting the larger grants; we find that the Dauphin area, which never accepted the unitary principle, is getting the same grant - getting the larger grant. Why do we discriminate against certain divisions which try and maintain the multi-district concept to retain the districts? Certainly if we believe in democracy we should accept the people's decision on it and not use the carrot and the stick to bring about changes.

The Manitoba Association of School Trustees, I think it was two years ago when Dr. Lowther of Portage was the President, there was a resolution of this type before the House, before the Association, and he strongly rejected the idea; that once you had accepted the principle of referendum and that the people had indicated their choice, and had more than once, that the principle should be retained, that we should not just overrule that principle of having referendums but that it be maintained, and that once the people had indicated, that this choice be left up to them. We find that across the border in the various states in the United States, many items under their Constitution referred to referendums. Time and again they have votes and never is this overruled. Never will the State go against them because they go back to the people with these referendums and have them vote on it. I think once you have established this principle, and it has been honoured heretofore, that we should stick with it. What we are doing in this case is ignoring previous votes and that you're actually encouraging the trustees of these various bodies to go against the wishes of their electorate when they have already indicated this time and again. And I don't feel that this concept is quite right and that it should be embodied in legislation of this type. The trustees, if they will indicate to the Minister that they want a unitary division set up, they will have to go against the wishes of their people, of the vote that was held previously, and this is what this government now says they will accept.

Then, too, the urgency about this whole matter now. We find that there is a deadline in this bill, that if the changes come about that it has to be done by April 30th. This is only a few days hence. Unless they do so, the grants will not be increased for the year 1971. I can't see why this cannot be extended to a later date. Certainly, when we allocate monies through the Estimates . . . that this could be arranged, so that this urgency need not be there.

Then, too, if it was such an urgent matter, why did we not call the session much sooner? I could have been here three months ago and I'm sure many other members would have been willing to come here much earlier than this late date. I have some misgivings that the urgency might be because of the -- The Estimates might be very revealing. There may be some things in there which they don't want to reveal before this legislation is passed. I hope -- (Interjection) -- Well, if you have it passed except for third reading, you can go through all the motions except third reading and yet it would be law by that time even though the -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Well, when we started off, when the bill was first introduced and when they said the urgency of it, that they would like to see it completed by Wednesday of this week - and this is the understanding that we were given; that they would like to see it passed before they went to Ottawa. I certainly got that understanding from the First Minister. The Honourable Minister of Finance in his speech a few moments ago indicated that we could debate these items under the estimates. Well, I think members of this House know well enough that once you've passed this legislation it's like closing the barn door after the horse is gone. What would be the use of debating these points later on once you had passed this type of legislation, once it was in effect. You could cry all you wanted to but you couldn't change it. It would then be just a matter of passing the estimates.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that we have similar legislation on the books in the Public

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) Schools Act which has similar provisions except for this new principle that we are bringing into being here, and I for one cannot accept this.

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

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, The Honourable Member for Morris. (Bill No. 18)

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Minister of Finance a few moments ago, one gets some idea of how the government feels about the purpose of debate in this Legislature. He had the audacity, Sir, to make the suggestion that we can pass the legislation now, and then after it is all passed, becomes law, then let's debate it in the estimates. I suggest to him, Sir, that this is not the purpose of debating legislation. The purpose of debating legislation is to probe for whatever weaknesses we may be able to find in legislation to prevent the government from making shortcuts, which this government seems to have a tendency to want to do, and to examine legislation in such a way that we can be assured that whatever is done is done according to the rules that are set out for debate in this Legislature and according to the laws of this province.

Sir, we had a recent example last session, some 150 items of legislation crammed through, much of them during the latter stages of the Legislative Assembly, at a time when the members of the Legislature were sitting from early in the morning till early the next morning. A bill that went through, the Highway Traffic Act, an amendment that was passed by this Legislature concerning an amendment to the Highway Traffic Act, was discovered by a magistrate was not in keeping with the kind of legislation that we have the authority to pass. And what does the Minister of Highways have to say about that, Sir? He said it was a bad job done by the Opposition; that we didn't examine it carefully enough. Well, Sir, and now today we have the extreme opposite of that situation. Instead of bringing it in at the latter stages and ramming it through the House, they bring it in first and say, "We must have this right away."

There was nothing preventing them from starting the session earlier, Sir. This is not to say, this is not to say, Sir, that there was any intention on the part of the Opposition to hold up or to prevent that legislation from passing which we believe is properly put before this House and in accordance with the rules of procedure. Well, Sir, the Minister of Agriculture spoke very few words in introducing this legislation, and I suppose that there was a good reason for that. He made one comment, however, that rather intrigued me. He said it was a measure to help tide things over for a short period. You can bet your bottom dollar it was a method designed to tide things over for a short period, and that thing that he was attempting to tide over was the by-election in Ste. Rose. He suggested that this item of legislation had been in the mill for a long, long time. But it's rather interesting, Sir, to look back over their statement on the virtue of acreage payments versus the two-price system. I recall, Sir, when the measure was first introduced into the House of Commons, and the remarks then made by the CCF Party. I recall the words of the Leader of that group, who has now gone to his just reward in the Senate, when he suggested that acreage payments were peanuts. The Minister says they are.

And then we come a little further into the last - not the last session but during the course of the last session when the Honourable Member for Minnedosa was Premier. There was a resolution introduced by the Member for Ethelbert Plains which called for the two-price system, and my colleague the Member for Virden introduced an amendment to that resolution calling for acreage payments. And of course the Minister of Mines and Resources, who feels the compulsion to comment on matters concerning agriculture from time to time, had a few words to say, and I'm quoting from the debates of April 2nd, 1969. This is what the Minister had to say: "I disagree strenuously with the resolution put forward by the Honourable Member for Virden" - and that is the one calling for acreage payments. What I take it they are saying to us is this, that people producing agricultural products require a basic living wage. Call it a wage, call it a return on their labours, call it what you have, by suggesting that there be a handout to the agricultural community, by suggesting exactly the opposite of what he says he is suggesting, because acreage payments are, Mr. Speaker, surely a handout based on the number of acres. And he goes on to say a little further, "if the Member for Virden

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) agrees that the present price level doesn't provide that return, then can't he trust us city folk to agree to the fact that we too believe that the farmer is entitled to a fair return for his labour."

And then he goes on on Page 953 to say this; "Mr. Speaker, this might not be the best solution but it's certainly better than the solution that has been advocated in this amendment" - and when he says this may not be the best solution he's talking of the two-price system - "but it is certainly better than the solution that has been advocated in this amendment on acreage payments. A dole," says the Minister of Mines and Resources, "a dole of a dollar an acre." It certainly is a better suggestion.

Well, Sir, those are the words uttered by the Minister of Mines and Resources. Let me quote something that was said by the Minister of Agriculture, the present Minister of Agriculture. Following the comments made by my colleague the Member for Virden, the present Minister of Agriculture rose in his place to ask a very pointed question. And he says this - and this is quoted on Page 950 of Hansard - "If I might be permitted to ask the Honourable Member for Virden a question, does he suggest that these be annual payments or just during election time?" I take it, Sir, -- (Interjection) -- I take it, Sir, at that time the Minister of Agriculture felt that there was something wrong with the payment of this kind of a payment to farmers at or around the time that an election had been called, and of course the Minister of Highways had some pointed comments to make about people who make election promises. He called it a vulgar campaign and had very much -- (Interjection) -- Well, the vulgarity comes in the amount of money that was spent during that election campaign.

Well, Sir, when the Minister rises, no doubt he's going to explain this difference of opinion, he's going to - perhaps the Minister of Mines and Resources could also explain when he rose in his place a short while ago to make his contribution on the Address in Reply, he emphasized the point that this was a party that was consistent in their principles, consistent in their views. I find it difficult to find the consistency in the attitudes now expressed by honourable gentlemen opposite as compared to the things they were saying in 1959, -- (Interjection)-- Yes, even the last bill, it's beginning to show through and wear pretty thin.

I want to remind the Minister however - and he's going to of course accuse the Federal Government of Ottawa because he's already made that suggestion to me, not in the House but outside the House - but I want to make sure that he understands one thing, that the first time that acreage payments were paid out was in 1958, a second time in 1960 and the third time in 1962. The Order-in-Council was passed on October 16th, 1958, and the election that year was held on March 31st, four months after an election. In 1960, the Order-in-Council was passed on August 31st, and that, Sir, was two years before the general election. The third time it was on February 8th, 1962, and the election was called some two months after that. Now we were beginning to get the message.

But, Sir, one thing you can say for honourable gentlemen opposite, they are learning a few things. The Minister of Industry and Commerce who took off in full flight the other day must be commended for what he has discovered. I recall early after the honourable gentleman took office there were statements made to the effect that planning must replace crude growth. This is a news release issued on October 23, 1970. It's credited to the Premier of this province and it says, "so instead of going after industry with a scattergun approach, we're going to use the tools at our disposal selectively to encourage industry which pay high wages." The government planned to develop the potential for more aerospace and electronics industries as an example, and Manitoba had an exciting future as a place for such industries. The Minister of Industry and Commerce yesterday - or was it Friday - Friday, carried away with his own verbosity and eloquence said - he said, "even the people who sweep this building make a tremendous contribution to the economy of this province." Gone are the impossible dreams of high wages and scientific jobs. Why, when listening to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, one would have thought that there would be no more jobs for garbage collectors, that this job would be performed by highly scientific and sophisticated machinery with college graduates with years of skilled training behind them operating them, and on Friday the Minister of Mines and Resources says the sweepers in this building are important. So he is learning and I presume that this education on the part of the government will continue.

But now, Sir, I come to the rather interesting thing that took place during the course of the by-election in Ste. Rose and the events leading up to the announcement of the decision on the part of the government to proceed with this legislation. I want to remind you, Sir,

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd).....that honourable gentlemen opposite and members of their party are those who continued to say that it was unfair that they couldn't get into the same poker game with the big boys, the Conservatives and the Liberals, because they didn't have that kind of money. There was no way that they could play those high stake games and so they passed legislation in this Chamber last year which in effect reduced election campaigning to a penny-ante game - forty cents, with about approximately a \$4,000 limit, and they applauded themselves for having brought about this greater equality amongst people campaigning in elections.

Well, the game was called by the Premier sometime towards the end of March and the play began. And you know, the Minister of Agriculture looked at his hand and immediately bet \$4 million. The Minister Sam the Plumber was in the game and \$4 million was the opening bet. But you know he had a crafty opponent in this game with him and he didn't realize it. Otto the Fink called his bet and raised him \$96 million. Well, Sam the Plumber was put on the spot. He didn't have enough money to cover that \$96 million, to call it, and he didn't have a horse and saddle, but he did have a lot of plumbing lying around and he threw that in, and the Minister of Education slipped him some money under the table to promise to cover the bet on education. The Minister of Mines and Resources slipped in a few extra dollars and some drainage was promised, so that was thrown in the pot. The Minister of Highways of course who doesn't play poker and resents very much this sort of thing that was going on in Ste. Rose, but he saw that his candidate was in a little bit of trouble and he couldn't very well refuse to help him. But he hedged his bet, Sir, he threw in some pavement providing they won the pot. So the game went on, and I'm happy to say that my honourable friends opposite won the pot, they got the \$96 million and I congratulate them for that.

But, Sir, the point that I would like to make is the ethics of a party -- (Interjection) -- ethics yes, and my honourable friend - and since this is not being recorded, Sir, I am going to repeat what the Minister of Agriculture said - good ethics, good ethics is to pass legislation limiting the expenses in an election campaign to \$4,000 and then spending \$4 million and some odd. Well, Sir, that is the kind of ethics that we're beginning to expect from honourable gentlemen opposite.

Now then, Sir, having dealt with that part of it, we come to the method by which this government was able to make the promise in the first place through the transferring of an amount of money out of last year's estimates into a special, what they call a Trust Fund, to be paid out of this year's estimates. Sir, never before have these questionable methods ever been used in the spending of the taxpayers' money. I'd like to ask honourable gentlemen where did the \$4 million come from? What programs were not proceeded with last year? Money that was voted by this Legislature - what school wasn't built? What drainage wasn't built? What road was not built? What money was held back in order to be able to make this election promise? Pay it into a trust fund and then pretend that the method that they have used is ethical and according to the terms of the Financial Administration Act. Section 42, subsection (1) is the authority that they had used.

And I, Sir, would like to read that particular section into the record and ask you to judge whether or not this highly unorthodox method of bribery in an election campaign by this government is one that can be acceptable by the people of this province and more particularly by the Opposition. Section 42, subsection (1) reads - and it's titled "Special Warrants" - "Where an expenditure not foreseen or provided for, or insufficiently provided for is urgently and immediately required for the public good, upon the report of the Minister that there is no legislative provision or no sufficient provision therefor and of the member of the Executive Council having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent and the expenditure for the public good, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may order a special warrant to be prepared and to be signed by the Lieutenant-Governor authorizing the expenditure of the amount estimated to be required and that amount shall be placed to the credit of an appropriation and against which payments may be made in the same manner as in the case of any other appropriation."

And here, Sir, is the key sentence. "There is provision under the Financial Administration Act for the transfer of funds from within departments. If money is not expended in a department, in a particular branch of a department, it can be transferred over but not from year to year. What they have done was taken the appropriations from the money voted for last year, which should have properly been transferred as a surplus into this year's estimates,

April 19, 1971

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd),.... but instead they used this method and one can only speculate as to the reasons why. The transferring of appropriations from one year to the next through the medium of a Trust Fund through the back door is one that we question very seriously. It is, Sir, if permitted to go through without question, as the honourable gentlemen would have liked us to handle this situation. Well -- (Interjection) -- Well, my honourable friend has made his contribution and we're thankful and grateful for that.

Now if this is to be permitted, it's quite possible, Sir, for the government during times of election to literally transfer millions - as he did in this case, \$4 million - to literally transfer millions of dollars into such Trust Funds to be used as election bait during the course of an election campaign. A highly unethical procedure. Never before has it ever been done and I defy honourable gentlemen opposite to find a precedent for this unusual procedure that they have followed in this instance. Well my honourable friend the Minister of Labour nods his head very weakly and says "I can't". I ask him to find a precedent meeting the same criteria that this one has and I expect he won't be able to find it.

Sir, we cannot and we do not intend to allow this procedure to go unchallenged. There's no question about whether or not we are going to approve the acreage payment in itself - - (Interjection) -- do it tomorrow. We are not opposed to that principle because we have said consistently that if public money has to be spent in assisting farmers then this is the fairest way of doing it. We found that out a number of years ago and my honourable friends who opposed it all along have suddenly found it out too. I congratulate them. Well my honourable friend the Member for St. George says "and what are you quarreling about?" My friend should learn in this Legislature that there are certain rules and certain procedures and certain ethics to be followed in government. He may not know anything about that having associated with honourable gentlemen opposite. But there are, and they are there for very good reasons and we don't intend to let the government get away with this.

I suggest to the Minister of Finance that if he will rise in his place and say today, right now, we'll rescind that Order-in-Council, we'll transfer that money over to this year's account and we'll bring in a proper bill, we'll let it all go through tomorrow if you wish. But we question this procedure because we believe that it sets a dangerous precedent and I don't want to attribute any ulterior motives to my honourable friends. That I, Sir, I won't do that. But I want to tell them that this kind of a precedent is one that cannot go unchallenged, and I suggest to them that they change this method. There is no question about the method of payment. No quarrel with that. We approve the principle, we deplore the method by which it is being done. We suggest to the Minister of Finance to rise in his place when I'm through and suggest that if the government are prepared to withdraw this, to rescind the Order-in-Council and to place these funds in a proper way before this House we're prepared to let the legislation pass tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

.....Continued next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I listened with interest to part of what was said by the Honourable Member from Morris. I don't apologize for not hearing all of it because after a while it became repetitive and I felt I could afford to be absent momentarily. But I did hear enough to listen to him and particularly to see the smile on his face when he talked about never being one to attribute motives to others and could see how well he himself reacted to his own joke on himself. Nevertheless, I want to deal only with the procedure that is being proposed. Of course the Honourable Member for Emerson never was a member of the Executive Council of the former government so -- (Interjection) -- Morris? Where did I put him? Well why should I -- I'm sorry, I apologize to the Honourable Member for Emerson. I was referring to the Honourable Member for Morris. Maybe he's not too aware of the fund that has been used in the past by the previous government in order to be able to handle operations that were not fully authorized by estimates and that was the War and Post-War funds which was used in order to provide funds for special purposes. As a matter of fact it is a form of "Emergency Fund."

In this case, Mr. Speaker, the decision was made to proceed with the proposal as is outlined in the Bill and then it was found that the operating machinery was such that it couldn't be dealt with in the last fiscal year as far as expenditure was concerned. Therefore there were several proposals advanced to us. One was that the money could be paid into that same War and Post-War Fund to be drawn out on the following fiscal year; another was that it could lapse and appear again in the estimates for this year. The third one was that since the money had been made available, was available, that it could be allowed to be placed into a Trust Fund and then it would be possible to bring it forward at the next session as quickly as possible in order to look for speedy passage in order to be able to make the payments that were proposed and which apparently the Opposition agrees with that the payments should be made. -- (Interjection) -- Tomorrow? Well if it went through in the way proposed by the Honourable Member for Morris, and it could, then it would have to wait until the Estimates were dealt with and gone through. And that would be not tomorrow, but would be a month, month and a half whenever we're through. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, since the money was indeed available and could be put in the Trust Fund they were done and it was felt that one could come quickly here and ask for the passage of the Bill - and no back door; the Honourable Member for Emerson is making a big fuss about a back door -- (Interjection) -- Morris, I'm sorry. -- (Interjection) -- No, well I don't want anybody mad at me. I'm sorry, I apologize - as the Honourable Member for Morris. If this room is the back door then I don't know just what he thinks is the proper way to do it. The proper way, as I conceived of it and the government did, was to bring the legislation to the House, to present it to the House and say now we want to be able to spend this money for this purpose, we could indicate where the money is, we can indicate the purpose and we can get it out speedily, because I'm told that the computer is ready to roll as soon as Royal Assent is given and there would be no other holdup required in order to pay the money. So that the method followed though unusual is still one that makes it possible for the principle to be debated here and for the money to be discussed here and indeed that is what we're doing. Now the other proposal is just bookkeeping insofar as the Honourable Member for Morris is concerned because he said let it fall into surplus, carry it forward and put it through under the normal estimates. Well that's bookkeeping because we still can identify the money and we can also discuss and define the purpose and the policy.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has not learned, as many of us haven't learned yet, not to interject and he found it necessary to talk about a General Account and a Trust Account. I don't know how knowledgeable he is about that; all I know is according to him very little - he already made it clear that as Minister of Finance I'm not interested in finance, in his opinion. Nevertheless, I know that my advisers have indicated that it is in order that this money can be put in a Trust Account and then can be withdrawn, but only by the passage of legislation - and that's why it's here. Now it would have been equally easy, I understand, to put the money into the War and Post-War Fund and then draw it out. Now this I am told was just as easy, but it was felt desirable that the program be considered and reviewed by the House in view of the fact that it wasn't possible to spend it in the last fiscal year. So you have it before you, and you say you are prepared to endorse the principle. Well then I think that's the way to do it. As to the manner of bookkeeping, this is the most open apparent bookkeeping that you could find, because it's right in print in legislation before you, and if you call that a back door then I don't understand how the Honourable Member for Morris is able to even debate matters of this type, because it seems to me he just doesn't understand that legislation is the way

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd.) by which one can come to government, to the Legislature, to review a program and to obtain approval for the passage. Now when this Bill received Royal Assent the money can be paid out. I don't know a speedier way that that can be done except through the War and Post-War Fund, and that we felt we shouldn't use but should use it this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Finance would permit a question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Is it not a fact that some monies that will be in fact voted when the Estimates are passed will be paid out as a result of an Interim Supply Bill that will be passed in this House prior to the Budget being approved and the Estimates being approved?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, I believe that that is so and that that is in accordance with the powers received from the previous year's Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, are you suggesting from the previous year's Estimates? You're not dealing with this year's Estimates when you're dealing with money being paid out -- (interjection) -- Yes that's right. This year's Estimates you're dealing with, not last year's Estimates, this year's estimates? The Interim Supply Bill that we are dealing with will be money that will be spent according to last year's Estimates or the Estimates to be passed this year?

MR. CHERNIACK: By authority.

MR. SPIVAK: The authority will be passed by the House dealing with I believe . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm afraid that we're getting into a back and forth conversation and this is not conducive to good order. Is the honourable member ready to proceed on the speech?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my purpose is not to speak but to elicit information from the Minister of Finance. Is it not a fact that an Interim . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm afraid that what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is doing is trying to speak across instead of speaking to the Chair and this is detrimental to what is going on in Hansard. I think I did mention it, that it will not appear in Hansard unless each member is recognized, so therefore all your questions were not answered. I'm bringing this to the attention of all the members once more, because otherwise Hansard will not be complete if you just direct your questions across the Chamber. I would request the indulgence of all the members to co-operate if you want to place your questions to wait so that the answer can be given. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder whether the Honourable Minister of Finance will indicate is it not a fact that Interim Supply will be passed prior to passing the Estimates and the Budget which will allow spending by the government on this year's projected Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Minister of Finance answered Yes. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, to the words that I expressed. Well then may I ask through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Finance, is it not possible the \$4 million that is to be paid to the farmers, be paid out in this similar manner?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then I'd like the Honourable Minister of Finance to explain why not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I've already made my contribution to the debate. I don't feel that it's necessary to go on further, but I will try to make it as simple as possible so the Leader of the Opposition can understand. That it is a much simpler transaction to put the funds -- (Interjection) -- he said - I think he used the words "isn't that simpler?"

MR. SPIVAK: No.

MR. CHERNIACK: What words did you use -- (Interjection) -- isn't that what? -- (Interjection) --.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order. The question I put, is it not possible to do it this way?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker. Hansard will have to show whether he said possible.

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd.) Of course it's possible, it was also possible to do it under the War and Post-War Fund. I thought the question was - isn't that the easier or quicker or something like that. Possible. Yes. But to make it most expeditious this is the quickest way and the simplest way and yet one which attracts the approval of the Legislature to what we are doing. The other way I believe would be somewhat more cumbersome.

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

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney that debate on this matter be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Attorney-General.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would mind calling . . .

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The debate remains open in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin. Shall we proceed?

MR. . . . : The Honourable Member for Roblin is not here.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, honourable members of this Assembly, before I proceed with the main objectives of my speech this afternoon, there are a number of individuals to whom I would like to say a special word. It is only fitting that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, W. J. McKeag be the first to receive congratulations for the excellence he has brought to that high office. His devotion to our province and great concern for our people is continuously exemplified by his diligence and ongoing service to Manitoba. Our Lieutenant-Governor is to be commended for his attempts to take Government House and all it stands for to the more remote areas of our province and to those citizens who could not otherwise be afforded the opportunity to meet the Queen's representative of Manitoba.

I would indeed be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not offer my warmest congratulations to you on your recent posting and wish Godspeed in the execution of your duties. Certainly yours will not always be an easy task but I think you have already well demonstrated to members of this House that you, Sir, are capable and prepared to handle the demands of your office. I offer my warm regards to the Deputy Speaker who too will serve this House in a worthwhile manner. I offer hearty congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition who is not in his seat and the Leader of the Liberal members of this House. I recognize that his is not an easy task because he must direct his members from outside the Chamber. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that my own Leader deserves the respect and admiration of this Assembly for the excellent manner in which he conducts the affairs of our province, and more specifically for being able to live with a group of individuals, individuals like ourselves on this side of the House. But don't worry we do work as a group and we are unified. I offer my congratulations to the Party Whips and urge all members to co-operate with them so that we can be a worthwhile part of this political process. Let us be united at least by being attentive to the business of the House which is so decisive in the fate of our province, both for today and for the future.

I would like to say a few words at this moment, Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Mr. K. O. McKenzie, Ken McKenzie, who had been a long time Deputy Minister of Welfare in the Department of Health and Social Development and equally Chairman of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Mr. K. O. McKenzie played a great role in this province and he's missed by myself and by all civil servants in the Department of Health and Social Development and more specifically by civil servants at the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

Before I leave, Mr. Speaker, the congratulatory part of my speech this afternoon, may I offer good wishes to the mover of the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Member for Logan, and the seconder, the Honourable Member for Gimli, and finally, wish to our two newly appointed members of the Legislature from St. Vital and Ste. Rose good fortune when they take their seats in this Assembly next week. The people of Manitoba in electing them indicated their faith and confidence in our government and we in our party are grateful for the opportunity to honour that faith. By giving Manitoba a majority government the victory is not only that of our party but rather belongs to the province in general. Our government can now proceed with those programs and policies which will truly make this province a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I must offer my deepest gratitude to the people of my constituency for giving me an opportunity to serve Manitoba and thank them for their patience and understanding in recognizing the obligations I have as Minister of the Crown. Because this appointment

(MR. TOUPIN, cont'd.) . . . demands much of my time I cannot travel my constituency as frequently as I would like to and I thank my constituents for making their thoughts known to me either directly in person, by telephone or by means of my qualified Executive Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents, because of their understanding of my duties within the Department of Health and Social Development, have greatly aided me in my responsibility as the MLA for Springfield for what will become the most productive constituency of Manitoba. With the co-operation of all concerned that is, with the continuing support of all my constituents, the various municipalities in the constituency of Springfield, all departments of the provincial and federal governments it is my intention to ensure the ongoing growth and development of my constituency. It is only by working together that we will achieve those things we want most for all areas of our province. I sometimes wonder if it would not be advisable to deal with the problems to be found in every corner of Manitoba according to need as we do in welfare. Priorities must be established according to need. This could apply to the employment situation in our province, it can apply to the inequities pertaining to the assessment of property taxes, to the greatly needed repair and upgrading of roads in the constituency of Springfield, and elsewhere in the province, to the excessive damages caused by flooding in various parts of my constituency and elsewhere, to the much needed industries right across the province and more specifically to some of the outlying rural areas which would allow our farming community to flourish.

We must have more co-ordination regarding Manpower services and they must be adapted to meet the needs of all concerned most particularly in dealing with welfare recipients and creating policies which will upgrade and recycle the working poor. There are many urgent needs in our province; there are many areas of concern and responsibility which must be priorities for all members of this House and we must, regardless of political allegiance, devote our energies and our skills to building a better Manitoba for all her people. I believe the people of Manitoba are confident that good measures will be taken by this administration to rectify that which has been left undone and expand on the already healthy areas of our society. Manitobans have given our government a grave and challenging responsibility and I assure them it is one which we do not take lightly. Our methods may not always agree with the thinking of members opposite because our government says it by action that what is good for people must be good for industry and not necessarily vice versa as has been experienced much too often in North America in the past.

As government of this great province our main goal must be to ensure that everyone has an adequate income on which to live for without this we are surely failing the greatest obligation we have. It must be determined that adequate income depends partly on the actions of the individuals and partly on factors which they are unable to control. The role of government is to develop social and economic policies that will influence those factors beyond individual control in a way that will help people reach this level. As has been practiced in the past, policies concerning poverty can no longer be evaluated by its contribution to economic development alone but must be evaluated on its over-all contribution to social needs.

As I mentioned before, a social development approach to poverty operates on the assumption that whatever is good for the social and economic well-being of Canadians is also good for the development of business and industry. This incidentally is a startling reversal of the traditional position which was, what is good for business and industry will be good for the population. What a long awaited and desperately needed change! Through social development programming we can assure all Manitobans their opportunity, their right that life can be improved and that living can be wonderful. This will actually be my responsibility as Minister of Health and Social Development and my main objective.

I wonder where we as members of this House will actually go after our discussion on the Throne Speech has ended. I urge that we strive to move ahead and implement forward-looking actions which will ensure a brighter future for all Manitobans. In so doing we must keep in mind the good and bad experiences of the past and profit from what has been. Let all generations of our society consult and communicate with the other and in so doing create a better environment for our children and our children's children. Surely to God, Mr. Speaker, this must be our only aim if our desire is to serve the citizens of this province through this august assembly.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to ask the indulgence of the members of this House so I could say a few words in French for the benefit of some of the 86,000 Franco Manitobans that we have in this province.

(Mr. Toupin's speech in French will appear in a later Hansard.)

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I can't recall ever having been accused of being a conformist, and if I congratulate you on your election as Speaker of this House, it is not to conform to tradition but rather because I'm convinced that you will always preside with impartiality, fairness and good judgment while retaining your sense of humor.

(Mr. Desjardins spoke briefly in French.)

I wish to congratulate the two new members of this House, the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and I wish them well as representatives of their constituents. The government has now attained a working majority and it is to be congratulated, but like most Manitobans I firmly believe that the April 5th victory was a personal one for the Premier of this province; with his down to earth and candid approach, with his honesty he has captured the confidence of Manitobans who see in him a man interested in their welfare.

The election of a few weeks ago, besides removing a heavy load from my shoulders also served I believe to vindicate me. It is almost two years since I rebelled at the suggestion that I give my support to the Weir government to enable it to stay in office after it had been refused the mandate that it had asked for by calling the ill-advised general election. During that period I have been villified and called every name under the sun, but I constantly repeated that many Manitobans were far from being radical socialists, were willing to give the Schreyer government a chance. This is exactly what happened in St. Vital and in Ste. Rose, constituencies represented for as long as I can remember by a Conservative in the case of St. Vital and a Liberal in the case of Ste. Rose.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, I can hear the answer now,"but the anti-socialists far outnumber the socialists." But I say to you, Sir, the conservatives are also far outnumbered by the anti-Conservatives. I wonder why the editor of the Winnipeg Free Press and the Leader of the Official Opposition never bothered to mention this. I have here a percentage of votes received by the different parties since the election of 1953. In 1953 a Liberal government was elected and it had 39 percent of the votes. In 1958 the Conservatives were elected with 41 percent of the votes; in 1959, the year of the great Roblin landslide, the Roblin government received 47 percent of the vote; in 1962 the same government had 45 percent, and in '66 it went down to 39; and in 1969 the New Democratic Party received 39 percent of the vote. Out of six last elections, three different parties I might say were elected with 39 percent of the vote. Nothing was ever said until the last election but all of a sudden it was realized that the government had less than 57 percent of the vote. Since then we have had two by-elections. I think that although we had prophets of doom and gloom I don't think the people were scared too much because I figured out the percentage of votes for each party in the combined constituencies of St. Vital and Ste. Rose both for 1969 and in the 1971 election, and the Conservatives went down from 35.10 to 29.20, or a drop of six percent; the Liberals from 36.10 to 32.19 or a four percent drop; and the New Democratic Party from 28.30 to 38.04, an increase of almost 10 percent. In Ste. Rose -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- The Independents? How many did they have? In Ste. Rose alone they increased their percentage from 16.7 percent to 42.1 percent. After the 1969 election we also heard that many people did not bother to vote, so therefore they must be against the government, but after the heavy turnout at the polls during the by-election, no more mention was made of this.

Of course the promises made by the government, as we heard today, were a factor, but although we don't condone it I think that we must agree that this is something that nearly all governments are guilty of and the worst one that I've seen in my years in this House has been the Conservative government under Duff Roblin. I was criticized for supporting a party whose members were to the left of me, but I would have been, I suppose, a hero if I had listened to the establishment and followed the lead of the Winnipeg Free Press and supported a party whose members were to the right of me. Why then would this be acceptable? Is it because the so-called privileged class in our society believes that it has a divine right, a divine mandate to govern? What arrogance, Mr. Speaker! And this is the feeling of those who claim to be defending freedom and democracy. What gall and what hypocrisy!

Mr. Speaker, every single member of this House is entitled to his beliefs and I'm no exception. I happen not to believe that political parties are sacred but rather that people are, and if I wish under certain circumstances to support a party other than my original party, or

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd.) even if I wish to change parties, I'm no more a renegade than the additional 25 percent of Ste. Rose who voted for the New Democratic Party in the by-election, nor the 18 percent who changed their mind and did not support the Liberals in the same by-election. I do not agree with the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, nor with the Honourable Member for Riel, or for that matter, with the Winnipeg Free Press. There will never be only two parties, no more than you could have only the two extremes. Oh, it's possible, and I would say that it's probable that before the next election we will follow the pattern of the United States and have only two official parties, but as in the States, you would then have the Liberals and the Conservatives of each party; in fact, you would have four parties Mr. Speaker -- and although there would be coalition between these parties.

Through you, Sir, I say to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and to some of the backbenchers on the government side to think twice before mocking these people who are liberal minded because they will soon be the deciding force, and come every election they might be the uncommitted who will decide who will be in power, and of course then the leadership of the parties will play an important part. I'm sure that the waffle group of the NDP party will certainly never vote for the Conservative come what may, not more than the members of the extreme right will vote for party of the extreme left. Does this mean that they are the only solid citizens, that they alone are loyal to their beliefs? If this was the case, Mr. Speaker, if you were born into a party you could never change, then democracy would not work. It would be a farce and you would not have any need for any election, you would have only one election in a lifetime.

Sir, I'm proud to say that I intend to look at the issues, the platforms, the leadership of the different parties. You see, although I respect these members and believe in their sincerity and dedication politically, I'm no nearer to the Honourable Member from Fort Garry than I am to the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, speaking about politics. Many I am sure like myself could belong to a party led by the present Premier, but could not work under the leadership of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Many also, as I, could belong to a party led by Mr. Asper or the former Attorney-General of this province, Mr. Lyons, but could not be at home belonging to a party led by the Honourable Member from Minnedosa or by the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it quite clear that I do not intend to criticize, mock or question the sincerity of any of the members that I have mentioned. My aim is simply illustrate the differences between certain political positions and also to defend myself against the abuse that I've had to suffer during the last 21 months. I make no apology for my conduct or for the decisions that I made, and under the same conditions I would do it all over again; or maybe I should say that I'm not too sure if I would have the courage to go through all this hell again, but I would certainly pray God to be granted this courage.

Those who are familiar with my political career, the few members who have sat in this House as long as I have know my priorities. They know what I have been fighting for. They know how the Roblin administration and later on the Weir administration, blasted my demands, often ridiculing what I stood for. The Winnipeg Free Press which has fought as hard against granting the rights of certain minorities as I did in trying to have these rights recognized, should never question my motives for supporting a government that has and will make some of my dreams come true. Oh, it's true, the attacks on me will have some effect. I'm sure that my credibility and my popularity are not what they were a few years ago when I was topping the polls, although it might be significant, Sir, that a good majority of those who either write to me or phone me to criticize me, start by addressing me with these words: "You fuddle duddle Frenchman and you fuddle duddle Dogan." But Sir if I can play a part in eradicating prejudice in Manitoba, in promoting national unity and making my province and my country a place where we can be united in diversity, it will be well worth it.

Before the by-election, I divorced myself from all political parties so that the people of Manitoba and at least those living in Ste. Rose and St. Vital could determine who they wished to govern them and now I no longer should be abused or accused of wishing to hold the balance of power. I hope that I will be just one member trying to work for his constituency, for what he believes in, and I certainly reserve the right to support or join any party of my choice. I will abide by our democratic principles and let my constituents decide if they wish me to represent them or if they wish to replace me.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened during the last year, I feel that it would only be appropriate for me to say a few words about aid to private schools, although my position is

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd.) quite clear on this issue. I have never tried to determine if the teaching received in these schools were superior or inferior to the teaching received in our public school system. This is not my concern nor my responsibility at the moment. But my reasons for supporting aid is quite simple: I happen to believe in parental rights in education, and I happen to believe in equality of opportunity for all our students in Manitoba. Many of my constituents, especially amongst the Francophones do not wish me to make an issue of this. They are so afraid that if the boat is rocked, they might lose recognition of the rights they have so recently been granted. But, Sir, my responsibilities are not only to my French speaking constituents, and I do not believe in exchanging rights. I do believe that the question of language should be separate from the religion or from the freedom in education, but I intend to fight for both of these principles, and on these I will not horse trade or soft pedal one to gain the other. I haven't the right to exchange one principle for another.

The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has served notice that he intends to fight this, even if it means opposing his Leader. One might notice that on this issue anyway he is in coalition with the Winnipeg Free Press. Of course, this is his right and it places us on opposite sides; and although he is a formidable opponent, I welcome this challenge. He claims the question should be decided by the members of the ruling New Democratic Party at their convention. I say, Sir, that this is mocking this House. What kind of participatory government is this. I always believed that the members of this House were to determine and that the government was elected to rule for all citizens not only for those of a special group, especially on an issue like this one that should be above parties and politics. Is aid to private schools against the ideologies of the New Democrats? Well certainly not in Ontario. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is trying to introduce partisan politics in this issue. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is pulling a red herring.

Mr. Speaker, this House has spoken, this House accepted a motion introduced by the Honourable Member from Rhineland last year. This House came out in favor of aid to private schools, and the leaders of all parties favored this principle. The Minister is not fair and he knows it. Oh he'll shout that all the House did was agree to "consider the advisability of," but that's not good enough, Sir, and when as House Leader he explained the position of the government in voting on members' motions he understood it exactly as I did. In fact, he quoted me and said that my explanation was the best he has heard in the House, that is, that members should be guided the same as they would on second reading of a bill. If you were not for the principle you would vote against it, and this is exactly what he did; but if you favor the principle and although you weren't sure of the timing, or how you should recognize the principle or in what form legislation be introduced, then you would vote in favor. Mr. Speaker, the speeches that we heard during this debate made it clear that those favoring the principle outnumbered the others. For once this emotional question had been removed from partisan politics, let's not start going backwards at this time.

The Minister tried to cloud up the issue by saying that if you accepted this principle then you should support schools for communists, snake charmers, what have you. This, Sir, is ridiculous and he knows it. The Department of Education must approve the schools and the teaching that takes place in these schools. I am ready to place my confidence in the Minister of Youth and Education.

Mr. Speaker, there is another cause that is dear to my heart. That is the cause of national unity, the cause of bilingualism and multi-culturalism, the cause of a strong Manitoba mosaic; and, Sir, let me say at the onset that I am not speaking solely of the promotion of the French language. With a high percentage of our population coming from many ethnic groups we could not speak of a Manitoba mosaic if we had in mind only those people of British and French origin. This government initiated and sponsored a Mosaic Congress. It was a real gamble, something that no other government had dared do. The discussions at that time became quite heated and it was controversial but I think it served its purpose and I'm told that the report is nearing completion. The government must immediately study this report and if need be introduce legislation that will foster better understanding between our people and will encourage what will become our Manitoba culture. We must bring our different groups together so that they will know, trust and respect each other more. If there is a demand, we must teach more languages in our schools. The only special status that the English and French languages should have is they are the official languages of our country and that whenever and wherever feasible Canadians could address themselves in English or French and could use either English

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd.) or French as teaching language. And here finally, on this point I am in complete accord with my friend the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. By recognizing the French fact we also make it possible to protect the rights of all ethnic groups. But what is meant by this? Am I advocating that French be shoved down anybody's throat, should be imposed on anyone for that matter? Definitely not. I am advocating that for those who want it the government must provide the opportunity.

It is not the role of the government to promote this language or to force it on anyone, even on the French Canadians themselves, but it should introduce proper legislation such as Bill 113 that was unanimously approved by this House last year. But if there is to be promotion of the French language amongst French Canadians and others then the leadership should come from the French people themselves and the government must of course listen to representative associations such as L'Association de Franco-Manitobaine, the French-speaking school trustees and the French Teachers' Association, but it must also hear those on the other side.

I wish to touch briefly here, Sir, on a point that is not sufficiently clear to many. Many well-intentioned people do not understand the objectives and even less how to achieve those objectives in a policy of recognizing the two official languages. Statements are made that cause unnecessary fear amongst many Manitobans and even amongst Francophones. Our policy should have the following objectives:

(1) Here in Manitoba it is important that all students should have at least a good command of the English language; therefore, the teaching of English should be mandatory.

(2) Whenever and wherever feasible -- this will vary as to degree -- all students should have the option to choose either of the official languages as their language of instruction.

(3) Whenever and wherever feasible all students who choose English as their main language of instruction should have the option to learn the second official language of the country. This could be done -- and again this will vary as to degree -- could be done by either the teaching of French as a language or the limited use of French as a teaching language.

(4) The promotion of bilingualism which would result in better understanding between our citizens.

Now how to achieve these objectives? We will not achieve one by cancelling another. Some feel that the simple answer is bilingual schools, but it is not the case. First of all, it is impossible to have truly bilingual schools. Automatically the language of administration would become that of the majority. The audi . . . would certainly not be conducive to the proper teaching of the French language and in order to expose the Anglophone to a little more French, the Francophone would be penalized. This is certainly not our aim. We must, therefore, have different schools to meet the demands of our people and to realize our objectives, and this need not create chaos. For those Francophones who wish to take full advantage of Bill 113 we will have designated French schools -- and again I insist that a minimum of English teaching would be mandatory. These schools would have a French . . . audi . . . all administration could be done in French, and these schools would serve as pilot projects. The schools, of course, would be limited and situated where the demand and the population warrant it and they could vary as to the use of French.

The first one would be the secondary school of St. Boniface College where a residence could accommodate students outside of the Greater Winnipeg area; the present Sacred Heart School in Winnipeg, the present St. Eugene, St. Mary's School in St. Vital and perhaps a school in St. Norbert and Ste. Anne. All these schools would be part of the public school system. We could then have some French classes in some English schools. With a little co-operation this could be done quite easily without imposition on anyone and without disturbance of the students.

I'm far from pleased, Sir, with the delay in the implementation of this legislation. I believe that this delay will only be instrumental in causing friction between our people. The government policies must be firm and I see no need for long bickering between groups. It must be available for those who want it and this should be final. This can be done without forcing it on those who do not wish to avail themselves of the opportunity but the government must act now. The French Language Advisory Committee should have been named months ago. It is time that the Provincial Government become firm while dealing with the Federal Government on the setting up of a teachers' college. Legislation should be amended so that certain schools could be designated as French schools by the Minister of Education. This is the only way that we can satisfy those who want to take full advantage of Bill 113 without forcing French

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd.) on those who do not want it. Of course, this should be done in co-operation with the different school divisions. The Minister must have the right to designate French schools if need be. Very little has been done in the field of retraining of teachers, preparing programs and textbooks, and although a French curriculum branch has been named, as the former speaker said, this has taken far too long and as yet it hasn't been properly staffed to carry out its work. Mr. Speaker, I guess I could go on and on with this line of constructive criticism but I will have further opportunity when we deal with the estimates of the Department of Education. And I say constructive criticism because this is exactly what it is meant to be. After all this is the government, this is the Minister of Education who introduced Bill 113 and we owe them a debt of gratitude. We must give credit where credit is due.

For many years, Sir, I've been advocating such things as recognition of French as a teaching language, aid to private schools, reduction in Medicare premiums, creation of the post of Ombudsman, vote for 18-year-olds, protection of our natural resources, development of the north, strong national unity and diversity, eradication of prejudice, etcetera, etcetera. In less than two years the present government has answered more of these requests, has introduced more legislation in these areas than the previous Conservative Government did during my first ten years in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against this motion of non-confidence of the Conservative Party and I must vote with the government at this time. As far as the proposed legislation on unification of Metro governments I intend to reserve judgment until I see the actual legislation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that we call it 5:30. I shall recognize the Member for Fort Rouge in the evening. It is 5:30 now, I am leaving the Chair to be back at 8:00 p. m. tonight.