

| Name | Electoral Division | Address |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| ALEXANDER, Keith | Roblin | Roblin, Man. |
| BAIZLEY, Obie | Osborne | 185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13 |
| BJORNSON, Oscar F. | Lac du Bonnet | Lac du Bonnet, Man. |
| CAMPBELL, D. L. | Lakeside | 326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29 |
| CARROLL, Hon. J.B. | The Pas | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron | Portage la Prairie | 86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man. |
| CORBETT, A. H. | Swan River | Swan River, Man. |
| COWAN, James, Q.C. | Winnipeg Centre | 512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2 |
| DESJARDINS, Laurent | St. Boniface | 138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man. |
| DOW, E. I. | Turtle Mountain | Boissevain, Man. |
| EVANS, Hon. Gurney | Fort Rouge | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| FORBES, Mrs. Thelma | Cypress | Rathwell, Man. |
| FROESE, J. M. | Rhineland | Winkler, Man. |
| GRAY, Morris A. | Inkster | 141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4 |
| GROVES, Fred | St. Vital | 3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8 |
| GUTTORMSON, Elman | St. George | Lundar, Man. |
| HAMILTON, William Homer | Dufferin | Sperling, Man. |
| HARRIS, Lemuel | Logan | 1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3 |
| HARRISON, Hon. Abram W. | Rock Lake | Holmfild, Man. |
| HAWRYLUK, J. M. | Burrows | 84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1 |
| HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C. | Selkirk | Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man. |
| HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C. | Ethelbert Plains | Ethelbert, Man. |
| HUTTON, Hon. George | Rockwood-Iberville | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| INGEBRIGTSON, J. E. | Churchill | Churchill, Man. |
| JEANNOTTE, J. E. | Rupertsland | Meadow Portage, Man. |
| JOHNSON, Hon. George | Gimli | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg |
| JOHNSON, Geo. Wm. | Assiniboia | 212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12 |
| KLYM, Fred T. | Springfield | Beausejour, Man. |
| LISSAMAN, R. O. | Brandon | 832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man. |
| LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C. | Fort Garry | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| MARTIN, W. G. | St. Matthews | 924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10 |
| McKELLAR, M. E. | Souris-Lansdowne | Nesbitt, Man. |
| McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C. | Dauphin | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| MOLGAT, Gildas | Ste. Rose | Ste. Rose du Lac, Man. |
| MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne | Pembina | Manitou, Man. |
| ORLIKOW, David | St. John's | 179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9 |
| PAULLEY, Russell | Radisson | 435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man. |
| PETERS, S. | Elmwood | 225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15 |
| PREFONTAINE, Edmond | Carillon | St. Pierre, Man. |
| REID, A. J. | Kildonan | 561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15 |
| ROBERTS, Stan | La Verendrye | Niverville, Man. |
| ROBLIN, Hon. Duff | Wolseley | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| SCARTH, W.B., Q.C. | River Heights | 407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9 |
| SCHREYER, E. R. | Brokenhead | Beausejour, Man. |
| SEABORN, Richard | Wellington | 594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10 |
| SHEWMAN, Harry P. | Morris | Morris, Man. |
| SHOEMAKER, Nelson | Gladstone | Neepawa, Man. |
| SPELLIE, Robert Gordon | Birtle-Russell | Russell, Man. |
| STANES, D. M. | St. James | 381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12 |
| STRICKLAND, B. P. | Hamiota | Hamiota, Man. |
| TANCHAK, John P. | Emerson | Ridgeville, Man. |
| THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C. | Virden | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| WAGNER, Peter | Fisher | Fisher Branch, Man. |
| WATT, J. D. | Arthur | Reston, Man. |
| WEIR, Walter | Minnedosa | Minnedosa, Man. |
| WITNEY, Hon. Charles H. | Flin Flon | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| WRIGHT, Arthur E. | Seven Oaks | 4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17 |

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, February 23rd, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. W. H. HAMILTON (Dufferin) introduced Bill No. 29, an Act respecting the Town of Winkler.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. G. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce & Provincial Secretary)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if before you call the Orders of the Day, might I invite your attention Sir, and the attention of the House to the galleries, where we have a fine body of boys and girls from St. Ignatius School who are attending the Legislature to watch the conduct of public business today. They are accompanied by Sister M. Sheila Margaret and it is our hope, Sir, that they will enjoy their stay here, that they will learn something, that they will find it profitable as well as enjoyable, and as in every occasion of this kind, we like to hope that they will take away a good deal that will profit them and that some of them, both the ladies and the gentlemen, will grow up to take an interest in public affairs, whether it be in School Board work or in other affairs, in municipal affairs or whatever the case may be, so that they may enjoy the participation in public life. So we express to them a hearty welcome to this Chamber.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Premier. My question is: When does he expect to solve the housing problem for the Leader of the Social Credit? I think the tent, not a joke, I think a tent standing there with a sign is a mockery and I blame the Leader of the Social Credit. I think it should be removed . . . ask me why? Everybody is asking why is the tent down there and I think the dignity of the House is lowered by allowing things like this.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say a word on this subject. In the first place, I think this whole stunt -- and I don't mean to reflect unkindly on it -- originated with a very humorous and very clever cartoon in the newspaper. I enjoyed it; I thought it was a point that was illustrated in a humorous way, and I thought the way in which it was followed through by my honourable friend from Rhineland with the erection of the tent was certainly a dramatic way of calling attention to a matter that he wanted to have called to attention. I might say that the position at the moment is this, that the honourable gentleman wrote me a letter, asking me to reconsider the decision which had been conveyed to him. I received the letter two days ago and as perhaps honourable members will understand, I have been somewhat engaged since that time. I have assured the honourable member he will get a reply and I think he deserves the courtesy of having it considered by the Cabinet as well as by myself, and so when the reply comes it will be with the concurrence of my colleagues, whatever the reply may be. So however the present stunt arose, I am not sure, but I think we will not allow that to influence us on what is the right thing to be done in this particular case. I did call the honourable gentleman today and say that he might, if I recall my words, wish to consider it advisable to remove the tent. He assured me he would, and I am perhaps a little surprised to find that it hasn't been done.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, as already stated by the Honourable Minister, I did confer with him and I can assure him that that will be done today.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I am just going to say in connection with this, I don't agree with the publicity any more than my honourable colleague, the Member for Inkster. I do appreciate the remarks of the House Leader, that the matter is under consideration, at least one individual who presumably represented a political party, whose ideologies I abhor, and I am sure that the former Premier of Manitoba abhorred as well, was given a room. I understand that, I agree with the House Leader when he was speaking the other day, insofar as the percentage of representation of the party is concerned to be perfectly correct, and while I don't think that the honourable member or any representative of his group may be in the Legislature for long, it might facilitate matters if the government do give.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) consideration, to what the former administration did, in respect of the representative from North Winnipeg, who I am very happy to say is no longer in this House or a representative of his party.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am to receiving some praise from my honourable friend who has just spoken or from anybody on the other side of the House, I am naturally quite affected by the fact that my honourable friend points out that the Campbell Government that was known far and wide for its outstanding generosity, was prepared to demonstrate its faith in democracy by giving a room, providing a room for a member who represented a party who had only one seat in this House, and even though the government of that day was by no means fond of the individual, and despised the organization, we still took the position that it was the privilege of the electors of Manitoba to elect him if they wished, and he, having been elected, the government of the day, with their usual free handedness where economy measures were concerned, gave him a room to himself, and I am quite amazed Mr. Speaker, to find out that a government such as the present one is disinclined to give to a very reputable member, of a very reputable party, equal consideration. So far as the tent is concerned, is it a case, Mr. Speaker, of professional jealousy? Because my honourable friends are great publicists and advertisers themselves. Do they feel a little bit jealous after all of their propaganda, that my honourable friend for once, got some of the flashlights and the press notices?

MR. A. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, if you, before the Orders of the Day—A few days ago, I had the privilege and the pleasure of introducing to you Sir, and to the member of this House, a group of 70 students from the Grade VII and VIII's of the Holy Cross School, who were visiting this fine building. Now, they enjoyed their visit so well that they went back to school and they told their older brothers and sisters all about it, and today we have the pleasure of having with us, and I would direct you to the gallery to your right, Sir, not quantity this time as much as quality, 18 pupils of Grade XI of Holy Cross Church with their teacher, Sister Ann Margaret. Now I might say that if you see the young ladies, charming young ladies on one side and the boys on the other side, it is not that they are segregationists, but I might say that Sister Ann Margaret is a very good chaperone. She is pretty careful. Now I certainly would also like to second the welcoming words of the Leader of this House and also take this occasion in wishing the welcome to the pupils of this St. Ignatius School and other parochial schools. In fact I am very very pleased to see that they have been recognized here today.

Monsieur l'orateur, il me fait certainement plaisir de pouvoir souhaiter la bienvenue et de vous presenter dix huit jeunes garçons et jeunes filles de l'école de Holy Cross. J'aimerais leur souhaiter la bienvenue et j'espère qu'ils jouiront de leur sortie. Merci.

TRANSLATION OF ABOVE: Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure for me to welcome eighteen young men and women from Holy Cross School. I would like to welcome them and hope they will enjoy their visit. Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, so far as the segregation that my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface refers to in the galleries to your right, I would say that that is just characteristic of the Frenchmen that I know.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce in the matter of Industrial Development bank loans made to Custom Packers new plant coming up on Dawson Road, and try and obtain a breakdown if necessary.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the honourable member for having given me notice of this question yesterday. It is the practice of the Manitoba Development Fund to keep private information concerning borrowers from being made public, and I am sorry I would have to say that that would be privileged information.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General & A/Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to lay on the table of the House, the following documents: The annual report of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1960; the report of the Comptroller-General, Statement of Assets and Liabilities, Profit and Loss Accounts for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1960. I should mention with respect to the first report, 56 copies will be distributed shortly to

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.).... members of the House. A memorandum showing the statement of general administrative and prosecution expenses by the Liquor Control Commission for liquor law enforcement for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1960; eight copies have been delivered to the House to the Clerk for tabling. A report covering the operation and enforcement of liquor laws in Manitoba for the calendar year ending 31st December 1960; 56 copies of this have been distributed to the Clerk for members of the House. A copy of a nil return under the Controverted Elections Act for the calendar year 1960, first from the Court of Queen's Bench and secondly from the Court of Appeal; no rules were made by the judges under the Act; eight copies of each document will be distributed, a nil return under the Trade Practices Enquiry Act for the year ending 31st December 1960. The Annual Report of Gaols for the fiscal year ending 31st March 1960; eight copies have been made available to the Clerk of the House for tabling.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce; will the House be given information not with respect to any particular loan but with regard to how many loans have been made for the last fiscal year and the total amount of the loans in dollars?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, yes, the annual report of the Manitoba Development Fund has already been tabled. There is a copy in the hands of your committee room. I should be glad, of course, to discuss any further information at estimate time.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board for the year ended March 31st, 1960, the annual report of the Manitoba Power Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31st, and the report of the Department of Labour for the calendar year 1960, and also copy of regulations under subsection 4 of 198 of the Highway Traffic Act. I would also, Mr. Speaker, at this time like to draw the attention of the House to a very important event which is taking place at this time in northern Manitoba; that's the Northern Manitoba Trapper's Festival which is now in its third and last day of this rather important event. You will recall last year I mentioned the Trapper's Festival and extended an invitation to members of the House to attend. However, unfortunately this has been a particularly busy week and I believe that I was the only one that took advantage of the opportunity of being there at this time. (Interjection) Just about, Hank. I would also like to say that I think it's rather important to note that this event is taking place during Brotherhood Week. The Member for Inkster introduced this subject, made the announcement earlier this week, and I think that it's rather important to know that the Trapper's Festival in a sense is an experiment in brotherhood, and while it may have its weaknesses I think it goes a long way in bringing peoples together of various racial origins at this particular time. I went up to The Pas on Wednesday of this week and was rather impressed by some elegantly dressed ladies who were on the same aircraft attending the ladies bonspiel in Flin Flon and I was wondering what wonderful stories were in the coats which these ladies wore, because they were of mink, and of course the Trapper's Festival pays tribute to the trappers and other pioneers of the north. I think one of the nice things about the Festival is that it does attract people from all over northern Manitoba to the town and there are some wonderful experiences to be told resulting from this gathering. I recall having met a young Indian boy up there whose mother was the daughter of a Scandinavian and an Eskimo and whose father was the son of a Chippewyan Indian and a Cree mother. So we get this kind of inter-mixture of relationship in the north; we have them all meeting at The Pas during the festival. I'd hoped on this occasion to be able to announce the winner of the major sporting event, the world championship dog race, however that race is taking place under very adverse weather conditions, blizzard conditions the first day and the times are running much later than had been expected, so that the winner will not likely be known until some time later this afternoon. I would also like to say that the Fur Queen was crowned yesterday, and I will hope to have the opportunity of introducing her personally to this House within the next two weeks when she and her court pay a visit to the city of Winnipeg. These young ladies do a tremendous job in selling not only northern Manitoba but all of Manitoba during trips which they make during the year on behalf of this province. I'd like to just draw that matter to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker if I correctly caught the announcement of the Honourable

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) the Minister, he gave notice of the tabling of the Manitoba Power Commission report. Will there be copies of that report for all members?

MR. CARROLL: These copies will be in the House later this afternoon Mr. Speaker. The Department of Labour report will not be available for some time; it would be my hope that it will be available before estimates on the Department of Labour. As you know, this being a calendar year document there is a great deal of work in preparation after the year end. The report itself was just completed a few days ago; the electric typing is now taking place which will make it ready for Queen's Printer and as soon as he can get through with the printing of it, the document will be laid on the table.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Legislative Library for the year 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Province of Manitoba received a firm commitment from the Federal Government of financial assistance for the Red River diversion, and if so what is the amount?

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the honourable member that I am not Premier of Manitoba, I'm the Minister of Agriculture, and I'm in no position to answer that question at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. Questions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be granted the privilege of the House for a moment, members will note that there are 39 questions, written questions, standing in the name of my colleagues, directed to the ministry. This Sir, as we are all aware, is the last day on the debate in reply to the Address to His Honour. We, being a very co-operative group of individuals, are prepared, providing the House agrees, that these questions stand on the order paper until Monday next in order to facilitate the business of the House. We are also prepared, subject to the agreement of the House, to allow any resolutions standing in the name of our party to be stood over until the next sitting of the House and when it would be reached on the order paper. I would like Sir, insofar as the question of the private resolutions are concerned, to have somewhat of an agreement from the House Leader that this year's session will not conclude before these matters are considered by the House. We do this, Sir, in an endeavour to facilitate, as I mentioned, the business of the House. Also it may be possible, as it was not possible last Friday evening, to allow the -- providing the debate in reply is concluded this afternoon -- to allow the members of the House who come from distant points to have this evening off. We do this, Sir, trusting on the co-operation of the House in an endeavour to facilitate first of all, to give everybody an opportunity to take full part in the reply to His Honour and secondly, as I say, to give an opportunity for, I believe the last time in this session, possibly the first time and the last time, our rural friends to have a long weekend at home.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the CCF Party for his suggestions and I am sure those who are going to speak on the main motion with regards to the Throne debate will also appreciate the fact that he is not limiting the time that will be available for the completion of speeches. We have no idea how many honourable members propose to speak but this will indeed give them an opportunity to do so. I think we can assure the honourable member that every effort will be made to allow completion of the debates on the resolutions that stand in the name of these members. The control of these matters is within the House but I can assure him that there will be no intention on our part to cause these resolutions to be pushed off the end of the order paper this year.

It had been my intention, Mr. Speaker, provided the debate concluded this afternoon, to table the estimates and then to adjourn or to suggest that you might wish to adjourn the House until 2:30 Monday afternoon. First I like the point that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF made that it does give our friends from the country a chance to get home for the long weekend. It also has the other practical advantage that we will have the estimates for the weekend and be able to study them and prepare for the debates at estimate time next week, and so I think we can say for this side of the House, Sir, that we agree with the postponing of the questions. I take

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) it this does not involve, unless you wish it to do so, the motions for the address for papers or the motions for returns, unless those moving them care to let them stand as well.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned if it meets the convenience of the House we would be quite in favour of the arrangement being carried right through and go directly to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. If that is agreeable then we'd be quite willing to a postponement of all of our business until a later time and I quite appreciate the fact that the Leader of the House is suggesting that the estimates would be tabled tonight; we'd be glad of the opportunity to look them over during the weekend.

MR. PAULEY: Mr. Speaker I did not wish to speak in connection with the Orders for Return and Address for Papers because some of them are held in the name of the Official Opposition. As the Leader has agreed I agree too that that will be stood over for today, and we would then go straight into the motion of the address.

MR. SPEAKER: There's only one point I wish to raise here, that today is private members' day, Monday is not; Tuesdays is private members' day again. Is it the wish of the House that the private members' resolutions take precedence on Monday?

MR. PAULLEY: Well Mr. Speaker, I believe orders for return and questions could be raised on Monday, even if it is government day. If not, the resolutions would have to come to their proper place and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would agree with this, but insofar as the questions are concerned, the address for papers and the orders for return, they appear on the order paper before resolutions in any case.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker I am sure it could be resolved this way that it requires only the unanimous consent of the House to deal with those questions on Monday, I can assure the honourable members that we would raise no objections in this quarter.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur for an address to his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of this session. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am personally concerned I don't think you need to worry about time, because my colleagues have made marvellous presentations in regard to the Speech from the Throne on the items are not there. At the outset Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to you -- I will be very happy to sign my name to all the good things and wishes that everyone who have spoken in this House wished you. I can tell you openly, sincerely and honestly that since the last Speaker in the House -- and I'm not criticizing anyone else -- Mr. Hopkins from Dauphin -- I have not witnessed a man who is so fair, helpful and who is trying to assist the members in every way possible, and my wish is to you and your family years of health and happiness, and guide this Legislature and those who may come whether I'm here or not, to the same extent that you are doing now. I wish to extend my congratulations to the mover of the Speech from the Throne. I admired his nerve, so to speak, to, very mildly though, criticize his own government. That shows that a man could be independent although he's a member of another party. His speech impressed me very much. I've learned a lot and I hope that I will get some benefit of his remarks in the future. As to the lady member, I'm quite honest, I am jealous of the Conservative side of the House because their kindness, their way of speaking keeps the House in my opinion in good terms and many members who probably do not use, including myself, Shakespearean language all the time, it's very helpful because I'm very careful before I utter anything that is not parliamentary or in a nice way.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of an article written by the charming lady of the press gallery two or three days ago, speaking out to members of our group who are outstanding. With this I agree, but at the same time the other eight members feel that they were elected by the people for the purpose of serving in this House and they feel sometimes, that we have no place here. If two are selected out of ten although the percentage is quite great, nevertheless I feel that the writer of the column is not a judge of human understanding, intelligence or service.

Now let me begin my few remarks by touching on a problem that is on everyone's minds here today, if not on their lips. That of course, is the question of state aid to private and parochial schools. Some weeks back I was asked to attend a public meeting to state my views on this subject. However, I was unable to attend on the advice of my doctor, who stated that

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....my health at present does not permit me to answer a barrage of questions. Besides I have not yet made up my mind as to what stand I should take on the subsidy issue. Two days later I received a letter from one of my constituents. In it he accused me of not taking a stand for fear that I would lose support. He further suggested that I could not retain the respect of my constituents by, and I quote, "acting like a politician and not like a statesman." Mr. Speaker, I replied to the letter and informed the writer that I was neither a politician nor a statesman, rather I am, I was, and always will, be a servant of the public. My sole ambition is to be a public servant and to use my mandate to bring about the kind of legislation which my constituents consider to be in their own best interests. A public servant I have been for over 40 years. In that I have fought 16 elections and won every one of them. Never before -- and I pray never again -- have I been accused of being fearful of stating my views on any question.

This issue of state aid to parochial schools, and I am definitely in favor of parochial schools, will be no exception. As I stated here today, Mr. Speaker, I pledge that if and when the time comes when a vote is called on this vital matter I shall stand up and be counted. That's definitely. Before saying anything further on this subject, I would like to digress for one moment to explain why the future of parochial schools is of particular interest to me. I was born in a Russian ghetto where freedom to obtain an education such as we know it here was unknown. Pogroms and starvation, rather than education for minority groups of which I was a member, were a way of life. The few schoolrooms that there were, were largely allocated for the teaching of the so-called few Russians under the Czarist regime. The rest of us -- Germans, Ukrainians, Poles, Jews -- were allocated 5% of the seating space, and that on a first-come, first-served basis; even at that 80% of the seats were empty they would not allow any other minority group to occupy them. As a result of my background, might it not be possible that I, more than most of you, can realize the priceless value of education, irrespective of race and religion. With the little education I was able to achieve I was able to recognize that Canada was a land of opportunity --- a land where one could obtain an education for his children, if not for himself, whatever his race or faith.

Thus, I came to this country at the age of 18, penniless but ready for hard work, and willing and eager to pay back the debt I owed to Canada for accepting me. Immediately upon arriving in Winnipeg I obtained employment at 10 cents an hour-- that was the minimum wage at that time. It was a struggle for many years, but nevertheless I felt I should try to do something for those who were in the same position as I. Therefore, I joined societies and organizations established to help immigrants and those of minority groups. As a result, I have in the past fifty years served as a member and on the executive of many societies and organizations. And, as I mentioned earlier, for 40 of these years I have tried to live up to my duties as a citizen by participating in the public life of my city as a member of the Winnipeg School Board, the Winnipeg City Council and the Manitoba Legislature. This is my record. This record I feel gives me the right to reject the statement that I am a politician. I did not enter public life for personal gain. When I began my service in this city I did so in order to repay a debt to the people of this community and to the country that bade me welcome and gave me refuge when I arrived here penniless as a Jewish young man. I emphasize Jewish because I believe that a Jewish and an Englishman at that time had the hardest job to get employment. I pray that I have repaid the trust placed in me and that I have fulfilled my obligations. I am not a statesman -- I am, as I said before, a servant of the people of this province. While I am a member representing a constituency I make no specific demands for that constituency. I say here and now, as I have said to my constituents: "What is good for the entire province is good for all of us." Unfortunately, it is my impression that my constituents, and for that matter the people of Manitoba at large, have by no means made up their minds as to what would be in their best interests in the school subsidy issue. I think the problem is an important one, a grave one and it should not be swayed in either direction by pressure groups. What we are going to decide on this subsidy question will have to be the law of the province for many years to come. A decision like this should therefore be made only after very mature reflection and consideration and not on an emotional basis. I would therefore feel that both the people of Manitoba and the members of this House should be allowed additional time and fully consider the matter. We had this system for over seventy years; we can wait another year, to give serious consideration.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) Through the democratic process of public discussion, a more clear-cut public opinion will crystallize by then, and will thus put us in a position to deal with the issue intelligently and at the same time in the secure knowledge that what we are doing meets with the wishes of the majority of the people of this province while also serving their best interests. I feel personally with a believer in parochial schools, who is also religious -- I believe in it -- feel however that the question of subsidies has so many problems that more time should be given, and I would rather have it or not have it by full discussion. True, it has been on the agenda before the public for a year and a half. Nevertheless another postponement as far as this House is concerned will not do any harm. This is my stand on this issue now, and again may I repeat that when the question comes up before the House I will be counted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of taking up much more of this House's time in my remarks on the Speech from the Throne, but I cannot help but reply in one or two minutes to the Honourable Member from Wellington who gave us a lecture the other day on religion and socialism. Mr. Speaker, since our honourable friend from Wellington entered this House I have always felt that music which the majority of the public appreciates and which serves to rest their minds in peace while listening to it, cannot be mixed with anything else, including politics. My honourable friend, who is an artist, and which no one can deny, cannot fulfill his duties as an artist while trying to be unreasonable and biased towards those who are attempting in all their honesty to create a better and more just world to live in. He said in so many words that God hates a socialist. If he would read the Bible and the writings and preachings of our prophets he would realize that he somewhat -- I haven't got a good word for it -- I put down ignorant, but it's not, I apologize, that's not the word to use here -- or perhaps to put it in more parliamentary language, he displays a lack of knowledge on the subject of religion, Christianity and politics. Firstly, I do not think that God himself would appreciate his speech. Mr. Speaker, I am a Socialist and have been all my life, but my socialism is based on the teaching and preaching of Moses, whose statue is placed in this House as a guide to the legislators at all times, and of the Prophets who have at all times preached equality, justice, peace and morals. They were Socialists because they always promoted the cause of the poor and the unfortunate. Even the Founder of Christianity was a Socialist because in all of His short life He preached equality and justice for the poor, the widows, and the orphans. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that this gentleman, whom I have no doubt is religious, not use such assertions in order to protect himself by word of religion. I realize that his pleasure in this world is to swallow a CCFer for breakfast each morning, but let me warn him that one day he will get choked.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word about the inclusion of the Speech from the Throne of the possibility of selling provincial bonds over the counter, and I am now, I'm going to give a bouquet to the government, and I'm always willing to give them a bouquet when they do the right thing. I think this is one of the most progressive suggestions made by the present government. The security of the bonds are the people of the province, a million of them guaranteeing my hundred to two hundred dollar bond, and no doubt it is presented to the people who will not hesitate for a moment to invest their savings in the provincial bonds. May I at this time inform the House that while I was a member of the City Council I suggested on behalf of my group there the creation of the Municipal Bank solely for the purpose of selling their bonds to the citizens of Winnipeg at a reasonable interest rate, at much less than they would have to pay to the investors in Canada or America. Council passed the resolution; it was presented to the Legislature; it received second reading but the committee, Law Amendments Committee turned it down by the suggestion of, and a great effort on his part, the late Mr. Evans (may God rest his soul) with his great powers in the House at that time, did everything possible to have it defeated by the Law Amendments Committee. However it proves that it was not all a dream at that time and I hope it will not be a wishful thinking for killing it now. I am all for it. For once I congratulate the government on it and I hope they will carry it through.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital) Mr. Speaker, I paid my compliments to you when I made my contribution on this debate on the CCF sub-amendment. Since then I have listened to many things that I am sure encouraged you, and there have been many things said that I am sure tended to discourage you. When I listened the other evening to the remarks of the

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) Honourable Member from Elmwood when he referred to the hassle that we had the day that you were elected to your present office, I thought of that day and of something that I'm sure will strike you as amusing. One of my guests on that day, a lady who was not familiar at all with the ancient custom of electing a speaker, first of all noticed you sitting, I believe in this seat, in your evening clothes, and when she observed that day you being reluctantly dragged from your seat by the First Minister and the then Minister of Agriculture, and then saw you bodily dragged across the hall by the same two gentlemen, dragging your heels, she thought you had come to this Chamber inebriated, that probably you had come home from a late party the evening before. But I was quick Mr. Speaker to rush to your honour and the honour of your office.

In looking through the Throne Speech I could see nothing in the Throne Speech that warranted the abuse and criticism that has been heaped upon us by the Opposition Party. In the field of economic development I think that we must all admit that the Department of Industry and Commerce have done a terrific job in livening interest in the economic and industrial potential of the province. In the field of education I think that the government does not have to be ashamed of its record in education, and I think at this time that I would like to look at some of the statements that were made during the campaign that was held to sell this new educational plan to the people of the province. This statement was made, "that Manitoba is on the threshold of a new era in education, the legislation to make this new era possible has been passed and heavily increased financial support from the province has been arranged." This was certainly true, Mr. Speaker, at the time that that campaign was begun. We also said that the new plan equalized educational opportunity throughout the province to an extent never possible before and this certainly has been borne to be true Mr. Speaker. We also said that the new plan equalizes educational costs throughout the province, based on the ability to pay, and this has certainly come to pass. The new plan, we said, also places a premium on high qualified teachers and if we observe the number of teachers in this province that are taking courses, the number of ex-teachers that are coming back to our schools we can certainly verify the accuracy of that statement. And we said that all political parties in the legislature supported the new plan, and that certainly was true, Mr. Speaker. All these things that we said about the plan at that time have been realized. We also said this, that in case you are not satisfied with the plan there is a provision whereby a school division can be dis-established after five years of operation as a school division, and I think if the members of the Liberal Party think that this plan is no good then they have a perfect right five years from the time of the inception of the plan to encourage the people in their school divisions to dis-establish. That then will show whether they have the courage of their convictions.

We also said that the government not only have legislated for a new educational plan but is supporting it financially to a large degree, and all we need do to verify that Mr. Speaker, is to look at the amount for education in our provincial estimates. We also stated that it would spread more of the cost of education over a wide base and it was designated to provide as a right a high school education for every boy and girl in the province, and in addition, to provide the right to every boy and girl, transportation to a high school. Both of these statements certainly are true, Mr. Speaker, and we need no more verification of the latter one than to drive on the highways of this province between 8:30 and 9:00 o'clock in the morning and observe the yellow school buses packed with children going to these schools. I recall I made a number of speeches during this campaign, and I can recall making no statement to the effect that it would reduce taxes, although I must admit that at the time that I had no reason to believe that it would. This plan has cost a lot of money and generally speaking it has been well worth what it has cost. I must admit that municipal school taxes have risen, are continuing to rise, and probably will rise more in the future. This aspect of the plan, I think must receive the government's serious attention, and I think that it is incumbent upon them to see that the government's share of this program is not lost as some of it has been absorbed to date by increases in teachers' salaries and a huge building program. It is their duty and I am sure that they see it this way to review this plan from time to time to review particularly the financial aspects of this plan, to make sure that it's ultimate burden will not fall on the property taxpayer.

As far as the Social Allowances program is concerned, Mr. Speaker, again I feel that

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) the government need not be ashamed of its program in this respect. Sure it hasn't proceeded as fast as the CCF would like, but the Minister and his department have exercised caution and have seen to it that the money they have available to them has been used to reach those that are most in need. This is what the plan is doing -- reaching those who need help the most. And I think that the Minister is to be commended for his caution and for the accomplishments of this plan to date.

In connection with the highway program, Mr. Speaker, I think the government can also be proud of its highway program. Good roads are being built, and although I don't pretend to be an expert on standards and I am not required in the course of my business to travel much beyond 60 miles away from the Greater Winnipeg area, but during the summer time I spend a great deal of my time travelling the highways of this province, and highways, good highways, are being built and the government should be proud of them. There is ample evidence that the highway program of the government is a good one and not a bluff as was said by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and this despite the fact that there are nine miles of highway still uncompleted in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Ethelbert. Any person who, like myself, spends his summers travelling throughout Manitoba, and a great deal of that time camping, can attest to the job that the Department of Mines and Resources are doing in the field of providing camp sites and recreational areas for the people of this province.

In connection with the proposed issue of Manitoba Savings Bonds, I would like to quote from two paragraphs from an article that I just read the other day in the Financial Post. I quote: "Foreign investment in the United States reached a peak before World War I, but it only amounted to the equivalent of 15% of U. S. gross national product. Currently this is down to 3%. Foreign investment in Canada, on the other hand, is now 61% of Canadian gross national product. Like any self-respecting man, a country of any integrity wants to be reasonably self-sustaining, reasonably independent of others and reasonably able to direct and manage its own affairs. These objectives have been Canada's since before 1867 and it might be expected in this sadly divided world where survival is an urgent and perplexing matter they have been given more emphasis recently, but it is disturbing indeed, to see many U. S. opinion-makers label as economic nationalism and anti-Americanism, Canada's honest concern about how best to shape its countryhood." I think, Mr. Speaker, that those remarks might well be applied to the Province of Manitoba in this respect. The Honourable Member from Rhineland in his speech the other day, assured us of the success of British Columbia's success in the field of provincial savings bonds and I am sure that Manitoba savings bonds will be well received by the investors of Manitoba.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to say a few words about progress in the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. I was pleased to see that the Throne Speech reports further progress on this project. I am pleased also with the Provincial Secretary's announcement yesterday that there would be published a flood-fighting plan. Both of these policies will be well received in my constituency, and well might they be, because in 1950, not only was the Municipality of St. Vital completely inundated, it was also completely evacuated. I sincerely believe that the First Minister meant what he said when he told us that the province would go alone on this project if necessary. (Interjection.) He said that the province, if necessary, would go it alone on the Greater Winnipeg Floodway.

MR. ORLIKOW: 1980?

MR. GROVES: He didn't say what year.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well neither do you.

MR. GROVES: I am informed -- in due course -- as I keep in touch with developments, that everything possible is being done by this government to proceed as quickly as possible with the construction of this huge flood prevention work. I have done my best to relay this information to the people in my constituency and I would, I think, in this respect be derelict in my duty as a member of this House and as a representative of my constituents, if I did not inform the government that there are many in my constituency that do not believe as they do. There is the feeling that this project is not proceeding as fast as it could, and I think this is understandable, particularly from those who have their homes and their properties outside of the present dikes. I sincerely hope, in fact I am going to ask now, that the Minister of Agriculture, either when he is introducing or at some time during his estimates, make a complete and

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) detailed statement on what exactly has been done on the Greater Winnipeg Floodway since the government took office. This will do much to allay the fears of many in my constituency. It will consolidate the various releases that have been made from time to time by the Department, and it will get the government credit for what it has done, which it is not getting in some quarters at the present time. Such a complete statement would be most appropriate at this time when, particularly those people who are living on the outside of our present diking system are once again beginning to wonder what they might expect this spring from the Red River.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I didn't, during the course of the Throne Speech Debate, mention Metro. As the member of the constituency that lives within the boundaries of Metro, I think that this is the time to make some general observation on what has progressed since Metro came into being.

MR. GUTTORMSON: "For or against?"

MR. GROVES: These are based on -- I'll tell you in a minute -- these are based on my own opinions and my own observations and on the observations of people in my constituency that have had occasion to discuss Metro developments with me. I share the views of the honourable members from St. James and from Assiniboia when they say that Metro has gone too far, too fast. I was left with the impression last year that we were giving the Metro councillors a four-year term of office to digest the tremendous range of responsibilities which they were ultimately to take over. Proceeding too fast in the taking over of these responsibilities, in my opinion, could unduly increase the tax load on property in the Greater Winnipeg area, and in the early stages of Metro will tend to unduly disrupt the affairs of the area and municipalities. The Honourable Member for St. James made an understatement when he mentioned salaries of Metro officials. In establishing the salaries they did and by importing so much high-priced help from outside, they did themselves, in my opinion, a great deal of harm from a public relations point of view. No other action of Metro has received, at least in my constituency, more unfavourable comment than this. In these days of high unemployment, in these days when people are trying, people on low incomes are trying to support their families with the rising cost of living, the public does not take kindly to public officials being paid from public funds salaries in the range established by Metro. I think, Mr. Speaker, all we need to do to confirm this situation is to look through the public accounts of Canada. As you know, in the public accounts of Canada, as in the public accounts of Manitoba, all those who are paid salaries in excess of \$8,000 a year are listed. For example, Mr. N. E. Robertson, the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, gets a salary of \$21,000. The Assistant Deputy Minister of the Department of Finance, gets a salary of \$16,000. The Inspector-General of Banks gets a salary of \$19,000; the Comptroller of the Treasury gets a salary of \$16,000; the Deputy Minister of the Department of Justice gets a salary of \$20,000; the Deputy Minister of the Department of Public Works gets a salary of \$20,000; the Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Works gets a salary of \$16,000; the Chief Architect of the Department of Public Works gets \$14,000; the Director of Property and Building Management gets a salary of \$12,500; and finally in the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Deputy Minister gets a salary of \$18,000 and the Assistant Deputy Minister, a salary of \$15,000, and we could find the same type of comparison in our own public accounts Mr. Speaker, but I have left them alone because in some instances anyway their duties might be comparable to some of the duties of our metro officials. Even in the United States, Mr. Speaker, for example, Doctor Weaver, the Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the United States of America gets a salary of \$21,000. Edward Murrow the Director of the U. S. Information Agency gets a salary of \$21,000, and it would appear to me Mr. Speaker, if you compared the salaries of some of these officials that I have just mentioned with the salaries received by some of our Metro officials, you'll find that in dollar amounts they're comparable, but I think if we were to compare the responsibilities of these men the responsibilities of the men that I read from the public accounts of Canada their responsibility reaches throughout the whole Dominion. The ones that I quoted from the United States, their responsibilities are for their agencies and they're also country-wide, and here we have a situation in Greater Winnipeg where we're paying salaries that are almost equal to men who are taking these types of responsibilities. If large commercial corporations care to pay their officials these type of salaries, and they can

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.)...recover them by passing them off on to the consumers by including them in the price, that's one thing, but by taking these salaries directly from the taxpayers particularly in times of economic uncertainty, that's another. The Honourable Member from Assinibola has dealt with the effect of this salary range on the other municipalities, on the morale of the civic servants particularly in the City of Winnipeg, and with what it is doing and will do to the negotiations between the area municipalities and their civic servants, so I don't intent to belabour that aspect of it.

Now, for the information of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, it was I last year who mentioned that bad word "amalgamation", not the government, and at that time I said this: "If we leave out political considerations and inter-municipal jealousies and rivalries, surely we must all agree, looking at this problem from the common sense point of view, that Greater Winnipeg is not too large to be governed eventually, and I emphasize "eventually", by one authority. Not amalgamation or absorption of the suburbs by the City of Winnipeg but a 50/50 partnership of both for the ultimate benefit of all." That's what I said last year, Mr. Speaker. Well, total amalgamation is a long, longways away now. The reaction of the area municipalities to Metro accomplishments to date certainly indicated that. We see a rush of the municipalities to form cities partly as a hedge against amalgamation and partly to strengthen their position against too great encroachment by Metro. There are other reasons, of course, why these municipalities are thinking in terms of becoming cities, but I say that these two are very prominent. We also have had formed an association of mayors and reeves to replace the old suburban municipal association, mainly, to ensure that the area municipalities will present a united front to Metro. I'm not against Metro because I believe as the Honourable Member from Assinibola does, that Metro is a long-range project, but the long-range benefits from such a project can be considerably set back by too big a rush and by trying to get too big too fast in the early and difficult years, and this, I maintain, is what our present Metro council is doing.

Last year on third reading of the Metro bill, I took exception to the government appointing the first chairman. It was my feeling at that time that this chairman should be an elected official and should have been elected at large by the people in Metropolitan Winnipeg. I have not changed my mind in this respect, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the chairman of Metro at the present time is in a very awkward position. He was appointed by the government. He is also chairman of the Board of the Manitoba Development Fund, another government appointment. He holds the position as the head of a body that in financial matters at least, in the future is going to be somewhat incompatible with the Provincial Government, for as the years go by, Metro council is going to be knocking regularly and hard on the door of the Provincial Treasurer for a bigger slice of the province's revenue, and justly so. If it were me, Mr. Speaker, in this position, I would be somewhat embarrassed by a situation like this. Again, I'm sure that the Metro chairman must at times be somewhat uncomfortable to be sitting at the head of an elected body with no mandate from the people that he is governing. He is also dealing with a high-priced powerful hierarchy of Metro's civic servants and his hand would be strengthened considerably by a mandate from the people of this area. I think that he would welcome the opportunity, and I think that the government should give him this opportunity by amendment to the Metro Act at the earliest possible moment, so that the Metro chairman could get from the people of the Metro area a mandate to carry on with its present work. This could also serve as a means of testing public opinion on Metro on the actions of the Metro Council to date. The government should also consider I think, the enlargement of the Metro Council, for at an early date, for at the present time, I think that they are taking on much more than was anticipated at the time the Act was passed, and I think the enlargement of the Council would not only bring the councillors closer to the people that they represent, but would also tend to have the work shared amongst more men. These are general observations I feel I should make in this debate, and hope that we will have an opportunity to discuss Metro in more detail, either when we're considering the estimates of the Department of the Minister of Municipal Affairs or when the Metro Act comes before our committee for revision.

I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, with something that has been on my mind since our session last year. My comment on flood control and on Metro will be interpreted in some sources to be critical of government policy and I get sort of tired every time somebody from this side of the House gets up and says something that is interpreted to be critical of the

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.)....government when he gets picked off and chided by the members of the opposition. I got it last year; the Honourable Member from Arthur got it no later than a few minutes ago from the Honourable Member from Inkster; and the Honourable Member from Cypress got it when she purportedly criticized the Minister of Public Utilities for not providing telephone service in her area or improved telephone service in her area. Members of the Opposition chuckle with glee when things like this happen, perhaps because they think that we are embarrassing the government. Well I think we all heard Mr. Speaker, what the First Minister said last year on January 29th on page 164 of Hansard. At that time he said -- he was talking about my being charged with introducing additions to the Throne Speech stating government policy -- "After 38 years of experience, that's his conclusion." -- I'm quoting now from the First Minister's speech, and he was referring to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition: -- "Or perhaps it's a natural mistake because I can only assume that my honourable friend used to abet the speeches. The gentleman that moved his speeches from the Throne knew very well what they were going to say. Such is not the case with respect to this administration."

We all heard the First Minister last Thursday night when he said that he welcomed constructive criticism regardless of where it came from in the House. During the debate last year on the changes that we were going to make in the rules, the Honourable Member from Carillon also had some very interesting words to say. At that time he said this, that this is a parliament, parliament is derived from the French word "parler", to talk; parliamentary government has been defined as government by talk, or more precisely control of government by talk. Last, he says that this is a talking shop, the parliament, and he says that a talking shop is the alternative to the concentration camp. So Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this is the place of speech; this is the place that our constituents expect us to say what they feel we should say. Those who sent us here, I think, can rightly expect that of us. I know that we government backbenchers have certain responsibilities that members of the Opposition haven't got. We iron out our difficulties in the caucus. We go to the Minister with our suggestions and with our criticisms; sometimes we're satisfied and sometimes we're not satisfied. Where the wishes of our constituents are satisfied in this manner and they see eye to eye with government policy, then they know that we're doing our job. On the other hand, where they think that the government isn't doing the things that it should; where they think that the government isn't going as fast as they think they should, then I think that they're perfectly right in expecting their member to do his job not only by representations in the caucus and by representation to the Ministers, but also in this House. In doing this it is no reflection, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, on a member's general support of the government or his loyalty to his caucus. Many issues come up where a member's personal convictions, or his conscience, or the expressed wishes of his constituents may direct a course for him opposite to government policy, or critical of some aspect of government policy, and I think that this is a healthy thing, Mr. Speaker, something to be encouraged and something that could and does add substance to the debates of this House. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we would never want it said in this Chamber, or of us in this Chamber, what Blair Fraser said in MacLean's magazine, of our counterparts in Ottawa, and I quote: "The plain fact is, that under the parliamentary system as it has developed in Canada, there is not enough to occupy a bright and energetic M. P. If he wants to, he can use his time studying public issues or learning the intricacies of government departments. This will do him no actual harm provided he doesn't make any special use of what he learns. But if he presumes to offer any advice to the Minister responsible for a particular matter, the backbencher becomes instantly a permanent suspect, and the more incompetent the Minister the deeper his suspicion is likely to be. All that the ruling party really wants of the private member is his vote from time to time, the rest of the time he can go to sleep. This a fact well-known to anyone sufficiently experienced to be elected to parliament. It is not true as some politicians say, that the Conservative first-termers are so naive that they thought they were going to be statesmen, even the greenest of them knew, in a general way, what a backbenchers life is like, the bright ones went into politics not because they didn't know that the private MP doesn't have much fun but because they didn't expect to remain private MP's for too long." Now as I said Mr. Speaker, surely we in this House never want it said of us what Blair Fraser said of our counterparts in Ottawa. I sit in this House as a supporter of the Conservative Party. I have the opportunity through our caucus to help mould and shape this government's policy but I also sit in this House as a representative of the people in the constituency of St. Vital and, that as such I am duty bound to plead their case in this assembly when we are debating the affairs and issues of this province, even if at times this may appear to be critical of the government.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, may I join with the other members to offer to you my congratulations and also to the mover and seconder of the address in reply. I would like also to welcome to this House the Member for Pembina. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Pembina realized that during the by-election the Member for Carillon did not appear. It's not that the Member for Carillon had not been asked, but because he knew that the charming lady was the Conservative candidate and because he was more of a ladies' man than a politician -- (Interjection) -- not like his -- on my left -- (Interjection) -- friend. Now I wish to welcome the lady in this House because especially her late husband and myself were very close friends. We sat for one year shoulder to shoulder in this small coalition of ours, we had two matters on which we were in full agreement, the destruction of coalition and to prevent margarine from becoming coloured. When I first brought the matter of margarine in this House he seconded my motion and year after year he opposed the colouring of margarine, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Pembina will not do or say anything in the coming debate on margarine to cause maybe our friend Hughey to turn around in his grave.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am touching a debate that is most important although there was no mention of it in the Speech from the Throne. You know the matter to which I refer, the question of the schools, the separate schools. I would like you to understand at first that I am not addressing myself especially to the so-called private schools. There are private schools in this province which can finance themselves properly; they are appealing or catering to wealthy people in this province, mostly dormitory schools, the fees are high and these schools can possibly function. There might be other types of private schools, supposing a group of rich people, doctors or lawyers would get together and say we want a better school than the public school, we're ready to pay high prices and we want a private school. Well then, I would agree possibly with what was stated in the auditorium that private schools should be paid for by private funds. I'm not appealing now for support for the so-called private schools, although, Mr. Speaker, I would agree that insofar as these schools save money for the government and insofar as they do no harm to the school system of the province, they should get possibly a share of the taxes that the parents who pay those fees contribute to the taxes of this province. But I am addressing myself to the parochial schools or separate schools, or I should say constitutional schools. Mr. Speaker, in their report the Royal Commission has not touched this problem of the constitutionality of these schools and possibly they had a good reason to do so. But the way this debate has been carried on in the newspapers and all over the province I think that each and everyone of us should know the background of the question and know it very fully because if we don't know the background we can't find the proper answers to the questions that come up.

Now since 1818 until 1960 we have had education in this province -- since 1960, pardon me, we have had education in this province. The first school was opened in 1818 and I would divide this period of 142 years in half, between 1818 until 1888, we had peace in education in this province, peace between Catholics and Protestants, we had a dual school system in this province. Everything was going fine. After 1889 when Dalton McCarthy came to Manitoba we started to have dissension, trouble, I might call it warfare, it was open warfare for about ten years and then dormant as you might say. But there was no peace between the Catholics and the Protestants, and there will be no peace until this question is settled, because a question is never settled unless it is settled on a basis of justice and equity. Let's go back a little bit to the start of this province when Father Provencher came and built the school on the east side of the river in St. Boniface. He built that school and operated it along the lines of the Catholic schools in the Province of Quebec. In 1880 Reverend John West built a school and opened it on the west side of the river, and operated it along the lines of the British school system and a Protestant school. And they got along fine on the two sides of the river. More schools were opened, Catholic schools in Winnipeg, one in Winnipeg, one in St. Francois Xavier, one in St. Norbert as the years goes on. The Protestants on their side, and mind you I would like to say, I should have said it before, that I'm using the words Protestants and Catholics, and I will use the word Orangeman later, because if you go into history and our poetry books with me, all the historians mention these words all the time in there, and I can't use other words because the dual school system, the separate school system, is based on one side, Catholics having their schools, and on the other side Protestants having their schools, and this is what's going on all

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).... across Canada. So I say that we had a dual school system, separate school system, and everything was going well. If I had time to quote from Begg, here I could quote you pages after pages in which he tells how the operators of these schools on both sides of the river and everywhere else were working side by side in harmony. This was a system that was being established by practice. The word, by practice, will come again, the type of dual school system, that was the practice in those years, until 1870. But before 1870 there was a little trouble here as you know -- not between the Catholics and Protestants who were living locally, there were a few outsiders who came in and called themselves Canadians, and then -- I'm telling you what Beggs -- Alexander Begg is saying -- he's saying that there happened that before -- these people over here some 11,000 people -- accepted the authorities from Canada, they wanted to have something to say, they didn't want to be traded like cattle or sold, they wanted to have something to say. There was a meeting in Fort Garry of 12 representatives from the English speaking Protestant parishes and 12 representatives from the French speaking Catholic parishes, and they met, and they agreed to prepare a list of rights. I will just quote you one, the first section of this Bill of Rights from Alexander Begg. The following is a list of the terms and conditions: First, that the territory heretofore known as Rupertsland and the Northwest shall not enter into Confederation of the Dominion, except as a province, to be styled and known as the Province of Assiniboia and with all the rights and privileges common to the different provinces in the Dominion. That's where the question comes in, the question of the rights that the other provinces were enjoying with respect to their schools. Article 17 says that "Whereas the French and English speaking people of Assiniboia are so equally divided as to numbers, yet so united in their interests, and so connected by commerce, family connections and other political and social relations, that it has happily been found impossible to bring them into hostile collision although repeated attempts have been made by designing strangers for reasons known to themselves to bring about so ruinous and disastrous an event; therefore that the Lieutenant-Governor who may be appointed for the Province of Assiniboia should be familiar with both the French and English language." After passing this list of rights they elected three delegates to be sent to Ottawa, to deal with Ottawa with respect to the entry of Manitoba into Confederation. They appointed Reverend Ritchot, Judge Black and A. H. Scott and these three men went to Ottawa and they conferred with the Premier, Sir John A. MacDonald and with and Joseph Howe and others. They had the British North America Act to guide them and they had their own opinion.

What does the British North American Act say about education? It says that education is a matter for the provinces, but "that nothing in any such law that the province might pass shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denomination of schools which any class or persons have by law or practice in the Dominion at that time.". Now that's the BNA Act. Nothing there should prejudice the rights that any class had by law at the time of the union. With respect to the Manitoba Act the word was added, "by practice", because there was no law respecting schools at the time, and so on. There are two or three sub-sections: An appeal shall be to the Governor-General-in-Council. Section 2 - from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education. And may I quote from C. B. Sissons in his book "The Church and State and Canadian Education". On Page 173, he explains in simpler language what this means, the Manitoba Act. It means this, he says: "Ottawa said to Manitoba in substance - any privileges you have been enjoying, anything you have been doing in your denominational schools, you may continue to do and to enjoy. That is your right; should you ever find it necessary to turn to us we are ready to protect that right by government action or that phase of effect through the power of remedial legislation by parliament". Well this is the foundation of the rights of minorities in this province. Now some might say, why were these clauses included in the Act? It was included to protect the minorities, and I would like to quote again from Sissons, this statement, with respect to the BNA Act. "The three later sub-sections were desired by God, God was the Father of Confederation, these are the sections that protect minority rights, these were desired by God as affording additional protection to Quebec Protestants. They were accepted by the hierarchy as calculated to improve the Catholic position in other provinces and welcomed by MacDonald as tending to

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)..... centralize authority at Ottawa." This is with respect to the BNA Act and our Manitoba Act is copied from that one. The three representatives in Ottawa have met with the central government. They were representing the two groups; they were evenly divided; nobody knew in 1870 whether the Catholics or the Protestants would become the majority in this province. Nobody knew. Of course the events have proven that the Protestants became the majority, but everybody was satisfied in Manitoba. Those who were participating in between themselves -- which was not passed by accident. A statement was made the other day at the Auditorium that we should not be tied because, by accident, other provinces have such a situation of dual schools. It's not by accident that any province of Canada has the dual school system. Never at any time was any legislation passed after having been so well considered. It's not by accident that in our Manitoba Act, these guarantees were given. It was by accident possibly that the majority from Ontario who came here are English speaking Protestants. What would have happened, Mr. Speaker, if the Quebec immigrants had come to Manitoba who went to the United States where there are now a million and a half to two million French speaking yet -- most of them still speaking French. What would have happened? The shoe might have been on the other foot. But what has happened, has happened. This doesn't mean that the Manitoba Act was not well conceived. After the delegates came and reported and the Manitoba Act was proclaimed, we still had peace between Protestants and Catholics in Manitoba.

The Manitoba Act was passed by the First Legislature of this province in 1871, establishing two school systems, one for the Catholics and one for the Protestants. Everybody was happy. The funds were divided equally for a few years, but then when it was found out that there were more Protestant students in the schools, of course a change was made to give the grant on a per capita basis. Years went along and everybody was happy. But things were happening in the whole of Canada. Riel had been hanged, some were not happy about it in Ontario -- happy in the sense he was hanged, they were, but not happy about all the circumstances -- not happy about the fact that Scott had been shot in Winnipeg.

There were other matters that came along, the Province of Quebec passed a bill, an act, with respect to the Jesuit Estates Act in which they said that with respect to a certain matter the Pope should be the trustee, and this had the knack of hurting the feelings of most people. Well if not most people, of a very many Orangemen in Ontario. They put pressure on Ottawa to repeal the Quebec Act -- the Quebec legislation with respect to the Jesuits. It wasn't done; they didn't get to first base, but there were hard feelings. Then Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who was a prominent member of the parliament in Ottawa, came to Manitoba, and he made a speech in Portage la Prairie, and we are entering into the second sphere -- the one of trouble and dissension -- and in that speech he said that Manitoba should be a British province, that there should be one flag, one language and one religion, that it was ridiculous to have the school system that we had in this province. At that meeting Mr. Martin was there -- "Fighting Joe Martin" they say -- and he got up after Mr. McCarthy had spoken and he said: "As far as I am concerned, I am through signing documents written in the French language and the separate school system will be abolished." Well that was the start of the trouble and there was a session in 1890 and a bill was brought forward by the Greenway government. I haven't time to tell all the details. Mr. Alphonse F. Martin, Member for Morris, spoke for nine hours; Mr. Prendergast, who became judge, for two hours; Mr. Norquay and Mr. Roblin - R.P. Roblin - moved resolution that the matter be not discussed until its legality, whether it was was decided by the courts. The fight went along for days, but finally the majority decided, and the Attorney-General, Mr. Joe Martin, said this, and I can quote from Mrs. Margaret McWilliams' book -- if I had time I would -- and he said, "The constitution was in favour of keeping the Catholic schools, but the majority was in favour of getting rid of them." What does that mean? That the law was for the Catholics -- the majority was against. To heck with the Catholics. That's the reasoning of it all, nothing else. That's what it means -- and the Catholic schools were abolished in 1890. What did the Catholics do? They went to the Federal Government for redress according to the Manitoba Act and there they were told to go to the courts. They were told that the opinion was that this law was ultra vires, it wouldn't stand in court. Mr. Barrett who refused to pay his taxes to the Winnipeg School District, took action against the City of Winnipeg. The case went from court to court. Mr. Barrett lost in Manitoba, won in Ottawa,

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) resigned themselves to make the best of a bad situation, but the Pope did say that the law was not just and right and they have protested quietly ever since.

In 1913 Mr. Rodmond Roblin, meeting a delegation from the Catholic taxpayers of Winnipeg with his Minister of Education, Mr. Caldwell, passed a bill that would have forced the City of Winnipeg to give back some refunds to the Catholic taxpayers who had to operate their schools according to their conscience - in the City of Winnipeg. But he had forgotten this question of segregation and the bill got nowhere. The popularity of that government was losing ground, and there was an election and Mr. Roblin was defeated. I have here a petition that was presented to Mr. Bracken in 1933 - found it from the desk of my late father - it was presented in the House, petition of the Catholic Taxpayers Association and signed by James Prendergast and J. C. Davis, asking for relief. These were the years when it was tough to get any money to carry on these schools over and above carrying on also and paying taxes for the public schools. I had the privilege myself in 1939 and '41, I took advantage of certain occasions to mention the issue, but by and large we were quiet about this matter, but I think that we can't be quiet now any longer.

Mr. Speaker, in 1957 the government appointed a Royal Commission to look into all phases of education. In the fall of that year the Catholic hierarchy presented a brief; the parents of the Catholics in Manitoba presented briefs to that commission; opponents presented briefs also; the matter became public in the fall of '57. This is three and a half years ago. Of course the Commission did not put in their report until 1959, but the matter became public to a certain extent. Members had some time to discuss it between those years even before the report was tabled. But let me come back to that moment when the Commission was appointed and recall that there was an election in 1958. Before the election the Conservative Party had promised equality of educational opportunity and they would increase education grants by 50%. Maybe I'm taking too much time, I don't know whether I'm going to

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has been speaking for 30 minutes. This is for his information.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I know, but I speak too long on this matter, I won't be able to say other matters that seem to be more important and I'll try to cut it short if I can.

But after the election when the Conservatives came back with 26 members they had had no policy on schools at all. They just had stated that they would give 50% more, and I stated once in this House that they ask the Royal Commission whether their report was ready. The Royal Commission on Education said "No". Can you give us an interim report? "It will be difficult" - but they got an interim report. The Royal Commission was somewhat hurried to give an interim report, and on that report the government adopted a policy and they presented this policy to the Legislature in the fall of 1958 in preparation for an election, and at that time, you can check Hansard - the Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Roger Teillet, and the Member for Carillon, myself, raised an objection - why does the government rush into this matter at this time; just an interim report, why do not wait for the whole report. There might be in the whole report some recommendations for private schools and if you spend \$6 million for the public schools maybe there will be not enough money for private schools later on. We expressed fear. We're on record as having expressed fear, but we got no attention of course. The government rushed ahead with the Boundaries Commission dividing the province and then we had a vote on the divisions and we had a short session; the government claimed it had been defeated in this House and we had an election and the government won.

In the fall of that year the Royal Commission made its final report and recommended aid to private schools. That was in December, the House did not meet before the end of January. It seems to me the government had enough time to study this and make up its mind. It was not as complicated as the recommendations with respect to divisions and teachers' salaries and everything of that kind. No, it was not so complicated. It involved possibly questions of strong opinion, but after all the Royal Commission had been appointed; it had come out with the unanimous resolution. And the government had no policy to announce last year. It said that in due course it would announce policy and we went along all this past summer. Late last fall the parents of these children who was supplying the funds to educate them in these schools were getting impatient. There was no word from the government what would happen at the session; they got the idea that maybe they should educate the people and they had

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).... some meetings. Some said they were indignation meetings. I do not think they were, Mr. Speaker. I think they were just educational meetings — and they had the right to do so. But there were letters in the newspapers all over the place. The question was being stirred up and the House was called together on February 14th and the government announced no policy.

But before I go on with my narrative, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss certain aspects of the problem. Is it a right for the Catholics to have these parochial schools, or is it a privilege? If you have listened closely, Mr. Speaker, if the members have listened closely, they sure will agree with me that this is a right — embedded in the Constitution of Canada, the BNA Act, and the Manitoba Act. It is a right also for them not only to have the schools, it is a right for them to insist on some contribution. The Privy Council has said so, definitely said so. There's an order from the Federal Government that payments should be made in compensation and I'm going to read from C.B. Sissons here something that will surprise you possibly, it concerns exactly these rights. It will surprise you because of the source, because of the party, the people that have made this statement. It's with respect to the discussion about giving back these rights and from Sissons, on page 192. For instance, quoting from Dafoe. For instance, the Manitoba Free Press denounced Sissons' attitude in refusing to accept the decision of Her Majesty's Lords of the Privy Council as rank disloyalty, the decision which has stated that the Catholics had the right to redress, and then all the worst, says Dafoe, all the worst treason as coming from the Minister of the Crown and the chief law officer of Her Majesty in the Province of Manitoba. Aren't these strong words, words that I wouldn't dare to use myself, Mr. Speaker. Sir John A. MacDonald had stated also that the separate schools of Manitoba were beyond the reach of the Legislature of the province and beyond the reach of the Parliament of Canada. I have here the Tribune in which a writer in the Tribune — he has signed his article Peter Desbarats — after reading the history of the school question wrote this — "Fighting Joe Martin and his followers undoubtedly trampled on minority rights of the Catholics" and he writes — "Is that a privilege?" It's not a privilege. Some people don't seem to understand the meaning of these words. It's not a privilege; it's a right for the Catholic minority to have these schools and to expect and to ask for some support for these schools. This is a constitutional right. It comes even before the parental right, because if every father and mother had the right to erect a school, a private school for himself and his children and expect to have government help, that would be going too far. I am talking on behalf of those parochial schools that were guaranteed the right to operate, not the right to die because of no funds.

I'm coming to the question as to whether state help as has been mentioned will violate the traditional Canadian policy of church-state separation. Is it state help? In a sense it is, in a sense it is not. It is giving back to the taxpayers something that belongs to them. Part of the money that is spent on schools is paid for by the taxpayer in Norwood, the taxpayer in Transcona, who doesn't send his child to school; the taxpayer in Brandon or in Winnipeg. They have a right to a part of their taxes, at least, to carry on the education of their children, and it doesn't violate, even if it should be state money. I claim it is the people's money. Does it violate the Canadian policy, the traditional policy of church-state separation? How is it looked upon in other provinces? How is it looked upon? It is not looked upon as violating this principle. There is co-operation in other provinces. That's the Canadian system of treating education, except in two provinces. This is the British system. Is it a violation of this principle? It is not. It is helping every boy and girl to get an education. Some say it will enrich the Catholic Church. Can we imagine anything so ridiculous? Can we imagine anything so ridiculous? These poor people, these ordinary people who carry on these schools because of their conscience are not rich people, and the clergy have nothing themselves. They are supported by these same people. This money will go to provide a little bit of equality of education, and it's not going to enrich the Catholic Church. To me it doesn't make sense. It's not what's going on in other parts of Canada. Is the contribution that the Quebec Government made to the Protestant school system a violation of this tradition? No. It's in accord with this tradition of co-operation if you will between the church and state. Some people show us the United States. They admire the system that they have over there, complete separation of church and state, neutral schools — and they claim it's a big country, united country. Yes, it has done

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).... great things, but should we say so because they have this type of schools. I don't think so for a minute, Mr. Speaker. They are a big country, but what have they done that we haven't done. They have come together, they have given themselves a flag, they have given themselves a national anthem, they have invited people from all over the world to come with them and establish a big country, and they have succeeded. Around their national anthem and their flag they can get together, they can be proud. What have we done in Canada here, the two big races, the two premier races in this province that have founded this country and established it haven't yet got together to get - give themselves a flag that they would all like to have. We have invited to this country Scandinavians, Jews, we have invited Russians, we have invited Mennonites, we have invited Czechoslovacs, we have Russians. We have invited people from all over the world. What have we given them? What point of cohesion, really, have we given them? We haven't yet even given them a flag. I think we should have done that, we should have done that soon. We want to unite our people. We want a distinctive Canadian flag. Mr. Chairman, do not think that I do not respect the Queen. I respect the Queen, the Queen of Canada. It's proper for her to have a flag, the British flag when she is in Britain. I think she would be very happy to come to Canada if we had a distinctive Canadian flag, and it would unite the people of Canada. I read in the papers the other day that the First Minister, I'm sorry he's not here, I would have liked to have made this speech in his presence. I was sorry to see that he was advocating a Manitoba flag. I think, Mr. Speaker, he's putting the cart before the horse. I think we should first have a Canadian flag, a national anthem, and then we should think of a Manitoba flag. Do we want to Balkanize this country of ours of Canada anymore. I don't think we want to do that, Mr. Speaker. Let us do first things first.

Coming back to my point about American system. Yes, they have Godless schools, if I may use that word, over there. But, Mr. Speaker, schools without God make churches without people. I think they should be more pitied than copied. I think the Canadian system, the British system with respect to education, is a better system. I don't think we should change ours to adopt theirs. Some say why don't you Catholics accept the common school, nothing wrong goes on there. They can't understand. Is it necessary, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, that everybody should understand that majorities should necessarily understand minorities. This is for Catholics a question of conscience. They think that religion is not something to be worn on Sunday and discarded the rest of the week. They would like to see an emblem in the school to remind them that God is always present everywhere. They would like to see, Mr. Speaker, the mother who teaches her son or daughter in the morning that God is the master of the world, and the Creator; that he has to be known and honoured and loved and served in order to be happy with him ever after. That mother doesn't like to see her child go to school and face the possibilities that the teacher will say well, there is no God, we come from the monkeys. There are other possibilities with respect to confession, with respect to Holy Communion, and these things have happened when this was tried in the late nineties -- these things have happened. The teachers in schools, agnostics or atheists or revolutionists, even some Protestants, who were not careful at times in their expressions. This is what the Catholics do not want to happen. That's why they wanted Catholic teachers in their schools. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that they want religion to be taught all day? Not for a minute. They are practical people. They want the atmosphere to be good, but they do not want religion to be taught all day. These teachers who are teaching in these schools, they are teaching to the future citizens of this province, not only religion, religion for half an hour, but the rest of the time, the three Rs, spelling, English literature, grammar, all the subjects of the provincial Department of Education school curriculum -- everything. They are rendering a service to the state, that has not been appreciated by the state. These 7,000 Catholic children now that go to school receive an education that cost nothing to this province -- an education that this province should be responsible for. This government, this Legislature, has the responsibility toward every boy and girl in this province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Might I remind the honourable that he's now about five minutes over his time. There's other speakers who wish to speak this afternoon and -- of course I'm willing to abide by any opinion in the House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this subject is a matter of such deep concern to the honourable member, a matter of such concern to the Province of Manitoba that I can say certainly for

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.).... our side of the House we would not wish to curtail the honourable member's speaking time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I add as far as our group is concerned, although I have one more speaker and possibly two, that I join with the House Leader in the sentiment that he has expressed. I know the Honourable Member for Carillon has this deep to his heart and with firm conviction, and while it may upset the plans that we may have had at the start of this afternoon's session, I think in all deference to my honourable friend, we would agree for him to continue.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I appreciate the courtesy very, very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I would like to — I would have said something else with respect to these women, these married men, who have taught in these schools for so many years, for seventy years, have never received a proper salary. They have rendered the province service which should be recognized. I pay tribute to the parents of these children, who have paid the little bit that they could. I think a monument possibly should be erected to these people. Some of the objections against these schools, they say well, if this aid is given irrespective of the conditions — conditions are strict -- I don't know if I agree 100% with the conditions, but we want to protect the public schools. We're not thinking of ourselves alone, we're thinking of others. But some say there'll be an enormous number of new schools going on all over the province. This is not the case; they're trying to scare people. The schools that have been erected are not ethnical racial schools in the sense that they teach only a language all day long, the language of the group that organized that school. It is ridiculous, they follow the curriculum. Some mention segregation. My friend, my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface has mentioned that. There's one point I'd like to touch.

We have segregation now. At nine o'clock in the morning some boys on one street go to one school, other boys of the other street go to the other school. Boys and girls in the North End go in the North End, those in River Heights go to River Heights. With the private schools, Catholic schools I should say, or parochial schools, it's the same thing. They go to their schools; nobody knows that there is segregation, nobody is conscious of that. But there is another segregation that is much worse, the segregation that is planned by The Public Schools Act. The segregation which says that at 3:30 the Catholics if they want religious instruction should be gathered in a room and if it's a Catholic district the Protestants should be gathered from the others in another room to get this instruction. And I say that this is much worse, this type of segregation, at 3:30, much worse. The other one is not considered as segregation.

I want to talk on equality of opportunity, and I won't be long. This government has promised equality of opportunity. It has made speeches all over the province on this program. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that when some pupils in this province who attend constitutional schools, schools provided by the laws, by the constitution I should say -- and the laws because they are legal schools and nobody can close them -- and these schools are good with respect to the compulsory school attendance act. They get not a cent and the others get about \$250 from the government. Is that equality of educational opportunity? I would like to show to this House a poster that I have here, a poster that was printed by the government before the vote on the large divisions. And it is this: "For every child an equal chance. Vote for. December 27th, Department of Education, Province of Manitoba." An equal chance for every child. Well, I plead with the government for an equal chance for every child, without telling to this child, or to the father and mother of this child that in order to get that equal chance you have to walk over your conscience, to deny your own convictions. We're supposed to have freedom of religion -- it's coming to the point, Mr. Speaker, where the cost of education for these Catholics in these schools is so high that it amounts to economic compulsion. They're just about forced to go to the schools that they don't like. It just about amounts to that.

With respect to the divisiveness, I was going to quote something from the Winnipeg Tribune, and I won't have time to do that. They said that the argument cannot be proven that it's It's just one sentence. The divisiveness argument simply does not stand examination.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to my narrative. To February 14th when this House was opened and the Speech from the Throne didn't say a word about this question.

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).... Lo and behold on that night I went home and I got the Winnipeg Free Press and I'm sorry that I have to say something disparaging at this time. It had some kind of an editorial on the news page, third page, big headlines: "Government won't act on school aid." We did not know it in this House. It's not in the Speech from the Throne. It's stated in the Winnipeg Free Press. And then a sub-headline: "Tell Catholics that patience best strategy." It means, I suppose, the government tells Catholics patience best strategy. And then it goes on: "The Provincial Government has decided against taking any action to provide aid for Manitoba private schools, because, in the words of one senior government official" -- who is the senior government official, is he the Minister of Education, is he the First Minister -- "We can't ram this down the throats of a province that doesn't want it." Is that what the government has told the Catholics of Manitoba in the Speech from the Throne? It's in the Winnipeg Free Press. And then -- it's too long, I would have liked to touch on all the points. At one point it says that the Premier, Roblin himself, was in favour. Was he in favour? I don't know. Does the Free Press know? His grandfather was in favour. His grandfather voted with L.....M..... and Prendergast in 1890. He voted against Bill 13 that was robbing the Catholics of their rights in education. So did John Norquay. Is the First Minister, Premier Roblin, in favor? I don't know. Does the Free Press know? I would like to go on. It's not news. It's editorial stuff. It's not signed by anyone. "The Tories are relinquishing the idea that the Member for LaVerendrye apparently will be in a dilemma about his position" -- but then the government, apparently from this article, the government has studied the whole situation. There's more votes to be gathered by being against this thing. That's what the article says, if I had time to read it -- but I'm coming to the last sentence. In..... Do you know what that means? In the tail is a poison, or the sting possibly. "Furthermore" the article states, "the result of such an election would be that the private schools would be denied assistance for many years to come." And then listen to this - "The government's private position to Roman Catholics as the result has become the position of the government towards Catholics - have patience, and when the furor dies who knows, you might begin gaining assistance; but make a struggle out of it and you have no chance at all." And this has not been denied, Mr. Speaker, and I'm addressing myself to the Leader of the government. Is the government in accord with this threat that is being made to the Catholics of Manitoba at this time? Does it come from the Free Press? Why the quotation marks before these words "have patience"? "When the furor dies" -- when will the furor die, I ask you? Thirteen months now since the government has stated "We will in due course" and nothing is happening. The First Minister the other day made a statement

MR. A.H. CORBETT (Swan River): Could I ask the member a question?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Pardon me, I'm sorry but my time is being exhausted, I'm sorry, I should be more agreeable but..... The First Minister the other day stated: "Let's wait. Let's continue to discuss the issue. We need to continue to review the facts. We need to continue discussing to find out our position, in a calm dispassionate and above all, political manner." Mr. Speaker, a Royal Commission has been appointed to discuss this matter in a calm, dispassionate, and above all, non-political manner, and it has made a unanimous recommendation. Royal Commissions are appointed exactly for a purpose to get the government off the hook on decisions of this kind, and the government doesn't do a thing and it's expressed, according to the Winnipeg Free Press, according to these quotation marks, that we will remain silent. How long can we remain silent? How long will the Catholics remain silent, and other people fiddle while they are burning and paying the shot. We've heard an honourable member this afternoon saying "Well, let's wait". How long can we wait? I ask you, Mr. Speaker. The time has come for action. I'm sure that my speech will not bring immediate action, but it had to be told. I've been accused in the course of those years by the Catholics of Greater Winnipeg, of Winnipeg proper, of being more French than Catholic. I told them I didn't think the time had come - I would quote but there's no time - I didn't think the time had come for me to speak, but now the time has come for me to speak. After the Royal Commission has recommended this thing, unanimously, after 70 years the same people paying double taxes all the time, the time has come. And why this threat that we should remain silent? Does it suit the purpose of the government that we should remain silent? Did it think that it will cause the Member for St. Boniface and myself not to speak? I don't think so; but they should have denied

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).... this statement in the Winnipeg Free Press.

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the government, Mr. Roblin, the other day in speaking on this thing, said to the Leader of the Opposition - "Where do you sit? Have you told your position in this matter?". If my leader should have spoken he would have said it's not the job of the opposition to declare policy in the House. It's the job of the government, the government is there to govern. The opposition is there to criticize and to oppose, and I'm sure that this cannot be anything else but passing the buck. Last year, Mr. Speaker, when nothing was done except the statement that something would be done in due course, the government knew at that time that the Liberals were going to have a convention to choose a leader. Is it that the government hoped that the Liberals would fight between themselves about it and waited for a year and then we'd have had another year? Does the government say nothing, yes or no, in the hope that the Liberals will meet in April and thrash this matter out and announce a policy after they have fought between themselves? Is that what they think is leadership? Is that what they want to do -- to wait and see? Well, would not the Liberals be foolish to decide a question when the government who has a duty, an obligation, doesn't do a thing about it?

You might ask me what my government would have done if they had been in power at the time, facing this issue. I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I knew the men in the government, that they were straws in the wind. I think I know - I can't speak out definitely - I think I know this government has introduced the teaching of the French language at the fourth grade instead of the seventh. They had exempted from taxation the parochial schools that had paid taxes for 65 years. They have done that. They were possibly taking their political life in their hands. They started giving grants to the professional colleges, St. Pauls, St. Boniface, United College. I saw them do that. These are not words. This is action and action speaks louder than words. I don't know what they would have done with the report of the Royal Commission, but I know the men who were there; they would have waited for the whole report, not consider this thing piecemeal and I think they would have acted, but I don't know. Nobody can prove -- but they were straws in the wind. I wonder if the government's playing hide and seek with the Liberals on this matter. How long will that go, this hide and seek game, if it is one? Will it go on for one year, for two years, for three years? When can we hope to have a decision from the government? The government has the obligation; it is the duty of the government to show the lead in this matter. I'm not going to ask them to resign and call for an election immediately, but I don't like to see this question to be left to politics. It could have been decided away from politics if the government had had the courage to bring it before this House at the proper time without waiting so long for the furor to develop in this province.

I would like to -- I'm missing many of the points that I had in mind to speak about, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to say very much -- but I'm going to say this, that there's still a chance possibly, and I'd like to make a suggestion. Is the government favorably inclined to giving something to these people who are citizens to help to give an equal chance to these boys and girls who have been educated to respect and honour authority -- they believe that, properly constituted, authority is from the Lord. They haven't tried to avoid, they haven't tried to do harm, they've been good, submissive..... to the law. The Catholics believe that they have no right to urge that the will of the majority should be discarded, but that they have a right to urge that the will of the majority should be changed. In the schools they have learned to obey the law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a chance to do something for these people. The lead would have to come from the government. The government would have to make up its mind and then see the leaders of the other three parties -- we have three parties in the House -- and see whether this thing could not be passed unanimously so that we will not have in this province a fight between neighbors and between members of the same political party. If that could be found possible by the government, the result would be, I'm sure, that no party would get the credit nor the blame, it would be all tied up together -- and if it were possible that maybe this would pass unanimously in this House. If the government recommends it unanimously, I have a hope that it might be passed unanimously by, and supported by, the other two parties in the House. This is a suggestion that I am making, but I am telling to the Catholics of Manitoba that even though maybe nothing will happen this year, or next year or the year after next, because of inaction in Manitoba, there are better days ahead. There will be a solution

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)..... to this problem, and before very long, and if the trouble, Mr. Speaker, came from outside interference the solution will possibly come from outside interference. I would like to tell you what I mean. You know, Mr. Speaker, that for years there has been pressure on the Government of Ottawa to have Ottawa pay grants for education to get into the educational field with grants. The Canadian Educational Association has pressed for grants; the Canadian School Trustees Association, the Canadian Schoolteachers Association have asked for federal aid for education. It has not yet been given. There has been a stumbling block and that stumbling block was the Province of Quebec with Premier Duplessis in charge. But there's been a change in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Lesage is at the head of the province now with new policies showing the way in the matter of co-operation -- not being so scared that provincial autonomy is going to be ruined if he co-operates with Ottawa. He has taken the lead with the repatriation of the constitution. He's co-operating, and the day might come when Ottawa will consult the provinces on aid for education, feeling that Lesage will support the move, then there will be some aid for education, and I predict that it will be before we reach the centenary of this country of ours, that there will be. And I ask everyone in this House, when there is federal assistance for education, is anyone able to stand up and say that it will not go to every school kid in this province along Canadian and British lines? It will necessarily. Will anyone tell me that Ottawa will give \$20 say, a day for the 170,000 pupils in this province and see this government giving it only to 160? This will not come to pass. This problem will be settled possibly if we don't settle it ourselves like men of integrity and honesty, and try to rid this province of the -- I haven't got the words -- rid this province of the controversial issue for good. It will be settled possibly by Lesage helping the Federal Government. Laurier has been detrimental to the cause; Lesage will be beneficial and before long. And this will not be interfering or violate the separation of church and state -- it's not considered that way anywhere else except in Manitoba and then we will have more peace in this province. And I say to these people who are carrying the load and are finding now that it is impossible to carry because of the fact that when I came into this House, Mr. Speaker, the government was giving \$200.00 a year per teacher and now it is giving \$4,000. a year. It's impossible to carry -- but they'll carry it -- I am not threatening that they will close their schools. We won't close those schools. It's a tough proposition, Mr. Speaker. I think that the day is coming when this will be done and I am telling to all the Catholics in Manitoba, now they have reached a point where they are close to one-third -- in 1890 they were one in five, now they are quite close to one in three. The French were nearly alone with a few English in those years, in 1890, now we have the largest group of Catholics, our Greek Catholics. I am not threatening anyone, but I am telling facts, and I say to these people, do not lose heart, the day will come and the day is not far away. You will see deliverance before long.

MRS. C. MORRISON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to make my first speech in this House, I wish first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on the distinguished position you hold in this Assembly. I know that you are held in high regard for the fair and impartial decisions you make to all concerned. I extend to you my very best wishes that you will be privileged to hold this high office for many years to come. At this time too, I wish to congratulate the Honourable Member for Arthur and the Honourable Member for Cypress, the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, for the excellent job that they did. It is an honour to be chosen for these duties and they proved themselves more than capable.

I do appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the many kind words of welcome that I have received from the members of this Legislature since taking my place among you. During the years when my husband sat in this Chamber and I looked down from the gallery on many occasions, I never thought I would ever be seated down here. However, life weaves many fantastic patterns and now I find myself holding this responsible position. I am especially happy to be associated with the Honourable Member from Cypress and it seems a strange coincidence that our constituencies should border one another. At this time I would like to pay tribute to my predecessor and my friend, the late Maurice Ridley. When I think of carrying on for him, I feel both proud and humble. Proud because I was chosen; but humble when I think of how very incapable I am in comparison. Maurice loved life, he loved people, he loved doing things for people. I only hope that in serving his constituency and mine, I can accomplish at least some of the legislation that he would have wanted for the good people of the constituency of Pembina.

(Mrs. Morrison, cont'd.)....

And now, Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me for awhile, I would like to tell the members of this House about my constituency. I do not know whether it is the desire of every member to talk about their constituency or not, but for the benefit of those honourable members who are not too well acquainted with, or perhaps have never been to my constituency, I do want to tell them just what a fine constituency it is. I don't wish to brag about it, I only wish to give them some of the true facts, because I believe it is one of the finest and most aggressive constituencies in the Province of Manitoba. The name Pembina which it received after the last re-distribution is a most suitable name because the very picturesque Pembina Valley runs through this area and adds a great deal to the beauty and attractiveness of this part of the province. If any of you are wondering, come summertime, just where you might take your family for a pleasant outing, I would say, "See Manitoba first", and it gives me much pleasure to invite you to the Constituency of Pembina. Follow the trail of that great French Canadian explorer, Pierre LaVerendrye and visit some of the area he visited some 200 years ago. However, unlike LaVerendrye, you will find a network of good highways, well marked, with very attractive and easily read road signs, which greatly add to the pleasures of travelling, and which were introduced by my government. If you prefer to leave your trip until fall, when the leaves are turning in color, I can assure you, Sir, a drive through the Pembina Valley is one of the most beautiful sights you can ever see. And whether you travel in the spring, summer or fall, you will find excellent hotel-motel accommodation along the way, and many fine eating places to add to your pleasure. The constituency of Pembina is basically a farming constituency, but I am happy to say that owing to people being willing to make financial investments in order to promote progress and also with help from the Industrial Development Fund set up under the Roblin Government, industries are developing to an amazing degree. And, of course, with the increase in industries, comes an increase in employment, and the bigger payroll.

In the eastern section of my constituency is the Town of Morden, where the story of industrial growth and increasing population reads like a fairy story. In the past ten years the population of this town has increased by 66%, it now has a population of over 3,000, while the taxable assessment of the town has increased over 300%. It would take much too long, Mr. Speaker, for me to give you any kind of a detailed story of the industrial growth of the Town of Morden. I can merely give you a very brief outline. For those of you who have never visited this part of Manitoba, I might tell you that as you approach the town from the east, you see the Dominion Experimental Farm, which in the spring is beautiful with its blossoms; in the summer, its shady nooks and flower beds, and in the fall, its great variety of luscious fruits and vegetables. And now to take a much too quick run over the various industries, I will name first, the Pembina Poultry Eviscerating Plant, where poultry go in live and come out ready for the oven. In conjunction with this, is the cold storage and animal food plant, where all the waste from the eviscerating plant is processed into animal food, frozen and used for feeding foxes and mink. I am not sure as to how many pounds of poultry are processed in this plant each year, but I know it reaches into the million mark. Moving on to a factory of a different flavour, we have the Canadian Cannery Limited, where vegetables such as peas, beans and corn are canned in large quantities and experiments are continually going on with other vegetables. This cannery at Morden pays out over a quarter of a million dollars annually for produce, wages and other services. We also have the fibre glass boat plant, the Farm Machinery Manufacturing Company, the Howard Smith Paper Mills where flax straw is processed. Now I will bring you to Morden's two most recent industries, the Dressler Headwear and Fur Manufacturing Plant where caps, hats, fur mitts and ear muffs are made; and now to the latest industry of all, the Hillcrest Potato Chips, manufactured by Manitoba Vegetable Products Limited, and I would like to mention that I have had placed in each caucus room, some samples of the Hillcrest Potato Chips. I think they are a fine example of the excellent produce that is grown and processed in the Morden area. I might say that they manufacture these potato chips in three different flavours.

And now, Mr. Speaker, to sum up my story. The industrial plants of Morden employ some 350 employees with an annual payroll of some \$600,000, not to mention the many farmers who are engaged in the producing of the products, chicken, turkeys and vegetables which keep these industries in operation. Water for these industries is supplied from an artificial lake,

(Mrs. Morrison, cont'd.)..... which during the summer is also a great tourist attraction. I must hurry along leaving behind us this very beautiful and progressive town with its fine hospital, fine schools, nursing homes, etc. However, I am going to pause briefly at the west end of the town, because here we have another industry, which people often wonder about. To the passer-by, it looks like nothing but a pile of clay — and how true, because that's just what it is. Some few miles away is a mine of clay called bentonite clay. It is the best of its kind to be found anywhere in the world. Truckers haul it to this plant, which is known as the Pembina Mountain Clays Plant where it is processed and the resulting product is used in the refining of oil, in the making of feeds, the making of powdered insecticides, and as a moulding sand in steel foundries. Approximately 20,000 tons of clay are processed here each year.

We will travel on now, Mr. Speaker, westward on No. 3 to the junction of highways 3 and 31, to the little roadside park, dedicated to the memory of Pierre LaVerendrye. Here the traveller can stop, if he so desires, read about LaVerendrye on the bronze plaque and have his lunch at the picnic table, if he has brought his lunch along. From here we will continue on westward to my own Town of Manitou. You will see before you come near the town, a water tower, reacing high in the sky. To the people of Manitou, this water tower will stand for the rest of time as a memorial to Manitou's much loved Maurice Ridley. I am sure many of you still remember hearing of the disappointments and frustrations that went on in Manitou some years ago in the search for water, but thanks to men like Maurice, who at that time was Mayor of Manitou, and who did not give up without a struggle, success came at last and Manitou finally got the waterworks, and how fortunate we are to have an abundant supply of soft water, as soft as rain water. However, progress must not stop here. Manitou must have industries and now has its Charter and with help from the Department of Industry and Commerce, the Town of Manitou has plans for getting a garment factory started in the near future. For some time a broiler plant has been in operation in Manitou which involves many farmers because the farmers in the area supply hatching eggs from the feed flocks to produce the broilers at the local hatchery. At the plant itself some 250,000 broilers are produced each year. Near the town a group of men have a hog enterprise and another group a turkey enterprise. From these various enterprises the district farmers receive approximately some \$250,000 from the sale of grain for feed and for their hatching eggs, and so we can see how the growth of industries provides employment and a take-home payroll which all goes to provide better living conditions.

Another few miles to the west and we arrive at that picturesque little town of LaRiviere nestled in the Pembina Valley, looking like a miniature Banff. At this season of the year it is a beehive of skiers because the sponsors of the ski slope at LaRiviere took advantage of the Manitoba Development Fund to improve their accommodation not only in the ski slopes but motel accommodation as well, and as a result LaRiviere is the skiers delight. I might add when the LaRiviere motels cannot accommodate the skiers and the travellers, Manitou's new hotel-motel only a short distance away can look after the overflow. And Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention here that after the sponsors of the LaRiviere ski resort had completed their development program they honoured their government member by naming one of the ski slides the Maurice Ridley ski slope. We cannot leave this town of LaRiviere without first turning southward and having a look at a dream come true. A dream for the people of the LaRiviere-Snowflake area, when through the efforts of the late Maurice Ridley and the government he represented, a highway was built which gives these people a new lease on life. A road they can travel on rain or shine, winter or summer, something they never had before. And here again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the very impressive ceremony which was held last December when the bridge built on this highway over the Pembina River was dedicated to the memory of the late the Honourable Maurice Ridley, fulfilling a request which had been made by the people of the LaRiviere-Snowflake area to the government that this bridge be called the Maurice Ridley Bridge.

Now Mr. Speaker, I could name a number of other little towns in my constituency but I will take time for only two more, and these in the north. The Town of Somerset which is predominantly French-speaking and Swan Lake where much of the population is of Belgium origin - two delightful little towns bursting with kindly hospitality and deeply interested in the health and welfare of their people - young and old alike. In this journey through my constituency Mr. Speaker, I believe I have shown where the Roblin Government has done much to

(Mrs. Morrison, cont'd).....improve the living conditions of the people. By assisting with industrial development it has helped to provide employment; it has built up a network of good roads, highways including a number of access roads completed, and I hope, plans for a few more. It has made improvements in the electrical power lines and I'm thinking especially of Manitou where last spring new cable lines were built, the poles and open wires on the front street were removed where possible and new poles and lines built from the back lanes thus improving the service and the appearance of our town. I neglected to mention earlier the winter works program at Morden where the new \$163,000 telephone building is going up which will institute modern dial service to the subscribers in this area. In the field of education the larger school divisions are, for the most part, proving very satisfactory. In those areas where the people feel the larger divisions are not too suitable, I am sure that with careful thought and planning, a satisfactory arrangement can be worked out. In the field of agriculture quite a number of farmers in my constituency have taken advantage of the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation by borrowing money to get themselves better established in their farming operations. In the field of health and welfare Mr. Speaker, I say that our senior citizens never before had the security they now enjoy with the added help of Medicare where needed, and in some cases extra cash assistance. I eagerly await the results of the report of The Manitoba Hospital Services Plan with the greatest hopes that those hospitals in my constituency which are so overcrowded, will be designated for additional accommodation and included in the building program. Looking over what the government has done in my constituency and realizing it is the story of the other constituencies of the province, I do feel that the Roblin Government has a record of achievement - a record to be proud of.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty to speak about the charges of bribery and threats that were made in reference to my election campaign last fall. During the campaign a number of persons spoke on behalf of the government record and on my behalf. I believe that I attended more meetings than anyone else. I talked to people in all parts of the constituency and never once did I hear tell of any such threats. In fact all the way through I admired the conduct and caliber of my opponents; I felt it was a most cleanly fought campaign. I must say Mr. Speaker, I regret the charges that have been made, and I feel they are most unfounded.

..... Continued next page.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with others that have congratulated you when you are back in the Chair one again. We do appreciate having a gentleman of your calibre there in that Chair because you have proven that you know quite a bit about parliamentary procedure and how this House should be conducted, which is a great help to us backbenchers. I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder on the Speech from the Throne. They have done a wonderful job -- a wonderful job. I never had that opportunity although I thought I had reached the heights of my political career, but not long ago I sat at a head table and am now holding down a seat in the front row. But, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the Member from Pembina. We were up in Pembina for a while and we enjoyed working with a candidate such as she. I have been around when there's been a male candidate but I never worked with a candidate as vigorous and who has put as much time as she did in that campaign; and I know she's going to be worthy of the seat that she holds and the people of Pembina will be proud of her.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker mentioned that it was a good clean campaign and I don't know just how to differ with her. I don't want to differ with her views but I would like to express my views. The candidate of the Liberal Party and the people that spoke for him in that campaign, they were human like the rest of us. They did wander off the beaten track but not too far -- not too far. We can forgive them for that because mostly one will do that in the heat of an election debate, but the other party, I wish I could say the same for them. Now I don't know if you folks have seen any of the literature that they had circulating in that constituency during the by-election, and they had literature that sounded good; but when you hear of the stories and their platform outside of the constituency of Pembina, it was amusing, pathetic in lots of ways -- really pathetic. You were just wondering what they thought the people of Pembina were made of. Now here is a clipping and it's from a reliable source, the Winnipeg Free Press, and it's November 12, 1960 and it's by Ted Hyde: "The Social Credit Party is working on a \$500,000 publicity and education program and will have 170 federal candidates nominated by next spring, Dr. R.N. Thompson, President of the National Social Credit Party said in Winnipeg." Now it was a different story there -- \$500,000. We were trying to buy votes. That's what they were telling right in the constituency. And he goes on to say that the solution for our monetary troubles is the Social Credit reform policy in our monetary system. That's what we need and it's terrible the way we're wasting our money and the interest that we have to pay and so forth and so on. But I think the most outstanding paragraph or paragraphs of this article is that he was attending a press conference here in the city, that is Dr. Thompson; and he pointed out to the press conference that one United States weekly magazine, that's the U. S. News and World Report, in the November the 7th edition carried a story by an American economist on how the Soviet system works. The Soviet system -- remember that point. And he goes on and says, "the economist said if the Russian government needed new money it would simply issue it. Coin and currency is being increased by two or three percent and the volume of bank credit by 20 to 25 percent a year. In addition, the Russian government can borrow from the citizens." Dr. Thompson said, "Canada could do the same if the Federal Government would take over control." Now what do they mean? Are they going to follow the Soviet plan of issuing money when they take over control? Are they going to follow the Soviet plan all the way through? And he said the issue is needed instead of allowing the banks to charge high interest rates for money they lend.

Well now, the Member for Rhineland the other day spoke that we should do something for agriculture. He said it was his duty and he thought it was our duty to speak in this House for agriculture. And he said, "why can't we take soft currency for our wheat and other commodities that we produce on the farms?" Well I don't know if there's many members in this House remember back in 1936 when Mr. Aberhardt produced that soft currency in Alberta, \$2,000,000 worth of it; and it was so soft they had to withdraw it within the year. It wouldn't stand up at all. Now they criticize our monetary system here and I think we have one of the finest in the world. And this is one of these prosperity dollars that Mr. Aberhardt used and this is what he was going to pay the farmers of Alberta for their produce -- and I am thinking now of the gentleman that had a store in a little town northeast of Alberta, and he had in the neighbourhood of three or \$4,000 worth of goods in his store -- and in the same little town there was a cheese factory and Mr. Aberhardt, the late Aberhardt, issued \$2,000,000 worth of this and this

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.)....unfortunate small country storekeeper was in the position where he got \$3,000 by cashing the cream cheques of the men that were hauling the milk to the cheese factory and taking this money for it. Now he had to replace his stock and he took his \$3,000 worth of this money into the wholesalers in Edmonton and they laughed at him and wouldn't take it -- wouldn't take it at all. They wouldn't recognize it; wouldn't begin to recognize it, but Mr. Aberhardt was a clever man in some respects and there is still some clever men, if they were thinking along the right lines, in the Social Credit Party yet. I will admit that, but Mr. Aberhardt was going to tax every individual that had this dollar on a Monday morning one cent, before he could turn it over to the next fellow. Mr. Speaker, there is 104 squares on this prosperity dollar, which meant that Mr. Aberhardt was giving a dollar plus four cents back in two years. -- (Interjection) -- Work? It sure did work. It worked, so did the \$25. a month work; it's still working.

Well if that is Social Credit theory, and I didn't want to bring this up, I don't like to be critical of any political party, but it was the campaign that they spread in the Pembina Constituency. I can't just find the little pamphlet that they had, but here is another glaring example. They had what we would pay in taxes as a citizen of Manitoba -- they had income tax there at \$144; gasoline tax, forty some odd dollars; amusement tax, some odd dollars. In total it was a total of two hundred and forty some odd dollars; and that was for a family of five -- \$244 I think if I can remember right. That was the tax that we were paying on a family of five in the Province of Manitoba. And this literature was saying, "elect the Social Credit and do away with debt; elect the Social Credit and do away with taxes!" And they go on in the next line and they multiply that by five and it comes to around \$1,200; and they say this is what the citizens of Manitoba are paying for taxes. That's why we have to be critical. And the Free Press has another article dated November 18th, 1960, and in part, this was a meeting of the "big-wigs" of the Social Credit Party held in the Fort Garry Hotel here in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Would this be a convenient time for me to call it 5:30?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might consult the wishes of the House at this point to see whether it would be considered advisable to allow -- perhaps my honourable friend might not have too much longer. I understand there is one further speaker on the opposition side of the House and I understand there are no further speakers from this group, that we might well be able to conclude our business perhaps by 6 o'clock, then it would require not more than 10 or 15 minutes, I am sure, to introduce the motions required to table the estimates. We might then be able to continue with our original plan. If that were suitable to the other groups, I am sure we would be interested to hear what the remaining speakers have to say.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as Robbie Burns once said, "The best laid plans of men and mice oft gang aglae." I think that has happened here this afternoon with our proposition. However, as far as our group feels at the present time, we have one more speaker, the Honourable Member for Fisher, who wishes to make his contribution to the debate, who I suggest would follow the Honourable Member for Morris. And if there are none other who wish to speak in this debate, providing there is nothing too controversial from my honourable friend on my left, then I would suggest that with the unanimous consent of the House that we may carry on to the completion in order to prevent coming back this evening. And while we are running a little backwards of what I had hoped we would have been, we would not have to come back this evening.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our group, and while we have a lot of things to say about this government, we are prepared to hold them until some other occasion which will present itself. And unless forced into reply on some particular bitter barbs, we have no further speakers tonight.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I am agreeable, provided the honourable member who is speaking puts his time to better use.

MR. SHEWMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that was a fair question but not a very intelligent one. I think it is my duty to stand in my place in this House and explain the best I can to the people of Manitoba what the Social Credit theory is, as far as I can see it. Now I was just starting to tell you, in this article of November 18th, 1960, "Social Credit maps national strategy." They're having this meeting in the Fort Garry Hotel of their council and they're discussing the monetary reform and such like, and the delegate goes on to say -- it did not say exactly how much new money they would create if they were in power -- the Party Treasurer, Herbert

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.)....Hoeppner, said the party would print enough new money to eliminate the gap between consumer purchasing power and consumer goods and services produced in Canada. I guess we know something about that gap. It's when the goods are up here and the price is down there, and vice versa. They are going to cut it off just level so everybody has lots of money and everybody has lots of goods. And Mr. Hoeppner goes on to say, "In the last fiscal year the gap was \$5,700,000." That was last year. Now that's the money that they would have to create to make their Social Credit theory work. And during the campaign in Pembina, the Social Credit Party accused us of piling up debt. Every post, every corner post, fence post, telephone post, and everything had signs on, "If you don't want debt, vote Social Credit. Social Credit has the theory to cure our debt." Now there were chaps there from Alberta speaking for the Social Credit Party; chaps from British Columbia speaking for the Social Credit Party; and they had a lot of these half-baked truths. Mr. Speaker, I have heard that expression used in the House before so I don't feel guilty for using it, but that's what they were.

The government in British Columbia, in striking their budget just a year ago, had to raise their taxes for education \$9.6 million; for public works, \$20.2 million; for Hospital Insurance, \$4.3 million; on mental health, \$2 million; on highways, \$20 million; making a total of \$85 million. Now I wish someone would explain how they get that if it is not taxation. And the irony of this whole thing is, Mr. Speaker, that they accused us of piling up debt; and I say that we were investing in the future of Manitoba. They said they were free of debt — absolutely free of debt. Well I wish someone would explain debt a little better to me than has been explained so far. But it says though all the direct debts of the government have been paid off, its very agents have borrowed \$543,220,604 with this unlimited guarantee. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that debt? Is that debt? That was to help pay for the Eastern Railway and their power facilities and such like, Mr. Speaker, and yet they would come into the Pembina Constituency and try and tell the people there was no debt in British Columbia. Now I think here is the one that takes the cheese, and here is one of those Social Credit pamphlets — you can get them almost any place at all if you run across a Social Creditor because they have pocketsful — and this is what they are spreading throughout the country. And this is "Taxation and Welfare State" by F.B. Shaw, M. P. I don't want to take time to read it all, but here is one thing that I like about it, and most likely you folks will too. This is it, when they say they are not going to control anything. Now this is by a man who is responsible, must be responsible or the the Social Credit Party wouldn't be delivering his literature, and this is what he has to say in part, "Parliament must repossess the right, which it has under the constitution decree, issue and control the circulation of our money." Now this is it — that's it! I didn't want to take the time at this late hour to berate the Social Credit Party, but I think the people in this House should know just what propaganda they were spreading up there in Pembina during the election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will only be a minute or two longer. I would like to say a few words or two on what was mentioned here the other night, that this government was not doing anything in southeastern Manitoba. I'm interested in southeastern Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the government has done quite a bit. They have implemented a long range program as far as reforestation is concerned and they have been doing their best to help the settlers in southeastern Manitoba after the miserable mess of things that have been made in years gone by. It's true that the previous government instituted investigations of an economy for southeastern Manitoba on May 6th, 1957, and it was later in that year that the government received its report; but it took very little action in regard to the report and we have heard it mentioned that the settlers down there have been cut-back with their permits for saw logs and pulpwood. The department today has been forced to do that on account of poor forestry management. It will take some time before nature heals this deep wound that has been created down in that country as far as the people of the district are concerned, because that country, in my driving through it, has been overcut; and it will take a good many years to replace the trees where they will be big enough so the settlers living in there will be able to get back to where they can make a living again; and this government is doing just that. They have instituted quite a plan for the reforestation of that country and they are working on it. It was mentioned that the winter employment service down there has been at a standstill. Possibly that is partly true this year, but there has been other years when the forestry department have been blamed and criticized

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.)....for hiring all the available help in that district. The forestry couldn't get men enough to carry on the work that they wanted to do. There has been a great deal of this land reclaimed and the government this year has planted well over a million trees; and by 1970, by 1970 I think the date is, they expect that they will be planting in the neighborhood of 7,500,000 trees. Now that is a lot of trees but that country will stand that kind of production when they're cultivated and good forest management.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member from La Verendrye criticized this government for having to cut-back on the timber permits and the saw logs. That is quite true, but we'll have to just bear and go along with them for a while, because at one time that was a good timber district. Even in the last few years, the last year, there was about 41% of the timber that was cut down in that country, was cut by the settler, a one-man operation. And the government are making — he mentioned the fact that permits were hard to get. The government is trying a new system that will take some time to work out, but they are trying a system of sale by tender instead of the open bid that they have had in the past. By doing that we believe that the farmers will be able to get together in groups, two, three or four, and possibly tender on a woodlot that would suit their requirements; and get it so they could handle the job and they wouldn't have to be bidding on these larger projects for themselves.

Now I said I would make my speech short. I, too, will have a chance to further this discussion. But, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention that the Liberal rally held in Ottawa recently, they were, as usual, groping around in the dark looking for some sort of an agricultural policy that would possibly fit all of Canada. But it was a very weak report. There was nothing that I heard of come out of that rally that would be concrete or give the farmers their say in any part of Canada, let alone the west — western Canada, any hope whatsoever of anything ever coming from the Liberal policies that they have today for the farmer of western Canada. They did advocate a two-price system for wheat, but we've been advocating that too, Mr. Speaker; and I think it's the duty of political parties for their part that they should come out with a good and solid piece of legislation or platform that will do some good. — (Interjection) — I haven't come to you yet.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I think I'll leave space for the other speakers that want to speak. But I would like to say this in closing, that the member for La Verendrye was quite critical; and for some unknown reason, because I mentioned in a speech in this House I made before, I did like him and I've known him for some time, I liked his father; and he has made the remark that he was born and raised a horseman, which is quite true — quite true. And he said, also, almost in the same breath, that on account of me he had gone into this political life. Well, Sir, I don't know. If his statement is correct, that he was raised a horseman, I think a little "horse sense" sometimes, when he's accusing the government of not doing things that they should be doing for the people of southeastern Manitoba, would help.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, watching the time, and my honourable friend ahead of me promised me he's going to be short but he spoke a lot longer than I thought he was, and it's a late hour now and I don't want to burden you legislators with my speech because my speech was a mighty long one. I'm sure I would have absorbed the 40 minute time in spite of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources told me five minutes. However, I will make my contribution on the estimates. I hope I will have that privilege. So I want to thank you all for sitting and relieving me at this time. I still can go home.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur, seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress, that a humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: To His Honour, Errick F. Willis, Q. C., Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, we, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

Mr. Speaker put the question

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans,

(Yeas, cont'd.)....Groves, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes, Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Orlikow, Pauley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 27; Nays 16.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented to His Honour by such members of this House as are of the Executive Council and the mover and the seconder of the Address.

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

MR. EVANS: I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: To the Honourable J. E. Adamson, Chief Justice of Manitoba, Administrator of the Province of Manitoba. The Administrator of the Province of Manitoba transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this now completes the business that we had appointed to be conducted this afternoon. I think the Members will wish to wait while the House staff distribute the copies of the estimates, but I think it would be in order if I moved the House do now adjourn. It would be my understanding to meet again at 2:30 Monday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you name a seconder?

MR. EVANS: I'm sorry I forgot that, Mr. Speaker. I'm quite sure my honourable friend across the way would be glad to second that, but on this occasion I choose the Minister of Education to second the motion.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.