

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Monday, February 17th, 1964

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, in taking part in this debate I do want to extend to you with all the others, my congratulations in having you back with us for the current session. To me, this government appears to be constantly striving for a grandstand performance for the benefit of the people of the Province of Manitoba; and it seems that they are always trying to create an image, of some sort of a vision, rather than action and good government. And Madam Speaker, I would like to confine my remarks to possibly two outstanding matters. One is the fine booklet that we all received on the Red River Floodway. Recent studies show that several control dams in the United States on those tributaries that feed the Red River, have been constructed to control overall flood conditions on the Red River since the last flood. Now on page 6 of this pamphlet it is absolutely amazing to find out that the answer to one of the questions is because the commission says 80% of the waters start to the south of us in the United States and we simply have no control over them. In other words, making a suggestion that the people down south of the border are unwilling to co-operate with us in matters of flood control. And yet, this government is proceeding with the utmost of haste to construct the floodway, which in my opinion most frankly is unnecessary and adds very little to this so-called visionary approach by this government. This project is an absolute waste and expenditure of public funds, and I think that Manitoba got a bit of a blind bargain. I also venture to say, Madam Speaker, that not in the next five years but possibly in the next ten years, you are going to find out that this is going to be a bit of a white elephant as far as the Roblin Government is concerned.

You take the matter of costs on this floodway. The preliminary studies indicated the cost to run someplace between 16 cents to 20 cents per cubic yard. The actual cost is now exceeding 31 cents per cubic yard, and yet we hear everyday reports that the estimated cost of this floodway is not going to be increased -- and I would like to go on record that the cost of this floodway is going to approach 100% double the initial estimate before you are through with it -- and I am going to tell you why.

You also have the matter of awarding contracts to outside contractors, and yet on page 19 of this same booklet you have the impression, and this is the correct impression that somebody is trying to convey, is that the people of the province will gain at least 10 million man hours of employment; at the peak of construction over 1,000 men will be directly employed on this project, and yet when a delegation came to see the Minister of Agriculture, they pleaded with the government to delay the calling of some of these contracts in order to give the local contractors the opportunity to complete some of the work that they did have in hand, and to have their proper share, and rightly so, to be able to bid on some of the floodway contracts. This was denied to them.

There's one very important matter that I think is in the minds of most of the members of this House -- and if it isn't it should be -- and that is, what about the grouting costs of the floodway that were not included in this booklet? When we were down to Grand Rapids I think that we were told quite clearly what the cost of the grouting of the porous sections of the limestones amount to; and also the number of miles of this type of grouting that was required. It might interest you to know that we have a floodway of 29.4 miles -- true, all of it will not have to be grouted, but there is going to be a large percentage of it will have to be grouted in order to seal off the underground water.

There are more important matters to be done in connection with the Red River channel than there is to be done on the floodway. This Red River Channel needs cleaning. It needs the stabilization of banks, and this an urgent need to all those residents of Greater Winnipeg that live on the banks of the Red River. But it seems that this is not an urgent necessity. It is more important to dig some kind of a floodway around Winnipeg just in case you have another flood 15 or 20 years hence and there seems to be a very strong emphasis and pressure to get this work completed at as early a date as possible. This, I cannot understand.

And I would like to remind the government that as far as underground water is concerned, they are really skating on thin ice. Last year, the Minister of Agriculture gave notice to this

(Mr. Smerchanski, Cont'd.) . . . House that there was certain problems arising from the underground water tables in Greater Winnipeg and he used the excuse that this was due to the large amount of water that was being drawn off by industry. Madam Speaker, this is incorrect. I feel that this was giving us advance notice for one obvious reason, that the floodway was going to interfere with the underground water conditions in Greater Winnipeg and this was the reason for it. Now underground water level has been interfered with during the recent construction of the spillway, and which my honourable friend from Brokenhead mentioned, it was not the perimeter highway. And, with the destruction of this underground water table during the excavation in the spillway, this underground water will never be returned. It's finished. It has been destroyed. This is why such very precise and orderly action was taken on the part of the government authorities to make sure that the home owners in this area were getting the proper water, even if they did have to deliver it by tank, in order that they would not raise too much complaint because this was most unpopular. The result of this is now you have to drill deeper wells; you have to put in bigger pumps, and this is only part of the story, because you wait till you get the spillway completed; and you wait until you put the floodway through the Birds River gravel ridges, and you are going to disrupt the water ground table in this area far more, and far in excess of what you've done to date. And I say to you this, when I mentioned this last year then all of a sudden the Chief Engineer of the Red River Floodway made the remark in the newspaper report, that he wasn't just quite sure to what extent they'd have to do grouting, but he did admit that this was a very serious problem and that additional surveys were being undertaken to try and determine what effect the floodway would have on the underground water condition of Greater Winnipeg. And I tell you, Madam Speaker, that at this very date there are still surveys being compiled to determine the effect of the floodway on the underground water situation as it exists today.

Now if it has been disturbed to the extent it has been disturbed by the spillway, which is only slightly underway as far as construction is concerned, what is going to happen when the floodway is finally finished? And the only answer, the only proper engineering answer to this is grouting, and this is a very, very expensive method of grouting in order to keep the underground water out of the floodway channel, and that underground water that has been disturbed to the present time is not going to come back. This is a finished chapter in the construction of the floodway and these people that have no water in their wells now; these people whose wells are dry, will have to dig and drill deeper wells, put in bigger pumps if they want to sustain their water supply from a deep water well.

The next item I would like to speak about and I think that one of the honourable ministers from the other side said, that it appeared as if we did nothing more than oppose and he hoped that there would be some constructive criticism from this side of the House.

The next thing that I would like to mention Madam Speaker, is the matter of lagoons. On the one hand it seems to be the motto that we should have a program to keep the rivers clean, and on the other hand we are developing and encouraging open lagoons which are nothing more than open cesspools. The air pollution problem from these open lagoons is rapidly increasing. It is not very important when you have an open lagoon serving a small city or small town, but it is most important to a city like the City of Winnipeg and I would like to explain it in detail, Madam Speaker, to the members of the House exactly what I mean in order that they too can understand the effect of this on our community in years to come.

Air pollution is defined as the addition of any substance whose presence diminishes the usefulness of that mixture of gases known as air and with this definition the aerosol air pollution problem from open lagoons, or aerobic waste treatment plants as they are known, are many and diverse. We all know what an aerosol is. An aerosol is defined as "finely suspended particles in air" and when you're treating these open lagoons with the aeration of air and the bubbling of oxygen in order to carry on the disintegration of your waste material, you have a continual bubbling of air coming through it and as these particles emerge as a mist or droplet, these little droplets of air carry all sorts of virus and possible diseases and this has been a proven fact in many sections of the United States where they've had these open lagoons and yet our present contention in that this is not so. The discharge of your effluent from these open lagoons quickly evaporates and you have a suspended piece of solid material in a small droplet which floats around in the air, and this nuclei of solid suspension is nothing more than dirty sewage. And it is this type of suspended material that carries, it's virus bearing and it's hazardous to

(Mr. Smerchanski, Cont'd.) . . . health. And I think that the Honourable Minister of Education being a medical man cannot help but agree that most of the . . . bacteria that are spilt into open lagoons survive the aerobic waste treatment that it undergoes in an open lagoon. And, Madam Speaker, it absolutely astounds me, -- because you don't have to be a bacteriologist, but with some basic knowledge of bacteriology, no one should be permitted to build an open lagoon any place within the vicinity of Greater Winnipeg. Now some of you may say, "But the risk of infection or disease is very small." But ask yourselves, and let us ask ourselves, when we're spending this kind of money, just how much risk we as citizens of Manitoba are willing to take, and why? There are other methods of sewage disposal besides the open lagoon method. Aerosols and fog from the liquids of these open lagoons are very corrosive and they are most irritating to the respiratory system of the human being. These odors and gases are most obnoxious. The kindest thing that can be said is that a lagoon gives off a spicy or non-objectionable odor -- and these are some of the remarks that are being used by people who are sponsoring the building of these open lagoons. But the volatiles given off during the disintegration of the sewage in the form of organic derivatives are complex and most objectionable to the community. Open lagoons please nobody. And the thing is that at times we often rely on specialists who are used as experts in areas outside their own fields.

We have open lagoons; we have the discharge of this effluent going into the river system -- and I want to tell you, that those of you who know something about bacteriology, will find that this is an absolute perfect culture within which to grow bacteria. It has enough sugar in it; it has enough nitrogen in it; it has enough phosphorous in it, and this is the kind of effluent that's going to start coming out of the open lagoon in St. Charles and will feed the waters of the Assiniboine River, which in turn will flow into the Red River, and this will encourage the growth of more bacteria and more evil smelling conditions along the Red River. This entire Red River basin is the most favourable bacteria growing medium that you can ever come across.

I think, Madam Speaker, that instead of us putting such great emphasis on this floodway that it is of such vital need, I think this government would be well advised to put more emphasis on the cleaning up of the Assiniboine River and the Red River as it flows through Winnipeg. We can cement the banks in stages; we can clean the river in stages; we can build small little parks on every turn of the river. We can spread this over many years. We don't have to build this in a matter of two, or three, or four years crash program the way we're building the floodway on a crash program. We can also make this a winter-works project. And I think that to do nothing more than to clean up the Assiniboine and Red River is possibly one of the biggest challenges that faces our community todate. It would help to prevent people from getting drowned on these rivers. We could then enjoy the pleasure of boating and bathing and fishing on these rivers. And if we would only follow the example of what most American cities are doing at the present time, and not wait for another five or ten years to start implementing this program, we can clean up our rivers the same way that the City of Pittsburg cleaned the Ohio River.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to make reference to the remarks made by the Honourable Attorney-General the other day. It is quite in order for him to make light and laugh at Mr. Gordon's budget - it's his privilege. However, let us examine what brought the need for these additional taxes that Mr. Gordon brought about -- (Interjection) -- I resent them just as much as anyone else does, and I think, I think that you will readily see that the excessive expenditures and unwise spending by the previous Diefenbaker administration made it necessary for the subsequent government to try and pay off some of the debts that were incurred by the Diefenbaker administration -- (Interjection) -- Is the honourable minister trying to say that the expenditures undertaken by the Diefenbaker administration were justified? And, if so, is he suggesting that the present Roblin government should repeat on a similar basis? Because, as you know, Madam Speaker, we in the Province of Manitoba have the highest provincial debt that we ever had in the history of Manitoba. And we're financing many projects in terms of debentures which we allot to that particular department, or that particular project, and say that they're self-sustaining, but we're not bringing in the matter of these debentures as a current expenditure. It would be wise to point out to my honourable friends that it is equally as efficient to eliminate unnecessary expenditures as it is to raise additional revenue in the form of additional taxation, such as a proposed Sales Tax. I think that more efficient administration

(Mr. Smerchanski, Cont'd.) . . . will cut off a lot of unnecessary expenditure and we should be able to take care of ourselves and carry on on those bases.

I would like to bring to your attention - I would like to bring to the attention of the Honourable the Attorney-General this too, that quite recently our Federal Government paid another \$60 million to the International Monetary Fund and this with the previous repayment of last fall, now leaves an unpaid balance of \$137 million as compared to the original \$300 million which was borrowed by the Diefenbaker administration in 1962 -- and those are figures that will stand up by themselves. Madam Speaker, these are actual figures and I do not think that the government of the day should make casual remarks in such important matters as creating new provincial taxes which will affect the pocketbooks of every resident in the Province of Manitoba. We should hold taxes down to a minimum and try to run a more efficient form of government instead of looking forward to additional revenue and additional expenditures in the form of additional taxation.

MR. PAULLEY: Understandable.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to take some small part in this debate on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and before doing so, Madam Speaker, may I pay to you the customary, and may I say the very sincere attributes that you deserve, occupying as you do with fairness, with a sense of judiciousness, and with a charm, the high office of this Assembly, which has now been yours for better than a year. Most of us in this Assembly are married men with one or two notable, and may I say probably understandable -- no, not understandable -- I was going to say that they are notable exceptions, and I was going to say as well that they are probably quite visible to anybody from the gallery from the different outlook that they have on life. And I suppose, Madam Speaker, that you will find it difficult to find any collection of married men, anyone who would say that he likes to be ruled by a woman but I can say, I suppose, without fear of too much contradiction in this House - speaking perhaps on this occasion for all of the married men, and with one or two notable exceptions that I've mentioned before that this House, the members of this House certainly like to be ruled by this particular woman.

MR. DESJARDINS: Speak for yourself.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I said that there would be exceptions -- I said there would be exceptions -- and we have heard the most exceptionally exception of all from across the way.

May I say as well that the mover and the seconder of the Address and Reply should be congratulated for their efforts. They, I believe, started this debate off on a splendid course. They injected that amount of goodwill that is necessary if the debates in this House are to proceed with friendliness and yet that degree of sharpness that is required from time to time when the inevitable clash of opinion occurs, and I think we all owe them a vote of thanks for the spirit in which they began the debate on the Speech and Reply. And may I say, Madam Speaker, that I believe most of the members of the House who have participated in the debate have carried on in that same spirit. I think that by and large there have been some constructive debates take place, again with one or two notable exceptions with which I intend to deal tonight.

And it would be, I suppose, surprising if I did not come first of all to deal with speeches made by members of the Official Opposition. I come first of all -- because his speech is so fresh in my mind -- to the address given by the honourable member who just took his seat, the Honourable Member for Burrows, and his complaint was, of course, that this government was strong for grandstand performances; that it was trying to project an image or a vision; it was trying to do all of these things as a replacement for action and good government.

Then, Madam Speaker, he embarked upon what surely must be the most surprising statement that he has ever made in this House, when he told the members of this Assembly and the people of Manitoba that he was opposed to the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. He is a brave man, Madam Speaker, representing as he does a city constituency, to come out now -- I suppose it might be thought safer to do it now that the floodway is half constructed -- and tell the people of Manitoba that this is a waste of money. And I can only ask him somewhat rhetorically, whether or not he made this same statement to the voters of his constituency in 1962, and as to whether or not they were aware at that time of the particular views of the Liberal candidate in Burrows,

(Mr. Lyon, Cont'd.) . . . when they flocked to the polls to support the member for their constituency. And I hear as well the voice from the Honourable Member of St. Boniface chiming in and I would like to ask him if he shares the view, representing as he does, a constituency which suffered so greatly, as did mine, from the Winnipeg Flood of 1950. Does he share the view of the Honourable Member for Inkster -- for Burrows? I'm sorry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes I do. Inkster and Burrows, if they both agree.

MR. LYON: Because if the Honourable Member from St. Boniface shares this view, I'm sure that all members of the House would certainly like to hear him get up and tell us about the evils of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. So I say its passing strange to hear this comment come today now that the floodway is half completed. It's passing strange to hear somebody on the other side of the House say the floodway is unnecessary; that it is a white elephant. Well, Madam Speaker, by 1968, if Providence will spare us from another flood, between now and that time, and I think we all hope that that will be the case, we will then have the opportunity to determine who or what is the white elephant. Whether the floodway is the white elephant, or whether the Honourable Member for Burrows is the white elephant. And if I were he, I would be on my knees every night, praying to that Providence that Providence would spare Winnipeg from any kind of torrential rain in the spring, or heavy snowfall, because if we aren't spared, in that way, we have the opportunity, as this flood report told us, once every 36 years of having a flood which is equal to or greater than the 1950 flood -- once every 36 years. I wish I could be so confident as my honourable friend from Burrows -- and he is an engineer and I wouldn't purport to argue with him on a field in which he is competent -- but I suggest that perhaps it was the political part of his grey matter that was activating him to speak when he did tonight on that subject, rather than the technical and professional part, because as a good engineer, I am sure that he would agree that what we need today in this city, if we are going to move ahead, as I know he wants us to move ahead, is protection, protection from this flood ravage which we have never had before and there is only one way to get it and I think, Madam Speaker, he knows as well as I do, that the only way to get that protection is via the medium of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway.

Well I am not going to talk about lagoons or cesspools -- I leave that to the Honourable Members opposite because -- (Interjection)-- I don't know if they are experts or not. I'm just not going to talk on the subject, because I don't purport to be again, as expert as probably the Honourable Member from Burrows.

The crash program re the floodway though was something that stuck in my mind -- and he likes to imply to us that this program we are conducting at the present time is a crash program. Madam Speaker, it has to be a crash program because there are many, many thousands of people in my area, the area of Burrows, indeed in all parts of Greater Winnipeg, whose home life, whose business life, whose very existence in this province depends on our getting this floodway built just as quickly as we can. And I repeat to him again, that if Providence will be so kind to us, as to hold back the waters until we get this large ditch built, then we can all count ourselves fortunate. That is the concern that we have between now and 1968, the concern that we shall be spared from this kind of a ravage and if we didn't have a crash program going, I think we could properly expect members opposite to be on their feet daily chastising the government for not doing, because it is only in this way that this city and indeed this province, can continue to exist free from this flood danger that has beset us from the earliest of days.

I was interested as well in his talk about his minor defence of the people at Ottawa. You know one thing that I have noticed about our honourable friends opposite at this Session - now that there has been a Liberal Government in office at Federal level for some few months -- one thing that I have noticed is that there is a preoccupation now with happenings on the Federal scene. We don't hear any more of these shots being fired over our head toward Ottawa because the same target isn't down there. They've got a different target - a different man - his name is Mr. Pearson and he is a Grit, so we are not going to hear too much from my honourable friends in the Official Opposition about the weaknesses at Ottawa. We are hearing from the Honourable Member from Burrows about devaluation, this terrible policy that was inflicted, he implies, on the people of Canada by the Diefenbaker government. If it was such a terrible policy, I wonder, Madam Speaker, why the present government hasn't seen fit to put the dollar

(Mr. Lyon, Cont'd.). . . back. Why hasn't it seen fit to change any of these basic financial or fiscal policies that were adopted by the predecessor government. I merely ask this question because I am not a man of high finance or anything like that at all. I merely wonder out loud why some of these things which were such terrible ills only nine or ten months ago are now looked upon as accepted, as being part of the very warp and the woof and the fabric of our nationhood, are being carried on by the present government at Ottawa almost as though they had devised the policies themselves.

Madam Speaker, with some of this preoccupation at Ottawa I detect I think as well, a small sense of embarrassment on the part of our friends opposite. There is a wee bit of embarrassment with big brother at Ottawa, because of the number of gross errors that have been committed by big brother at Ottawa since he took office. We've heard of a few of these. My colleague the Honourable the Attorney General referred to the Gordon Budget in terms which I don't have to repeat. The withholding tax--we heard a bit about the withholding tax that was put on and then withdrawn. We heard a bit about--what about co-operative federalism? Now here is a subject I would really like to hear the Members of the Liberal Opposition talk about. What about co-operative federalism? What about this new era that is dawning on Canada via Pearson and Lasage, whereby there is going to be constant consultation between the provinces, and that this great Confederation of ours is going to be held together by virtue of Grit politicians who are going to do things that should have been done years and years ago.

As I say I detect that there is a bit of embarrassment across the way because when you get such items as the Municipal Development Loan Fund that we were talking about earlier on today, brought into the House very bravely at Ottawa by the new Government; withdrawn just as quickly by the new Government, because the Premier of Quebec said you can't do that; a Dominion-Provincial Conference called right away because the Premier of Quebec demanded that it be called right away-- and when he demands, he gets-- and as a result of listening to the provinces subsequently then there emerged a piece of legislation which we are pleased to now present before the House and in which I think most provinces can find some merit. There was a great example of co-operative federalism on the part of the senior or the big brothers of our friends opposite - the Canada Pension Act, and Miss LaMarsh's contribution to Canadian unity-- there is a delightful piece of legislation.

MR. PAULLEY: This sounds like his lagoons.

MR. LYON: Yes. The original form of it, Madam Speaker, is one of the cess-pools that the honourable member didn't talk about. Well we've had the Canada Pension Plan in and out of the House of Commons so often that it looks like a ping pong ball. And at the last Federal-Provincial Conference, which this government and all the other provinces were privileged to attend, the negotiations on the Canada Pension Plan were conducted by the Prime Minister and the Premiers. There was a young lady sitting at the right hand of the Prime Minister who, I was subsequently told, was the National Minister of Health and Welfare, but I think it is with some encouragement that we can note that these negotiations on this now much changed plan are being conducted by the Prime Minister of the country and by the Premiers of the Provinces-- so they have some cause to be preoccupied by the happenings at Ottawa. They have some cause to be preoccupied with co-operative federalism, because this is not only an idea it's not only a scheme which can be made to work, it is something that has to be made to work in Canada today but I think they must talk to their big brothers at Ottawa and try to prevail upon them to understand that there are certain things that should be done, even as a matter of basic courtesy, if one is to do more than pay lip service to co-operative federalism in Canada.

It is rather difficult you know when we were being berated two years ago by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition for doing nothing about the townsite at Churchill - I remember those debates quite vividly. It's difficult today you know under this new and enlightened government at Ottawa to know really how co-operative federalism works because you pick up a newspaper in Manitoba now and you find out that in one fell swoop Churchill has been closed. There is a good example of co-operative federalism when we have to find out via the newspapers what the Federal Government is doing with one of our own towns in Manitoba.

We pick up a newspaper a few weeks later and we find out that Cranberry Portage has been closed via the newspapers. There is a good example of co-operative federalism working under the auspices of our Grit friends opposite. These are ideas that I suggest my honourable



Mr. Lyon, Cont'd) . . . friends should be taking to Ottawa and talking to them about, because we can't co-operate if we don't know what's going on, and if he had any prior knowledge of what was happening to the town of Churchill, or the town of Cranberry Portage, it certainly would have been nice to hear from him, but I think even my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition probably had to read about it in the paper the same as the rest of the people in Manitoba. So I make one small plea to him tonight and that is if he has an entre into any of those high offices in the east, that he say to someone down there, who is in charge of the show-- and I yet haven't found out who that person is -- he say to someone down there, that there should be more lip service paid to co-operative federalism, because we need real co-operation, not just lip service in this day and age.

As I said, it's interesting, however, in this session not to have these shots being fired over our head at the Ottawa government. No longer do we hear any resolutions about free trade. No longer do we hear the long speeches about what should be done to improve crop insurance in Manitoba because their big brothers can do it. No longer do we hear about the floodway deal or anything like that, because if it is such a bad deal, why of course the Liberal government will rally around the Leader of the Opposition right away and will give us a much better deal than those terrible old conservatives offered us just a year or two ago, but I doubt if we're going to hear very much about these things in the future. I doubt very much, because as I say this embarrassment prevails opposite and it's quite understandable.

We come for a moment, Madam Speaker, to the address given to the House by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, a short punchy address which he can deliver I think quite successfully. He is a master at glossing over certain situations and making his point and my honourable friends opposite, before they go complaining to this government about image-making and so on, should take a few lessons from their leader because he is a man who can gloss over and glibly present an idea just about as well and with as great facility as anyone in this House, and so they don't have to look over here for all of the smooth work that is being done in terms of speech-making.

As I look through this speech, however--and as I listened to it it impressed me-- how ever, as I stopped to look through it after, I came to the inescapable conclusion, Madam Speaker, that it was riddled and laced with a number of what I might call lazy inaccuracies-- lazy inaccuracies. Inaccuracies which I suggest, Madam Speaker, a little bit of interest, a little bit of effort, and a little bit of homework could have cured. Facts on each of these situations which I'll mention in a few moments were available to anyone who wanted to get them, but I suggest that because of these little lazy inaccuracies the speech wasn't quite up to the standard that my honourable friends have come to establish in this House.

I know just as everyone else in this House knows that it is always easier to speak from unbridled emotion than from a sound foundation of fact, but it is a temptation that we all have to overcome because we are here, we are elected by the people of Manitoba to deal with fact, not unbridled emotion. I know as well, and I think I can forgive him to a certain extent because he is being tutored by his big brothers at Ottawa, and if one were to follow through from their promises in the 1960 pre-election into the field of action in government, one can understand why any Liberal would be susceptible today to a number of lazy inaccuracies when talking about policy, whether it be provincial, federal, or international, because it's a strange thing to watch today in action at Ottawa the government which only nine months ago was crying "ruin" about Canada, to watch this same government today performing, I suppose about as poorly as any government has ever performed in the history of Confederation, watch this same government performing today and carrying out and undertaking tasks and creating omissions which if they had been done by a government of any other political stripe would have rendered them probably sighted for confinement in a mental institution, and yet the Liberals are trying to get away with some of this today. So I can pardon my honourable friend opposite if he watches the example of what's going on at Ottawa and then tries to apply some of the same tactics here.

Well, what are some of these inaccuracies? I don't intend to dwell with them too long because he makes his points very briefly, but he tries to leave a little barb as he goes along. He talked about my predecessor the Minister of Mines for a few moments and he said about him that he hadn't found any new mines since 1958--I believe that this was the substance of what his remark was-- "that there had really been not a single new major mine opened in the

Mr. Lyon, Cont'd) . . . Province of Manitoba since my predecessor, former Premier Campbell, negotiated the opening of the multi-million dollar Inco Mine at Thompson". That's Hansard, page 19, February 10th. What a wonderful vision that conjures up in one's mind--the former First Minister of this House walking, striding into the northland with pick over his shoulder right up into the heartland of northern Manitoba and digging with his pick and digging up this wonderful find of nickel and saying ; "Here International Nickel, I've found it; you come and develop it now." Well --so foolish --because even my honourable friend from Lakeside never made such pretensions when he was First Minister in this House. Ministers of Mines --Premiers don't find mines, but I suppose any government worth its salt tries to create an atmosphere in which development and exploration can take place by the private sector of the economy based to some extent upon surveys, geological and otherwise, made by government which can then result in the private sector going in and finding mines. Now I may have read him improperly. Maybe he is suggesting that the Province of Manitoba should now take capital investment money and go up and start a wide open search for mines and open up a few operating mines in Manitoba. If I was to draw that conclusion then I'm sorry, but I really don't think he meant that.

MR; MOLGAT: . . . business last year.

MR. LYON: I really don't think he meant it. We got into business last year and I was happy that my honourable friend voted and supported us when we did.

But I talked a moment ago, Madam Speaker, about lazy inaccuracies and there I suggested a fine example of a lazy inaccuracy, passing off to the people of Manitoba that nothing major, nothing of any import at all, nothing has happened in the mining industry in Manitoba in the past five years. I don't know if my honourable friend reads a paper called The Northern Mail-- it's a paper that's produced in the town of The Pas, and if he would look at the February 12th edition --that's only five days ago! -- if he would look at the third page of it he would see this large fold-out sheet; "Congratulations to the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company on the opening of their new Stall Lake Mine." Pictures of the townsite and a description of what's going on at Stall Lake. "The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Stall Lake mining operation will help northern Manitoba to expand" says the story, and on through the whole section --Congratulations-- congratulations from all of the business men in the north who happen to know about this mine. A full treatment, a full treatment on the whole mine situation --(interjection)-- Well somebody opposite says "is the mine new?" Well I don't know. It commenced production on the third of February, 1964-- I think that's something like 14 days ago. That's when it commenced production. So I come back, Madam Speaker, to the question of lazy inaccuracies.

But I think an even more startling one, if my honourable friend doesn't wish to believe me or the Northern Mail or the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, why doesn't he talk to his friend the Honourable Member from Burrows who just sat down in this Chamber, because the honourable member can tell him about some interesting finds that he has out east of Flin Flon, and I'm sure that the Member for Burrows would be quite happy to enlighten the Leader of the Opposition about what is going on in northern Manitoba. I could only wish that the two of them would get together because there is a very active mining man, the member from Burrows, and I charge you, Sir, I think you should inform the Leader of the Opposition what is happening in Manitoba. I think we would both be happy to take a prospector's course if we could do as much for mining as my honourable friend has done and I pay him that tribute. He's done a lot for mining in Manitoba. He will do a lot in the future, but I only ask him this one small favour, would he please tell the Leader of the Opposition what he's doing because obviously the Leader of the Opposition doesn't even know what his own members are doing with respect to mining development in this province.

Well there hasn't been much going on, he says, in the last five years. The value of metals produced from 1962 to 1963 increased only \$8 million. Now that's really not too much --only \$8 million. Now I realize I'm speaking to "what's a million" Howe people across the way, but that's only \$8 million and immediately they're going to say, "but oh well most of that is from the mine that was founded by the former Premier." Well five million of that was produced as a result of the International Nickel Mine at Thompson, but \$3 million of that increase, Madam Speaker, is due to the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting copper finds. The

Mr. Lyon, Cont'd) . . . Chisel Lake Mine of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited commenced production of essentially zinc ore late in 1960.

Now we don't boast about this as a government. My honourable friend the former Minister of Mines, he didn't stand up and bare his chest to the Assembly and say; 'Isn't this wonderful, I just found another mine', but this mine did come into production, even though my honourable friend would hate to admit it, it came into production in late 1960 at a tonnage of 1,000 tons a day. It's not a huge operation, but it's a nice tidy little sort of an operation to have going in Manitoba. The zinc production rose as a result of it. From 1959 to 1961 there was an increase of \$7,900,000 in zinc production in Manitoba due almost entirely to the Chisel Lake mine production. Now that's not a great amount of money and I apologize to my honourable friends opposite who were used to dealing in millions and billions a la Walter Gordon, but we like to think that this is --you know, progress that some account should be taken of-- and we don't like to feel that the Leader of the Opposition is saying to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and some of these other companies that they're falling back under this deleterious Conservative administration. I don't think that they would necessarily agree, and I don't think that the people of Manitoba would agree with what again I call a lazy inaccuracy in the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

The Stall Lake Mine of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company commenced production, as I mentioned, February 3rd --only 750 tons a day-- a nice sized mine just the same. The grade is reported equivalent to 1500 tons per day mined at the parent mine, essentially copper ore. These are small things on the surface perhaps but they do represent progress and I wanted my honourable friend to know that these facts have been taking place in Manitoba even though he was completely and absolutely unaware of it, and I am sure that if he will get together with the Honourable Member from Burrows, that perhaps an enlightened state of mind will result from that communion.

Well then he talks about Crown lands, there has been no development of any land use policy in Manitoba. That's a matter in which I'm beginning to take a fair amount of interest because I have reviewed what's been going on in the department with respect to this. I can tell my honourable friends right now without any intention of meanness or anything like that that the policy that we are pursuing at the present time, and it is a hard, firm policy which has been developed over the past five years -- it was doubly hard to develop it because of the drift and indecision that took place prior to 1958 when for decades nothing was done in this field, and so I admit to him that it is difficult after years of drift and indecision to come to formulate policy -- but the policy has been formulated and I am sure that my honourable friend is aware of the meetings that took place with members of the Department of Mines, members of the Department of Agriculture and the other government representatives who were necessary, meetings taking place at places like Rorketon -- I don't think he is unfamiliar with the town of Rorketon, Eddystone, Lundar. My honourable friend the member from between the lakes he knows about Lundar. He has been up in that territory once or twice I'm told. Toutes Aides in Manitoba -- one of the biggest meetings they had or series of meetings -- they had four to five hundred farmers in Toutes Aides explaining the whole policy and system. My honourable friend . . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: I was at the meeting.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend was at the meeting. I'm glad that he admitted it because I heard he was at the meeting, so how can he say that there has been no policy? He was at a meeting when the policy was being outlined to the farmers and the ranchers. He is probably going to turn around and say, "ha, but they didn't all agree with it." Of course they didn't. They had some suggestions to make but there is a policy nonetheless. May I suggest, Madam Speaker, again, when we come to a speech by the Leader of the Opposition in which he says that there is no policy on land use in Manitoba that this is another lazy inaccuracy, because really there is and he knows that there is and he knows very well what this policy is and where its headed.

He talks as well about the community health program and I'm not going to take any time on that. Why aren't we doing more about the community health program he says in his speech. Well, the Minister of Education I think dealt amply with that subject today. There has been

Mr. Lyon (Cont'd)

more done in the last five years in the field of community mental health development than there was ever done in the history of this province, and again he knows it. The people of Manitoba know it even if he doesn't, and so that's perhaps even a little bit worse than a lazy inaccuracy -- it's a little bit worse than a lazy inaccuracy. I won't attach a name to it, but my honourable friend knows very well that this is just not the case. He talked about the Canada Pension Plan and said that the senior citizens of Manitoba were being let down by this man Roblin because all he was doing was objecting to this plan. Well I wonder who the primary and the foremost objector to the plan was? I recall a man by the name of Lesage saying to the Prime Minister of Canada, "you can take your plan and do what you want with it, because I'm not having any part of it."

Now he was, if I recall rightly, the first and the primary objector to the plan. We didn't hear any criticism of Mr. Lesage here today of course because Mr. Lesage of course may have bigger things in line for him and I don't think anybody opposite wants to cross his path too badly, but he was the first objector to the plan. The Premier of Ontario took some objection to it and of course we did in Manitoba. Now I wonder if it comes perhaps as a realization to my honourable friend opposite to know that in the most recent unrevised version we have of the plan, and I think that this is about the fourth or fifth, I'm not quite sure because one really has to have some form of computer to keep track of the different plans that are thrown out to us -- but this one came from the Prime Minister so I think it's got some weight -- in this latest version we find strangely enough that far from doing harm to the old age pensioners in Manitoba, that this government at Ottawa is taking some account of the suggestions that have been made by the Premier of this province and we find that certain of the ideas and suggestions that we made with respect to improving this plan have actually been incorporated in the plan.

Now I realize that it will probably come as a shock to my honourable friend because he would much sooner be able to say that we are not looking after the interests of the people of Manitoba, but I say to him that if we are not, then we are joined arm in arm with the Federal Government at Ottawa because they are acceding to some of the recommendations at least that we are making with respect to this plan. And I suggest to him that if he wants to be concerned about old age pensioners in Manitoba that he had better look to some other area, and look he did -- and look he did -- he went back to that great old dog's bone the Welfare payments that was brought up in the House I think some two years ago. I don't intend to spend any great amount of time on that issue tonight at all, about how the institutionalized pensioners, according to my honourable friend opposite, are being deprived of this last \$10.00 and so on that this grasping government across the way has taken from their outstretched hands. What a pile of tommyrot that is. We debated that subject in this House two years ago.

My honourable friend was one of the members of the Liberal Party opposite who voted for the new Social Allowances plan when it was brought in, lock, stock and barrel, and that included the principle behind the plan -- the word is "principle" -- p-r-i-n-c-i-p-l-e -- principle -- perhaps a strange word, but there is a principle involved in the plan and my honourable friends opposite voted for the principle and the principle was to meet need -- to meet need -- and this is exactly what the government of Manitoba is attempting to do, not always successfully, but attempting to do through the agency of The Social Allowances Act of Manitoba. But that is an old story. It's so old a story, Madam Speaker, that we had the debate two years ago, we had an election in between, and I think my honourable friend talked about that in the course of the election, and I would like to suggest to him in case perhaps the message has missed him that the people of Manitoba listened to him and then they trooped to the polls by the tens of thousands and voted against him.

MR. MOLGAT: Look at the figures.

MR. LYON: While the issue may be of some academic interest to him and a few of his hearty colleagues behind him, I suggest that to the people of Manitoba it's crystal clear. They at least know what the principle is behind social allowances and they are not going to be befuddled by any vote-getting type of appeal which is based, may I say, more on the desire to appear to be on the side of old age pensioners than it is based on the side of the principle of The Social Allowances Act.

Mr. Lyon (Cont'd)

Education -- my honourable friend the Attorney-General dealt quite adequately with the whole question of education, and after listening to him can my honourable friend the leader of the opposition, can he not now begin to get some idea of what I mean when I talk about lazy inaccuracies? No curriculum revision in Manitoba? What nonsense is this? The former minister went on to describe what has taken place. These are all facts, Madam Speaker. They are not unbridled emotion; they are facts.

Welfare Plan -- he talks about the old age pensioners and the context of the pension that they were receiving. Welfare is a fascinating subject in the Liberal Party today and I want to say, Madam Speaker, that they have a speaker on every aspect of it. If you want to take the 19th century view they have a speaker on that aspect of it. If you want to take the center view and not get off the fence one way or the other, read the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition; and if you want to take the small "l" Liberal view, and these are very much in the minority in that party, why then you read the speeches of some citizens not too well known who congregate together once in awhile at what they are pleased to call a Liberal policy meeting. These are the three views that you hear and I would like to find out and to ask my honourable friend really what is the policy of his party on welfare. We know what our policy is. Our policy is stated in The Social Allowances Act and in the principles that underlie that Act, but we hear the Leader of the Opposition standing up in the House and saying, "oh, you terrible people, you took the \$10.00 away from the old age pensioners."

What does the former Minister of Welfare, R. W. Bend, what does he say? He is making a number of speeches throughout the province, a number of significant speeches throughout the province, and if I were my honourable friend I would be looking over my shoulder a little bit because these people who go around making speeches are not always making speeches just to hear themselves. They may be wanting to appeal to an audience for all one knows. Well, here's what the ex-minister said, speaking at a meeting I presume on the 5th January -- reported in the Tribune January 6th -- I'm not going to read all of the account. "This was only one of several swipes that Mr. Bend took on controversial items. He hammered at the young liberals themselves, at welfare costs, at increased socialism in our society, at the provincial and federal government and at the lack of concern for young people not equipped to finish high school among other things."

We heard a faint echo in the House the other day when my honourable friend was talking about the forgotten few in our educational system. We heard a faint echo of one of Mr. Bend's better speeches coming from the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition, but we didn't hear the Leader of the Opposition making these statements and I quote now from the Tribune account: "Turning to increased Welfare Costs, Mr. Bend said there was too much given out now." The Leader of the Opposition just finished telling us there wasn't enough given out but Mr. Bend says there is too much given out. "In some cases now a man can give his family more opportunities if he goes on welfare than if he gets out and gets a job says Mr. Bend." He suggested that welfare be reduced to the bare minimum to maintain individual initiative. Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, that if anyone knows what a bare minimum is it would be the Honourable Mr. Bend and his former colleagues, because that's exactly what they paid and less. I believe they established the ideology or the policy in Manitoba that so long as a person wasn't starving, that was sufficient in terms of welfare assistance. He finished his speech by saying he told the politicians they must keep in touch with the people. Quote: "This is why the former Manitoba Liberal Government lost to Mr. Roblin."

Well, Madam Speaker, this is one of the views of the Liberal party on welfare. I think we have another speaker on the subject, the Honourable Member from Portage. I didn't realize that he had any interest in life other than the Portage diversion until I read this statement by him. A headline taken from a paper -- I think it's probably the Brandon Sun -- Headline: "Welfare Spending Termed Disgraceful." This is the honourable member from Portage, the one-shot wonder -- the Portage Diversion man. He, speaking at Portage, says: "The welfare situation in Manitoba" -- and he is quoted -- "is fast approaching a disgrace. This welfare is something they (the government) are very vulnerable on, claimed Johnston who was first elected to Manitoba Legislature in the December, 1962 election and upset Conservative

Mr. Lyon (Cont'd)

Welfare Minister John Christianson. He promised that the Liberal Opposition in the Provincial Assembly is going to give them a blast."

Well now, Madam Speaker, we are waiting for the blast. Which one are we going to get? Are we going to get the exhaust blast or are we going to get the forward thrust? We don't know yet. We don't know if we are spending too much or not enough, because we haven't read all of the speakers from the Liberal Party. Mr. Bend says that we are spending far too much; Mr. Johnston says it's a shame. Whether it's too much or too little I don't know. The Leader of the Opposition says you are not spending enough on the old age pensioners. Would they please get together, Madam Speaker, in the interests of good government in Manitoba and please let us know constructively whether we are spending too much or not enough, because it would be of some help when the government comes to formulate policy to find out exactly where they do stand with respect to welfare in Manitoba. Right now we don't know. There is a speaker on every subject and there is a different opinion on any aspect of any subject that you want to talk about. It's very interesting to hear these different speakers. It's very interesting to hear my friend so concerned today about the Willard report.

..... Continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the speaker that he has three minutes left.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, on a point of order may I rise and say this, that in the circumstances the honourable member is speaking for the government on a motion of want-of-confidence and I think the rules provide for no limit to his speech.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, only in respect of one Minister though.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I can put my honourable friend at ease because I will not be much longer. But it is interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak about the Willard report, the same man who in this Assembly some -- what was it -- two and a half or three years ago when we brought in at the special session the new financing scheme for the hospital plan in Manitoba because we had up-coming demands for hospital beds and so on, the same man who at that time said you shouldn't be doing this, this same man, Madam Speaker, who even today is complaining about the extra income tax, the extra corporation tax that the people of Manitoba are called upon to pay for the hospital scheme. And yet he turns around, after saying that these taxes should be abolished or done away with, he turns around and he says completely without any worry, completely without any sense of misgiving, he says: "You're not building enough hospital beds in Manitoba."

But, Madam Speaker, what do we build hospital beds with? We certainly don't build them with the airy promises we get from Ottawa. We're not building them with Mr. Gordon's sales tax because we're not getting enough of that. We don't built them out of cesspools such as my honourable friend from Burrows talked about; we build them out of money. And where are we to get this money? You can't have it both ways. If you're going to build hospital beds you've got to have money in order to build them, but let me remind my honourable friend that the ratio of beds per population in Manitoba is on a very favourable rating with all of the other provinces of Canada, as he well knows. And because the Willard plan has been amended in certain particulars where different and other pressing needs have been found is no reason for him to cry alarm, none at all, not unless he is ready to say to the government: "you've got to build all of the beds that were laid down by Willard and, in order to do it, you've got to have X number of dollars more and here's how you can raise it." All I say to him is that it's quite easy when you don't have any responsibility for it, it's quite easy to say what should be done as long as you can turn around at the next breath and say at the same time you should be reducing the impost on the people while you're conducting or building up all of these services that the people, he says, should have.

Well, these are only a number of things that come to mind, Madam Speaker. There were a number of other comments that he made in his speech which probably I will pass over. On page 18 though, he did make one comment that rather tickled my fancy. He said the heavy agenda outlined by the government doesn't impress the members on that side of the House. Well we didn't expect that it would impress too many of the members on the other side of the House. I think it probably will impress the people of Manitoba. "Some of the measures will no doubt be withdrawn at a later date for further consideration by the government", says he, "then some proposals will be referred to committees and commissions and studies. That's another tactic that this government has frequently used to get itself off the hook. The third trick," says he, "will be no doubt to keep some of the legislation under wraps until the very dying days of the session."

Madam Speaker, if ever one was reading a chronicle of what the Liberal Party does at Ottawa today, there it is. All I can say to my honourable friend is that this government doesn't necessarily follow all of the tactics that we observe being followed at Ottawa today, and when he uses these terms, I would suggest that his teaching has been far too good, that he should pay more attention to what is going on with the government here in Manitoba because we are not nurtured by that political vine of life that nurtures his party...

MR. MOLGAT: Tell us what you built last year, sir?

MR. LYON: "We in our party", he says, "are strongly opposed" -- he comes to the sales tax -- "are strongly opposed to the imposition of the unfair sales tax which hits the poor harder than it affects those in the higher wage brackets who can afford more" -- and so on and so on. And yet my honourable friend allows his big brother, as my colleague the Attorney-General pointed out the other day, allows his big brother to do this with impunity and, may I say, without even a mandate for doing. So we have a different set of morality that is applied. What can

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... be done at Ottawa can't be done here, because it all depends on who is doing. That, I suppose, is the thesis we are supposed to draw from the speech of my honourable friend. Well, I don't think that that will wash too well.

He goes on again, he says he had some interest in the recent Cabinet portfolio changes. He said, "I say that the main function of government is to get the job done, and Cabinet Ministers need not be changed unless they have either completed the job they have set out to do or they have proven to be a failure." Well again I suggest that here is an area where he wasn't too well taught by Ottawa, because we have a number of Cabinet Ministers at Ottawa who are complete and gross failures and who yet haven't been kicked out of the party where they should be kicked out, so I suggest that my honourable friend had better work on his big brothers at Ottawa before he comes and gives gratuitous advice to a government at the provincial level about what should be done with Cabinet Ministers. I would like to hear from him some day his own personal free and frank opinion about the Minister of Finance and as to whether he should still be occupying a seat at the Treasury benches at Ottawa.

Well then we went on to the mine situation, we got on to the land situation, community mental health, and a few other topics that have already been dealt with by some of my predecessors speaking in this debate. Madam Speaker, what I've been saying tonight, I suggest, and I suggest with a great deal of -- without any sense of inflicting pain upon my honourable friends opposite -- but it does suggest that there is some form of disarray in the Provincial Liberal Party in Manitoba today. There is a sickness in this Party today. One of my colleagues described it, I think a year or two ago and I believe it was the Honourable Doctor Johnson, the medical man, he described it as a form of political schizophrenia. You know, they are maniac depressives. One minute they want something, the next minute they're against it and so on.

Well I think they're still suffering from this political schizophrenia and that probably the symptoms have been enhanced and enlarged by what they see taking place at Ottawa, because here we have in this great party, or this once great party opposite which is now represented by thirteen hardy souls in this House, this hardy little band still carrying the tattered flag forward on behalf of "gritism" in Manitoba; here we have them made up of a group of people, some of whom, as I believe was mentioned in one debate a few years ago in this House, some of whom still have to be dragged kicking and screaming into the last half of the twentieth century, and others who are really trying to do something constructive for the province but haven't yet found the leadership under which they can do it, and still others who are wandering lost in the forest and who someday hope to emerge and find out what government is all about in Manitoba. Well they are a hardy little band and they deserve our congratulations for carrying on, putting on the facade that they do, because it must be difficult under the circumstances in which they operate. We have the three voices that I've mentioned before: the voice of the nineteenth century, the voice of the fence straddler, and the voice of the small "l" Liberals in the Party today, all chiming out uniformly, contrary to one another, but all chiming out at the same time, trying to tell the people of Manitoba what they are going to do in order to gain confidence from the people.

Well, Madam Speaker, I suggest that one of the great problems to one of the great objectives of an opposition in Manitoba is to gain the support of the people, to present themselves as a true alternative to government, and I suggest that unfortunately our friends in the Official Opposition have failed and have failed miserably thus far to present any such image or to present any such firm policy to the people of Manitoba. And I suggest as well, Madam Speaker, that the motion, the amendment that they have made to the Speech from the Throne, in itself, represents a form of lazy inaccuracy which really does not deserve the support of this House and certainly will not deserve the support of the people of Manitoba. They are not an alternative to the government; to consider that would be laughable. They are a party striving to find their way. We wish them luck because a good parliamentary government in a province, or at the federal level, requires good solid party and I don't think that we have that unity in the Liberal Party that we might wish to find in what was once a great Party in this province.

And so we wish them well in their struggles and their survivals over the years that lie ahead. Unfortunately, perhaps our honourable friend won't always be around to give them what



(Mr. Lyon, Cont'd.) . . . leadership he can because rumour has it that he has his eyes on fields that are much greener at the present time in the east, and we have others going about in their Party making speeches which commend them perhaps to the rank and file of the Party. So one cannot tell what is happening in the body corporate of the Liberal Party in Manitoba today, but we wish them nothing but good because we want them to emerge from this period of stress and strain that they have been in for some considerable time strong and more imaginative and more constructive and better equipped to do a job on behalf of the people of Manitoba, a job, Madam Speaker, which unfortunately they can't do today.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, we heard a great deal of a very interesting speech tonight, several references made by the minister to the references of the promotions and demotions. You know when the Premier announced the changes in the Cabinet, many of us felt rather sorry for our little friend. We realize of course, that the Premier in desperation had to make this demotion-- it was coming a long time. Actually though, Madam Speaker, the topping of the cake rather came when our young friend went to the convention and suggested that he would like to sell canned beer in grocery stores. Well, it looked like, Madam Speaker, it looked like the Premier tied the can to him. For those of us who have known the little fellow as long as I have, he enjoyed that position; he liked to lord over his colleagues in the legal profession; and when the Premier lowered the boom, there was a heavy crash in that home of the former Minister. But you know the Premier went about and tried to comfort him from his friends. He said, "I was trying to give the department depth." Well you know, Madam Speaker, if he digs much deeper the fellow would be right out of sight. However, we'll wish him well and we hope he does a better job in his new department than he did in the last one -- procrastination, delay after delay in his own department -- never in the history of the province have we had the Attorney-General's Department run so badly as when he took office. Like one very prominent official said to me, "You know when this man was in office, we couldn't get a decision an office boy could make." It wasn't long in coming and a change did have to be made.

My friend, Caesar there, hasn't got too much to brag about either. You know, Madam Speaker, the Department of Industry and Commerce has just issued another report and, Madam Speaker, it's an admission of abject failure. Here is what the minister said when he took over the office five years ago. He said: "In this department work must result in the practical result in new jobs, in new products and new prosperity for our own people in the most practical terms." A very interesting statement, Madam Speaker. What were the results of the Minister? Not one single new job was created by his department in industry in Manitoba last year, and this stagnation occurred in a year when the Canadian economy as a whole was making one of its largest advances in history. Madam Speaker, in the last ten years this Department of Industry has created only 260 more additional jobs. The result that this Minister is going can be the year 5,000 A.D. before we get the new 75,000 jobs that COMEF speaks about.

One thing that the Department is high on although, they look bright on their own department. The annual report claims that there were employment increases in all industries except for decreases in the transportation, storage and communication industries. They didn't leave very many left did they? But if there's one section of the economy that has been booming, however, it's the Department of Industry and Commerce. They have added almost as many jobs in their own department as they have created for other people in the whole Province of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, for every three people they employ, they've hired one more for the department, and if they have to depend on this department to create the 75,000 jobs that COMEF speaks about, they'll have to hire 25,000 people for the Department of Industry and Commerce.

Madam Speaker, here are the startling figures. In 1953 there were 43,740 jobs in Manitoba. In 1962 there were only 44,000, an increase of 260 in ten years. What was the budget in Industry and Commerce in 1952-53? -- \$271,000 and 28 employees. In 1963, there were 105 employees and a budget of \$1,519,000. When the Federal Government decided this year to set up its own department to help the provinces encourage industrial developments it ran into a stone wall of obstruction and criticism and abuse from this Minister.

MR. EVANS: That is not correct.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Who's going to blame the Federal Government if they concentrate

(Mr. Guttormson, Cont'd.) . . . their efforts on other provinces which appreciate assistance? If they do, Manitoba will again be the loser from a Minister's empire-building tactics. Madam Speaker, it's just about time the Minister remembered his own words and set out to work, to achieve the practical results. It's not enough for the department to spend its time turning out self-praising press releases on reports read by nobody. It's time that the Minister got down to work and started doing the job he claimed he would do.

I'm just beginning to wonder if perhaps the Minister has given up, because there's news afoot in the city now that the Minister is laying the groundwork to seek the federal nomination in Winnipeg South. However, it's not surprising when you see the performance of the Minister during the past few years why he's looking for other fields.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to refer to a situation that is getting on the point of critical in my constituency, and that is taxes. In 1958 when the school plan was put into effect, people in my area heard speeches from the government side, many of which I attended, and these people there were very anxious to have improved education. One of the things though they remember very vividly was the firm promise that such a school plan would not involve increased taxes. In the town of Eriksdale at a meeting which I attended, the new Attorney-General said that such a plan could be implemented without increasing taxes because they would be drawing from a larger tax base.

Well I would like to give you the figures of what happened in the municipality of Coldwell. Since 1958 the school taxes alone in the Municipality of Coldwell have risen 52%. Madam Speaker, the people in the community are getting desperate regarding the taxes. I'll give you an example. Here's what some of the mill rates are in some of the school districts. In Abbeyville, a small school district, their mill rate is 107 plus the general levy, making a total of 168 mills. In Lundar, the mill rate there is 54 mills, that's the mill rate for schools, plus the general municipal levy of 61, making it a total of 108 mills. This government has got to take some steps to all eviate these people because the tax increases just can't go on. As one person in the constituency said to me recently, "unless something is done, they're going to make ghost towns."

I'd like to give the Minister an indication of what's happened in the town of Lundar. In 1962 -- I'll give you some comparable taxes compared with 1963. Some of them have jumped up as high as three times. In 1962 one person was paying \$95.92 and when the new assessment came in he was paying \$202.40. Another instance, a man in 1962 paid \$100.28; in 1963 he paid \$238.05. Another home owner in 1962, his taxes were \$92.65; in 1963 the taxes were \$226.00. Another case, the 1962 taxes were \$125.35; in 1963 \$263.00. Another example of high taxes, a fellow paid \$213.64 in 1962; last year he paid \$540.50. Here's one that's gone up almost three times. In 1962, he paid \$136.25; last year he paid \$399.05. The last one I have here, he paid \$117.72 in 1962; last year he paid \$342.70.

As a result of this situation many people who have planned to build new homes have abandoned them because of the high taxes. Some have moved away. You may not be interested in the situation but it is serious. The municipality is very much afraid now that a great deal of the land is going to be turned back for taxes. There has been a lot of interest to buy some of the land owned by the municipality, but as soon as they see what the taxes are they're frightened away. Madam Speaker, this is a very serious situation and it's hitting a lot of people, old age pensioners whose income is fixed and they don't know how to meet it. I can't stress enough to this government to take some steps to try and change the situation.

In the Municipality of Siglunes, a similar situation is developing. However, I can't give you figures yet because the tax rate hasn't been set for this year and we won't know until late in the spring the comparative figures, but I know something has got to be done.

I've talked to the council members and they feel with regard to the school tax, the government should give every consideration of exploring the possibility of having a uniform mill rate for schools right across the province. As you can see, some are paydng 107 mills for school taxes alone. Other parts of the province perhaps they pay 19, 30, and they vary. I hope that when the Minister of Municipal Affairs discusses this point that he will give us some hope that some rectifying measures will be taken to alleviate a very serious situation in this particular part of the country, because if they don't, I'm afraid that many of the people will just have to leave their homes and leave their farms because they won't be able to meet the

(Mr. Guttormson, Cont'd.) . . . payments the next time they're called upon to do so.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Leader of the Opposition in amendment to the main motion, that this House regrets that the Government of Manitoba, after calling on the Government of Canada for an immediate increase of \$10.00 in the old age pension, has denied that increase to many elderly persons in the province by reducing its social allowance payments.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg permission of the House to have the debate adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I don't mind if the debate is adjourned, but I would like to speak and I'm ready to speak now.

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry that the First Minister is not in his seat here tonight because the bulk of my remarks were directed to him, and after inviting me to speak on this tonight I thought that he would be here, but nevertheless I imagine that if he's interested enough he'll be able to read my remarks in Hansard.

A few days ago following the Premier's statement on the shared services plan I spoke on this question of state aid. I mentioned that this program might have some merit but that I wanted to wait and get the Premier's text before commenting on it. Since then I have done exactly this. I've studied this text and I've also listened to the numerous interviews the First Minister had on radio and television. I am not the official spokesman of the Liberals; I have no authority to speak for all the Catholics of Manitoba, nor for the members of the minority group. However, I feel that all those who believe in true freedom of religion -- I'm speaking for them -- and also that I'm speaking for all those who believe in the rights of all Canadians in the equality of man when I say that I cannot accept the First Minister's statement. If the Premier had simply said: "at this time we will give fringe benefits; we will study the possible implementing of a shared services plan; well those advocating state aid might have been disappointed, but nevertheless they would have been forced to admit that he was trying to do something and I'm sure that they would have compromised and they would have been ready to study a plan. I might say that at this time I do not feel that this plan is the right one, but at this moment I'm not too concerned with this because this is not the important question and I will not be baited into discussing it tonight.

We know, Madam Speaker, that starving people are tempted by left-overs. We know that even the crumbs under the table appeal to these people and it is difficult for them to say: "No, I will not crawl; I have my rights and my dignity of man and I will insist on these rights", when they know that the situation is cut and dried and that it is crumbs or nothing. The Premier knew this. He knew that the parents of these children forming these minorities would be tempted to accept. Perhaps they might have free textbooks, free bus rides and perhaps some other minor benefits, when at the moment they weren't receiving any help at all. He was counting on them thinking of their four, six or ten children. Maybe they would be forced to accept and then maybe they would not carry the fight for their principles for a few years. Maybe by then he would be in Ottawa and somebody else could inherit his mess. What did he care if this could keep them quiet for a little while. After all, he had asked them to be patient five

(Mr. Desjardins, Cont'd.) . . . long years ago and he was fairly successful. They had not caused him too much trouble. They did not want to antagonize him. Now maybe he could trade a few more years for a few crumbs and this would indeed be a nice way to repay them for their patience and for their confidence that they had in him.

Madam Speaker, I say to the Premier, "Sir, you have insulted the Catholics of Manitoba. You have insulted those who believe in fair play and in freedom of speech." He and he alone has decided that certain principles would have to be accepted and that they would have to be accepted as he understood them, and this is what he says and I quote from his statement: "Looking back from the vantage point of 1964, I believe three main principles stand out as basic to the settlements of 70 years ago. First, it was decided that there should be a separation of church and state as this expression is understood in Manitoba. Second, it was decided that public funds should be dedicated to the support of a single public school system in which all children have a right to enroll and which all taxpayers have the duty to maintain. Third, it was decided that parents were at liberty to enroll their children in private schools of their own choosing, such schools, however, to be supported entirely by private resources." After he said this all Manitobans were to bow their heads and say, "Amen." They should accept without protest and all of a sudden, very conveniently, the main topic of the Manitoba school question would no longer be a question of principle, but the setting up of a committee to study the possibility of a shared services plan.

To say that I am extremely disappointed by the actions of the Premier would be putting it mildly. Although I do not agree with him too often, I have always had high respect for this man and I admired him in many ways. I knew that he had strong political aspirations. I accepted this. Why not? We needed men like him in public life, but I never thought for a minute that he could act so cruelly as to step on the rights of the minority and deceive the people of Manitoba, of Canada, and apparently even some members of his own caucus in order to fulfil his personal ambition. He completely ignored the unanimous report of a Royal Commission, named to study amongst other things this very question, this question of principle. He forgets that when this question, the question of setting up this Royal Commission was discussed in this House, he joined the then Leader of the CCF to insist on broad terms of reference. He fought for this -- he got it. And now, after having had enough faith in this commission to implement most of its recommendations, and thus capitalizing on them to win an election and to brag about what his government has done in this field of education, he rejects Chapter 11. He rejects directly what he has recommended in the Chapter 11 of this report. And why does he reject it? Because, he says, that direct aid to private and parochial schools would violate the principle of the separation of church and state and as, and I quote, "We understand it here in Manitoba." As who understands it, Madam Speaker? As you understand it? As the Premier himself understands it? As the former Minister of Education understands it? As the new Minister of Education understands it? As the Members of the Cabinet understand it? Or perhaps as some members of this House understand it. Certainly not as this principle is understood elsewhere in Canada, where aid is given to private schools without violating the principle of the separation of church and state. The principle, incidentally, which Catholics in America wholeheartedly affirm. Has aid given in Ontario, in Saskatchewan, in Alberta established the Catholic church in these provinces? Has aid given to the Protestant schools in the Province of Quebec established the Protestant church in Quebec? I would be interested to hear the Premier, or the Minister of Education, speak for five minutes today or some other day in explanation of how direct aid as recommended by the Royal Commission would violate the principle of separation of church and state.

In fact, I challenge them to do so and yet on this very point, vital because it is the reason offered by the government for rejecting the recommendations of an impartial Royal Commissioner. Mr. Roblin has said not one word. Why this silence? Is it because the Premier knows very well that the principle as understood by him and his ministers is their poor rationalization to justify their opposition, deep rooted and adamant to Catholic education. Without giving good reasons for rejecting direct aid, the Premier insults the intelligence of the Catholics of this province and many others by asking us to step off the solid ground of our principles to follow him into what might as well be the blue yonder of his shared services plan, or should I say to follow him up the well known garden path. I say to him, "Sir, until you

(Mr. Desjardins, Cont'd.) . . . offer us a good reason for rejecting the solution offered by this Royal Commission, we must doubt the sincerity of your government's purpose to help us with your shared services plan."

Look at the terms of reference that he might give this special select committee -- no principle to study, only a plan. Oh, he had a great idea to pretend that he was a real leader with a gun at the heads of the minority to keep them quiet and this motion to set up a committee. No one would dare vote against this, so he thought, because they would be accused of stopping progress, then this committee would report not to the government but to the Members of the Legislature who would have to act on it. At no time would the real question, that is, the question of the principles be discussed. Oh, I know, a few days ago the Premier stood up in this House with a very sympathetic look on his face he said, "The Honourable Member for St. Boniface can bring in a new amendment, can discuss the principle." Who was he trying to kid? How can a member change what he had already decided and what is the purpose of arguing, of debating on something that is so finalized? Then he has the colossal nerve to end his speech with this paragraph, and I quote, "Let us pledge ourselves to deal with this matter on the highest level of public responsibility. If Manitobans can be brought to an understanding and acceptance of this measure, I believe we may look for a new increase in the mutual respect, affection and appreciation that exists between the communities of our province and a growth of spirit and of unity amongst our people."

Earlier he had made the statement: "Few of us wish this question to become a matter of issue between political parties." He rejects the recommendation of the MacFarlane Commission -- five experts who studied the problem through three years of careful investigation and now, without offering a good reason puts the thorny problem into the hands of a Legislative Committee, politicians who more than most men are subject to pressures which make fair and objective solutions difficult to say the least. In fact, Madam Speaker, we have every reason to suspect that this committee will give only as much help to the private schools in this shared services plan as the Premier and his Ministers have already decided they will give.

Even the Toronto Globe & Mail, the Conservative newspaper, who certainly seems opposed to state aid, does not believe in the sincerity of Mr. Roblin -- and I would like to quote excerpts from an editorial of February 12th: "Background of events, pressures and ambitions which has brought Premier Duff Roblin of Manitoba to the decision that his government will provide some sort of assistance to separate schools is almost as confusing as his statement on the subject." Then a little later: "There appear to be a number of unreconcilables in this statement. It will be interesting to watch Mr. Roblin attempting to reconcile them. More intriguing at the moment, is what precipitated him into the business of assisting separate schools in the first place." Still further: "But there is another pressure which may be patent with Mr. Roblin, his name is prominent on the list of candidates to take over the leadership of the Conservative party when Mr. John Diefenbaker departs. Also on that list is the name of Premier John Robarts of Ontario. The man who wins the contest must command some support in Quebec and both Mr. Roblin and Mr. Robarts have made forays into that province; spoken in forthright and friendly fashion; have been accorded favourable reception." And finally, "The prospects for aid to separate schools would seem to rise and fall in this country, not out of religious or educational, but out of political considerations."

The First Minister said that this is not to be the thin edge of anybody's wedge. Well he might as well know right now that if the Catholics of this Province have to settle for what he is now offering, they will never accept this as final. He will not be praised as the one who has solved the Manitoba school question and we will continue to fight for what we believe are our rights. We know that our rights come from God and not from Mr. Roblin. The Premier in his statement said the voters of Manitoba in the provincial elections of 1892 and 1896 displayed in the words of Professor W. L. Morton, and he quotes Professor Morton: "The civil belief of the electorate that the school question was no longer an open issue." End of quotation. And so it seems that this assumption was to prove wrong in the minds of many citizens of this province, is a fact that history was subsequently to establish since it is all too apparent today that this issue is still with us and still smoulders explosively beneath the surface of our political and community life. I say to him, "Mr. Premier, it is still with us, and it will remain with us because you have rejected without debate, the principle." I said that I would not

(Mr. Desjardins, Cont'd.) . . . discuss the shared services plan at this time, and I don't intend to, but I wish to show how much he knows of what is going on in this province, and how much he has studied before bringing the suggestion of this plan, and I quote from his statement again: "However, if the child is enrolled in the private school, he then forfeits any part whatsoever of the public school services. He thus has lost all his rights in the public school system and the rule obtains even though his parents are obliged to continue to pay their public school tax. The practice therefore is all or nothing. The child must take 100% of the public school services or he will get none of them." He repeated the statement on a TV program a few days later and he said then that the students that were taking courses had to pay for these courses but we know that even here in the Winnipeg School District 300 students of private schools attend public schools for some course -- 275 of them resident of this district pay no fee at all. Out of the 25 remaining students, 10 of them have parents who own property here and they also do not pay. There is only 15 out of 300 that pay anything and they are non-resident of the district. And we know that around Dauphin and Flin Flon, some other children of private schools are allowed to ride in buses provided for public school students. We know that there is this kind of co-operation now and when my leader corrected him the next day in this House, what did he answer? "Well this hasn't much bearing on the case." Have you ever heard anyone contradict himself so clearly, Madam Speaker.

It might be felt that I am too militant; that I should not rock the boat, but I feel that all of us that believe in justice must in this hour of crisis speak for what we believe. The poor simple prize fighters, such as Floyd Patterson who, although colored, was well treated because he was the heavyweight champion of the world, went to Birmingham when there was so much trouble there and he explained his action to Jack Matheson, the Sports Editor of the Winnipeg Tribune, by saying that he had gone to Birmingham just to show his people that their fight was his fight, and I would like to quote from Mr. Patterson's words: "If the negroes had stood up to fight 100 years ago, there wouldn't be any segregation now. I get a kick out of people who advise us to have patience, wait and everything will be all right, but in places like Birmingham, they inject their hatred into the kids and it would always be the same if the Negroes didn't stand up to them."

Yes, Madam Speaker, I hope that all the Catholics of Manitoba and also all the people who believe in fair play, will make it their fight. In the past we have been complacent. We've even been divided, but now we stand united and for this we thank Mr. Roblin. We were told that the committee would provide an opportunity for representation by the public who may wish to express their views. I would like to see the largest delegation ever march on these legislative grounds and show in an orderly way, by their number, that we are united and that we resent being deprived of our rights.

A few days ago the former Minister of Education talked about the would-be-debate that he was supposed to have had with the Leader of the Liberal Party. Well, at this time I would like to challenge him, or to challenge the Premier or the present Minister of Education, not to debate their shared services plan but to debate the three principles apparently settled 70 years ago, their meaning and their justification, although I cannot approach any of these three gentlemen in the art of debating, I certainly would like to try. And while on the subject of public information, may I quote from the February 12th perspective from radio station CJQM under the heading, "A Vital Difference Between Two School Plans." Premier Roblin says in the same breath, "That his proposal for private and parochial schools to share programs with the public schools is a simple one and that he fears many people will not, and do not understand it or grasp the basic idea. The Premier has asked that the proposal be given patient study and since it is the only proposal on the subject the government has made after nearly six years in office, it is not likely to be rejected outright." Still quoting here, "The Premier has taken some steps to make sure that his government's proposal will get an examination so that voters will know what he is talking about." Very few, if any, speeches made in the Legislature are printed in advance of delivery, but this one was, not mimeographed or duplicated in some other way, but printed! Since that time, the Royal Mail has been busy dispatching from the Legislative Building, copies of the proposal to a large mailing list. It has been announced that copies of the printed four page folder may be had on request by anyone left out of the general mail. Excellent service has been rendered by the daily press to the Premier's words for

(Mr. Desjardins, Cont'd.) . . . thorough dissemination of his outline of the shared services plan for the two types of schools. Editorials in both Winnipeg dailies have given the scheme a warm and sympathetic welcome; and both papers have printed it in its entirety the text of the original statement in the four page folder as spoken in the House by the Premier on Monday. This all out effort presents an interesting contrast. Four and a half years ago when the McFarlane Royal Commission devoted a chapter of its report to private schools and recommended a formula for state aid, no such effort was made to assure that everybody got to know about it, much less understand it. There was no splurge of effort by the government to see that all the people obtained a thorough understanding, of how an independent panel felt the seventy year old problem could be handled without peril to the established school system of the state." End of quotation.

Two plans for the solution of Manitoba's vexing and shameful school problem: One advanced by the government, after five years of silence and inactivity, gets full publicity and warm invitation from the Premier for all parties to debate. The other, a plan unanimously recommended by a Royal Commission after three years of investigation and study, gets little or no publicity and having been denied the recognition of a public debate, either in this House or elsewhere, it is now summarily dismissed by the Premier again without debate -- and most insulting of it all, for a very poor reason, namely, the government's understanding of the need of the principle of separation of church and state. No, Madam Speaker, Premier Duff Roblin, has not solved the Manitoba School question. In his rejection of the recommendations of the Royal Commission for aid to private schools is a flight from principle which will be noted with great interest by many in other parts of Canada who had hoped that this man had the quality for national leadership.

I conclude by asking one thing of the Premier, let this House debate the principle of direct aid as recommended by the commission -- maybe I could ask this of the Minister of Education also. Let the people of Manitoba hear your explanation of your understanding of the principle of separation of church and state. Let the people of Canada see that we, in Manitoba, respect and preserve the democratic process in our Legislative Assembly. Let me introduce my motion on the principle of aid; and let the members of this Assembly stand up and be counted on the question which is of such concern to a large minority in our province, then and only then, can we with confidence in the sincerity of this government enter into debate on the shared services plan. Thank you!

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, as this is the first time that I have risen to take part in this debate, I would like to pay you the usual compliments. I always regarded you very highly as a private member when you sat in the benches with us and I have grown to respect your abilities much more since you took over the office of Speaker and I wish you many years of successful tenure in that office. You are the person responsible for the protection of the rights of the members of this House -- the rights and privileges of the members of this House -- and in this connection I have a minor complaint, Madam Speaker, I would like to know who it is in the Legislative Buildings that opens my mail. Yesterday and today I received mail in my mail box, both of these letters had been opened. I am prepared to admit that the contents were rather interesting, but I would like the privilege of opening my own mail. And I would also ask if this is an error of some member of the staff, that if they have opened this mail in error, that they might at least have the courtesy of sealing it up again and writing on it, "Opened by Error" and sign their name. So I would appreciate, Madam Speaker, if you might look into this on my behalf.

I would also like to congratulate the Honourable Member from Dufferin, who moved the Speech and Reply to His Honour's Address. The honourable member and I have been close friends for a good many years and I think he did an excellent job. I would also like to congratulate the Honourable Member from Kildonan who seconded this motion. He also did an excellent job and I'm sure, we in the back benches of the Conservative Party are proud of this first major effort of his since he entered the House.

I would also like to congratulate, as I have done already personally, the new Minister and to wish him well in this, his first session, as a member of the front benches of the government.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . it's really my right to do so, but I rather resent the statement made by the Member for St. Vital, because it seemed to have connotations of innuendo about it. I think that the right thing for him to do would be to take it up with the Minister of Public Works privately and not throw it out in the open and leave the implication that some members are opening other members mail. It was unfortunate reference, Madam Speaker.

MR. Groves: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, I was not making reference that other members were opening my mail. I presumed that since it was all scotch-taped that it was some member of the staff in the building, in the Post office, or some place, but somebody has opened my mail and I think that is a matter that I, as a member should bring to your attention.

I'm a bit disappointed, Madam Speaker, in the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I was under the impression that he was going to speak about the matter of truancy in the school in St. Vital and I would like to start my remarks with a statement in this connection, and also later on to deal with some of the statements that the honourable member made in his speech, and that he has made in numerous speeches on the subject which he chose these past few years.

First of all, in connection with the situation in St. Vital, I think we have to understand that this group of parents is exactly the same group of parents that a few months ago registered their children in the public school, obtained text books and carried them away with them to the parochial school. They refused to return these text books and the school authorities --it was necessary for the school authorities to take the matter to Court and to have the Court force the parents concerned to return these text books to their proper owners. Now, when this matter was settled, these people of course were, I assume, looking for another issue and this fall, for reasons that are now common and public knowledge, when the School Board advised the parents that the children could no longer ride on the public school bus, this was an issue that was made to measure for these people, and we know how far it has gone. At the time of the textbook issue Father Bouvier, the priest in charge of St. Emile Parish, telephoned me, advised me what had been done and in the course of this conversation, frankly told me that they thought they had the right to these textbooks and that they were intending to take the matter to Court. When the children were advised that they could no longer ride on the school bus, I received a phone call from one of the parents, asking me to intercede on their behalf, I telephoned the School Board to find out what had actually happened. I also telephoned the Minister of Education, who was already aware of this situation and had at that time the matter in hand. This is the only phone call that I ever received from any of the parents concerned about this matter. On November 8th, however, two of the parents came to my house and gave me a copy of a mimeographed letter, dated November 7th and addressed to the Premier of this province and I would like, Madam Speaker, quickly to read this letter into the record. It says; "We, the undersigned residents of St. Vital, Manitoba, hereby, wish to inform the Premier of Manitoba, the Minister of Education, the School Attendance Officer and the St. Vital School Board, that a grave decision has been forced upon us, that of keeping our children home from school. We have been notified by the St. Vital School Board that the free transportation to St. Emile Parochial School via school bus paid by our public funds, has been denied to our twenty-one children as of November 8th, 1963. Our children will not be attending St. Emile Parochial School, because: (1) We have no means or possibilities of transporting them to the above mentioned school. (2) We cannot allow our children to walk five or six miles to and from school every day, particularly in inclement weather. (3) Our children would have to risk their lives by walking on a heavily travelled, zoned 55 mile per hour highway. We cannot afford to pay the \$6.00 per month per child to the Manitoba-St. Vital School Board and the Provincial Government for the transportation of our children. As conscientious catholic parents, we firmly believe, that the present public school system with (1) religious teaching and inspiration excluded from the greater part of the school day, (2) its refusal to protect the rights of catholics to religious instruction as shown by the refusal of the Department of Education to intervene in the Winnipeg School Board catholic parents' dispute, and, (3) its refusal to recognize the religious factor in education and to respect the religious heritage of each child cannot satisfy the dictates of our conscience. It is unfortunate and deplorable that Canadians and citizens of Manitoba should be forced to take such drastic action." And this letter is signed by the mother and father of the six families that are concerned in this present dispute.



MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if the honourable member will table that letter.

MR. GROVES: I certainly will. In response to the telephone calls I contacted the Minister of Education and found him to have the matter in hand. I have never received any letter from any of the parents concerned so there are no unanswered letters as charged by the honourable member from St. Boniface in the question period on Friday. At that time he said, "In view of the fact that on April 24th the honourable member while delivering a speech on Denturists in this very House, suggested that Denturists should go on breaking the law and fully endorsed their attitude; and in view of the fact that he has refused to assist these people and for the past three months has ignored correspondence and phone calls received from these people, does he believe that his remarks concerning the parents of 21 St. Vital truant students, comparing them to Doukhobors was in order, coming from him, and if not, does he not feel that he owes these people an apology?" Now as far as the statement that the honourable member made in connection with Denturists I intend to deal with that in later debates of this House. I want to assure him that I have not refused to answer any letters or phone calls in connection with this matter and in view of the circumstances, and the facts as I know them, I don't feel that I owe anybody any apologies and I do not apologize.

Apart from the two instances mentioned of the people that did contact me, these people have dealt directly with the Premier and the Minister of Education. I have, however, received many telephone calls and many letters from people in my constituency about this matter and in view of the fact that the St. Vital School Division lies largely within my constituency, has been responsible for my taking a very keen interest in this matter from the beginning despite the fact, Madam Speaker, that the six families concerned in this dispute live in a part of St. Vital and that St. Emile School is situated in a part of St. Vital that is within the boundaries of the constituency of Radisson. There are a number of matters or facts concerning this matter that I think should be brought to the public attention.

Firstly, prior to there being a school bus at all the St. Emile children got to school under their own steam. Some of these parents own cars and probably others in the area with children going to this school own cars. Mr. Schick, one of the parents concerned, owns a garage, so surely if it's so important that these people attend this school, car-pools could be organized to get their students there just as is done in many parts of rural Manitoba to get students to the public schools, and as is done in the other suburban parts of Greater Winnipeg. So their first three reasons for keeping their children out of school are pretty weak: that they have no means or possibilities of transporting them there; that they can't allow them to walk five or six miles in inclement weather and that they shouldn't risk their lives by walking on a heavily travelled Zone 55 miles per hour highway. I ask, Madam Speaker, were these circumstances not also present at the time when these children were getting to school on their own?

With regard to the expense. This is only a part of the cost of educating these children which the parents voluntarily assumed when they decided to send their children to the parochial school. Mrs. Champagne, who is the spokesman for this group, who has appeared on T. V. on their behalf, does not have any children attending this school and is therefore not directly involved in this dispute. What she, in fact, appears to be doing is inciting these parents to create a public mischief and I would suggest that she be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law for this. This woman, from what I can gather, is merely a trouble-maker and should be dealt with accordingly.

The fact that Father Bouvier was aware of what was being done at the time of the textbook issue; and the fact that he must surely be aware of what is going on at the present time; and the fact that the Sister who is the Principal of St. Emile School signed the transfer slips, transferring these students from the private to the public school are at least shreds of evidence that the present actions of these parents are condoned by their church. Surely also their actions must be known, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I presume approved, by the ecclesiastical authorities in St. Boniface. No statement to my knowledge has ever been made by their church disassociating them with the unlawful and irresponsible acts of these parents. It is in my opinion the duty of the church authorities, not only in this case, but in all cases similar to this, to see that the laws of the province are upheld and if changed,

Mr. Groves, cont'd): . . . changed in a democratic and a non-violent manner. If for no other reason in this case than the serious damage that is being done to their cause, and it is my sincere hope, Madam Speaker, that these people will use their influence to see that the present mischief is ended.

I also understand, and I pass this on to this House for what it may be worth, that these people may be prepared to resort to violence before this matter is settled. I sincerely believe that myself and I pass this on for what it's worth to the members of this House.

Let us also consider, Madam Speaker, the embarrassment this must be to the Honourable Roger Teillet, Federal Minister of Veterans Affairs. Mr. Teillet is Mrs. Schick's brother. He will have to approve of his colleague, the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare terminating the family allowance cheques of his nephews and nieces if they are not returned to school. Madam Speaker, all of this hullabaloo is not, in my opinion, a matter of obtaining transportation at all; nor was the textbook issue merely a matter of books. This is a lever welded with a strong and well-organized arm to force the hand of the Provincial Government on the much larger and real issue of public aid to parochial schools. These people of St. Emile have offered themselves as living sacrifices on the altar of public aid to private schools. Their efforts are spoiling, and perhaps banishing forever hope for that which they seek and I am sorry that their efforts are approved by many who might otherwise stand to gain. People are getting a bit tired of this situation in St. Emile School. Nobody, Madam Speaker, wants to see an open rift between Catholics and Protestants in this province and I strongly deplore the actions of those who appear to be trying to foment it.

The plan of shared services which the Premier laid before the Legislature in his speech the other day, is I feel an effort to try and prevent this. Whether it does in fact should await the deliberations and the report of the select committee. People like the St. Emile parents and the Honourable Member from St. Boniface are not, in my opinion, doing much to help. Most important of all, regardless of all the other aspects of this situation, I do not believe that these parents should be allowed to play fast and loose with the future of their children, for they are surely jeopardizing at least this year of their education and surely the example which the parents are setting for these young minds cannot be in harmony with the religious teaching and inspiration received in their school and can only be harmful to the religious heritage of each child.

If the Honourable Member from St. Boniface wants to do battle on the issue of private schools versus the public school system, I am willing to join up. I am not afraid to stand up and be counted on this issue. I am against any aid directly or indirectly to parochial schools, and I would like to repeat that, Madam Speaker, I am against any aid directly or indirectly to private or parochial schools.

Now the honourable member has achieved part of his purpose. He's had at least one of us stand up to be counted and this is apparently what he's been after for some time. Madam Speaker, I am for a strong public school system as the only means of preparing children to make their way in this life as we know it today and I believe that our churches outside of school hours can do an adequate job of preparing them for the hereafter.

I hoped Madam Speaker, that I could avoid making this type of statement at this time, because I had decided to give the Premier's plan of shared services a chance-- at least to see what the select committee of this House recommended after hearing the pros and cons. After the report of the Royal Commission that has been referred to so many times in this House, I must admit that I was sympathetic to some of the problems which parents of private school children thought they had. As time went by I became a fence sitter. I received so many arguments on both sides of this question that I admit that I was skeptical--although I was skeptical of my original sympathies-- that I was somewhat at a loss as to what was the best thing to do. This was my position during the last election campaign and I made it quite clear during this campaign that I was not prepared to discuss it as a campaign issue and I didn't. I am sorry that other candidates in the same election campaign were not of the same opinion and did on many occasions try to introduce this issue into the last provincial election campaign.

The Honourable Member the other day, made an impassioned speech in which he told us of his young daughter giving the gift of her eyes to a blind child. I was tremendously

(Mr. Groves, Cont'd.)... impressed with this action and moved and I am sure that the other members of this house were likewise. This act, Madam Speaker, is a reflection on her home life and her devotion to the greater things which she had learned to appreciate through the efforts of her church. I am sorry that unlike the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that I am unable to give any credit to her school training for in these last few days I have had occasion to deal with other graduates of the same school and I can sum up my impressions of these in a few words - three words in fact, and they are ignorance, vicious and anomalous.

Sometime I will share with this House the foul language and the nasty, dirty things that were said in the name of parochial school aid to my 9 and 11 year daughters on the telephone. I will share with this House the vicious, ignorant, despicable and crude anonymous letters which I have received advocating the same cause. Perhaps you would be interested in the mentality of those who ring my home at two, three and four in the morning and hang up immediately one answers the telephone. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface I am sure would be proud of his lady friend with the red hair who after visiting with him in the hall after our session this afternoon showed her complete ignorance by passing a snide remark to me as she rushed past me in the hall. I am sure that he must be proud of this lady.

Perhaps even, it was some of these same people who damaged my car in the parking lot on the Legislative Building grounds this afternoon - I don't know -- I can only surmise from the viciousness of the attack that has come from other quarters.

Well, Madam Speaker, from my position as a fence sitter in the last election campaign, I have shifted to my present position, mostly due to my strong feelings of support for a great public school system that I think is adequately equipped to give our children the type of training which we need in this day and age and I must say regretfully in some part, due to the antics of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and those, who like him, are at all costs anxious to foist onto the treasury of this province the cost of operating their schools. I may be a dirty rat, a bigot, a bastard, and a s. o. b. and, Madam Speaker, in the last few days I have been called all of those, and if any member can think of something else that I might be called, whatever you get that's it, because I'm sure I have been called much more than that. However, whether I am any of these things I leave to the judgment of people who know me better than the idiots who have made these statements and I find consolation, Madam Speaker, in the fact that letters and telephone calls taking the other point of view have been received in the ratio of 25 to one - and Madam Speaker, I cannot leave this particular part of my talk without taking off my hat to the few members of the catholic faith that have 'phoned me and discussed this situation and this matter with me in a gentlemanly and ladylike fashion, and I emphasize again, Madam Speaker, I take off my hat to the few.

The Honourable Member from St. Boniface forgets that the majority in this province and in this country also have rights and I am here to defend them and I will do so, regardless of the actions of people such as I have referred to this evening. I am prepared to put up with that, Madam Speaker, so is my wife, and so is my family. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface might as well be put on notice from hereon I am going to defend the rights of the majority or the majorities, as I see it and I promise in so doing not to send any poison pen letters, not to make any foul 'phone calls, not to damage anybody's property and to sign my name to everything that I write.

Madam Speaker the Honourable Member from St. Boniface stated in his address earlier this evening that he doesn't speak for the majority of catholics in this province, and he also stated that he doesn't speak for the majority of the members of the Liberal Party in this province, and I say, "Thank God for That!" But apparently he does speak for some of the people with whom I have had to deal these past few days.

HON. G. JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I wish to say what I have to say on this particular part of the Throne Speech debate at this time if I may. I don't know whether, Madam Speaker, I should run the risk of flattering a woman Speaker twice in the same day but I take that risk willingly knowing the tremendous esteem with which you are held by everyone in the House. However, to flatter a lady twice in one day, with a wife and six children waiting at home, must be qualified.

In rising to speak at this time, Madam Speaker, I do so, and I hope I am in order, in view of the fact that this matter has been mentioned in the Throne Speech, that is, the

(Hon. G. Johnson, Cont'd.)... relationship between private and parochial schools and also as part of the debate which we have heard tonight, and I think certain problems have arisen within this relationship and some of the points that I would like to say at this time I think in order to clear the air with respect to one aspect of the problem that is before this House and before the Province of Manitoba at this time, namely, the St. Vital School problem. The complexity of the problem facing the people of this province has been exemplified this evening. We have heard a discussion of the principles and certainly I think we all agree we must agree to attack this entire problem with the spirit that the Premier has mentioned of understanding and tolerance.

You know, Madam Speaker, I think of the analogy of the young practitioner who might be prone, on seeing the red angry tonsils in the throat to jump in and cut them out. Madam Speaker, if compassion for the patient is in the heart of the physician, which it is, he allows time for the acute inflammatory process to subside and then proceeds with an orderly treatment of the patient or until the conditions are such that he can decide whether or not to remove the material. We've had some, that is, I don't believe that a frontal attack by either side in this debate is going to help us resolve the problems before us in the spirit that I know underneath we would wish. I respect the views of those who have spoken before me on this subject but I would like to point out very clearly, and to clear the air, for the benefit of the members of the house and to say something about the role of the Department of Education and the Administration in view of some of the statements that have been made which I find a little difficult to accept.

I think we have to go back to the development of the problem as touched upon by the Member from St. Vital this evening -- in fact, he touched on certain aspects of this that I will probably repeat -- that is the origin of the problem with respect to St. Vital.

As we are all aware, Madam Speaker, there is no transportation in which the province shares, within the Metro urban area of Greater Winnipeg. It is in the rural parts of urban Metro areas that you have provincially shared transportation and this is the case in rural St. Vital and was provided for the rural students who would attend the Lavallee Public School. I would point out, Madam Speaker, that at the time of the formation of the St. Vital School Division there was concurrently the formation of a Municipal School District which brought about certain consolidation and the abolition of a local public school called the Vermette School. Now the situation was such when in 1960 the St. Emile Parish School was built and, as mentioned by the member from St. Vital, between '60 and '62 the parents provided their own transportation. I have determined that it so happens that within this Metro Urban area that I refer to there are children walking to school, or going to school who, I am told, have to go as far or further than some of the students who come from the rural area into the urban Metro area, and who attend the St. Emile Parish School. In October of 1962, Madam Speaker, some St. Emile parents, the parents, some of whom are in the present group, presented a brief to the St. Vital School Board asking accommodation for their children on the public school bus. Now the delegation attended the St. Vital School Division on October 11, 1962, and I wish to read an excerpt from the minutes of that meeting. This was when the parents of the children coming from the rural areas to the St. Emile School were requesting transportation because there were empty seats on the bus. I am quoting now a statement by the delegation which attended upon the St. Vital School Division: "The empty seats are there. We are not asking the Board to go to additional expenses for us by spending more government grants or local taxpayers money, but as you know these grants and local taxes come out of our pockets as well as yours." Now I won't read all the minutes, but the last paragraph in these minutes give the decision of the Board on October 1962, and I quote: "After a discussion the Board decided to grant transportation to approximately 17 children attending St. Emile Parochial School, providing there will be no additional charge for transporting these children and that this service will be rendered only as long as there is accommodation available on the present facilities." Madam Speaker - this particular amicable arrangement existed until the end of October approximately of 1963. Now during November of '63 the contractor who was delivering the bus services, or had the transportation contract for the St. Vital School Division, requested an increased amount of money because of the extra passengers which were involved. On October 31st, because of this request for increased monies from the operator of the bus services, because of

(Hon. G. Johnson, Cont'd.).... the extra passengers, the School Division sent a letter to each of the parents involved who were using the bus under the arrangement which had been made in the previous year. I am quoting from that letter: "The Board has discussed this matter" -- this is a copy of a letter which went to each parent. "The Board has discussed this matter at considerable length and regrets that there appears to be no alternative under the statutes of the Public School Act but to request you pay for the additional costs of transporting your children. The effective date of this arrangement," it ends, " will be November 1st, but the Board will allow all students to be transported until November 8th to allow you to make other arrangements."

Now, Madam Speaker, we recap just briefly that there was as I have read, the meeting following the children who had been going to school for two years -- an arrangement was made because there were empty seats which were obtained at no extra cost to the division, then the division was asked to pay extra monies for these children. They in turn, as they had agreed to in the year previously, wrote to the individual parents concerned, pointing out the fact that as of November 8th of '63 there would be no more transportation. The letter read by the Honourable Member from St. Vital, strangely enough, is the letter which I was going to share with the members, but I note it has been called for, for tabling. This is the letter received by the Minister of Education at that time and reads -- is a copy of the letter placed before the House by the Member from St. Vital -- pointing out the fact that the St. Vital School Division -- its refusal to recognize amongst other things the religious factor in education and to respect their religious heritage -- in section 3 of that letter.

Now the parents' decision therefore and their action following this date when they kept their children at home. As I point out this action from reading the minutes which are available through the St. Vital School Division, was an action which was not in concert really with the arrangement which the parents had -- which the Board had made a year previously and which I read to you, wherein it said, "We are not asking the Board to go to additional expense for us by spending more grants for local taxpayers' money." Now, this is the situation when on November 11th, 1963 the students were withdrawn. Now when children are not in attendance at a public school, they must be in attendance at a private school, who must on a monthly basis submit truancy reports, or attendance reports to the School Attendance Officer in the Department of Education. The Department received the November truancy report just before the Christmas Season, or it was brought to my attention just before the Christmas Season, when I had the honour to follow my colleague who is now the Attorney-General in the Department of Education. At that time, when this came to my attention, showing this gross truancy it was determined that at that time that should the parents not place their children back in school in the New Year, the proper thing was to contact the parents and ask them to come in with the purpose in mind of exhorting them to place their children back in school. Now we've been charged in the House with a callous disregard for the children of these people. Pointed out that a law is a law and we're guilty of flouting the law in this particular case.

Madam Speaker, it has been our hope -- it is our hope -- that the parents having made their point would realize that only their children were suffering by this action really and we earnestly believed that they would place their children back in school in the New Year. When the second truancy report was submitted to the department and I received it in mid January revealed a gross truancy still persisted, I contacted the parents. The actual date of my phone call was January 17th and asked them to attend in my office to talk the matter over. On the Monday morning they graciously attended my office and they were accompanied by a woman, Mrs. Champagne, who identified herself to me as a spokesman for the group and as the local parish worker. She accompanied representatives of each of the parent groups to my office. I mention this, Madam Speaker, only because I wanted to identify the people that I was talking to. I pointed out to the parents that grass roots told me that prosecution or no prosecution the children were the ones who were suffering by this continued truancy. I pointed out that representations had been made to the Premier and they in turn pointed out to me that they were moved by their conscience to do something which they recognized was against the law, namely, requesting, and suggested that they were merely requesting, transportation costs.

I pointed out that there was no way by which the Department of Education or this administration could assist with this specific request they were making as the law did not permit it.

(Hon. G. Johnson, Cont'd.)... I told them that we were trying to approach this matter with compassionate understanding as to what they were trying to do and that the reason I had them in the office was to try and encourage them to bring about an early end to this truancy. I pointed out I thought it was the job of government to mediate if possible; that I'd hoped that time would have a healing influence on what frankly, and that frankly we were reluctant to impose the letter of the law. I pointed out our differences had been aired and that this gross truancy was by no means a routine affair. In fact it was unprecedented in the memory of officials in our department and that unless their children were back in school, we fully intended to carry out the provisions of The Public School Act. I pointed out that the truancy reports would be turned over to the local Attendance Officer and I would recommend that two warning letters be sent -- one which is statutory and one as a matter of courtesy.

In all we had a brief but friendly discussion and they were quite frank with me as to why they were not wishing to place their children back in school. I think they agreed that it was the principle which was involved, that there was no ready solution to this matter, as I pointed out to them. I feel that the attitude of the government, Madam Speaker, is reflected in the Premier's remarks, which he made the other day, that of looking upon the job of government as a matter of one of tempering justice, and at the same time in this case of exhorting the parents to avoid the continuance of what is, in effect, civil disobedience.

We have recognized our broad public responsibility, Madam Speaker, and have acted however with restraint. The children are suffering, prosecution or not. Those who have pressed for immediate or early prosecution fail to recognize that this is not a problem of simple truancy. Truancy is usually an individual casual problem. In this instance of gross truancy six parents of the children are involved, plus a spokesman who is not a parent, and as their actions have been occurring in unison, in concert, they are therefore planned actions. Therefore surely, Madam Speaker, this case differs from any other case.

Madam Speaker the first notice -- I kept some records -- and it went out on the 21st of January, delivered by the local truancy officer or local school attendance officer. January 25th this was acknowledged by the parents. This is a registered letter and it reads thus: -- this is addressed to a parent, this is a simple copy delivered by the attendance officer, the St. Vital School Division No. 6. "Take notice that unless you cause your daughter so and so to attend some school within three days from the receipt by you of this notice, and to continue in regular attendance throughout the period during which she is required by The School Attendance Act to attend school regularly, or make satisfactory provisions for the education of the person herein before named during that period, you will be liable to prosecution under The School Attendance Act." Signed by the local attending officer. This is the kind of notice sent. This is required by statute, Madam Speaker, in The Public Schools Act, section 21, under school attendance.

On February 3rd a second notice was sent, although as I mentioned, not required, and the last notice acknowledged on February 7th. This is in some rural post offices here. It takes a few days to deliver a registered letter. Madam Speaker, Friday last a report was made to the Attorney-General by the attendance officer following inspection with respect to the second warning and the matter as of now rests with the Attorney-General's Department. This is his prosecution. The local school attendance officer turned the report into the Attorney-General's Department who, I believe, draw up the -- what ever is required to prosecute. The bizarre events of the last few days are difficult for me to have followed -- however, I understand that the children are at school today. I am hopeful that the parents of these children will continue to send their children to school and that the truancy has ended.

There were as I understand, bizarre events which occurred last week, which I don't think add or detract from the general candid statement which I have tried to make before on this particular issue tonight, Madam Speaker, in replying to some of the charges as I said, which were made in the Throne Speech Debate.

Madam Speaker, I do hope that this short presentation gives the honourable members, as I say, a candid picture of our attitude in action with respect to the St. Vital problem. I must say, Madam Speaker, that a gain I make a plea to this House for the understanding and compassion which I feel is required by all parties in a provincial issue of this importance and complexity and emotional involvement. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, could I direct a question to the Member for St. Vital? I was prevented from doing so after he sat down. Will he allow me to ask him a question?

MR. GROVES: If I still have the floor, Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, we should obey the rules that are established. I think it would be quite out of order to ask a question now of a previous speaker. I'm sure my honourable friend will understand that.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Inkster, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Tuesday afternoon.