

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 13, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 10th was a disappointing day as far as I was concerned in regards to the result of the vote. I was one of the members in opposition that I think I can stand up here tonight and say I truthfully and energetically gave an effort to the government to try and promote and pass the single district vote in my particular area. I may have had an ulterior motive, Mr. Speaker, because for the past two or three years the particular districts and particularly two municipalities, Turtle Mountain and Morden, who at that time if they didn't have the most number of one-room schools, were comparable to that picture, they had upwards of, in the two municipalities upwards of some 30-odd one-room schools. And in the past two years with an organized effort these schools have consolidated with the elementary schools of the two larger towns, Killarney and Boissevain.

On the basis of the forthcoming vote, the elementary boards had accepted through arbitration and the various legal means had accepted these schools into the position of being part of the elementary school system and it was disappointing that the result not only in the 19 divisions but particularly in the division I'm speaking of was turned down. And when you analyze it, Mr. Speaker, we have some very very worthwhile lessons to learn, number one is there will be discussions as we move along in debate in other departments in regards to the boundaries and I'm going to suggest to you that as far as the Turtle Mountain division was concerned that one of the reasons of defeat was the fact that they did put in an area in this particular division that didn't want to be and this particular area was the one that defeated the vote. And when I say I'm disappointed, I'm not only disappointed for the benefits that is going to be derived to our school children but I'm also disappointed on the statement of the First Minister today when he said we played a game, we had certain rules we played with and this is what today he made the statement would continue. I took a little comfort that there might be some change very shortly in regards to relenting the fact that the divisions that turned down would not get some benefits towards education.

I would point this out, Sir, that in these two particular communities, Killarney and Boissevain, they have accepted by consolidation upwards of these 35 different schools - elementary level - they haven't sufficient room, they are facing a prospect in the two communities of building fairly large elementary schools, possibly anywhere from 15 to 20 rooms. In both of these communities, Sir, they had a favourable vote of the consolidated areas that were looking forward to the benefits of a one school system. And now if we are going to have to accept the fact that we are a second rate community and our children are going to be treated as such, then I'm pleading tonight, Sir, that this government will take into consideration particularly if nothing else, particularly the benefits of the grants for the single division board to what now is left in our division, because as I figure it out, we're going to be faced as a direct contribution by this vote being turned down of at least 25 percent discount on our building program - and when you're talking of 18 to 20 rooms, Sir, you're talking a fair amount of money. So I would like to plead with this government the fact that while the division as a whole turned it down, there was a terrific amount of support, there was no politics I can assure you because I appeared on platforms with the First Minister, the Minister of Education, and I think I did conscientiously try to give personal support to the government in promoting this particular plan.

It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, if some of the members of the government would stand up and be counted as to how much effort they put in, in their particular constituency. I attended in the week that we were recessed, 7 meetings, and I think in most of the meetings that I attended - and I don't take all credit myself - but in most of the meetings the vote was favourable. But we go back to the fact that because the vote was turned down in the division, because it was a fact that there were some disgruntled people due to certain boundaries set up in this particular division, that we should be made to suffer. Mr. Speaker, I think in all fairness, I make a plea to this government to reconsider the fact that we did play games, we did have rules, but I would hope that in all sincerity that they would take a good look and when they bring down the Bill, they will give some consideration particularly to those areas that have been forced to - the urban areas in the rural parts have been forced to accept consolidation and I think that in Manitoba generally this situation is not just a little isolated effect, I

(MR. DOW cont'd)..... think you will find that over Manitoba, the urban areas, particularly I say the progressive areas, have accepted the fact of giving consolidation to elementary schooling and then now we were thinking progressively of the fact that this one school system was coming into being, the plans were developed to promote this, and now we should be subject to having to pay this extreme penalty. And I would plead very sincerely that the government would give this consideration.

There's other means that we could do, we could possibly ask for new divisions but I don't think this is the proper move. I'm quite convinced in my own mind that eventually we're going to come to it, but how long? And how long can we stand this extra money? When you take into consideration that actually we are not a second class citizen because of the fact that the total vote was turned down against this and because of the fact that division boards in expectation of the vote passing have set up their program of an integrated service to try and tie in the whole system and now be faced with this extreme financial penalty when they're all looking forward to the fact that we would have a progressive system of education. And here again I make this plea, Mr. Speaker, I hope the First Minister just retracts a little bit in his thinking, mellows his thinking to a point that when he considers the Bill, he does give consideration to this fact, that in larger urban rural areas they have accepted the penalties, the consequences if he leaves it at such, that they have accepted this because of the fact they were trying to promote a better system of education in the Province of Manitoba.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, when I look back on what happened Friday night, I think I must say that I was one person in Manitoba who was really shocked. I'm shocked on two accounts because I wonder within myself just as to what state our democratic system of government is in. For many years I have said to the voters of this province, when people present themselves for public office there is an onus on you the voter, as well as the individual who presents himself to office. It seems to me that we have lost this somewhere during the last years and I think each one of us should bring this to mind what has happened to our democratic system because nowadays when you present yourself for office, individuals will tell you I won't vote for him, he never came to see me, he didn't come to shake hands with me. Well after all it's usually a fairly large territory that everyone has to cover and surely to goodness there is some responsibility on the part of the voter that he should get to know his candidates and the program that they are trying to promote. I think this is something that has happened in the school question, because at every meeting I attended - and during the week we were in recess I wasn't in recess - I was out there afternoon and evening and I worked to try and see what the people of the area were doing and saying, and I attended every meeting that was scheduled and had some of my own on the side. But I do know that you have to know what is happening, that when we went to these meetings there was only one issue there and the issue presented by this government was "shall you vote to retain the elementary board and the division board, or do you want to vote for a single district board" - and all the questions that came had practically nothing to do with this one issue they were voting on. It was all the things that had built up over the years. And I have to think of my own area in particular, and what caused some of this, and I think we have to do some soul searching here if we're going to help these people and do what the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain would like to see done, and many others who expressed themselves in this way.

But I think of Tiger Hills, and I ask the members of this Assembly to picture Tiger Hills for one moment. It starts on the east end at Rathwell down No. 2 Highway to Treherne, Holland, Cypress River, Glenboro, Stockton and then think of the curve that it makes down to Hilton, Belmont, Balder and Glenora, and since Pilot Mound does not get along over in Pembina now they have asked, or they did ask some time ago to come into Tiger Hills and so Pilot Mound down to the south belongs to Tiger Hills Division. Now visualize this for shape and then see what is sandwiched in between - Mountain School Division, starting on the east end at Haywood, St. Claude, Notre Dame, St. Leon, Somerset, Swan Lake, Bruxelles and Mariapolis and the little districts around. And why are we divided this way? Well, I ask all members of this Assembly, what happened when we drew up these divisions? You know and I know that we drew them on a pattern to help the ethnic groups. And they wouldn't have come in if it wasn't for this, and so Tiger Hills accommodates the English Protestant speaking people, and Mountain accommodates the French Catholic speaking portion. We can curl together, we can go to ball games together, we can go everywhere together except to church and to school.

Now these are some of the problems that beset us, and these are some of the reasons

(MR. FORBES cont'd). . . that this was turned down. Not altogether were they voting just for a single district board, but they were voting for the troubles that came to them from this area. Let's look at Tiger Hills - and the people of this Assembly should remember that this was the first part of Manitoba, this central area, not just where I am speaking of, these two divisions - but all of these areas where you built up towns of equal size, and when the divisions came in, wards were instituted where you elected a member to the division board. And greed came into the picture, because everybody said to their member, "You're our member, we want to see you build schools in the division, but remember, you build one in our town or else", and this albatross was hung around their neck before they had a chance. And what happened in Tiger Hills? The Division Board never got off the ground. I felt sorry for them. They didn't know where to turn and it was greed among the towns to be able to have a school in their area. Unfortunately, Treherne had a fire and there were children in that Treherne area who never saw the inside of a high school in Grades 9, 10 and 11 and onto 12. They forced the Division Board to build a school somewhere in the area. They preferably wanted it in Treherne and the pattern was set - a school was built there. True, they voted on it, but the west end voted because they knew if the east end ever got a school there'd be one in the west end. But the pattern was set and they didn't have a policy, and the Division Board is a level of government, too, which must take its responsibility here, and as a result this problem is yet unsolved. Now how can you expect the people of Tiger Hills to go and vote for a Single-District Board when they are dissatisfied with their divisional board?

MR. DOERN: Ask the Minister.

MRS. FORBES: This is one of the things that -- I'll ask the people. This is one of the things that happens along here that you have trouble within an area where a board has not acted and this is our democratic system of government. Now there was nothing in legislation to say that when a board doesn't act within a certain time - granted there was nothing in there to say what must be done - but this was the only division in the province that had the problem in this particular light. They couldn't solve their problem and it's still unsolved, and so I can see that the elementary boards in these areas did not particularly want to vote for another board that was, they felt, just a little further away from them yet.

And when I think of Mountain I think of their problem, because as soon as this division developed they built their schools, one in practically every major town. As a result, they see today where they made a mistake, because they have four-roomed high schools at the most and they are not able to teach all the courses. When they look at their problems, they certainly say to themselves, what about distances? If we are going to take our elementary children long distances with the shape of our division, then this is utter pure nonsense and they feared this. They feared losing that elementary board, and I must say that when we say that the school boards and trustees did all they possibly could for this - I agree many of them did - but I must say to this Assembly that it must have been the executive of the boards because certainly all the elementary boards in every town were not in tune with what the executive wanted them to do and they did not help to build a Single-District Board. They would rather retain their own elementary board and there are several reasons. You have the other side of the picture too, and maybe I won't be popular for saying this, but I am going to say it anyway. Elementary boards really appreciate the fact that they are there. It gives them a certain social status in the area. Some of them who are secretaries want that position. There is some remuneration in it even, however small it is. This is something that they want to have. These people fail to see the idea of giving up these jobs to someone in a far distant town where they know they won't be on the board, in all likelihood, and they do not want to step down from these positions. At the same time, I know that they have at heart too that they want to see good education for their own children in their own areas as they see it, and they are hard to change in their ideas.

But I come to this point. We as members in those areas must try to create within these areas communities of interest, communities of interest where people won't be forced to go unless they want to go. The member for Turtle Mountain just finished saying that one of the causes there was because one group of people did not want to belong to the division. I think you have to create these communities of interest, not only for schools but certainly for your municipalities, and if you are going to have your schools you must have the municipal services that go with them. They all tie into the picture. If you can get a community of interest that has the customs of the people, the language of the people, their churches or lodges, their municipal services, their hospitals, if they can shape themselves into these communities, they don't of necessity have to be large, but they should be a community of interest that they

(MRS. FORBES cont'd).... are willing to be a part of, and if we do this I think we have an answer to some of the problems in our school areas.

Now I want to say one thing about some of the meetings that I did attend - and this was one of the things that really jarred me - and that was that at every meeting I was at, somewhere in the crowd was posted a member of the Social Credit Party. He was the one who had the questions and he was the one who took up most of the evening. If you have a strong chairman, he made him come out with his questions; but if you didn't, he took the floor for an hour. And when you ask, "Were you there at any meetings?" Yes, and I was at a meeting and more than one that lasted until after one o'clock in the morning, because of not questions from everybody but from one or two individuals who were posted with these and made an effort of trying to sow the seed which would bear the fruit of not voting for it. Now I dislike this because I think there's an onus on every party, no matter where you are, to sow good seeds if you're going to sow any at all, and I must say those were not the kind of seeds that were sown for the benefit of the education of the children of this province.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Did you ask for their membership card to identify themselves?

MRS. FORBES: I want to say in ending that I've had telephone calls, telephone calls this evening during my dinner hour, from parts of my area asking whether there could be another vote and how they could go about it. They feel just as bad as we do - just as bad.

In the Beautiful Plains portion the vote was light but the storm was great and the roads were certainly anything but good, and I think that this is probably one of the reasons why it didn't go over in that portion. But in the other part, I do know that I've outlined some of the troubles and I hope that some way or other we can do everything we possibly can to encourage these people to take another vote and to bring the system within their reach too. I hope that we can do it by seeing that something is done about boundaries and communities of interest so that we will have gathered together in this province people who desire to be together through their customs and the necessities which they require in their daily living.

So let us all try to find in our hearts some way that we can help those who turned it down at this particular time so that all may enjoy the benefits -- so that all children in the province may enjoy the benefits of a good education.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to capitalize, to play politics, I would be in an excellent position. Last year on third reading I voted against Bill No. 16 and this year I stated in this House that I would not be ready to sell this plan. But, Sir, I was protesting another matter, a matter that I will not discuss tonight, and I don't think that it would be wise for me, or would be honest, or would be fair to pretend that I was against this plan at all. I do not agree with all the government's programs but I must say - probably very few of us do, there's always certain things we don't agree with - but I must say that I think the principle was good; I think that the principle is good; I think that it is a progressive step.

I was invited to speak against the plan; I refused to. I said in this House that I would not sell the plan but that I would not lift a finger to hurt it or harm it. I have an Order for Return -- I've prepared an Order for Return that I certainly will hand over to the Clerk one of these days. I had in mind to do it last week then I thought that this might hurt - the Order for Return that I wanted was the cost of this referendum and who was being paid and so on - and I thought that I would be fair and wait until after the vote because I didn't want anything to distract from the vote or give the impression that I was against it.

The Minister of Education asked me for co-operation on some matter and I gave it to him. Now having said this, I want to make it quite clear that I'm not against the principle, that I do not agree with the Member from Rhineland on this. I think that this would be progressive legislation. You know my stand and it's something else, another injustice that I often talk about, and although I'm tempted to bring this in, I won't mention anything about this tonight.

Now then what - if it's a program that we agree, that most of the members agree - what is there to do? We heard this afternoon about leadership and arrogance. I would say, if the government was so sure that it is something good, I think that the government could have brought in legislation - could have, I said. Now they chose -- I think that this would have been the proper step, especially if you are bringing in a new way of financing education, but the government - and you can often second guess but you have to be fair - there was two choices. It was either bring in legislation or ask for a referendum. If they'd have been ready to bring in legislation, fine; but they talked about a referendum, and, Mr. Speaker, this is where we

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... part ways because it wasn't a referendum. It wasn't a referendum and this is why this thing was defeated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a dictionary here and I want to read from it before I ask you a question. I want to read a definition of a bribe. "A bribe is a reward for doing something that a person does not want to do; to influence by giving a bribe; to clear or open a way by means of bribery." This is what the definition of the bribe is. --(Interjection)-- If somebody didn't hear it I'm ready to repeat it. Then I'd like to read a definition of a threat. "A sign, cause or source for possible evil or harm; to threaten; a statement of what will be done to hurt or punish someone; to allow himself to be tricked;" and so on. This is a threat. And finally, a definition of the word "extort." "To obtain a promise by threat, force, fraud or illegal use of authority; to take unlawfully by using one's official position; obtaining of money, a promise and so on by threat; obtaining money by promises obtained in this way."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask you if the three words that I defined, if they're parliamentary, because I would like to use these words and I don't know of any other way to say what I have to say.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Tell us what shameless means.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I can come to that. I can come to that. --(Interjection)-- All right. Now, I will give you one of the reasons, the main reason why this was defeated. This is a meeting reported in the newspaper February 28th, 1967, "Roblin probed on School Vote. 300 attend Memorial Hall Rally in Holland". I think by reading this, Mr. Speaker, you'll have a good idea why the people of Manitoba voted against this.

MR. SPEAKER: honourable member's question. He was good enough to read from the dictionaries, and I'm sure that if he uses those words he'll use them in a gentlemanly manner with no intention of abuse.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well no intention of abuse. Just an intention, I hope, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I'll - apparently I'm on a tight wire here, but if you say that I can't use these words, I won't use it. Well, I'll read this and maybe we'll cross that bridge when we get there, Mr. Speaker.

"The question that raised the most reaction in the form of cheers from the audience dealt why the referendum was being held and why provision had not been made to retain the school boards of some of the larger elementary districts. One man argued that elementary school trustees could still co-operate with the division board as well as serving the people better, and if the government believes this is the best system and that it has worked well in Alberta and other provinces, why were we given a choice, why not just put it in?" That was his question. Mr. Roblin replied that it could have been done by government order, but it was felt it should be taken to the electorate. I'm sure if we didn't have a vote there would be a mighty uproar about that. The same spokesman asked if there was a free vote. It is a free vote only if you have a free choice and only if there is not a financial penalty if you vote against it. Mr. Roblin replied that if the division rejected the single district division it would remain in the same position as it now was and it would still get the school tax rebates as before. If we have the same teacher after rejecting the referendum why should we not have the same teachers' grant, asked the man. He then argued that because of the new sales tax they would not be in the same position as before. I submit that this is true, Mr. Speaker. I continue. "I venture this guess, if Tiger Hills was self-supporting they could, but it isn't. You cannot expect us to support a system we do not believe is the best in the same way," said Mr. Roblin. Maybe I should read this again: "You cannot expect us to support a system we do not believe is the best in the same way." I'd like somebody to explain this. If it's no good you don't support it at all, but you don't allow it. "Goodness gracious, Sir, this is just -- this is not me saying that, this is that gentleman -- "Goodness gracious, Sir, this is just what you say when you go down to Ottawa. You say you want equity for Manitoba. We can't expect the same sort of money as the big provinces get, but you blame Ottawa ask for more. We say if we turn the referendum down you have to look after us lesser ones too, that's what you say about Ottawa," said the questioner to loud cheers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is quite clear this was not a referendum, because a referendum is a choice, you are asked to give your opinion on certain things without bribes, without threats, without extortion, and the people who give you this vote think that you have enough brains to vote the way you wish and they are saying when they're giving this referendum we will do what you want us to do, because they are not ready to take leadership. This is what they're saying.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)....

Now there's another thing, last Thursday I supported a motion by the Member from Rhineland. The motion said that there hadn't been enough information given, both sides of the story. Was he wrong? This doesn't say that I agree with him, but was he wrong in stating this? What did the Minister of Municipal Affairs just finish telling us? The people didn't know. It was supposed to be a referendum; the people were told, you vote for this you get the grant; you don't, you don't get the grant. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs who's talking about democracy....

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I said no such thing. I said the onus was on the people to find out about these things. The material was there.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm very sorry, Mr. Speaker, the onus was on the people. They phoned here during the dinner hour, she couldn't finish her dessert or her coffee - "Please give us a vote tomorrow, please give us a vote tomorrow". What was Tiger Hills? -- 1,075 for, 1,680 against. They knew everything there was to know Friday, but they phoned here today, "Please give us another vote because we're sorry". Is that being logical? And what did she say, talking about the -- "It was too bad, because democracy was suffering in this country", and so on, and she blamed the Boundary Commission, the boards and everybody, and somebody had the gall to come to the meetings and ask for a question; in this democracy, somebody had the gall to come and ask them. It must have been a Social Credit Party, sent by my honourable friend; it must have been. And she's talking about democracy. I don't agree with my honourable friend, but I respect him and he has every right - what's a referendum for, what's a referendum for? I would ask what expenses was he paid? How much did this referendum cost? Half a million dollars, perhaps? How much was spent to show the other side, how much was spent? And my honourable friend's talking about a democracy, my honourable friend is talking about a democracy. They're sowing the seed, that's not fair for the people of Manitoba. They're sowing a bad seed, she said; but she wants to defend democracy to the very limit. And her Leader of course feels the same. We're not going to worry about minority, the majority rules here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this 80-85 percent, this red herring that he tried to bring up, that doesn't go at all. These people are interested in the financing like all the people of Manitoba and they have nothing to do with this, this is a rural matter, so let us not throw everybody else in the province, the people that were denied a vote in this great democracy of ours, let's not throw them in and say they're for, and let's not say all the people in the city are for. Mind you, those that have the vote, the people around the surrounding areas of the city were for. Now, this great majority that we hear about, this great majority - sir, there were 39,410 in favour and 38,197 against, 1,213, about 50.8 percent in favour and 49.2 against. And we're going to take care of the majority, the great majority. Now we're not concerned with the minority. And, Sir, could you tell me, could any member here tell me that out of those 39,410 there is not at least half of these people that voted in favour because - now, here's where it comes - because of the bribe or the threat? Maybe I shouldn't.

I'll just read one line in one paragraph of an editorial in the Free Press today: "While many supported the plan in general terms there was opposition to the government's method of putting it before the people, the suggestion that those who did not vote yes would get no money sounded too much like blackmail. The people are often bribed with their own money, but there are after all limits." And this is what I'm saying, this is what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker. When we want to bring something in like this - and we all agree except one that this is good - we need salesmen. The government has failed, and this is what my leader said, the government has failed and this is a vote of non-confidence in the government. The First Minister admitted that himself, he said there's a lot of issues, there's the tax, they don't like this, they don't like that, that's what my leader said. They don't trust this government - they don't trust this government.

The Minister of Education wanted to know what the difference was between arrogance and leadership. It's no good to say like the First Minister, "we had to have a referendum, what would the people have said" - now we're going to try and shove it through again. We felt that with this financial help that these people would get that they could not refuse it, then we could have said, "You voted for it, you voted for it". Now the people said 'no', but the referendum is no good. We'll have another vote tomorrow and one next week and another one with the same thing.

Now, what did my honourable friend use? --the Minister of Public Works was shocked.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... Well, I was shocked, when the First Minister said this afternoon, "We are playing the game, we're not going to change the rules now." Mr. Speaker, this is not a game. We are dealing with the children, the education of the children of Manitoba, and this is not a game. How can anyone say, how can this government talk about priority in education; how can this government say that they believe in the equality of opportunity for all the children -- they didn't say the equality for the parents, but for the children, and say, "There's only 40,000 people or so on, they can add that to some others that are not being treated well here, but we'll forget about that, we'll forget about that." How can the First Minister believe that for one minute that he can say, "You didn't want to vote for it, well boy, you're going to get it now. We're not changing the rules of the game". That is arrogance, that is not leadership. That is what the people of Manitoba are fed up with. That is why the people of Manitoba, although they had everything stacked against them, 49.2 percent of them voted against, and some people mind you - my honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not the only one that received phone calls. Some of use have received visits from the whole school board who said that the only reason why they voted in favour of this is because of the financial set up, and they feel that they've got to be able to opt out of this. This government took time out, spending money of the taxpayers, this will not be shown, even if I bring in a referendum, how much did that week, how much did that week off cost the people of Manitoba? And what did we do? We were so afraid of one member, the Minister sent a tracer to follow him. I'll put a tracer on you if you dare, if you dare, and I read at some of the meetings that he attended - oh yes, there was a tracer there - this man just happened to be there --(Interjection)-- Yes, truth squad. Well that didn't pay off in the Federal and I don't think it paid off here.

The First Minister said, "We're not going to change the rules; now you played the game, you suffer the consequences". But he's saying, "We must respect the right of the people who voted to make up their own mind. Now, is this possible? They tell me that the people are in favour of this - half the people voted against. I would venture to say that at least half of the other ones voted in favour just because they had no choice. A very prominent member of a constituency told me, "I know how I'm going to vote; I'm going to vote in favour. I have no choice. We cannot afford \$90 million here and we must compete. We can't afford to let all the best teachers go in the areas that voted in favour and be left with what is left over." That, Sir, is pretty close to a threat, or blackmail or a bribe.

The people of Manitoba have lost the confidence of this government, and if they'd listened to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs you can see why. Sir, she got up and she was going to say that it's the Boundaries Commission's fault and it's this group's fault and we should eradicate prejudice, we should work together, we should do all these things and we should not play politics and say you'll have a school there. Why didn't she get up and say they shouldn't have a school in St. Claude or maybe they should have one in Rathwell. Why did she? She's known for this. I think they had a bridge built without a road in her constituency - a bridge without a road - and she says don't play politics around here. I challenge you to get up and say in your constituency where they should have schools and where they shouldn't have schools.

MRS. FORBES: Don't be stupid.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, it would be stupid expecting that from you I know; I know. I don't think that you can come here and make a speech like she did - and that is arrogance - and then saying this member had friends there. They took over all the meeting - one innocent fellow or two or three or four - they took over all the meeting; they took it over, except if they had a good chairman who told them to shut up and sit down. Then she had a chance to speak.

The First Minister said today, I'm tired; it was awful to hear about Russia. What did they mean by this? They mean that this Cabinet is an arrogant bunch of legislators who will not even discuss things with their backbenchers. Did they have a caucus meeting on Saturday? Did they say to all these fellows -- no, a Cabinet meeting. These are the people that were supposed to give leadership. The Minister said daylight time - daylight saving time - they brought the bill; they took it out. They brought it in again. We brought one; they amended it. They brought in uniformity; they did away with uniformity. That's the leadership, and now they had -- the timing was bad; they brought it in now and it was poor timing.

Then the people remembered the pension - that's the group of people that do not give us much more chances than in Russia - that's what the friend of my leader meant. These are the people who were looking for this big pension that last day of a session a few years ago,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... the terrific pension for themselves. The people are fed up and I'm not shocked. I think that finally democracy has a chance because people, 20,000 people got up and said, "Keep your money and your bribes; we're not going to be bought with our own money." I think democracy has a chance. This was certainly a vote of non-confidence in the people who just raised their salary a month after the election, probably hiding in Neepawa or somewhere else. That was the reason of their big meeting. A group that are giving themselves \$3,000 tax-free when we're putting a tax on heat - tax-free - close to \$5,000 tax-free, which is more, quite a bit more than the average salary of the people of Manitoba. They are the people who get up and say, "Oh, if we could make the people understand." The people are starting to understand, Mr. Speaker.

Now we're talking about a tax. It was an education tax; then it's not an education tax. I don't know what we're going to use it for now because we're only going to give to 14 divisions. The others, we're keeping the same rules. We're not changing the rules in this game. Isn't that arrogance, Mr. Speaker? Is that leadership? Is that what the First Minister of this province is going to give us before he makes a stab at Ottawa?

Then we have a committee on tax - you're talking about arrogance - studying about the tax. No, we're not - no regulation. What did we say on this question of the White Paper when we got up and said, "Give the people the information; give them the regulation. Don't ask them to sign a blank cheque." What's going on now on this education that is not an education tax bill? What is going on now? No regulation. It's got a -- well the lawyers don't even agree with this. This is just another arrogant piece of legislation. We'll play the game; we'll set the rules once you vote for it, then we can say, "Oh, you voted for it."

That reminds me of something else that I'm fed up with. I'm fed up with the First Minister getting up and saying, "you voted for this. You don't want to spend money but you voted for this." How ridiculous and asinine is that! When you're asked to look at one piece of legislation, one program - and the second reading is you are voting on the principle of something, either it's good or it's bad - but we haven't got the purse of the people of Manitoba; we're not the one that sets up priorities. If you have a family and your son said, "All right, I'd like to have a bicycle." You say yes, a bicycle would be nice for you. Roller skates - yes, that would be nice too. A gun - that would be nice too. They're all good things. Well, I was going to say I don't know about the gun but maybe they could use it some of these days. There's a lot of things like that but the father takes the responsibility and he says, "well, I've got so much money, what comes first?" Let's not have any more of this red herring that you talk against this, you talk against that or you talk for it, but you want to save money. There's a lot of ways you can save money. We would look - we would look at the priorities, and we certainly would not start by saying we are getting \$5,000 tax-free then what's left we'll see what we can do with you.

I say again to the members of the backbench: you people have a responsibility. You have to go back to your constituency. What are you going to tell them? Isn't your nose bloody enough now to stand behind that front bench of yours without any question? One says "no". All right, well mark my words, mark my words and see what your constituents do. Mark my words if you approve of these things. You approve like a rubber stamp. One of your members has got a proposed motion now that he doesn't dare bring in. He runs out for a cup of coffee every time it comes in because he didn't know about this legislation, about this tax that was coming up, and it's kind of embarrassing to put it in now, to say what are you doing at Ottawa when they're doing worse here. You people have a responsibility. It's all right to have party loyalty but there's a limit. As I said before, your first loyalty is to your own constituents and I would suggest that you do a little bit of thinking about this.

We are talking about -- another thing, the people that voted in favour, the divisions that voted in favour, you know how much interest there was? Only 35.9 percent of the people that could vote, voted there - 35.9 - let's say 36 percent of them voted out of a possible 100 percent. Now those that voted against it were 48.5. I don't know if this indicates anything; I think that it does.

Now it's no use just talking about the past, but I say to the Minister - the First Minister and the Minister of Education - don't just try to save face; don't feel you're stuck with this because you said that you won't change the rules. Think of the people of Manitoba; think of the children of Manitoba. How can you, how can you have different methods of financing education in this province and still be fair? This is something -- if this is the part that you want, this financing, impose it on all the province, that everybody, that if a child is entitled to so much

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... money and if the child has no vote - I didn't hear of any school kids voting, it's their parents - and let's say - let's say that I agree with the Minister of Municipal Affairs that they're ignorant and they're dumb and they're stupid and they voted wrong - what about the children? What does this government say? Not that they're giving every adult a chance to be stupid or dumb; this government is saying this: We believe in equality of opportunity for all the students here in Manitoba, and can they tell me that if you have 10 percent or five percent of a grant that others are getting that you are getting the same opportunity? Can they tell me that these people are going to have the same opportunity, those that voted against, when they're going to be left with all the teachers that can not get a position with those that can afford it? Do you think that you're going to help reduce the tax load on the people? Those that voted against will not take second best and they will have to put another high tax on the people of that division because they'll want to keep the proper education for their children. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this government has not the right to use the money of the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers' funds in this manner.

All right, let's sell this a better way, and I would say that the salesmen have to go. I think the people of Manitoba have not confidence and this was proven. I don't know how many Cabinet Ministers, by the way, really gave all the help to the Minister of Education. I know that he worked hard. I never heard anything about the Minister of Welfare, the one that's always talking about equality out there. I never heard anything about him being at any meetings. Was he at any meetings? Was he at any meetings? How many? I'd like to know. And the Minister of Labour who has been laughing all day, how many meetings did you attend?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right. What's right? You've been laughing all day.

MR. BAIZLEY: Laughing at you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Laughing at the people of Manitoba.

MR. BAIZLEY:if the people of Manitoba could come down to this gallery and listen to the kind of talk that we have to put up with from you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not a gun at their heads. If they want to leave, they can leave. There's no pride in my I'm asking you how many meetings did you attend?

MR. BAIZLEY: I didn't attend any meetings.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's what I wanted to know, Mr. Speaker. That's what I wanted to know. We had a week to go to work. I didn't attend any meetings. I didn't attend any meetings and he's laughing all day. --(Interjection)-- You can speak after if you want. Your leader is telling you to be quiet because you'll only get in trouble.

MR. BAIZLEY: I can't think of anybody I'd rather get in trouble with.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's fine. For a person that's

MR. SPEAKER:honourable member to use that language which will continue the ordinary discussion of the House without exciting any

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you're probably right. You are much more realistic than my honourable friend the Minister of Labour and I should direct my remarks to you. I think that you'll understand them better. I think you had reasons for not attending meetings anyway.

But, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I repeat again that we cannot play with the lives and with the education of the students of the children of Manitoba. The education - I think one-third of what we spend in this province is for education - and we can not start saying 10,000 children will not have anything at all and another 20,000 will have just smaller grants and so on. We've got to finance education here in Manitoba the same way for everybody, and if this is wrong, if this government feels like the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that we acted wrong, that we should have it, the government was elected not too long ago, they should have said, "All right, this is the legislation." They choose to have a referendum that wasn't a referendum, so therefore they have no business saying that everybody that was against - as I say, I don't agree with my honourable friend in everything he says, but I admire him. He attended a few meetings, he attended

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate again to interrupt the Honourable Member, but he has three minutes rather than five.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I was getting so interested in this discussion between you and I that I kind of lost track of the time. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's probably quite a few of the members that wish to speak; no doubt the Minister of Labour will tell us why he could not attend; he'll bring a major contribution to this debate, so I will give him the floor.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I looked forward with some anticipation to participating in the debate because I did play a small part in the campaign as did I think most of the members of the House, and in common with members on this side of the House and the other side of the House, I think we can all say genuinely that we were disappointed with the result that occurred on Friday night. And I think as the Honourable Member from Elmwood said today the problem that we should be discussing at this time and the problem that has been dealt with by a number of speakers in the House is essentially, what is the task before us now to do what is best for all of the children of Manitoba? I think that is our responsibility as responsible legislators, partisan politics aside. I'm not one who is afraid to at any time in any form or against any adversary to participate in a partisan political debate; I enjoy it. But I wonder if that is going to serve the purpose of the children of Manitoba on this particular debate. I really wonder that. I wonder if it does much good for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to start the debate off this afternoon - and I welcome the debate - I was questioning not the debate, but rather the procedure under which he was attempting to introduce it. I think the debate is good, I think we should have the debate and discuss matters back and forth responsibly as elected members of this House to make sure that the plans that we have laid before the Legislature and those that will be laid before the House again when the financing bill for the single district division system comes down to make sure that these plans are the best for the people of Manitoba, regardless of where they live and regardless of whether they're in a unitary division or a non-unitary division; this is the task that faces us today. And while we all have disappointment, with one exception, about what occurred on Friday, I for one am prepared to say, that's fine and dandy, the people have expressed themselves, they've expressed themselves clearly in many divisions, particularly in rural Manitoba. In my own constituency they expressed themselves very clearly the other way, almost seven to one in favour of the plan. So if I wanted to engage with my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition in a partisan debate, I would invite him to look at certain constituencies that he's perhaps not too familiar with, and some of them may be urban constituencies but they are people of Manitoba and they are voters, and for him or for anyone else to draw the single and sole conclusion that this was a vote against the government, a vote of non-confidence in the government, is stretching the bounds of credulity of even a reasonable person, because this wasn't the case.

I can tell you though the items that I ran into when I was participating in the campaign both in urban centres and in rural seats: transportation in the rural areas; and here was a real problem facing the parents of young children. If you have a child, six, seven or eight or nine years old, you have to ask yourself the question if you're living in a rural area, do I want to put that child of tender years on a school bus and have that child travelling for half an hour, three quarters of an hour, perhaps an hour on the bus. This is a real problem. And I had to confess to those who raised this problem with me in rural seats that I didn't know the answer to it, and that it was a real problem, that I as a parent could share this feeling with them. But I had to say to them as well that after putting everything in balance, that is the future of that child and how he could make his way in the world as against the temporary inconvenience of a child of tender years going on school buses to a school in another part of the division, I had to confess to them honestly that I would probably make that choice, just as people 25 years ago or 50 years ago or 75 years ago - and the Member for Lakeside will know some of the ones of whom I speak - had to make a choice as to whether or not they were going to get even a Grade 5 education or a Grade 6. And as one of our generation said during the course of this campaign, he said he couldn't see the problem in transportation, this was an urban person now, who had been raised in the country, because he said 25 years ago, he said, "I had to walk three miles to a rural one-room school", but he said, "I walked it, or in the winter I took a cutter, or in the summer I rode horseback". And he said, "Nowadays, there is a transportation scheme offered for the children of elementary grades, a heated bus picks them up on a well-travelled road, and they've got a question about transportation". Well now, he didn't see it the way I did, but there are differing viewpoints on the same problem. I found transportation to be one of the big items in the rural areas that people were concerned about, and I say frightfully concerned; but I suggest at the same time that having regard to the plans that were laid before them, the fact that the local boards, the division boards, the unitary division boards would have the control over transportation that they would have, that this was a fear I think that could be resolved, and that will be resolved in all of those divisions that have chosen to go into the unitary division plan at this time.

I found as well that there was some minor mention of daylight saving time. I couldn't

(MR. LYON, cont'd)honestly see that this was a real problem at all, I think it was an area for people to vent their feeling about an old subject that has been chewed around for many years in this province. I personally don't think that it affects the unitary division plan one whit, but it was a bone that people were chewing on, and one that occasionally came to light. I found as well - I got this by hearsay from other people who were at meetings - that there was a considerable amount of feeling, antagonism, in some areas particularly against the present sitting secondary division board because there was a feeling to some extent in some areas that the present division board on the larger scale had muffed it, had not done the kind of a job that some of the people felt should have been done. I think that was an item, I don't say it was an overwhelming item at all, but certainly I think it played a part in certain areas.

I found as well that there was some concern, particularly in the smaller areas, the towns, about losing their one or their two-room school; or about the neighboring towns six or ten miles away that might get the schools and they wouldn't, the local parochial jealousies that we still find, and that no Party is powerful enough to overcome. This is human nature, this is part of our social fabric of life in Manitoba, and this played a role; not an overwhelming role but this was one of the factors that I ran into. And quite frankly I didn't know the answer to that; I don't know the answer as to how you overcome some of the parochial feelings as between one area and another. I think it would take the wisdom of Solomon to give an answer to those problems as you find in some of the areas of Manitoba.

So while I mention all of these things, I say Sure, I found some feeling against the sales tax, not a great amount - I found some against the sales tax. Some people according to the newspapers apparently thought that if they voted against the single district division plan they could thereby avoid the sales tax. I'm sure some honourable members found that. Well this is a piece of mythology, but some people felt that. --(Interjection)--. . . yes; and they were sincere in their thinking. There were a whole spectrum of reasons depending on the particular area, depending on what their experience had been with secondary division boards and so on, as to why a particular vote succeeded in one area or did not succeed in another area.

I have a pretty good idea why it succeeded in my area and there were local problems there which this new plan would solve. It succeeded with a great thumping majority, although I think it was something like only 18 or 19 percent of the electorate turned out to support it. And when we stop to consider that it was what? - 29 percent of the electorate on the average in Manitoba that turned out right across the province in all of the 33 divisions that were voting, I think we have to add to this list that we've been talking about 'apathy'. I for one have to admit some responsibility for not being able to rouse people out of their apathy, and I think all of us in the House take our fair share of responsibility for that.

I think as well we do well to remember that since this province became a province of Canada, this was the first substantial and dramatic change that the people had ever been asked to contemplate with respect to elementary schools. A hundred years is a long time - habit and customs and familiarity with boundaries and familiarity with a school and with grandfather having gone to that school and father and now grandson, these things don't change easily - and that was a factor. I am sure every member in this House, depending on the area that he comes from, can think of different reasons and they wouldn't be the same, they wouldn't have the same accentuation in every division as some of the ones that I have mentioned; but I dare say that of this group that I have mentioned, and there possibly are many more, of this group that I have mentioned you would find one or two or three or four that would be common to the particular area that you worked in, or that you spoke in or where you had conversations with the people.

So there it is; we had the vote; it wasn't as successful as we wanted it to be, but we must look at the picture of the province in total to see where we must go from here and to see what plans we should be making and that is why it is significant for the First Minister to mention as he did the fact that roughly 80 percent plus of the school children of Manitoba today are under the unitary division plan; notwithstanding the fact that this vote was disappointing, 80 percent of the children are under that plan. Something like 38,000 people in Manitoba voted against the plan and their votes caused 19 divisions to be out of the plan. And the fascinating thing of course is that - those figures that were mentioned earlier today I think they're repetition - the 14 divisions that voted into the plan have something like 47,000 students, 67,000 -- 60,000 in and the 19 who voted to stay out had 40,000, 47,000. These figures are rather interesting and they point up of course to something that all of us know, education is people it's not geography, it is people we're talking about. So here we now have a system in Manitoba that covers 80 percent of the people, 80 percent of those who are presently today using our educational services.

(MR. LYON, cont'd) I don't think anyone can fairly, can reasonably say that the plan has been dealt a death blow, when 80 percent of the people of Manitoba for one reason or another are in the plan.

My constituency, my home area is in the plan. We've had a single district division for eight years in my area. The City of Winnipeg has had it for eight years - I shouldn't say eight years, they've had it for many many years. Of course they didn't vote it. They saw this taking place in other areas and it was being encouraged and they went into it, many of them voluntarily accepted it.

My honourable friend from St. Boniface is still chirping, he says it has nothing to do with the referendum. Well, I'm not prepared to write off all of the school children of Winnipeg and say they have nothing to do with the referendum because they are getting precisely the kind of education that we want to see available to all of the children of Manitoba, because I think we all have to admit it is the best, it is the best.

I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to understand some of the arguments that we have been hearing tonight about this being a fiasco and this being catastrophic and some of the other rather dramatic adjectives that have been applied to this. From some of the speakers from the opposite side, I think we have heard this, that hindsight is a wonderful thing, especially 48 or 72 hours after a vote, everybody can tell you what was wrong with it.

And No. (2), we've heard from some of them who have chapter, line and verse to be able to preach and say to us today, I told you so. Well, when you're in that position it's very comfortable. It's very comfortable indeed to be able to take a position on either side, but is this doing anything really that is beneficial for the youngsters of Manitoba?

I come back again to what the Member for Elmwood said, that we've got to sit down as legislators and determine the best plan that we can - we think we have determined that for 80 percent of the children of Manitoba - and the other 20 percent we've got to see what can be done in order to make sure that the equality of educational opportunity that we think only this plan can offer them, what we can do to make sure that that plan is effective in their area. It's no good saying, well, you should have done this; you should have done that. I can think of five or six things that we might have done. And it's no good just to stand up and read a Free Press editorial tonight, which I thought was a very moderate and a very reasonable editorial, and to say we should have imposed the plan. Well, that's fine and dandy. Everybody can say that today, but I didn't hear too many saying that prior to the vote. I must give credit where credit is due, if that indeed is credit. The NDP and the Free Press were both consistent - were both consistent, I'm told

MR. PAULLEY: That doesn't happen very often but it has on this occasion.

MR. LYON: But I only ask, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the speeches that we would have heard from the Member from St. Boniface and from some of his colleagues opposite if we had brought in a plan to impose this on the people of Manitoba. We would have heard about dictatorship and about arrogance and about all of these expletives which he applies at such random to us, when we adopted the other plan. Imagine what he would have said if we had imposed the plan and followed his new found wisdom of tonight.

MR. DESJARDINS: That was a referendum.

MR. LYON: Just imagine the speeches he could have made.

MR. DESJARDINS: That was a referendum.

MR. LYON: He would have been the hero again of the much vaunted little man that he stands in favour of so often as he says.

MR. DESJARDINS: Who do you stand for?

MR. LYON: But you know, the longer I stay in this House, I have the habit of remembering some of the speeches that are made by honourable members opposite on particular occasions when issues of some importance come before the House. I remember - when was it - back in 1959 or 1960 this government brought in a Metropolitan Winnipeg Act and at that time there was a choice - there was a choice. Now you could impose that Act or you could have a referendum on it. And on that occasion what did the government do? The government said, well now we've had representations from the councils; we've had a Royal Commission on this that was set up by my honourable friends opposite when they were in office. We adopted as a matter of policy the fact that we will set out this new plan, we'll have public hearings and so on and we will put the plan in without the benefit of a referendum. What did we hear from the Honourable Member from St. Boniface when we adopted that plan? Dictatorship, arrogance, forcing something on the people that they don't want. What did he say? He said, "you should have a referendum."

MR. DESJARDINS: What else did I say?

MR. LYON: I can't remember. I can't remember everything.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on a question of principle -- Mr. Speaker, I also said today ...

MR. SPEAKER: You have me a little confused.

MR. DESJARDINS: We drank from the same glass, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, a point of order. I also said today that I agreed for a referendum, but a referendum was a choice and we weren't given any choice. The people of Manitoba were not given any choice at all. I said that a few minutes ago. I'll go for a referendum but not a bribe.

MR. LYON: Well, I'm not aware of what the point of order is but I always enjoy my honourable friend's interjections because they always remind me of something else that he said that was wrong, because we had on that occasion a plan that was supported. I think The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act - and here my memory may not serve me too well - but I think that my honourable friend from St. Boniface was one of the few who voted against it. The Member for Lakeside I believe voted against it and there may have been others in that dauntless crew. I think there was just a handful who voted on that occasion against the Metropolitan Winnipeg Bill. Here we have the same choice, but I suggest in this case - and I make no defence of it because it's academic now, it's over and done with - I suggest in this case that we had a solid precedent to follow of some nine years ago where the people of Manitoba had been asked vis-a-vis the secondary school division plan by way of a referendum if they wanted to make a change, a fundamental change in the education system. We went to them by way of referendum, not with the same wholehearted support I must say that we had on this time around from all sides of the House, but we went to them with a new plan with increased grants, an increase grant system that was in some ways more dramatic than what we have at the present time in the elementary schools. So if my honourable friend wants to call it a bribe, he was here, he can remember, but there were increased grants and we did have a referendum and we felt that that being a relatively recent precedent that it would not be unfair or unreasonable to suggest the same procedure should be followed, and I still stick by that decision. We could have imposed it, that's true, but ...

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): What about the Interlake vote?

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend wants to talk about the Interlake, I'll be glad to because if my honourable friend wants to suggest at this late date that there should be today, or that there should have been a vote in the Interlake which would prejudice the implementation of the greatest life-saving plan that that community and that region is going to have in the lifetime of any of us, then let him stand up in this House and say so. Let him stand up and say so. He knows what's involved in the ARDA plan. He knows it because he's been at the meetings. He faithfully attends them and I congratulate him on it. The people of the Interlake know what's involved; it's the difference between social life and death for the Interlake. And I want to say to my honourable friend that I don't back one bit away from that decision because the Interlake can become a desert or it can become a meaningful part of the life of Manitoba in terms of the last third of the 20th century, and I don't think that scuttling the ARDA plan is the way to give that kind of meaningful life to the Interlake area. That plan, as we know, isn't going to accomplish everything we hope it will, but it's one of two areas in Canada that are being chosen for a selective pilot project of a dimension that is unknown before in this country - and here I'm speaking on fields that are better spoken of by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Education - but I say no, I think this is a small price to pay for the injection of federal money and federal planning and federal ideas in concert with the provincial support that is necessary, and the prerequisite for the implementation of this plan is to have a vastly improved and an integrated educational system for the area. I know there are some who say, why didn't we have a vote, but those are the people I suggest that my honourable friend should talk to because I think he does appreciate that this plan is vital for the future of the Interlake and that is why no vote was taken there and I back not an inch away from that decision.

Well, my honourable friend from St. Boniface says we were arrogant because we had a referendum. He would have said we were arrogant if we had imposed it, so where does that leave us? We're going to be arrogant in any case I suppose in his books, so I suppose the only thing to do is -- the Leader of the New Democratic Party very rightly and truly said on one occasion, - do what's right. That's what we tried to do and I think we were supported by and

(MR. LYON, cont'd) large by all members of the House in doing what all of us thought was the right thing to do. Crying over spilled milk isn't going to do anybody any good today; trying to take partisan advantage out of the vote isn't going to do anybody any good today at all, whether on this side or that side of the House. It's a decision the people have made; it's clear, it's clean-cut and everybody knows about it.

The problem that worries me as a legislator in Manitoba today goes much deeper than that and it's not a problem of Liberal against Conservative or Conservative against NDP or Social Credit. It's not that kind of a problem because that's the kind of a surface problem that we can deal with quite adequately in this House. The thing that concerns me today more than anything as a result of this vote and even the restricted effect that it has had as a result of the 19 divisions that stayed out - I say restricted in the sense of still having the large number of the children under the plan - the problem that concerns me is this, that there were and there are citizens of Manitoba who live in the rural parts of our province who were voting one way and citizens who live in the cities and the towns and some of the villages where the vote by and large carried the majority - that is in the towns - who voted the other way.

I know from time to time we talk about the rural-urban split - and I mean urban in the broadest sense of that word, recalling that 70 percent of our people in this province today are urban in the sense that they live in a city, town or a village - and I'm concerned about that problem. I think it's a much more deep-rooted problem. I only hope that this has not exacerbated that problem too much because it is one of the factors of living in Manitoba today. It is a factor that goes with the quality of our social life in this province today and it's something that we've all got to be concerned about as legislators. It's not good enough for the person who resides on a farm to think that the fellow in the town, whether it's Minnedosa or Rivers or Mafeking or Ste. Rose or Morden, to think that the fellow in that town is a city slicker and doesn't understand what is good for the education of he, the farmer's children. But these attitudes do develop and I don't like to see them extended and I don't like to seem them enhanced by the kind of vote that we had on Friday, and yet I think that to me at least that is one of the serious problems that does emerge from the vote.

I don't like to see this kind of clash. It's not a partisan clash, it's just the clash of a person living in one area believing one way and a person living in another area believing the other. I think we've got to do as much as we can on all sides of the House to make sure that there is that bringing together of feeling and of attitude toward the future of this province that is necessary if we are to achieve the goals as a province, as a united province, that everyone in this House would want us to achieve. It isn't good enough - with the greatest respect to my friend the Member for St. Boniface - it isn't good enough for him to say to our members or for me to say to those opposite, you've got to pay attention to your voters; that's your first loyalty. I beg to disagree with him. That is not my first loyalty as a member of this House. My first loyalty as a member of this House is to all of the people of Manitoba, not just to the people of Fort Garry or Tuxedo or Charleswood that I represent but to all of the people of Manitoba, and that same onus applies to every one of us sitting in this House - every one of the 57 - the onus is to serve all of the people of Manitoba in the best way that we think possible.

So I do not accept that theory, that injunction of his to our backbenchers that they should give their first loyalty only to the constituents. That's a very important loyalty, one we cannot disregard, but it is not the supreme, it is not the supreme loyalty. It's been quoted hundreds of times before I know, the famous speech by Edmund Burke, but I think it is worthwhile reading a portion of it once in a while just to remind us occasionally why we are here as members in a democratically elected Parliament. I'm not going to read the whole thing because I know my honourable friend from Lakeside could probably quote it, but it's a good gospel for a parliamentarian to remember occasionally.

Here are part of his words on that great occasion of the address to the electors at Bristol: "Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain as an agent and advocate against other agents and other advocates, but Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation with one interest, that of the whole, and where not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member indeed, but when you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of Parliament." Those words are as true today to each of us in this Assembly as they were more than a century and a half ago when they were spoken by Edmund Burke - almost two centuries ago.

(MR. LYON, cont'd)

So I say it's not good enough for us today to say, well, there are a number of members of this House who represent areas where the division vote did not succeed, all those members are going to have a tough time. Those members have no tougher a time than any of us here because we all have the same responsibility, to make sure that what we believe is right is brought to the people in such a way that they will understand and they will come to see that what we are attempting to do collectively is for the total benefit of the people of Manitoba.

It's been said in this debate, and I say it again, that the immediate problem that we face is I think a very transitory problem, one that we'll probably look back at three or four years from now and say, "What was all the excitement about?" I remember as well that when in Saskatchewan - I was told this just on the weekend - when in Saskatchewan this plan was brought in with the provision for the divisions to opt some 20-odd years ago, I was under the impression that the whole province came in. They did initially but then they were referenda held after that and there was opting out. I was told on the weekend that the last division came into the unitary division plan in Saskatchewan, when? - a year ago. This is what you have to face when you're dealing with people with different ideas, so I don't think we can lose heart or lose faith in this plan because part of Manitoba, an important part of Manitoba has voted at least temporarily to keep itself out, we can't lose faith in the plan, the plan's still good. Have the teachers come storming to our doors today or the educationists or the trustees and saying, "Well, you've got to change the plan because if the people don't like it, it's not a good plan". The plan's still good; we've got to improve our job of selling, that's true; we've got to convince the people that this is a good plan for them and particularly for the future generations who are going to have the benefit of it. I know it's always easier to oppose than to be constructive, but I think that each one of us when we participate in this debate should try to be constructive about this, what are the constructive approaches to this. I haven't heard too many ideas tonight or this afternoon that are too helpful; and I must confess I can't give you too many, except to understand ourselves first of all, to understand our Province, to try to understand what motivates some people to think the way they do about certain issues. I think once we have a better understanding of the social fabric of our province, even though my friend the Leader of the Opposition thinks that some over on this side don't have any understanding of it at all, I think if we continue trying to understand why, what is the motivation for some of this feeling, then we can best get at the idea of bringing into force in this province the kind of plan that we all agree is the best kind of plan. Selling is the business of politics, each of us; we have to sell our Party ideas ourselves in our own constituency. So I don't fault the person who says this is a job of salesmanship, of course it is. We haven't won all of the rings yet as we've gone around the merry-go-round, we've got a few more to pick up; but I don't think that we should be discouraged by what has happened, I think we should carry on with the plan knowing that the plan is the best opportunity that we can offer as a Legislature to the youngsters of our province.

I really don't know, Mr. Speaker, if there's anything much more I can say tonight in connection with this debate, except to reiterate what I said at the beginning, that I was disappointed with the vote, as I think all members were. There is one other thing I do want to say and that has reference to the remarks that were made by the First Minister with respect to the Minister of Education and his role in this plan. The Minister of Education is not going to resign. There is no reason why the Minister of Education should resign. It would be a catastrophe to this province if the Minister of Education did resign, and I say that with sincerity and with great feeling, because it's all too rare for us in public life to have a person of that kind of devotion assume the responsibilities of public office, it's all too rare when you get that kind of a fellow, to have him turn around on an issue such as this and say resign because 14 divisions didn't come into the plan. Was the plan wrong? Of course it wasn't. Was his way of promoting it wrong? Sure, there could have been improvements in it; he admitted it himself this afternoon. We're all much wiser today than we were on Friday. Oh, but no cause for resignation, and certainly I want him to know that insofar as this speaker is concerned and insofar as this Cabinet is concerned, and I am sure insofar as this government is concerned, he is the man who has the right to carry on; having initiated the plan, having put as much of his enthusiasm and effort and vigor into it as he has, he's the man to carry on and to make sure that the plan is brought to a more successful fruition than is the case at the present time. That's the second last thing I wanted to say.

(MR. LYON, cont'd)

The last thing I want to say is that I hope that as and when the time comes again as I'm sure it will for people on their own initiative to seek to have a vote again on this plan under the legislation which is presently on our books, that we can enjoy that kind of co-operation in this House that we did on the plan, and that the same members who went out and supported in a non-partisan way and supported fully this plan, as did the members opposite, the Member from Turtle-Mountain - he wasn't patting himself on the back when he said he was on the platform with the Premier and the Minister of Education, he was; and he spoke for the plan in a non-partisan way. This is the way to get this plan over and I wouldn't want to see a debate of this kind rupture that kind of cohesive action on behalf of the House which I think is necessary if we are going to in any way temper the feeling of some of the areas, temper some of the misapprehensions that people in some of these 19 divisions certainly do have - I don't fault them but I do think they do have misapprehensions. But I don't think by rupturing this kind of cohesive approach and co-operative approach that we've had as between Liberal and NDP and Conservative that we're going to do anything to be helpful to the ultimate bringing in of this plan for the admitted benefit of all of the children of Manitoba; that's the last thought I have. I join with the Minister of Education in thanking all of the members who participated in the plan and hoping that I for one will meet them on the same platforms when the time comes again for these 19 divisions to have a vote in the plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Would the Minister permit a question. This afternoon, the First Minister announced as government policy that there would be no further assistance to those who voted against. Tonight the Minister of Municipal Affairs, a member of the same Cabinet, appealed for some extra assistance to the areas who voted against. What is the policy of the government?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend did not quote me correctly. If he will read Hansard tomorrow he will find out exactly what I did say.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, was it not correct that the statement made this afternoon is that there would be no further assistance to those areas who voted against, that there would be no change in the rules --(Interjection)-- that isn't what the Minister of Municipal Affairs said tonight.

MR. ROBLIN: Read my statement, you'll find that I made it very clear.

MRS. FORBES: On a point of privilege, he better read my statement. I didn't say there was any change in policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm rather surprised at the length of the debate and I'm rather surprised at the turn that the debate has taken. It would occur to me that what a great number of the honourable members are saying tonight is that the referendum idea and the school division idea would have been all right and we would have had no debate today if the vote was overwhelmingly in favour of the referendum, that is that the honourable friends who have spent a great deal of time debating and who opened up the question have levelled their attack on the basis of the fact that the referendum didn't go through.

Mr. Speaker, we in this Party recognize one principle, and many others, but one principle primarily with regard to this particular matter, that is if you have a referendum that the vote could go one way or it could go the other way and you have to be able to accept the fact that this is what you face if you face a referendum. It ill behooves people who agree that a referendum should be taken to then say that the government is at fault or anybody is at fault or any members in the House are at fault because the referendum was defeated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that I do not think that the government is absolved in this matter. I place the blame for what has occurred in this matter squarely on the government, but not because the referendum didn't go through, but because a referendum was held in the first place. I can't take the position, Mr. Speaker - I can't in conscience take the position that for six months or for the last three months I've sat here and watched the government of this province try to bribe the people of Manitoba and let them do it and only raise my voice because the bribe wasn't successful. I don't see how anybody can in conscience take that position. What we say in this Party, Mr. Speaker, and what we have continued to say and what I'm happy to be advised my colleagues said last year when I wasn't in the House, is that it's wrong to take a referendum, that it's wrong for the government when 56 out of 57 of the people in the House are in favor of a particular program to then abdicate the theory of

(MR. GREEN, cont'd)responsible government and go to the people and try to sell them this program.

Mr. Speaker, I don't say this for the first time and I think that my Party doesn't say this for the first time. When I got up on my feet on December 8th, which was the second time I got up on my feet in this House, I said, "My short experience has indicated to me that people who are elected to public office make much better legislators than they do salesmen. It's not the responsibility of this Chamber to go out and sell a program", and then I referred to Plan C. Now, Mr. Chairman, what we have had in this House today is a whole area of speculation as to how the people voted, and we've had it suggested, and I think there is much truth in it, that the people didn't necessarily vote against the single division plan; they voted against the government. We've had it suggested, and on the other hand contradicted by the same people who suggested it, that the people were forced to vote in a particular way. Well the force wasn't very effective as a great number of them didn't vote that way.

We've had it suggested by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland that the people who voted against the single division, the elementary division, voted on principle, that those people who voted in favour voted because they wanted the money, and of course each person who has spoken has attempted to interpret the votes of the people with their own particular thinking on the subject. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's one area of Manitoban who hasn't been speculated upon and that is the person who didn't vote, and I think that on the average approximately 60 percent of the people in the province didn't vote. My honourable friend from Rhineland says, "more than that." Well let's speculate on those people, Mr. Speaker, because they're Manitobans too, and they're Manitobans who I submit are interested in their school system, and what I say about those people is that they said that I have elected a representative to come to the Legislature on my behalf. That representative is going to be in a position to examine all of the expert advice, he's going to be in a position to debate, he's going to have available to him the various opinions of people who've done things outside of the province, and when he has all those opinions and expert advice and reams of expensive material available to him, I expect that he will make a choice on my behalf; and if he can't make a choice on my behalf he puts me in an impossible position. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that 60 percent of the people adopted just the position that the New Democratic Party has adopted in this House, that we didn't send you to the Legislature to then come back to us and ask us what we are to do. We sent you there to legislate, and this is the thing, Mr. Speaker that we hope will be learned from this debate. If this debate ends with the feeling on the part of members that what we have done is in principle right except that it wasn't successful, then I think we will have adopted a bad approach.

Mr. Speaker, we say that the principle of having a referendum under these circumstances was wrong and it was wrong for two reasons. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it contradicts the theory of responsible government to which we should be committed. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this idea of having a referendum and then going out to the people and spending public money to sell a political program is morally wrong, and that the government in attempting to be what they say is democratic, in fact it adopts a procedure which contradicts every basic principle of democracy, and that is, Mr. Speaker -and I think I can make the point so my honourable friend the Minister of Education at least will understand - that if this party was in power, the New Democratic Party, and we said that we were going to enact a medical care program and we said that we were going to have a referendum on it and then spent public funds trying to sell the people of Manitoba our program, what kind of excitement would we create in this House? We don't have a referendum on Medicare, and I'll refer to that because my honourable friends in this House have suggested that there's something criminal, something criminal about the idea that the government will offer an incentive to people who adopt a certain program.

Mr. Speaker, I may have misgivings about that type of approach, but that approach is the modus operandi of almost every government in this country, including the Liberal government at Ottawa. We have exactly that situation before the House today on the bill that was introduced by the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health has introduced a bill which must be framed in a certain way if we are to get federal funds, and I don't see any objection to that. I say, Mr. Speaker that people who adopt a minority approach have to be prepared to fight for that approach, and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they have to be prepared to forego financial advantage in support of their approach. We in this Party know this and we have had to forego, I suggest many of us, financial advantage by virtue of the particular approach we take, but we

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) believe that it's the right approach and we're willing to fight for that approach and we know that this will not involve having the same privileges sometimes other people have.

So, Mr. Speaker, the main point that we in this Party wish to make is that the referendum is wrong, whether it is successful or unsuccessful, and that if people are prepared to have a referendum then they can't come into the House afterwards and spend the next three days talking about how the people voted and why they didn't support it. It's contrary to responsible government; it results in debate which is of no consequence whatsoever, except, Mr. Speaker, and we hope it will have this consequence, that it will teach the members of this House that this is not the way to govern the province and this is the blame that we place on the shoulders of the government, that they adopted this approach which we suggest is wrong in principle.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, just a comment or two on the Honourable Member for Inkster's last comments here, that surely if he's suggesting here that 56 legislators were right here and that all the Manitobans who voted were wrong, then I'm afraid I can't agree with him here, because had we adopted the principle of bringing this in directly in defiance, I think this is the final test regardless of all the in-between steps that he made. The fact of the matter is that it could have probably been brought in directly and imposed but obviously we know now it would have been against the will of the people --(Interjection)-- No, it's not against the majority.

MR. GREEN: Definitely against the majority.

MR. CRAIK: But it is in respect of divisions. Mr. Speaker, what I really wanted to speak on is not the comments of the last speaker but the comments that have been made primarily by the official opposition. I think that tonight we have been treated to a very venomous and very vindictive attack. I think it's been very subjective. I think that the name of education has been used but I don't think in many of the points that were made -- well certainly the true aims of education did not appear to be involved in many of the arguments that were being presented, and in fact it was very seldom that the speakers referred back at all to the very fundamentals and principles of education. It seemed to be more of a subjective attack. I will go a step further and say that I would suggest that it was a carpetbagging attack using the name of education with which to even a score with the government side.

Now, I for one believe and I'll state ..

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I resent that remark of a carpetbagger. As one who supported this plan, I would like a retraction and I would like him, if he thinks there's any carpetbaggers on this side, to name them.

MR. CRAIK: I'll say again that I think it's political carpetbagging.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable member to name the people he's calling carpetbaggers.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I am going to continue on at the moment. I'll say again that I refer to it as political carpetbagging.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this member has made

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Portage has made a request of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. I wonder if he would accede, that is to withdraw the remark of carpetbagging.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I made it as a generality. I said before that I felt it applied to the comments made by the official opposition. Now I'm going to go one step further, Mr. Speaker, and

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege that some of us were imputed to be carpetbaggers. Now I'd like either a retraction or I would like the honourable member to name the people he's talking about.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I don't think it behooves me at all to name the people in person. I made the generality that the comments made by the official opposition have been primarily a political carpetbagging operation.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Will the member for St. Vital accede to the request of the Honourable Member for Portage? Did he withdraw the word? That was your first question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm interested too. Might I have a definition of what a carpetbagger is?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would look it up in his dictionary and we could have the answer to it, and then we'll decide whether I should or should not retract it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I appeal to you as the Speaker of this House to make a ruling on whether or not this is a parliamentary term and whether it should be used or not in the connection that my honourable friend is using it.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that I have noticed the word "carpetbagging" in our Book of Reference here. I did look into these points a little earlier because of something I said earlier today. I didn't see the word "carpetbagging." If anybody would care to inform me I would appreciate it too, but there's only minutes left and I leave it with the Honourable Member for St. Vital to put the House back where it belongs.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there's nothing personal imputed here. I'm simply suggesting by carpetbagging that they're picking up the bits and pieces that are left laying around and there's other suggestions that have been made today that are far stronger than that. What I will go on further and say is that I feel ...

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, could I help him by reading the definition? "The carpetbagger is a traveller who carries a carpetbag."

..... continued on next page

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member meant by his definition of a carpetbagger as my honourable friend from St. Boniface has quoted it, well then I withdraw. If the honourable member means it in the context that it was used in the war between the States as a carpetbagger, I object to that.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable gentleman still has the floor. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I think that between the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and myself that we have defined what carpetbagging is. I said he's picking up the bits and pieces that were left lying around after and he suggested it's stored in a bag he hangs over his back, and I don't think any further definition is necessary.

The other point that I would like to make, and I felt very strongly about it for some time, is that Manitoba's educational system to some extent is still overcoming the state of disrepair which it went into primarily in the 1950's - and I don't mean to say this because I'm trying to be political, but I think it is a fact of life - and I think that we are still to some extent overcoming the very near criminal negligence which a great deal of our educational system experienced at that time and I think it'll take us a while to graduate from it. I don't think that the referendum was an indication necessarily that it was entirely political; I think it did reflect to a very large extent the wishes of the people. I think to some extent they are still conditioned from past experience. I would hope that we will see our way out of the situation that now exists and that at some future date that very likely, if in fact the government has been right - if in fact it has been right, I am sure that people will see it that way; if in fact the government has been wrong, then perhaps there will be some alterations when these wrongs show up.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, QC (St. John's): Would the honourable member permit a question? In the context of the first few sentences, did I understand the honourable member to reconcile the position of responsible government with referenda?

MR. CRAIK: What I was saying here was that this was a point that has come up continuously over the last three weeks, that if 56 people in the Legislature are in favour of this you should impose it; and the argument against this of course is that it is a big question that affects democracy. Now perhaps I'm not answering your question directly but I'm trying to answer what I interpreted his statement as being, and that was that if in fact we had opposed this we would in actual fact have been, in the divisions which turned down the referendum, been going against their wishes.

A MEMBER: Would you have a referendum on the sales tax?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the House would care to call it 10:00 o'clock.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think there is a motion before the House to adjourn, and I think

MR. MOLGAT: that the House do now adjourn, Mr. Speaker, and I move that we act on my motion.

MR. LYON: I think all that has to happen now is that the question be put.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't quite -- what was the

MR. MOLGAT: I moved earlier today, Mr. Speaker, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.....

MR. MOLGAT: Seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Still speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition would withdraw his motion we could then have the regular motion to adjourn. On the other hand if not, then the motion is presumed to have carried, the House adjourns - that is the motion to adjourn - and that's all there is to it.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I do not choose to withdraw my resolution, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a perfectly valid one and I simply suggest that the House moves on my motion, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ROBLIN: Now, we must be very careful what we are doing here, Mr. Speaker, because if we're moving to adjourn, that's fine; but if we're moving to accept a motion to discuss an urgent matter of public importance in the terms mentioned, that is not fine, as nobody on this side of the House has the slightest intention of voting for it.

A MEMBER: Have you checked with the backbenchers?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm satisfied that the backbenchers keep me very well informed as to their opinions - very well informed. I'm satisfied, Sir, that the proper course and the usual one is to withdraw the motion. If the honourable member doesn't do that, you will have to consider, Sir, how you can send us home.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order and the proposition we have before us, I scooted out and took a look at Beauchesne. Now I don't know if I have the Honourable gentleman right. We have to consider Citation 100 dealing with Standing Order, 25 I believe it is, or 27. The situation as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is a motion to adjourn the House was proposed this afternoon somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2:30. That motion is the motion before the House. The only difference between it and an ordinary motion for adjournment is that there were conditions or reasons for the adjournment of the House proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition. We have now reached the end of the sitting of the day - as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have gone past it - 10:00 o'clock when you leave the Chair. As I understand it, a motion to adjourn the House for the purpose of considering a matter of urgent affair can not carry over to succeeding days. We have to accept the motion.

Now if my honourable friends from the other side of the House, the government, wish to circumvent the proposition of voting for the motion of my honourable friend the Leader of the Official Opposition insofar as the motion to adjourn for a matter of urgency, they have the proposition to move that Orders of the Day be entered into. If that motion carries, then the motion to adjourn, I would suggest, would be right in order. If they don't want to vote - I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if they don't want to vote for the motion of adjournment as proposed by my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, then let them propose a motion that the Orders of the Day be entered into even though we are past our day; that motion carries and then a motion to adjourn would be in order which would supersede the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I think this is proper and within the rules of Mr. Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member of the New Democratic Party for his opinion. We have been dealing with the motion to do with the adjournment of the House. I now call it 10:00 o'clock.