

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions; Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, as honourable members well know, it is our custom, I believe a custom unique to this Legislature, to pause during our deliberations in order to reflect on the memory of persons who once served here and who have since passed away. I refer on this occasion, Sir, to the late Gilbert Harrison Grant who passed away Sunday last at Souris Hospital at the age of 86. I really don't know if anyone in this Chamber, with the possible exception of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, had the privilege of knowing Mr. Grant in any personal way.

Mr. Grant was one of those who entered political life, at least in the service in this Legislature, at a relatively senior age, as I understand it being about 60 years of age when first elected to this Assembly in 1945 as a member of the coalition government of that era. Mr. Grant was a druggist by profession, was presumably active in the community, was active in the Masonic Lodge and other local community organizations and was returned to this Legislature by the electorate of the then constituency of Glenwood. He is one of those, I'm sure, who represented a very definite phase of this province's development, being one who in a very obvious way was sort of part of the pioneer generation of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Killarney that the House convey to the family of the late Gilbert Harrison Grant who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the First Minister for the privilege of seconding the condolence motion in memory of the late Gilbert Harrison Grant of Souris, former member of the Legislature here, and I guess no one here in the Legislature sat with the late Mr. Grant. Mr. Grant was a member of the constituency of Glenwood at that time, 1945 to 1949, was my member at that time during the coalition government, and I remember so well that particular election in 1945 when Mr. Grant was elected. At that time many of the members were elected by acclamation in those days but in our constituency that seat was contested.

Mr. Grant was one of the pioneers as the First Minister mentioned of the Souris community, a druggist, as the First Minister mentioned, a community man - he devoted many hours during all his life to the community. He was chairman of the Souris Hospital Board for many years and I think up till about five or six years ago he was chairman of this particular board. As mentioned by the First Minister, he was also a member of the Masonic Lodge and I remember so well the year he was Past District Deputy Grand Master of that district in the south-western part of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Grant passed away on Sunday and his funeral was this afternoon in Souris. I'm sure that many people in the Souris community will remember him for his dedication and duty in service to the community for many years to come.

Mr. Grant was also for many years, a Director of the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company and also a Director of the Wawanesa Life Insurance Company up till last summer when he could no longer be re-elected because of the laws that were passed dealing with election of new directors which makes it impossible for directors to be re-elected after they reach the age of 75. And we have in our midst here the Honourable Member for Riel who has taken Mr. Grant's place on that particular board. I'd like on behalf of our Conservative caucus here to join with all the members of the Legislature in expressing our sympathy to Mrs. Grant and members of

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) the family and hope that he will be remembered in his community for many years to come.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, it has been a long and time honoured tradition for even those members of the House who did not either sit with or know a former member, to take a moment out of our legislative session to recognize the contribution that has been made by a former member. In the case of Gilbert Harrison Grant, at the age of 86, it is well-known in the Souris area and throughout Manitoba that this man has served his community and his province extremely well; and the members of the Liberal Party in the House today take this opportunity to extend to the family and friends of the late Mr. Grant our sympathies and our recognition.

MR. SPEAKER: In adopting the motion would the honourable members please rise.
Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - THIRD READING

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to proceed with third readings of bills and I would suggest -- the question period is gone for those who didn't come in earlier. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the order of procedure should be the third reading of bills. Starting with the bills without amendment and the first one in that category would be No. 58, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

BILLS Nos. 58, 74, 84 were each read a third time and passed.

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks): I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No. 98 an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I wish I could be as congenial on this bill as the one we just passed, namely the Icelandic Festival, but I must say, Sir, that I have grave reservations in Bill No. 98, which states that we're going to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, a bill that has relevance to Bill C-176 which was passed in the House of Commons, a bill that I can't think of any other bill, Sir, that has had more concern and more disagreements from the farmers of not only Manitoba but of western Canada insofar as the legislation of that bill was concerned. And I briefly want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture and particularly to the First Minister of this province, that his policy insofar as our agricultural industry is concerned, is one in which the Conservative Party cannot go along with.

The Minister of Agriculture seems to choose the path of regulating of controls, of supply-management, which in my view, Mr. Speaker, is not the answer to the problems that we have in agriculture. I just want to say, Sir, that I think that the Minister and I agree in one thing, that the agricultural industry certainly does have a problem, one chiefly of economics - I think we both recognize. But, Mr. Speaker, the way in which we try to solve that problem is one that we cannot agree with him on.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the weather situation that we've seen this summer is one indication to state that while we try to legislate policies and probably to improve our agricultural industry, the weatherman can come into play and so quickly throw out all those plans and hopes that you strive through legislation to improve the situation, that you wonder what happened to the legislation that you had adopted in this Legislature and other legislatures of this country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the peculiarities of the agricultural industry that differs with most all other industries in this country of ours, and because of the nature of that problem that I know the Minister of Agriculture faces and we do on this side, makes it different and more difficult to solve the problems that the farmer has in this province. However, Sir, I wish to say that our policy is this, that I believe in the freedom, and I say there's no one more independent on the face of this earth than the individual farmer, while he wants to run his own enterprise, and I think the farmer knows best how to run his own farm, how to run his own enterprise, but in a sense collectively if that is their wish, that they band together to try to solve the problem that may be common to the majority of those farmers. But when we have legislation that is tending towards dictating to the farm people, then I have grave concern, Sir, of where that may take us.

(MR. EINARSON cont'd)

I've had a number of complaints, Mr. Speaker, in the last number of months from farmers who are saying this present government, while we are trying to get to see them - is the first thing, they're having difficulty. And when we do get to see them, we find out after we've presented our views they're not listening to us. And I want to say, Sir, that while I listened to the Minister last night when we were going through these bills in committee, the Minister indicated that if the farmers have problems they can come to see us. But I'm afraid, Sir, it isn't as simple as that. We on this side of the House feel that the farmers should have the opportunity of expressing their views, and if it is their wish that they wish to organize through commodity groups to establish a board to try to sell their products, then I would be one who would not stand in their way.

I want to use the Hog Producers Board, Mr. Speaker, for one example. The Minister was complaining, or indicated to us in committee last evening, that we as a Conservative Party had done nothing for the hog producers of this province. We established the Hog Commission, it was on a voluntary basis, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture and to the members of that government what have they done and they've been government for over three years. They established a provisional board, they ignored the Hog Producers Board which was elected and is an organized group representing the hog producers, but they were not allowed to have a vote as to whether they wanted a Hog Producers Board or to have the commission continue.

And so, Sir, I feel that this government, while they criticized us when we were government, have done nothing to improve the agricultural situation. Sure, the Minister made a \$100 payment to each farmer but, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that was political, I say it was an expensive one to win one seat in Ste. Rose and have to pay every farmer in Manitoba \$100 in order to get it. I think, in essence, that's what it amounted to. --(Interjection)-- Yes, as my colleague behind me says, it violated the Election Act. I suppose if one were to delve into it that just might be the case.

But, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to state for the record that we do not agree with the policies, the way in which this government is trying to solve the problem of the farmer in this province and the way in which they are working with the Federal Government. I stated once before in this House not so many weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, and I indicate again that the Minister of Agriculture indicated publicly, and why the press didn't pick it up I don't know, but he stated that if we had an NDP government in Ottawa things wouldn't be any different today. What did he mean by that, Sir? That there's no difference in the party that is operating this government in Canada as opposed to the NDP. That's the understanding I received from that comment. And so, Mr. Speaker, he can go out and ask the farmers, not only in Manitoba but in western Canada, what they think of what is being done in Ottawa.

My colleague from Roblin I think indicated very well that there's no way in which we can solve our problems whether it be politically, economically, when we're forced to probably have to agree with policies that are going to have to be satisfactory to Ontario and Quebec, and I say, Sir, this is the crux of the problem which we find ourselves in in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have to oppose this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is that important that it needs just a few more moments. You know, Mr. Speaker, there are only a few members in the House that truly appreciate the importance of that bill - three in fact. One is the First Minister, the other one is the Member for Fort Garry and the other member is the Member for Morris, because these three gentlemen know from firsthand experience what the political structure, the political muscle of this country is. And, Mr. Speaker, contained in this bill is the potential of giving over the future productive capacity, the potential of our production and all that it has into the hands of that particular political hierarchy which is centred in eastern Canada, as the First Minister knows as the Member for Fort Garry knows, and the Member for Morris knows; and with the passage of this bill there is potentially at least giving the Minister of Agriculture the power of putting into the hands of the eastern potentates the destiny of western Canada and western Canadian farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not an exaggeration. We grow barley, oats and wheat here in western Canada, then we with our taxpayers' money we subsidize it to the tune of up to \$15 a ton to see that it gets shipped to Ontario and Quebec, and then Ontario and Quebec they then decide to grow multi multi chickens and then they have too many chickens and then they decide

(MR. ENNS cont'd) that we should start killing chickens, so now we all have to start killing chickens including here in Manitoba. And that's how the marvelous policies of supply and management fostered by that NDP owing to the Liberal government in Ottawa and supported by the NDP government here in Manitoba is prepared to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to belabour this subject and I say it is the potential in this because the Minister, I recognize in the bill that we're putting a great deal of, you know, responsibility and authority in the hands of the Minister and of the government of the day. But, Mr. Speaker, let's make no mistake about it. The mess, the mess that we can get ourselves into in the area of supply and management in agriculture, you know, just would leave such other peripheral problems as aid to private and parochial schools laying in the dust.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being in Europe a short time ago, just at the time that there was a beef shortage in the common market countries, and I happened to read in the newspapers - the daily newspapers - about how to alleviate this situation: the six common market countries relax and abandon all the import duties and tariffs with respect to importation of beef into the common market countries. At the same time of course in Britain, to prevent the possibility of the British livestock producer from taking advantage of that better and improved market in Europe to send some of his product to Europe, they imposed a ten percent export tariff to prevent any animals from leaving that particular country, and this is the kind of nonsense that goes on when you have overt government interference with the normal market play particularly in agricultural policies.

Mr. Speaker, I relate that incident only as a minor example. The crux of my argument, and I'll make it very briefly, is that we by passing this bill expect somewhat five or six rurally elected federal members in the House to stand up to the hordes of MPs that are put in that House from Ottawa, from Ontario, from Quebec, and we expect a fair shake. Mr. Speaker, that will not happen. It will happen if our interests happen to coincide with those interests of Ontario and Quebec agriculturalists and only then; and, Mr. Speaker, I say that that is a dereliction of duty, that is a dereliction of responsibility, and that will have tremendously grave consequences for the future development of not only this province but of the whole western region.

Mr. Speaker, the first hundred years of Confederation, the first hundred years of Confederation we were prepared to patiently bide our time in western Canada because we've always been more patriotic Canadian citizens than some of the rest of the people in this country, and we have said, and we have said, Mr. Speaker, we will live with that tariff wall that we've allowed our Canadian governments to build around the eastern manufactureres so that we could build an industry in the east, so we could build the Massey-Ferguson and John Deere plants and the other industrial empires in the east. But, Mr. Speaker, surely now with the centennial year under way and as we approach our second one hundred years, that we should now have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, we should now have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker . . .

(Recording failure for about one-half minute)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate that I can appreciate the exuberance of the members but I would like to appreciate it more if I could hear what the honourable member is saying. The interjections are just killing every audible bit of what the speaker is saying, and if we don't have the co-operation I certainly won't be able to know what is going on whether the member's in order or out of order. The Honourable Member for Lakeside may continue.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat for you, Sir, I'll repeat for you, Sir, in multi-subtle terms, because it is very important what I just told them, those who choose not to listen, they're making a bad mistake, Mr. Speaker; they're placing the potential expansion of future agricultural production in the hands of the politicians of this country and it is a long-established and familiar fact that in that ball game we don't necessarily call the shots. It is the east that does that and any government, Mr. Speaker, any First Minister and any Minister of Agriculture in this country and this province that is prepared to jeopardize the position of Manitoba farmers and the Manitoba agricultural industry in that manner, Mr. Speaker, they know not what they do.

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): . . . a question, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would answer. I was wondering if he would agree with me that approximately three weeks ago his national leader, the Honourable John Diefenbaker, was on the national TV and stated that if price controls and supply management . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think all honourable members are aware that questions are for clarification not for opening up new areas of debate, and if I gave the floor to the Honourable Member for Lakeside he'd probably go for another half hour. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be long but certainly when we are called to vote on a bill such as Bill 98, the Natural Products Marketing Act, I think it is highly essential that we give our reasons or qualify our vote and I as one have never subscribed to the principle of marketing boards even when the Natural Products Marketing Act was brought in by the previous administration and this is an act that we're amending that was brought in by the previous government, if I'm correct. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? I think it was amended way back in the 60s. Marketing boards generally are for the purpose of providing the same price for all producers, and what generally happens is that we don't get the higher prices. This means that prices are being lowered and not increased. This at least has been the experience for the many years where we've had marketing boards in existence. What I fear and the reservations that I have was that now that the federal legislation is passed that we will on occasion be subject to the federal act and by passing this bill that this could well be the case in certain future developments, and I for one don't subscribe to being regulated as a producer. I think farmers want to be free; they want to produce and they want to sell as they well please. And therefore I do not subscribe to the principle and therefore cannot support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take very many minutes to refute some of the suggestions made by members opposite because we've been through that circus before. I simply want to indicate a couple of points which would remind members in the House how ridiculous the members of the Opposition have been behaving with respect to any legislation proposed and in particular --(Interjection)-- I know. And in particular, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this piece of legislation. It seems that it's a tactic of Opposition to mislead the people of Manitoba and it has always been my impression that Opposition was to be constructive and that a loyal Opposition was working in the best interests of the people of the country by whom they are elected. And I find that has not been the case in this Legislature in the three years that this government has been in office in Manitoba and I can cite a number of examples. And one of these examples, Mr. Speaker, dates back to another piece of legislation which I dealt with only a week ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable Minister address himself to the bill before us?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm doing precisely that in that the members that have spoken on this bill this evening have misrepresented the facts of this legislation to the people of Manitoba in their attempt to confuse the issue. The provisions of this bill with respect to national marketing plans of any kind that may arise in the future and may come into being in the future may only come into being, Mr. Speaker, these plans may only come into being on agreement of a number of provinces across Canada including the Province of Manitoba. So it doesn't mean at all, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this bill will determine in fact that there will be any national plan with respect to any commodity marketed in Canada or in Manitoba. So that it's purely hypothetical and very misleading to the people of Manitoba to suggest that the future is not well for the farmers of Manitoba because we are handing over powers to another authority - that is the authority of the Government of Canada - which is not the case, Mr. Speaker, because nothing in this bill compels the Province of Manitoba to enter into a scheme in the marketing of any product under any national legislation unless we want to do so after negotiation and otherwise.

And while it is true, Mr. Speaker, while it is true that there is a likelihood that there will be agreement in a number of commodities, and the number is limited, Mr. Speaker, because the legislation passed at the federal level is limited to poultry products only, and those are the producers within Canada that are concerned with marketing of their product and have been frustrated with a state of bankruptcy over the last two or three years within their industry, which has resulted in the passage of federal legislation and the passage of amendments to provincial acts across Canada in order to facilitate the proper orderly marketing of these products.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not a dangerous piece of legislation as members opposite would like the people of Manitoba to believe, and more so, Mr. Speaker, because it is going to be

(MR. USKIW cont'd) administered by a very responsible government in Manitoba, a government who has the wishes of its producers at heart, a government which is trying to improve the bargaining power of our primary producers, production of many of our agricultural products. And as I indicated to members opposite in committee only yesterday on questions put to me at that particular time, that the Government of Manitoba is prepared to move in these directions and whatever directions are necessary in order to bring about a degree of stability towards our farm community and an improvement of farm incomes. Now members opposite suggest, and they are suggesting today, that the present system of disorganized marketing is one that ought to continue, the one that we've had for the last 100 years should continue, and I ask members opposite to reflect only in the last three years and determine whether or not the state of chaos and bankruptcy that exists within the industry is what they wish to continue. Because that is the impression that they are leaving me with this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the last words of the Minister truly reflects the attitude of this government when he said that they were moving in different directions. That, Sir, typifies the approach of this government. They're moving in all directions at the same time; they know not where they go like Christopher Columbus. Mr. Speaker, what this bill is suggesting, and notwithstanding all of the statements made by the Minister, the fact remains that in this piece of legislation the power of the marketplace which has always been good to Western Canada is going to be replaced by the power of politics. Sir, we as farmers, will take our chances in the marketplace because we know as producers we can produce at a lower price, a better quality than any other place in Canada, and we're prepared to compete in those markets. And if there has been frustrations, and indeed there have, if there have been frustrations it is not because of the marketplace, it is because of the interference of politicians, the interference of governments imposing restrictions and controls that have distorted the value of the marketplace. Now, the Minister knows that and yet he has the audacity to stand up here today and say that the power of the politicians, that the direction afforded by this government and other governments is going to be superior to the farmers' chances of achieving any kind of equality in this country if he chooses to use the marketplace. Sir, we know full well that that will not happen.

What the Minister is doing in this bill is what is characteristic of socialists, including that group in Ottawa, and that is to --(Interjection)-- The present government in Ottawa, The First Minister want me to be more explicit? What this bill intends to do is to reinforce failure in agriculture instead of exploiting success. Sir, we have a classic example of what is happening today. Opportunities galore. Beef prices. What are they? \$1.85 a pound for beef today. What an opportunity for our hog producers to move in and take up what must be a market opportunity that farmers in this country haven't realized or haven't seen for many many years. But the restrictive approach of this government is going to prevent them from doing that, the imposition of production controls.

My colleague the Member for Lakeside pointed out the classic example of socialism in the program of slaughtering a million hens in this province. And so what has that done? That has distorted the egg production; that has distorted production of poultry meats that could now be moving into the markets taking the place of the high priced beef, and all of these things have come about as a result of situations and conditions unpredicted by my friends opposite who pretend to have all the wisdom and knowledge in the world and be able to predict all these things. They now should be able to recognize how foolish it is for them to even dare to predict what's going to happen in the markets in the future. There's only one group of people that are competent to judge that and that is the farmers themselves, each one of them making an individual decision on his own farm, running his operation the way he sees fit, not the ways some bureaucrat in Ottawa, or some bureaucrat in the Legislative Buildings here, thinks he should run his farm. Sir, this is a recipe for failure in agriculture; it is the destruction of the agricultural community in this province. It's going to be denying the opportunity to our farmers to take advantage of those markets that are today available to us. Notwithstanding anything the Minister might have said about --(Interjection)-- Nothing will happen said the Minister unless this government approves. Well, then, Sir, if they didn't intend to approve, why did they pass this legislation in the first place? It is their intention to enter into those agreements. It is their intention to allow the farmers of this province to be dictated to by eastern Canada. Sir, we can't win that game if it is in the realm of politics, and we know that, and yet this is precisely what this government opposite are intending to do. Sir, the Minister said that the Opposition

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . is misleading the people of this province by the statements we are making. Sir, what we are doing, and the role of the Opposition is to expose the foolishness, the stupidity, and the wrong direction that this government is going in agriculture. That is the role of the Opposition, that is the role that we've been fulfilling, and I hope that the farmers of this province are able to see, and as I am sure they are, that this is the road to destruction of agriculture in this province.

The Minister cannot get away with these platitudinous statements about how they are attempting to do so much for the farmers. There is one group of agricultural producers in this country today who are successful beyond any other group of farmers and those are the beef producers. And, Sir, over the years the beef producers have continued to emphasize and to insist that the government stay out of their business and let them run it for themselves. If there ever was any evidence required as to how the interference of government can ruin agriculture we have seen it in all the other commodities; in beef it doesn't happen because that group of producers have insisted that government stay out of the business, and as long as the government does stay out of their business they will continue to be successful.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. (On Division)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 102. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson) presented Bill No. 102, an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club, for third reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to note my honourable friend the Member for Roblin is back. There is one third reading of an amended bill --(Interjection)-- What was that interjection?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I even welcomed you back this morning, and I'm sure everyone joined in the welcome back to you my honourable friend. --(Interjection)-- If you'd stop your prating then I will ask, Mr. Speaker, to call the third reading on amended Bill No. 22.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin,

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin) presented Bill No. 22, an Act to Repeal an Act to Validate and Confirm a Certain Agreement between the Town of Dauphin and the Rural Municipality of Dauphin, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye wish to . . .

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I do wish for the record's sake since this has been an argument of long standing, that perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs would like to make some statement on this bill because I think there are a lot of people that have not studied this bill or have not followed it over the last years, they are concerned about it, and I have a feeling that --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you called for the vote and it was agreed that it passed, and I suggest that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye missed his opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye,

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order then, I think I was standing up here and I don't think I can do too much shouting without a mike, and if the House Leader wasn't looking, and even if he was, I don't really care, I think the ruling should be yours and not the House Leader's.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would concur that probably I was going a little fast when I said, "Is it agreed?" Members shouted "Agreed", but I did recognize that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye was standing, therefore I recognized him. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs,

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this bill, as mentioned by the Member for La Verendrye, has been before the Committee of Municipal Affairs now for a period of two years, and real earnest effort has been made by both the R.M. and the Town of Dauphin to resolve their differences. The members of the committee have given a great deal of thought and effort as well through this two-year period in order to

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) attempt to assist the municipalities to come to a resolution. They have been unable to do so and as a result the bill has been approved as amended. It was amended in committee by the addition of wording which made it a fact that in the future the criteria that would be established insofar as the assessing of properties by the R. M. owned by the Town of Dauphin would be on the same basis as well as all other properties that would be assessed under the provisions of the Water Supply Board. So that in fact, for example, the lands upon which the structures, the lagoons, the water treatment plant are located, owned by the town, would be assessed for taxation purposes. On the other hand, the underground pipes would continue to be exempt from taxation as they have been up to the present time.

The major point is, Mr. Speaker, that the bill as amended will make the situation pertaining to the R. M. and the Town of Dauphin exactly the same as in every other town and municipality in the province. I would like to say that this is clearly our intent, and I would also like to add to that that if it should be found that in some small way or other there is a detail missing and that intent is not recognized, then it would be my desire to rectify it in the future if that intent was not realized.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether you would start at third reading of amended bills, commencing with Bill No. 53 in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

BILL No. 53 was read a third time and passed.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks) presented Bill No. 54, an Act to amend The Farm Machinery Equipment Act for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to correct an error in the wording on Page 4, Section 8. The word "travel" is incorrect, it should be "labour". It's a typographical error.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side have a very few brief comments to make on this bill. I think we are all alarmed at the decline in the local dealers in rural Manitoba. We feel that there is becoming away too much centralization. We also feel that the relationship between our farmers and our dealers as in the general run of things it's quite good, but the relationship between the dealers and the companies is at times considerably strained. We feel that companies are exerting more pressure on dealers at all times. The net result is the fact that the farmers are picking up a higher price tag for practically every implement and every part, etc., that we're buying. Now we feel that the clause of the three year warranty is definitely going to add to the cost of the farm machinery in Manitoba. We feel that a warranty of this type is more or less an unconditional warranty. It's still confined of course to defects in material in workmanship, but where are you going to arrive at this? A person takes a machine out and it's going to be awfully difficult to distinguish whether a machine has been properly serviced and maintained. This is in the bill that it shall be properly serviced and maintained, but by the same token a machine can be run for six months and not properly serviced, and then a person can start greasing, etc., and it's going to be pretty difficult to show whether or not we're on the right track there.

Now I don't know as there's too much more that we want to say about this bill, but we do feel that this particular clause of three years is going to impose another hardship on our dealers. We feel that the paper work that goes along with this is going to be excessive. We feel that there is going to be a considerable amount of dispute between customer and dealer, and consequently, Mr. Speaker, I think that we would have to take a long hard look at this bill and this particular section. I think that it is definitely going to raise the cost of machinery in Manitoba and I feel that the end result is going to be that the farmers are going to be picking up the tab again. Thank you.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few comments and an observation or two on this bill. I happen to have been a dealer, an implement dealer, for approximately twenty years and in those years I've seen the price of implements rise year after year for no less than eight or ten years in a row, and at that time the warranty period on a tractor

(MR. ADAM cont'd) was one year; and I would ask those members on the opposite side who say that an additional longer period of warranty will contribute to a rise in price, and perhaps they could advise me why the prices have gone up since 1949 to 1970 without a change in the warranty on any of these machines, so this argument I feel is not a valid one. I think that the longer warranty period will make the manufacturers realize that they have to put in better materials, better workmanship, and not so many frills on the tractors - make them more durable.

I don't want to say too much more on the bill but I think that their fears are foundless in this regard. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? (On Division) So ordered.

BILL No. 93, the Clean Environment Act, was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 104. Does the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party wish to speak to this motion?

MR. I. H. (IZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to put back on the record and make certain that the proceedings record that while the Liberal caucus will vote in favour of Bill 93 because of the underlying thrust, we still express the strongest reservations and objections to Clause 13 (2) even as amended, inasmuch as it is an unwarranted preservation or assumption of power by the state, giving government the unappealable power without proof of cause for the simple statement that it is environmentally required to close down this province industrially and economically, and it may be that the members opposite are benign and moderate, benevolent in their approach to government; nevertheless it is not suggested that law goes on the books not to be used and when members opposite coo and try to placate those of us who are concerned by things, "well we don't really intend to do it." Then we say don't put it on the books. The bill intends -- well, it has the right aim, it uses the wrong figure. To suggest that any government by Cabinet order should have the right, even well-intentioned, without appeal, without the ability of people to be heard, without the right of people to demand proof of the necessity, to have the power to unilaterally close down industries, or say there will be no more industries in this province or what have you, with the broadest interpretation of section 13 (2), is offensive; and while we understand the intent and recognize that there are circumstances where governments must act swiftly, this is not the way to do it and this is not an appropriate piece of legislation. And so, having recorded our opposition to clause 13 (2) even as amended, we will support the bill with that reservation and that caveat.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, just very briefly. As the honourable member recognizes, we did amend the bill last night in this particular section and we did point out very clearly that the intent was strictly for environmental purposes. I would simply ask him to compare this legislation and this section with similar legislation of other jurisdictions across the country including the Federal Government's legislative intentions, or either stated or perhaps already in law, but the fact is that the people of our country, the people of Manitoba, demand of their governments not only of the Province of Manitoba but of other provinces in this country, that they take action when an emergency arises. Certainly this bill provides for proper procedures for appeals. It provides for procedures for application to be made to the Clean Environment Commission and so on. This, as the honourable member should know, is an emergency clause in effect which does enable the government if the occasion should arise to take the necessary action, and I think this is what the people of Manitoba want us to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Is the Minister suggesting that his interpretation of this act - the question is to the Minister - is he saying that the interpretation he places on his hours under 13 (2) are appealable and if so, would he state the circumstances and the clause under which it can be appealed?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member did not hear me properly because I did not state that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to register a protest. I remember too well when the NDP group were on this side, on the opposition side, and when legislation was brought in by

(MR. FROESE cont'd) a previous administration in connection with the sales tax, how they lamented that they weren't getting the regulations at the time that the bill was introduced, because so much was left to the regulations and left in the powers of the Cabinet to deal with. This piece of legislation is the very same thing, Mr. Speaker, that the most important parts are left to the regulations, to the Lieutenant-Governor in power, to do after the legislation is passed, and we are supposed to pass this bill on the assumption that the regulations will be proper, will be good and will be to the benefit of the people and will be in accordance with what we think at this time they may be, and for this very reason when the Minister mentioned last night that there were proposed regulations, why aren't they tabled? Why weren't they tabled when the bill was distributed to members of the House? I think if there are regulations available they should be produced, they should be brought in with the bill so that we as members could evaluate them and in that way assess the legislation in a much better way.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? So ordered. BILLS Nos. 104 and 106 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are four bills, I believe, that from the report stage have written amendments produced for the benefit of the members of the House, and may I ask you if you would first call the amendments suggested in respect to Bill No. 70. I believe that the first amendment received in the Clerk's office was that of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. SPEAKER: Report stage - Bill 70, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland with his amendment.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member move his motion first?

MR. ALLARD: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the proposed new section 32 of the Amusements Act as set out in section 4 of Bill 70 be struck out and the following section be substituted therefor:

Penalties:

32. Except where otherwise specifically provided in the Act and except for a violation of subsection (3) of section 28.1, every owner who is guilty of a violation of this Act or any of the regulations is liable on summary conviction

(a) to a fine of not less than two hundred dollars or more than two thousand dollars; or

(b) to have his place of amusement closed to the public for not less than two business days or more than thirty business days; or

(c) to both the fine set out in clause (a) and the closure mentioned in clause (b).

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words. I want to say that I am not happy with this bill; I am very unhappy with it. I am not at all convinced - as a matter of fact I am quite clearly convinced of the opposite - I am not at all convinced that we will have less smut or less violence or less degradation in our films because of what is proposed in the bill. Now I am not at all impressed by the ability of the provisions of the Criminal Code to keep smut and violence and pornography off our streets and I need but give you what's happening on Portage Avenue today in the flesh parlours that exist there. If anyone wants to go and have a look, let him do so. I have been --(Interjection)-- There are two groups sitting on the government side, Mr. Speaker. There are those who argue that this bill will provide for better control under the provisions of the Criminal Code and I am concerned, I frankly don't believe that this is true, and if the experience of what's happening in the other establishments that are supposed to be under the control of the code is any example, then I think that it's the members who say that we will have a freer situation who are right. That's what I'm concerned - that's my belief, and I think that the Member for Inkster is right and he says he hopes so and I believe him to be honest, and I think he is right and I believe that the Minister is kidding himself when he thinks he's going to do well. So I don't think we are going to any place -- you know, there's a dozen places down Portage where you can get your fill of sadistic pornography, of bestiality, of sodomy and of God knows what.

If you had any sense of responsibility as members of this House you would go and do a little checking of your own to see whether it is there or not. --(Interjection)-- Because I go to play a game of pool once in awhile, Mr. Speaker, and I have to go by this place.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that I've developed over the course of my lifetime the ability to visit the zoo without getting into an argument with the monkeys.

A MEMBER: It doesn't work in here.

MR. ALLARD: Or to get angry at them. So I want to repeat that I'm unhappy with the bill, that I think it will lead to more pornography. Yes, I have to face the prospect that this bill may pass, and as I look at the bill as it exists, in section 32, the teeth in that bill resembled those of a newborn chicken; you know, the kind of fine, the kind of fine that is set out, you know, amounts to a license to operate a smut parlour, a smut shop, for some of the larger theatres in this province, so on that basis and with the fact that when a liquor outlet is caught in dereliction of duty breaking the law, they are closed down, or when a drunken driver is nabbed, you know, he ends up in jail whether he's rich or poor, and with the notion of putting some teeth, I see no reason why the theatre owner shouldn't receive exactly the same treatment because, you know, I see -- you know, we close down the beer parlour, you know, 17 year old kid gets into it and I don't know whether anyone here would argue with me, who would try to make me believe that somehow a glass of beer is something that is worse than the degrading smut and violence that you can pick up in some of these shops that you will end up with in our theatres. And it is for that reason that I move this amendment which provides for equal treatment for small or big establishments, and you know a thirty-day closure is as damaging is as much of a problem for a large theatre as it is for a small one.

So with the conviction, with the hope that this amendment will pass and that the bill will be defeated, and I say I hope it will be, but in the event that it is not, then I urge you to support this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. ALLARD: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support?

MR. ALLARD: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, what was the . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: I asked if the honourable member had support? Call in the members. Order please. The motion before the House is the amendment by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland on Bill 70.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Asper, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Blake, Borowski, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 24; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it; I declare the motion lost.

Proposed amendment, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, --(Interjection)-- There's one more amendment. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move on behalf of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Member for Swan River, that Section 28.1 (3) of the bill be amended by adding the following after the word "years" where it appears in the first line thereof: "unless accompanied by a parent, guardian or spouse . . ."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I voted on this bill at second reading because I felt that it was an honest attempt to bring about a rationalization of a problem with regards to the showing of films in Manitoba and the lack of ability of the former system to actually pursue legislation that was intended for it whenever it was conceived many years ago. Mr. Speaker, in voting for it at second reading, I expected that the government in good faith intended literally to liberalize the legislation that existed and to provide for society at large to make its decision as to whether or not another form of censorship at some time should be brought in, and I think that this bill was an interim bill towards that end.

Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed in the government's reaction to this bill in dealing with amendments that were presented at the Law Amendments Committee, because, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) I came to the conclusion that the government was more interested in shifting an onus of responsibility off itself and onto the movie industry rather than the honest intent of providing a bill that provided for that interim stage that is required for society to actually settle out and decide what form of control is required in this industry, and I think that this amendment, Mr. Speaker, where a parent or a guardian of a child - I say a child meaning by that a person who is under the age of 18 years of age, he may not be a child - would have the opportunity at the discretion of the parent to go to a movie regardless of whether that movie was considered to be obscene or lewd or otherwise, but at the discretion of the parent, that if they felt that in the case of Clockwork Orange or some other movie, that it would be their discretion that decided whether this young person should see that movie or not for whatever their reason may be, and I felt that this amendment presented by the Leader of the Opposition was a move that was not out of context with the move by the government to actually bring in a change to a set of legislation that over the years has not proved itself to be helpful in the problem that faces the government and faces the people of Manitoba.

So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is entirely in context and I recommend that this change, which I don't consider to be a major change except in principle, except in principle, Mr. Speaker, not a major change in terms of what's going to happen at the theatre gate but a major change in keeping with the principle of the original bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? (Agreed) Any opposition? Does the Honourable Member for Inkster wish to speak to the motion?

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the only reason I hadn't risen is I thought that another member had risen to seek the floor but I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well I have to ignore some members; they are continually standing. Would the honourable member state his point of privilege.

MR. ALLARD: I frankly don't think that pointed remarks like that are very funny in this House, Mr. Speaker, whether it's from you or any other member.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't call that a matter or privilege. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that I support the amendment that has been moved by the Member for Riel. This, Mr. Speaker, should not come as any surprise to anybody. When the bill was presented on second reading, I indicated that I thought that this was a bill which had the potential of creating a scheme of freedom with regard to what a person might see, which I felt would in the last analysis lead to a better creativity in the film marts than we are now getting, whether it's underground or overground, and I indicated at that time, Mr. Speaker, that I felt that the bill was in every way an opportunity of obtaining that type of freedom. But I did indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there was one portion of the bill which I thought by accident was more restrictive than the existing law and that is that part of the bill which says that the classification could result in a situation whereby a parent could not take their child to whatever movie they wanted to take that child to, and secondly and what was pointed out very well by the Leader of the Opposition, and what is even more anomalous, is that as the bill now stands a husband would be prohibited from taking his wife to a movie if she happened to be of the age of 17.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I indicated at the time that I thought that that would be changed, that I would support that change. I do support that change. I think that the bill has potential - potentially and I repeat just potential - a chance of being more restrictive than the existing legislation as a result of that section and therefore I intend to support the amendment.

When the amendment is dealt with, Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal with my position on the bill depending on how the amendment goes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, having to take a stand or vote on this I certainly want to qualify my vote before it is taken. I feel that we are in the bill stating that those 18 years or under shall not participate in the viewing of certain films and I think it shall apply equally to all of those who are under 18, that we are not making exceptions to the rule, and this is what we are doing by accepting the amendment that is before us. I know this can be argued different ways but I am not for the exception that is being proposed in the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have not taken advantage of the previous opportunities to speak on Bill 70 because I felt that the point of view that was put forward by certain of my colleagues on this side was accurate enough a presentation of the understanding which this

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) government entered into in proceeding with Bill 70. Certainly it can be argued by any reasonable person that it is a very difficult task for society to come to a sort of a decision as to precisely where to draw the line with respect to the everlasting problem of freedom of expression, the right of personal freedom of expression on the one hand, and on the other hand that of society, to draw a line however wavy, somewhere, some place, to protect itself against a gross impingement on its generally felt code of ethics and morality.

I may sound old-fashioned but let it be very clear that the government understands and appreciates as well as any honourable member opposite, that there are in the field of censorship very great problems of coming to decisions. I know that the Honourable Member for Thompson expresses a point of view which is symptomatic or which typifies the attitudes of many people in society. On the other hand, the whole trend of society in the past generation and more has been towards more and more liberality and freedom of expression, freedom of artistic expression and more and more liberality with respect to the right of the individual to have access to the various forms of cultural expression, be they in the form of screen, be they in the form of books, and so some in more recent years have pointed to the rash of movies which tend in many people's eyes to appear to be, and in some cases no doubt are, pornographic in nature, and say, well where does all this stop?

Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to make it as clear as I can, that what is intended in Bill 70 is to allow so far as adults are concerned even more right of individual expression, exercise of individual taste than perhaps has been the case in the past. We also say that it is not as though, as a result of Bill 70, that in one fell swoop both forms of restraint that have up until now been imposed by society are being removed, because they are not. The Criminal Code continues to exist and presumably, presumably, it will work better than having to rely on censorship which is prior restraint. Now I think, and this is only a guess, that most honourable members would want to see a change from dependency on prior restraint insofar as trying to cope with the problem of definition of pornography, hard core pornography, obscenity, etc. and to shift away from prior restraint to one of relying on the provisions of the Criminal Code and adjudication by the courts.

Now honourable members are well aware that in the past ten or twenty years, in the higher, in the superior courts of our country and in the United States, and here I think there tends to be a certain parallel, that the justices of the Superior Courts have tended in their decisions to allow for, shall I say more liberal definition as to what is permissible, and in striking down some of the cases that have been brought alleging pornography or obscenity, etc. but it is interesting to note, and I believe I am correct, that every single superior court judge, supreme court judge in Canada and in the United States, all of them without exception have made it quite clear that while their views may vary between themselves as to what is to be defined as hard core pornography, or obscenity, and the views certainly do vary, but nevertheless they all share one point in common and that is that they acknowledge, they freely admit that there is such a point beyond which society should not want to go with respect to allowing for forms of artistic expression that can only be described as hard core pornography or obscenity.

Now in the past ten years the general definition of unacceptable degrees of pornography or obscenity have gone something more or less as follows: that a work, be in cinematic or be it written, a work which when applying contemporary community standards, is such that it tends to appeal to those with prurient interests or values and which does not have interspersed in it any redeeming passages, any passages of redeeming social value; if a work in their judgement is of that kind, they would tend to regard it as being hard core pornography or obscene, and therefore not entitled to any guarantee under the consideration of freedom of expression.

Now of course that kind of definition is not very helpful because one's interpretation as to what constitutes such a work will itself vary greatly. But let it not be said that the government holds the view that there is no theoretical possibility of artistic works being obscene or in the nature of hard core pornography; and we are relying on the provisions of the Criminal Code, and they will be applied I should think certainly, wherever it is deemed applicable.

Honourable members, some of them, have made a great deal about Bill 70, but in terms of practical effect members should be interested to note, for example, that in all of 1971 the variation as between all of the several provinces of Canada, the number of films actually outrightly rejected under censor boards is as follows: British Columbia 8; Alberta 24;

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Saskatchewan 9; Ontario 15; Quebec 5; Nova Scotia 7; Manitoba 3. But in this year, from January 1st to the end of May, number of complete rejects, outright rejects: British Columbia 5; Alberta 1; Saskatchewan 2; Ontario 2; Nova Scotia 4; Manitoba 5. So it varies. And insofar as cutting is concerned, Mr. Speaker, there have been apparently some 35 to 40 films a year in which cuts were made, out of approximately 360 films received. But then I must point out, so that it is not misunderstood, that of the 360 films that are viewed by the Board, that many of them come to them from other provincial jurisdictions where they have already had cuts made, so that particular statistic is not all that helpful. But all in all, I simply recapitulate this one overriding consideration, that while it has to be admitted that in Bill 70 we are moving prior restraint, we are not in any way suggesting that there is a complete removal of any restraint by society in respect to the possibility, the admission of the possibility that certain works may be in the nature of being hard core pornography or obscenity.

Now, the Member for Rhineland, I have to agree with him that insofar as young people are concerned, under the age of discretion -- and here again definitions and concepts can vary, but surely there is such a concept as the age of discretion below which judgments are difficult to make for young people, and it is the thinking that if we are to allow for adults the greater scope for making their own decisions as to what they want to view or read, this comes under the notion of freedom of expression, it is a form of expression; that with respect to young people the same argument does not apply, those below the age of 18, and I suppose any age we set would be arbitrary, it could be 17. But it's interesting to note that in many of the jurisdictions in the United States and in Canada there is this reliance on the age of 17 or 18 as being the age below which they are advised or restricted from entering a movie house.

Now I know that some will argue that the parental rights should supersede. Well, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that there are any rights; in fact I would be so bold as to say that there are no rights that are absolute, in the purest sense of the word absolute. For example, I heard it said just hours ago, and a few days ago, that there was something inconsistent here in this Bill 70 in that we are not allowing children if they are attended by their parents from attending a movie which might be classified as Restricted Adult -- and I leave it to my honourable friends' imaginations as to what kind of movies generally those Restricted Adult movies would be, and it's been suggested that on the other hand we allow under our law young children to go with their parents into any liquor establishment. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is simply false. That is simply false. We have in our own faltering way tried to make some adjustment in the law with respect to accommodation of parental rights in children where we thought it was a matter of common sense. For example, I think a year ago we amended Section 133 of the Liquor Control Commission Act so that if a young person, a child, attends with parent or parents in a licensed dining room or restaurant if they are having a meal, the parent -- and the Act is quite clear, honourable members may check it -- the parent may, if he or she wishes, serve with the meal, to the child, a portion of beer or wine or whatever. But Section 131, the essence of it has not been changed for the past 30 years and more, perhaps 50 years for all I know, and it's still not changed, and I have not heard anyone suggest that it be changed. In my personal opinion it ought not to be changed. And that is, that with respect to beer parlors, to cocktail bars and cocktail lounges, that the law says very simply that a person under a certain age may not be admitted, and there is a penalty provision in the act to the owner of the establishment if such a young person is admitted. So, over the years there has been this distinction made on the basis of age, and that aspect of it hasn't changed. And it applies more or less with respect to movies in this case.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the whole intent and purpose of Bill 70 must be seen in total context. It was an effort on the one hand to recognize -- although for some it was more difficult to accept than others, I quite admit -- to recognize that in the problem of censorship and prior restraint, the question arises if censors are to censor for adults, who are to censor the censors, and it was thought better to rely on adjudication after the fact rather than by prior restraint.

Now I know that that kind of reasoning commends itself to some and not to others, but that was the reasoning. And on the other hand, there was the intention to make a differentiation as between adults and those under the age of discretion. So if honourable members are trying to justify in this amendment that they are proposing something so as to make it consistent with the liquor law, let it be very clear that it is not consistent with the liquor law.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I, like the First Minister, listened to the discussion over several weeks with regard to this bill. I appreciate his opinion that he's a little old-fashioned. Maybe I'm a little more old-fashioned, but I did want to comment just for a moment or two - it's not my purpose to take up the time of the House, but rather I appreciated the opinion or the thoughts that the First Minister gave us this evening with regard to the record of the rejects and so on, province by province. But I do feel, Mr. Speaker, throughout the discussion of this particular bill that the matter of censorship has been over-emphasized to make the point of the particular speaker. I think the censorship down through the years has been moderate and understandable and acceptable by the people of Manitoba. I feel, too, that this cultural expression that the First Minister spoke of, and others have a habit of speaking of these days, is to some degree over-emphasized. I feel too, that the term "freedom of expression" is over-emphasized also, to the detriment of society to some degree.

I feel that insofar as this bill is concerned that we as legislators have a responsibility to the people of Manitoba; 57 of us here are making laws for almost a million people, and they would expect of us to use discretion and I see nothing wrong with the censorship as we have seen it down through the years. I may be mistaken in my thinking, but somehow or other I still feel they have done a good job. I still feel that they clip the films as they should be clipped, and somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, I would look for our province to give a little leadership, and I may be a little old-fashioned, but if I had my way I'd ban all these films once and for all, every one of them that had the slightest hint of pornography. This, Mr. Speaker, is the sort of thing that the film industry will probably understand and turn out the films that society should have for the good of mankind, for their well-being and for the uprightness that we all look for. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we've got to find a way to put a stop to this sort of thing. I know very well - a Chinese restaurant I visited the other day, it wasn't on my holidays, it was in Manitoba, I'd like the Honourable Minister of Labour to understand, and I said to the proprietor of the restaurant, having looked over some of the

--(Interjection)--Yes, and I broke the cellophane too. And I said to him, Mr. Speaker, "you know, Sir, it only requires the complaint of one individual to the RCMP and you can be charged." And I said, "For the money you're making out of this, why put yourself in that position?" He understood, and within 24 hours, Mr. Speaker, his shelves were clear. I think this is the sort of thing that we as citizens of Manitoba should relay to the people that are dispensing this sort of thing around our province. And we all have a responsibility to the young people. There's nothing wrong with the young people, Mr. Speaker, today. All they're looking for is guidance, and surely we as legislators here should find some way in this bill to see to it that we do our part in preventing this material from getting into their hands or for them to view.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being tolerant in giving me the time, but I do think of the rural theatre owner, the small man that has a theatre, that orders the films and the films come in, and the penalties that man must meet, unknowingly to some degree, give him some credit for being the average type of a chap that cannot differentiate between what he should show and what he should not show, but rather what he buys to make a living. The penalties under this bill leave him no other alternative but to refuse to accept these things, and I think we're being entirely unfair in placing responsibility on him to determine as to whether he shall censor and show that film to the people in his community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Would the member permit a question? Having spoken to the amendment, could he indicate to the House whether he supports his Leader's amendment which, as I understand it, would permit people under 18 years of age accompanied by a parent to attend films of any kind uncensored. Is he in support of that amendment?

MR. BILTON: I said, surely the Honourable Minister will understand that in no way can I support the amendment, or any part of this bill either.

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

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, on the amendment I think some of us on this side of the House are a little bewildered at the position taken by the Member from Swan River inasmuch as I understand it he is the seconder of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. May I suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party it makes no difference whether you second a motion or not, you don't have to be in favour of it; it's only a courtesy to get it on the floor. If he doesn't know that, now he does. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the preceding two contributions have been addressed more to part of Bill 70 rather than to the amendment, I think. In saying that we will support the amendment, as we proposed and did last night in the Law Amendments Committee, the issue for us on the amendment is simply this. When the bill was introduced we were led to believe that we were seeking greater liberality in the law, and those of us who approved of broadening the freedom of expression would vote in favour of it and those who believe that there should be some form of censorship would not support the bill. But the present law, I think, we must recognize is in most respects more liberal, more freedom-evoking than the present law unless the amendment is passed, because the present law permits an adult to make the judgment for his child as to what he will see and what he won't see, when it comes to the classification of Restricted Adult pictures. We presumably said in the present law that the state has no right to impose on a parent, or to superimpose its judgment on a parent as to what his child shall see, read, think and so on.

Now, Bill 70 proposes to deny the parent of the right to make the judgment. Now there are three circumstances in which this situation can lead to convictions and they were all cited in previous debate.

The first, where the parent takes the child to a drive-in theatre, or to a walk-in theatre, an infant, and instead of having to hire a baby sitter takes the child to the movie, now would be prohibited, or if he does it he's guilty of an offense. It's even been suggested that an interpretation of Section 70 is such that if a child were smuggled in by route of being under blankets in the back seat, that the two year old child could be charged with a juvenile offense.

The second circumstance is the preposterous situation where the adult married to somebody under 18 is unable to bring his wife into the theatre.

The third is where a father is unable to take the child, who is a young adult of 17, into a movie that he thinks the child should see.

The state confers the right --(Interjection)-- my honourable friend with his usual razor-sharp incisive view of the world says, can he take his child to vote? --(Interjection)-- Now the Member for Churchill of course. The taking of a child to vote is not a right, it is something the state confers, the right to vote, not the parent. But the right of a parent to educate his child is an inherent right according to my friend who speaks so passionately in favour of private schools, the right of a parent to say I will educate my child my way and you the state will pay for it, and I repeat again, as I said last evening, that the inconsistency, the inability to reconcile those two positions of those who say the state has no right to interfere in the way I want to educate my child, and I'll educate my child the way I want and the state will pay for it, are the same people who are now saying, but the state can tell the parent what movies a child can see. The position is so preposterous, so ludicrous, such a patent absurdity of the law, that we have no hesitation in voting against it.

For those who are concerned about the parent who decides to drown and smother his child in smut, pornography, obscenity, we have provisions under our juvenile code where a child can be declared to be neglected, and if a parent is an unfit parent, in extreme circumstances the State can act to take a child away from its parents, or to impose guidelines on what the parents may do. I think that prohibition in the Juvenile Delinquency Act is adequate to protect the child whose parent has no sense of direction, but in any other case it is the right of a parent to make the judgment for his child, not the state.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I will make a very brief contribution for the benefit of the Honourable Minister of Public Works. I think the logic of having the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Riel on my part has been sustained as a result of the contributions that have been made to this particular debate.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, would like to make a very brief contribution and say to the members opposite, we as a caucus voted as a caucus for the six month hoist, introduced by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland. We did it on the basis that we believed that further consideration should be given to the bill. We were not sure that it was fully understood by the Members opposite and whether it was fully understood by our members, and we say that

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) because in the opportunity given to review the speeches that were made in written form, it appeared that many of the people who spoke didn't understand what the bill actually contained, and the speeches really are not relevant to the detail of the bill but to some mythical belief that they were providing some way a freer form of censorship than before, with the ability of the individual to make the choice and to be his own censor. I want to for that purpose quote from the words of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, when you go back and read the contribution that he made on the introduction of the bill, and it must have been done in three minutes, one recognizes how very little was introduced when the bill was brought forward to indicate the real intent. Now, Mr. Speaker, we voted for the hoist as a caucus. We then voted as our conscience dictated with respect to the bill, and I voted on second reading for the bill in the firm belief that there would be some fundamental changes made in the detail, and it came as a result of some brief discussion, whether I was correct in interpreting that discussion properly or not, is another question, but nevertheless I felt that there would be some changes coming from the government, and it hasn't been forthcoming, and I'm faced in this position, Mr. Speaker, and this is why the amendment's introduced. The position is an inconsistent position with some of the statements that were made in what was I believe the clear intent. The Honourable the Minister of Cultural Affairs said in introducing the bill, and I quote: "This is a bill that has been awaited by all the members of this House. I must say from the outset that I do believe in censorship although this bill is abolishing the Censorship Board. I believe in censorship only on one condition, if I could do the censoring myself."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the basic thrust of the bill. The Classification Board is to indicate to adults the category in which the Classification Board has placed a movie, and the decision of whether the adult will attend or not is that of the adult, but the classification has been given to him by the State. In this respect the State makes a contribution to his consideration and the decision is made by the individual.

Now with respect to a person under 18, I accept that there is a restriction but I will not accept that the same adult is not in a position to make a determination for his own child, because I think that's thoroughly inconsistent. The truth of the matter is that an adult once the state has given him the classification has the right to make the determination as to whether he will, or not, allow the child or the person under 18 to see the movie. That's his choice, and if you want to be consistent with what you have expressed logically this amendment has to be accepted and, Mr. Speaker, that's all there is to it.

. continued on next page

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, there is one thing while introducing this resolution that wasn't mentioned at all. Those favouring this amendment would like to give the impression that this bill does not at any time allow the parent to go with their children to see a film, even a film that is restricted. Certainly the mover, or the one that prepared the resolution has never mentioned that, neither did the Leader of the Liberal Party. Now let me make it quite clear again, I repeat that this bill will do the same that it has done in the States except that some of the states are more restricted even than this, and I don't think that the States is necessarily the country that we want to take as an example when it comes to morals.

Now the classification will be - there will be about four classifications: there will be General that anybody can attend; there would be Adult where the suggestion is, in the States they call it "parental guidance", we call it Adult, it is suggested that this is a film that should be seen by adults but they can bring - at least the children should be accompanied by their parents, by an adult; then there is Restricted that we call "parental guidance" and that would be the majority of restricted movies or practically all the restricted movies - I say practically all, because I have no way of knowing, I am not the censor, but I would say in general those that are restricted now would be "parental guidance" and the parent could take their children to these movies. Now we are saying this, the same as they do in the United States, we are saying that we are keeping one other classification for extreme, dirty, obviously dirty filthy movies, and we are saying that in the States they call this "X" classification "X", and we say it's restricted adult.

And one other reason - let me quote from a letter written by one other member of the board who favours, who wants to do away with censorship but wants to retain some kind of order and this is what he is saying, and I'll read a paragraph. "There have been instances during my experience on the board where scenes depicted in films were of such utterly degrading nature they would have disgusted and revolted even the most of our . . . film boards. To give only one instance a number of inmates in prison, entirely in the nude, were depicted engaging in acts of Sodomy. These were shown with great explicitness and made it a rather revolting scene. We in Manitoba cut these scenes as did all the other boards across Canada of which we received reports."

There has been in some of the movies, some of the movies that were thrown out, that was rejected by appeal. There has been in the movie acts of fellatio and cunnilingus and this is what - can anybody, if I had asked anybody here and say, do you want to bring your children to see that kind of stuff? Every single one of them would say no. But all right, we want this right, it will only take maybe five percent but there's sick people. In fact, the most ridiculous statement that I've heard all session was by the Honourable Member from Wolseley who is fighting, was saying, give them the right to go to these things but if they go, there's something in the delinquency act, we can say they are unfit parents, we'll take the children away from them. This is exactly what my honourable friend said two minutes ago. No, Mr. Speaker, we don't want to use this. It might never be used. It has to be in the act just in case it has to be used, and it will be used very seldom. It might be - and what are we saying here? We are saying that no more censorship, no more cutting of films.

I had a fella, I wouldn't call him a gentleman who came to my office - I wasn't there or I would have thrown him out, but he talked to a member of my staff and he wanted to know when he could start to make these dirty movies. He wanted to hire a man and a woman, a little room and a projector, and that was it - he was in business. He was in business and we are saying all right, adults, there's not much we can do. If they want to do it, okay. But we are saying that we want to protect, at least protect the children, then this would be the shows, now the films, that have been thrown out, some of them, and my honourable leader said that there were five that were thrown out so far but he forgot to say that three of them, or four of them, have been appealed, and in three cases they won their appeal, so there were two of them, and one of them is the one that I'm talking about, what was seen there. So we are saying, no, in certain cases there's a damn limit.

My honourable friend likes to quote, and I recognize me when they say that I'm for parental rights. You're damn right I'm for parental rights. I'm for parental rights, and I was for parental rights in education because those schools are open, but I also said that if somebody wanted to start a Fascist or a Communist school that the Department of Education would

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) not let them. Does that mean that being for parental rights is a license to do anything. If my child is going near me and he says "Daddy give me a rock, I want to throw it in this guy's window" I'll give it to him? Does it mean that if a doctor says this house is quarantined that they won't stop me from bringing my kid in there? Is that what it means? And that's a helluva lot worse fellows, it's a helluva lot worse. So if anybody here wants to point the finger at us, or at me and say, you're against parental rights, because you do not want to see kids see this kind of stuff in extreme cases, well then I'll accept that responsibility, and I'm darned glad that I feel the way I do; and I'm sure that this is not going to be a party vote because I can't see listening to some of the speeches that were made by the members of the Conservative Party, by the member that usually sits on his left, I can't see him voting for this. I can't see my friend . . . voting for it, and I can't see - well I did, I was surprised yesterday I saw two of them that made a terrific speech, a terrific speech, but then they voted for it. I'm talking about the Souris-Killarney and Birtle-Russell; maybe they'll duck the vote I don't know, but at least we're here, we're standing here, and we'll vote and we'll be very damn proud to vote for this.

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

If I may, Mr. House Leader, I think the proper procedure is to go through all of the reports.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, the question now before the House is the third reading of the bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I may, I am informed by the Speaker that we will go through all of the reports. This motion that we are reporting on was part of the bills reported from Standing Committee, so the proper procedure would be to proceed through all of the bills in the report stage and then to proceed through third reading of these bills.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, in all due deference to Mr. Speaker, I believe the proper motion now if it hasn't been put, would be the motion for third reading of Bill No. 70.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Universities.

MR. MILLER presented Bill No. 70, an Act to amend the Amusements Act (2), for third reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my remarks on the amendment, which I really believe that perhaps one or two speakers stuck to the amendment and most of the people spoke on the bill itself, I indicated that I would be speaking to the bill as well as the remarks I made on the amendment.

It's only because the amendment has not been accepted that I feel necessary to again say a few words, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try and be brief, on the bill itself. I indicated when this bill came to the House for second reading that there were people on both sides of the House who would be supporting this bill for different reasons. I firmly believe that there are people on this side of the House, as evidenced by the Attorney-General, as evidenced by some of the remarks made by the First Minister, who believe that there should be a form of censorship and that the state should be involved in that censorship, and that the bill that we have before us has a better chance of dealing with pornography or undesirable films than the bill that we presently have.

There are another group of people, amongst whom I include myself as one, who believe that given the freest form of expression and the greatest freedom of activity with regard to the people concerned, that we will likely in the total and on the balance, have a better result in terms of the creative arts than we will have if we try to get that result by means of restriction; and I made that position in speaking in the House and I don't intend to repeat it now. The only question, Mr. Speaker, is what chances are being taken now with the bill as it is, because there is a measure in it which is more restrictive than the previous measure.

I therefore look to the total of the bill and say in total, Mr. Speaker, is it a more restrictive bill or is it a less restrictive bill? I am taking a chance and I realize that my position is not as good as it was on second reading, I am taking a chance that it is a less restrictive bill, and, Mr. Speaker, in taking that chance I know that the existing Attorney-General is going to prosecute where he feels a film offends against the obscenity laws of Canada, and what I expect to happen at that time, Mr. Speaker, is that the films will be defended, that those defences will go as far as is necessary, that they will go if necessary to the Supreme Court of Canada, and that it will become apparent that the judiciary will be just as unwilling, Mr. Speaker, and this

(MR. GREEN cont'd) has happened in other jurisdictions, that the judiciary will be just as unwilling to say that they are able to define for others as to what they could see, what they could hear, what they could think, as I believe myself to be, and that therefore the Attorney-General's efforts to make this a bill which will give him more power of restricting films will not succeed.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong about that, then I believe that if the judiciary does start censoring films under the present laws of obscenity, that the complete inequity, Mr. Speaker, and the complete impossibility of making such a definition for other people will make itself felt on the Canadian people as a whole, and that this will eventually, Mr. Speaker, result in the repeal of the laws with regard to obscenity. And if that, Mr. Speaker, appears to be too ambitious, then I would ask the members of this House to remember that approximately three years ago the Federal Government repealed laws which some people thought would never be repealed. They repealed laws which said that two consenting adults were governed in their activities in private by themselves, were governed by what the State said that they could or could not do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have shown that society, confronted with the problem will react or can react in a positive rather than a negative manner, and frankly I know that I am speaking against what the Attorney-General has said, I know that I am speaking against what the Minister for Municipal Affairs has said, and I know that the First Minister has indicated that there has to be these lines - and the Member for Rupertsland. Mr. Speaker, I say that the lines create more problems with regard to degrading and vile or other, any other adjective that the members wish to use, than would exist if the lines were not there, and I say that if this is a start at removing first the provincial censorship and then making a frontal attack, Mr. Speaker, on the federal laws of obscenity, then I'm prepared to participate in that start and I don't think that it's a battle that can't be won.

Mr. Speaker, there used to be, there was a law with regard to Sunday movies and I was president of the Winnipeg Film Society, and we were showing films on a Sunday and they told us that they would prosecute us, and we went to the Magistrate's Court and were prosecuted and convicted; we went to the County Court of Appeal, we were prosecuted and convicted; we went to the Court of Appeal for the Province of Manitoba, we were prosecuted and unanimously convicted; so that six judges in Manitoba convicted us. So we went to the Supreme Court of Canada and five judges acquitted us, and from that point on it was apparent that an organization such as we then had could participate in that activity, and it resulted, Mr. Speaker, I think in general, Sunday movies being shown.

So if somebody says that this is an impossible war, I say that it is not an impossible war, that there will be theatre owners who would wish to challenge the right of a judge to say for somebody else that something is obscene. There will be lawyers who will defend these people and, Mr. Speaker, in the last analysis I say that we will wind up with a freer society. And when I say freer, Mr. Speaker, I say that the things that the Member for Thompson is talking about, the Member for Rupertsland is talking about, the "vile dirty" - and I use all of these statements in quotation marks - will reduce rather than enhance because that has been, Mr. Speaker, the history.

I want to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by just making one small reference to the Member for Thompson who chose to identify in some way pornography with Bolshevism - I think he used the expression "porno-thirsty Bolsheviks" or something like that, Mr. Speaker, identifying it somehow with Left Wingism. Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable member to know that . . .

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would allow me to ask him a question? Would he not agree when I used the remark, I made the remark Bolshevik, that I wasn't referring them to the Czarist or pre-czarist day; it was really a figure of speech and I was not suggesting that they were Bolsheviks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I am happy to hear it, Mr. Speaker, because I want the honourable member to know that from all my reading on the Bolsheviks, and I think I have read a little bit about them, that they were very prudish, Puritan people who talked, Mr. Speaker, about these things almost in the same tones as the Honourable Member for Thompson. Mr. Speaker, there is one Communist state in Africa and that Communist state has restricted everything and apparently is doing very, very badly and there is an article in today's Tribune which is rather current. It

(MR. GREEN cont'd) says "But if Toure" - it is Seko Toure who is the prime minister, whose state is Guinea, French Guinea, and it says "If Toure's revolution has deprived the population of material benefits and political freedom it can boast of progress in other areas". Now I want you to know that these are the Bolsheviks. "The beggars and prostitutes that accost visitors in more developed African capitals seem to have been eliminated. A strong streak of Puritanism is apparent in the general ban on the sale of liquor to Guineans." Now he only deals with liquor. I would venture to predict, Mr. Speaker, without fear of being very wrong, that that same streak of Puritanism extends in the same state with regard to pornography.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on the second reading of this bill it will be remembered that the Liberal caucus plead . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . this is third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I recall that on the second reading of the bill the Liberal caucus split on the issue and we declared that it would be a free vote because members of our caucus regarded this as a question of morality. When I addressed the House at that time, Mr. Speaker, I made the point that I was opposed to censorship and that therefore I could vote approval in principle for Bill 70 because I believed at that time that it would create a freer, less restricted, less inhibited set of communicative laws.

I added the caveat at that time that there was some very serious concerns that I faced in supporting Bill 70 and that I would have to be satisfied that they had been removed before we could support it on third reading. Those reservations were expressed by me in the committee. The question for me is not only is there a removal of a form of censorship, but is it done fairly and does it really accomplish the purpose? And in committee, Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed by the intransigence, the lack of flexibility, and the total unwillingness of the government to give a sympathetic or a reasonable hearing to suggestions for change which we believe might improve the working of the bill.

The true government attitudes came out at that time because in private conversations with members of the committee, members of government, the issues we raised made eminent sense and yet the Attorney-General who characterized or at least was the public voice of the government's position on many issues last evening, was that he doesn't really want to see a loosening of the censorship laws; rather he wants more prosecutions for violation of his standard of morality. If passing Bill 70 will, as I now am convinced, result in more prosecutions and more people being convicted, having no defence because the censorship, the alleged censorship classification has been removed, then I can't support that any longer.

Now what convinced me that the government really wasn't interested in freeing the censorship issue, was that when we said Section 28 (1) (2) should be amended so that where a member of the theatre staff sold tickets to people who were under the age of 18, the owner should be prosecuted, we said no, the person who commits the crime should at least have joint and several liability, particularly where the owner has gone to every length possible to instruct his staff. The government member said "No. The owner is responsible for the criminal act of his employees". Mr. Speaker, it is an odious concept to me that it is true we accept as a matter of course that what an employee does in the course of his employment, his employer will be liable for in a civil sense. If an employee runs over somebody, driving an employer's car in the course of his business, the employer is liable, but where an employee commits a criminal offence, or a quasi criminal offence, it defies reason to say that his employer should be charged with the offence. And when we saw the intransigents and the lack of willingness to even see that rationality of that proposition, we became dismayed.

Then we moved to the next section, the one we have just debated the amendment on. It was our proposal last night to move an amendment in identical terms to that which was moved by my colleague or the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and again tonight we saw that there was no desire to loosen and to free human action, but rather to restrict it even more than it's restricted today, by saying that what is legal today, the right of a parent to take his child to whatever movies he likes, that freedom is removed under Bill 70.

Finally last evening we said, there is the grey area of the law. And its implications are not ascertainable by a normal human being but the government must impose a system, or set up a system, of advance rulings so that the person who wishes to commit no crime will have a forum to which he can go and say, "If I do this, if I show this movie will you prosecute me?"

(MR. ASPER cont'd.) It is not a form of censorship, it is the precise act that is followed by the Department of National Revenue where you can determine if the act you are about to commit is criminal and will yield a criminal sentence; you can go to the Combines Division in Ottawa and say I propose to do such and such, will it provoke a criminal charge, and you can get a binding ruling. And more and more as law becomes incapable of understanding by the ordinary person, governments must establish tribunals which interpret in advance the law. Not restrict, but simply say in our view this is what the law says, and when we were unable to get any sympathy for the proposition that no person should be required to commit a crime in this country in order to find out that what he's done is a crime, we have lost touch with reality, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment we drafted last night which did not provide a defence for anybody in a private prosecution, was not appealable, would not have cost the state five cents because we said, he who seeks a ruling must pay for the ruling, as they do under the Income Tax law. There was absolutely no willingness to even discuss the ability of the government to provide an advance ruling umbrella. That failure, Mr. Speaker, tells us this, that the movie industry will now censor itself in self-defence. It will censor itself not knowing what the law is going to do to it. It will therefore become a very conservative kind of censorship - you'll pardon the expression - and we'll have greater censorship under this bill by the movie industry being fearful of being prosecuted, of having a stain on their record as individuals, you'll have greater censorship than you have today. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the enactment of Bill 70 in the inhibition of human action, freedom of parental control, and the incentive it gives to greater censorship, becomes greater censorship than what we've got today, and for that reason the Liberal caucus unanimously will vote against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I hadn't entered the debate on this particular bill when it was up for consideration on second reading and perhaps I wouldn't have even bothered to enter into the debate at this time except for the last contribution but just before I respond to a few of the remarks made by the Leader of the Liberal Party, I just want to mention that one of the reasons I didn't enter the debate is because I was quite apprehensive about this bill.

If I was to express my personal opinion I am probably more - I could associate myself closer to the Member for Thompson than perhaps anyone else but I don't think it's my responsibility to superimpose my concept of things on other people but --(Interjection)-- well sometimes the only time we disagree is the way of going about it and the language that we use sometimes.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I had any hang-up on this bill at all it was absolutely removed by the representatives of the theatres themselves because what was brought forth at the committee meeting was that the owners are apprehensive that they might be subject to prosecution under the criminal code. Now I know the Leader of the Liberal Party made further reference to the Attorney-General, so perhaps I'll get to that in a moment. But there was another chap made representation to the committee, Mr. Speaker, a fellow from Portage, who has been in the Province of Manitoba for quite some time, and he expressed similar apprehensions. And I have to agree with him that this is what we are doing in fact with this bill, is making the theatre operators, the people who are making a dollar on the showing of films in our community, more responsible for what they do. And one of the questions I asked Mr. Ferguson, who appeared before the committee, was - you know, a number of years ago, here's a man been in the film business ever since film business started, and I asked him, "What would happen if, when we were younger, you in your community showed one of these types of films that is coming before the public today?" And he had to agree, Mr. Speaker, that he would have been tarred and feathered and run out of town. Now that in my mind is the best type of community parental control, where the parents are absolutely responsible for what takes place in their community. So the apprehensions by the people in the business, making the dollar, is that they have to accept this responsibility. It shouldn't be any longer hidden behind some censor board or anything else. If these people insist upon showing these films, which may be pornographic, which may be obscene, then let justice take its course.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party, who has been with us for such a short time, I had hoped that he would make a contribution to the quality of debate in this House. Having read a few of his articles in the Free Press on taxation, I thought that perhaps his

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) knowledge of the law would make a contribution. But if anything demonstrated his inability to contribute to debate, was his last contribution. On the one hand he criticizes the Attorney-General for wanting to set up - and you can read your remarks, honourable member, in Hansard - his type of censorship, and he criticized the Attorney-General for wanting to set up his type of censorship. He removes himself in about two or three minutes to an absolutely ludicrous position, because what he was insisting upon, and which he once again in his contribution to this debate, was chiding the Attorney-General for, was that the Attorney-General refused to set himself up as a censor, because what the honourable member wanted to do was to have the Attorney-General set up categories, yes, no, or maybe, as far as prosecution under the Criminal Code, but if you attended to what the member said, he drew parallels between provincial law and federal law, all cases that he used were federal law. I tried to get this through to the honourable member during committee meetings that he has a marvelous case to take to the Justice Department of the Dominion of Canada who is responsible, if the member doesn't know, for federal law.

Now he has demonstrated in this House that he has a lot to learn about rules of parliamentary procedure, but, Mr. Speaker, I am shocked, I'm shocked, that he doesn't know this, that when he pursues income tax law he is talking about federal law, if he is talking about combines law, he is talking about combines law, if he is talking about Criminal Code he is talking about federal law, and if he has a case to make, take it to his illustrious colleagues who have one policy, one Liberal policy for the whole of the country. I ask you, I ask you. Mr. Speaker, I just couldn't sit idly by and let this type of argument rest on the records of this House, and especially with the remarks made about the Attorney-General.

The borderline cases; with this specific amendment that is before us it is a difficult decision, and as I said before, the reason I didn't enter this debate before is it was a difficult decision for me. In a TV debate with the Member for Lakeside I said I would support the bill in second reading so that it could go to committee, and when asked, would I support it in third reading, I said it's a government bill, of course I have to support the bill, because if I don't I have to join the Member for Thompson. I'd given my reasons for staying here more comfortably because of what happened in committee, but with the specific amendment that is before us, I will have to vote against it --(Interjection)-- The amendment that was defeated. I'm sorry, I can't refer to that; I'm out of order. --(Interjection)-- Would I permit a question? Certainly.

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

MR. ASPER: Is the honourable member aware that the administration of the federal law of obscenity, pornography, is exclusively with the Attorney-General of Manitoba and not the Justice Department in Ottawa? Is he aware of that?

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, that just demonstrates it. Of course I know that the prosecutions, the prosecutions under federal law are administered by the Attorneys-General in the provinces. Of course I know that. Of course I know that. But apparently the honourable member does not know that. But this isn't what he was asking us for. If an accusation or an information is laid - maybe I should give the honourable member some post-graduate law courses, starting now --(Interjection)-- Well you need it. If a citizen through information laid with the police, and a citizen who thinks something is pornographic and wants to lay his, you know, economic well-being on the line for counter suit for - I forget the term; maybe he could tell me with the jargon - you know the jargon, Sir, but not the philosophy of law. But if a citizen wants to prosecute somebody else they can go to the police and they can sign, lay out all the information, fill out all the forms, and the Attorney-General will prosecute. If the police lay information, the Attorney-General will prosecute. But this isn't what was being asked. The member was asking for a parallel system, a parallel system to that established for getting prior opinions on income tax, which isn't done by Attorneys-General of any province, as far as I know. What was the other example that the member used? Combines Act, which is done by the federal department, it's not done by the Attorneys-General of the province. Well I appreciate the contribution and the assistance from the front bench, but all I want to show is that any backbencher over here could take on that gentleman over there and cream him as far as legal philosophy is concerned.

I digress - I digress. I have gone as far as I am willing to go in coming to grips with this bill, and Mr. Speaker, I can support it gladly in its present form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue where I was

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) so unceremoniously interrupted and prevented from completing my remarks when I spoke on second reading. I don't have more than 40 minutes to go, so I hope the government can stand the flak that I'm going to throw at them.

But before I do, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment or rebut what the Member for Inkster said. I think his statement was that any time you have a great deal of restrictions this helps to push or promote smut. I'm not sure if he used those words but that's what he was implying. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that Sweden and Denmark and California, which have the loosest laws, if one can call them laws, they have the worst and the most smut in the world. And that, I think, Mr. Speaker, is something that needn't be argued, it's sowell-known. In fact in Denmark, Mr. Speaker, the main export crop is pornography. It's as important to them as our wheat is to the prairies, and that's a matter of statistical fact, and I don't understand why the Member for Inkster who is very accurate, he always does his homework very well, why he'd make the kind of a statement he has. However, it's not important, I simply want to correct that impression that's been left here that restrictions encourage pornography.

When I left speaking last Thursday before I went to Thompson to attend the Miner's Day Festival, Mr. Speaker, I think I was saying, calling the government smut-thirsty Bolsheviks or unrepentant hybrid cultural barbarians, I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, and I indicated to the Member for Inkster it was a figure of speech where Bolsheviks were concerned, but whichever words I was using I think that they pretty well apply because this government is using this Legislature to give blessing to dirt and obscenity, and there's no way they can get around that. May I say, Mr. Speaker, when I use any of these remarks I'd like the First Minister to know that they're not directed towards him because I know that if he had his way this bill would not be here, and if there was a free vote, this bill would be defeated by a margin of about five votes. The majority of the people in this House don't want smut and obscenity canonized; the people of Manitoba don't want it and the theatre owners don't want it. However, the whip is on and all the members, and I understand, all the members are going to have to vote with the government.

Mr. Speaker, this thing is being done all in the name of rights, individual rights and freedom of speech, and as we indicated this afternoon, they have a strange way of deciding what is freedom of speech and individual rights. In the Labour bill, which I supported, there were several sections that took away the rights of the employer. Somehow he is a second-class citizen when it comes to employers in this province but when it comes to the smut pedlar, it seems they have all the rights in the world, and this government is hell-bent-for-leather to see to it that they can operate with no restrictions. It's going to be similar to Joey Smallwood's economic development, no holds barred; come in boys, help yourself. And this is the way it's going to be for the smut pedlars.

This government is going to exile and send into oblivion the decent standards that have been set by our forefathers, Mr. Speaker, the moral standards that have built this country and are the foundation of our Christian society. I don't care if a person is Christian or un-Christian, the fact of the matter is this is a Christian country, as India is Hindu, and as Pakistan is Moslem. Nobody can change that.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this government, who likes to parade as the people's government, if they bothered asking the people across Manitoba - and I'm not even referring to the Party, because I know where the Party stands - did they bother asking the people; have they been reading the letters they've been getting - and I know the Premier has been getting a lot because I've been telling the people, "If you don't like it, write the Premier, because he's sympathetic with you. Write the Premier and tell him what you think of it." I wonder if the Ministers really care about what the people in this province think, and I'm going to have more to say about that towards the end of my speech. This government who is always championing the rights of the people is now going to be, I think, Mr. Speaker, properly called the champion of the smut merchants, and that's a title that I'm sure no New Democrat, certainly no backbencher, is going to be proud to carry. But they will carry it, and they will carry it at the next election - smut merchants. They have treated the rights of the people with highest contempt in spite of the fact that they have been flooded with letters - and I know they have; they have taken the same attitude as they took when the Premier invited, on bad advice again, invited the two degenerates from England, Yoko Moko and some other clown, and only after they were flooded with telegrams and letters did the government come to its senses and say - and I don't know how they did it but I know they did it - they said: look, it may be better if you go someplace else. They did

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) not come to Manitoba. That was the power of the people, and at that time they weren't drunk with power and arrogant, they still listened. What a difference three years makes!

They're not listening to the people, Mr. Speaker, where welfare is concerned, legalization of marijuana, abortion, and all these other things: weekend passes, day passes. Mr. Speaker, there was a survey taken recently on several of the issues we're talking about - and I think the survey was national in scope - clearly demonstrated that the people were against these things. Do you think it has any effect on them, Mr. Speaker? They feel - and maybe that three years of power has really corrupted them - they really feel that if they make a decision that they are absolutely right and it doesn't matter what anybody says, they're going to run roughshod not only over the Opposition, that's understandable, you know, the Opposition has a function to perform but the laws have to be passed by that side, but, Mr. Speaker, the people surely have some rights and if they don't want to listen to the Opposition at least listen to the people who are paying your salaries, because if you don't, Mr. Speaker, next election you're going to be on the outside looking in.

I have bragged, Mr. Speaker, as a member of that government, about open government, but I have come to see day in and day out, month in and month out, that it's open government for the criminals, for the oddballs, for the draft dodgers, we seem to bend backward to help these people out, but if there is someone else that's an honest worker, whether it's criminal aid or whatever it is, there's no champions. Bertha Rand's a good example. There's no champions on that side to go and fight for an old lady. She may be nutty; if she is, lock her up, but if she isn't, then it seems to me that that government should be looking after the most hopeless, the most helpless, and the most inarticulate in our society. They're not doing it; they laugh about it; it's a big joke to them, Mr. Speaker.

We are passing legislation - as a matter of fact I think we gave it third reading today - a bill on air, water, soil, pollution. We're going to tell the farmers how many horses can drop their droppings by the river; what kind of chemicals they can use and what they can dump in the river and a creek, on the field. We're concerned about our environment, and that's good; I congratulate them for it. We have neglected far too long the area of the ecological consequences of industry and sometimes towns and cities that dumped their sewage. So I agree with the government moving in that area. We must stop this; if we don't we'll find out that our rivers will become sewers like they are in the United States. They are very concerned about what the people eat, the consumers. They ban cyclamates and they ban other things. It puts industry to great cost, and I shed no tears for it. After all, our citizens are entitled to protection; they're entitled when they go into a store to buy something and take it home to be certain that that stuff's not going to cause cancer or some other disease, and if it costs the industry to put it out, some money, that's just too bad; our citizens come first.

But, Mr. Speaker, the most important area of pollution and that is mind pollution, and the government sits back and treats it like it's nothing. You know there's more concern shown about the whooping crane and the buffalo. They get all kinds of special areas for them and they put fences around, Mr. Speaker, and they have special guards and game officers to make darn sure that the buffalo survives and the whooping crane survives; this costs a great deal of money. But when it comes to our children, Mr. Speaker, and our citizens the government takes the position, well they can do what they want. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is really an incredible and irresponsible position to take for the government. We won't do it in any other area and Mr. Speaker, just look at the bills we've passed since we have become government. We have passed more bills than any other government in Canada - and good bills, a lot of them good bills, I'm proud of them. But, Mr. Speaker, nobody can be proud of a government that's going to bring in a bill that's going to allow every degenerate and every rotten skunk in the world to bring his sewage and let it run in Manitoba from one end to the other - and it will; it will.

We have an example of some of the books that are starting to show up. Once the word got out that this government really doesn't like censorship - and it quickly got out. There's some --(Interjection)-- Yes they were there right along that's true but they're getting worse, and I don't think there's a member in this House that will not agree with me that they are getting worse. I have shown the Attorney-General some stuff that came from California and I think he probably threw up when he got home. Well that stuff used to be sold under the counter in plastic wrappers, that only people that they could trust could get them; but now they keep them on top of the counter. And I suggest to those people on that side who are pushing this bill that they should talk to the morality officers in this city; they should talk to the police; they should go out into these bookstores and see what's being sold.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd)

You know, I believe, Mr. Speaker, if the citizens of Manitoba could see half, half the stuff that's being shown in the theatres and the dirt that's being sold in the bookstores, there'd be a revolution, there'd be an uprising. You go to a theatre - and I don't go very frequently as you know - who do you see in there, you see the young people. The old people don't know, they're just as - how shall I say - ignorant as I was when I went to see one movie there last year. I really didn't know that we had gone so far in the few years, I think it was four, five years I think I haven't seen a movie. I couldn't believe in that short space of time how the filth just opened right up. At one time if you showed a nude in a magazine it would have to be a side picture or it would have to be a fig leaf or something maybe a box of candies anything, just to cover it up. But, Mr. Speaker, now not only they have frontal and rear pictures, but you have what's the word? - copulation. They've got sodomy, you've got all kinds of junk on there and it's being openly showed or openly sold on news stands. And I understand it's being shown in theatres. And stag movies well, I think one only has to read the last two prosecutions to find out what the judge and the police had to say about the stuff that this particular person, that this government sent up for four months and I congratulate them for it. But the magistrate had something to say about that - and he was a pretty broadminded magistrate, or was he a judge, I don't recall. But you know, this guy was no prude and you should have read the remarks that he had.

Mr. Speaker, somebody here suggested that we should allow children into theatres with adults, as if somehow, Mr. Speaker, since Cain and Abel, since Moses, since Christ and since all the prophets and all the wisemen of old have somehow been different from the children today. You know a child is five years old or ten years old, he is no different no more innocent than he was when God created Adam and Eve and they had their first children; no different. And they will never be different no matter what our technology is, no matter how we double our knowledge as we are doubling it every ten years; that has no effect on the child. And somehow we are being told by members on this side - fortunately the government is not foolish enough to buy that - but some members on this side have suggested that our children are more sophisticated and more mature and somehow this is not going to affect them. Now that's really incredible to suggest that. And I think they were saying from up to 18 years old which means from one year to 18 years old, to somehow suggest that that three or five or eight year-old child is somehow different than he was when the earth was first created; or that somehow he's going to be smarter five years from now and less susceptible to that junk. It's an incredible argument to put forward.

Mr. Speaker, we heard some of the remarks and some of the presentations in committee, or is it Law Amendments, and it was quite clear that the theatre owners didn't really like what we are doing; you know, I take what they say with a grain of salt because they're affected by it, I don't really know if they were sincere when they said that or not. But, Mr. Speaker, one thing came out loud and clear after those hearings, we know that there's going to be 71 censors in Manitoba, no question about that; this government and a Minister is saying I will agree to censorship only on condition that I can do the censoring - and if I'm wrong I'm sure you'll correct me. Yet, Mr. Speaker, he passes legislation that is going to give the right to censor to 71 people who stand most to gain by their decisions. It's offensive for our government and offensive to the Member for Inkster that an unwashed semi-literate jerk like me is going to decide what he's going to see but it's okay if a theatre owner who's going to make money on it is going to make that decision. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are elected here by the people and if we make a bad decision, I mean a really seriously bad decision, the people know what to do with us and they have recourse every four years. If the Censor Board makes a bad decision the government is at liberty to dismiss them, to terminate their appointment; I don't know if their appointments are from one or three years, but they are at liberty, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council which is Cabinet can terminate them any time. They have all the weight on their side. But they are saying and the Minister is saying, and I again, I really can't blame the Minister too much because he is carrying out a Cabinet decision, but they are saying they will not trust us intelligent - well perhaps I shouldn't go any further, but elected members of the Legislature who the people put in here to pass laws, good laws, bad laws, taxation laws, you name it - wouldn't trust the Censor Board but they're going to trust 71 businessmen. Now, Mr. Speaker, that just doesn't wash. Nobody is going to buy that kind of nonsense.

The gentleman from Portage la Prairie who represents Famous Players and has a theatre, what did he say? He says I did not show Stewardesses because it made me sick or I thought it

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) was terrible, I forget what the words were. But he said I would not show it. The guy from Winnipeg he said: Who are you and who am I to decide who's going to see it? I showed it. And of course they made money on it. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people are living in Portage la Prairie because they have a man that's got some decency and some decent standards. They cannot see that movie. People living in Winnipeg because there are people that are more interested in a buck than they are in some standards, some restrictions, are going to see everything. Now is that fair to the people of Manitoba? Isn't that a double standard? Isn't that worse than having a Censor Board? At least under the Censor Board, Mr. Speaker, everybody will be able to see the same thing or not to see the same thing. Isn't that true? Well, the Member for Inkster shakes his head - no - and I don't know how he rationalizes it unless he's telling me that the Censor Board, that the Censor Board had one type of standard for the country and one type of standard for Winnipeg. And my understanding was when they cut a film, that cut went throughout, whoever showed it they had the same film -(Interjection)- except yes, thank you for reminding me, the Member for Rhineland, except university students.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are three standards, there are going to be three standards. Our students at universities whom we spend a great deal of money educating or supposedly educating, I think it's \$52 million this year; we're going to allow them to look at the dirtiest garbage imaginable, even though they may be under 18, no restrictions there. I mean what kind of a citizen can you get out of university, Mr. Speaker, if you allow him to openly, blatantly violate the laws as the Minister of Education, Minister of Universities and Colleges is doing. He knows what's going on. Now whether I'm a prude or not is unimportant, the fact is they are breaking the law. Now how can a government sit back and say well, that's all right because they're young fellows and they'll grow up one day, we'll let them break the law. Do you think they're going to grow up with a healthy respect for the law, Mr. Speaker, when they're allowed at the seat of learning to disrespect law, to break laws. Do you think they're going to have a very healthy respect for the law? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to quote a couple of statements here and one of them is an appeal to trade unions and one is going to be an appeal to the press, and I hope that the trade unions take the action they have taken in the United States because I know as a trade unionist where they stand. It's just unfortunate we have not had - because of the Labour Bill, labour has not been able to organize themselves to really make a push to stop this bill. And I've talked to some of the top labour leaders in this province, and they said; You know Joe, how unions are, they're generally - union guys are conservative and he said they don't like that stuff. But he said we're too busy on Bill 81 and we haven't really had a chance to deal with this. I'd like to read this into the record, Mr. Speaker, it's called again "Morality in Media." I've quoted from it in my last week's remarks: "Man of the Month - Harold Doern. 'We want to get every union in the country working on the smut disaster' said Harold Doern - and he will. Harold Doern, President of Local 1203 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, already has most of Rhode Island working on the problem and he's just beginning. A smiling, likeable, energetic young man, Harold wasn't too aware of the smut problem until last fall when a union officer showed him a sex paper he picked up in a neighbourhood food store. 'I couldn't believe it and I went to see for myself.' He saw and he was shocked. In store after store in Pawtucket he saw the vilest sort of smut on display near bread counters, next to candy counters and in all sorts of places where children could get their hands on them. Harold went to work at the next union meeting, he asked if an anti smut committee could be formed. He received approval of his members and then got the okay from the international vice-president in Boston. Local 1203 with Harold at the helm is just beginning. They have the support now of the State Letter Carriers Union, the State Firefighters Association, all electrical workers' locals in the State of Rhode Island; two steelworkers locals, the State PTA and in all 22 locals in the State." So, Mr. Speaker, the unions are concerned and you, Sir, are a union man, I'm sure that you are concerned. I appeal to all the unions in Manitoba to take on this crusade to stop this smut in its tracks before it floods us.

Now I'd like to read another one and this is an appeal to the press from the same Morality in Media, that's April 1971: "The Examiner draws lines on smut ads. Following are excerpts from editorials that appeared in the San Francisco Examiner early in December of 70." And I quote: "There comes a time when even the most open-minded editor must draw the line. So far as the editors of the Examiner are concerned the time is now. The line we draw is against advertising in our columns by the dispensers of depraved entertainment offered presently in more than two-score theatres throughout this area. We are not bluenoses, we do not seek to

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) impose the Puritan ethic on the community in general or our readers in particular. However, we can no longer permit our advertising columns to be exploited by the panderers of moral pollution. In the past we have editorialized against smut, filth and obscenity. We have quietly and patiently agreed, urged moviemakers and night club operators to upgrade and improve their offerings. Over the years we have refused countless thousands of dollars in advertising that we felt exceeded the balance of good taste. We sought to base our position on the laws of the land and look for guidance to the Supreme Court decision and the Eros case, which found a production obscene because advertising forces appealed to the prurient. This approach though merely laundered the advertising appearing in our columns and thus tended to hide the slime of the shows being presented. We grudgingly accepted the decision of the Supreme Court that community standards should determine what is obscene and what is not. After witnessing the results of this decision, we are now convinced that community standards do not determine what is pornography. Quite the contrary. We believe the results in San Francisco are proof positive that proliferating pornography creates debased community standards. And that is something that those that have argued should ponder on because there's not many people that have been brave enough to make that kind of a statement." And I continue with the quote. "In this beautiful city, our standards sink lower and lower. We are not discussing the relaxed standards of some movies produced by large studios. While we do not endorse many of the acts and attitudes that are labelled sophisticated, we are not in this instance referring to such movies and plays. We are denouncing the hard-core pornography that flourishes in all too many parts of our city and offers dangerous entrapment for our young. We are denouncing the sexual depravity on film and stage that can and does breed moral pollution and social degeneracy. We should have thrown this ugliness out of our advertising columns long ago. We are sorry we delayed; it is out now and it will stay out. If this action on our part invites lawsuits we will welcome carrying our case to the highest courts, not only the Supreme Court but also to the highest courts of public opinion." I hope that the press in Manitoba, some of whom have been accepting some pretty dirty stuff in their personal columns soliciting for various things and also advertising the movies, will take this example to heart.

Mr. Speaker, a lady from England has sent me a couple of pages of material. She has been visiting Sweden and Denmark and talked to many of the people including the Attorney-Generals and some of the Cabinet Ministers of the two countries, and here is the comment of one of them: "But the essence of the whole sordid business was summed up for me in a statement by Carl Lowell Christensen, head of Copenhagen's Criminal Institute, when he said, 'Legalized pornography has changed the Danish attitudes towards sex. We have stopped yelling every time a man is seen in a dark alley with a woman or a child. We have matured in this respect and this is shown in the sex crime figures'." And she adds, "I can only say that if maturity is to be measured by our ability to ignore what may be happening between a man and a child in a dark alley, then heaven save us from it."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote in closing my remarks, from remarks made by Pat Michalls of KCO Radio San Francisco - probably some of the members have seen it reprinted in parts in a local press - and this was given during an address at the recent Police-men-Firemen Award Breakfast at Oakland, California. And I'll just read parts that are relevant. He starts off by saying, "I am sick. There are those who claim that ours is a sick society, that our country is sick, our government is sick, and we are sick. I am sick of being told that religion is the opiate of the people, that marijuana should be legalized. I am sick of being told that pornography is the right of free press, but freedom of the press does not include being able to read the Bible in school grounds. I am sick of paying more and more taxes to build schools while I see some faculty members encouraging students to tear them down. I am sick of not being able to take my family to a movie unless I want them exposed to nudity, homosexuality, and the glorification of narcotics. I am sick of pot smoking entertainers deluding me with their condemnation of my moral standards on late night television." Perhaps they should have added professors to that too.

"I am sick of reading so-called modern literature with its kinship to what I used to read on the walls of public toilets. I am sick of cynical attitudes towards patriotism; and I'm sick of politicians without backbone; and I am sick of permissiveness." He ends the note, Mr. Speaker, by saying, "take note you in high places, you will not see me under a placard, you will not see me take to the streets, you will not find me throwing a rock or a bomb, you will not find me ranting to wild-eyed mobs, but you will find me expressing my anger and indignation in letters to your political office. You will find me cancelling my subscription to your

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) , , , , periodical next time it condones criminal acts, or advertises filth. But most of all, you'll find me at the polling place - there you'll hear the thunder of the common man."

Mr. Speaker, I say to this government, if they don't change their attitude and their direction, they too will hear the thunder of the common man at the next election. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Churchill, that Bill No. 70 be not now read a Third time but read three months hence.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to take part in this debate but on a point of order, to make a correction that the mistake - the statement that my honourable friend made and I know that he didn't intend to make this statement that's incorrect, but he mentioned that a Mr. Ferguson who works for Famous Players, is in fact the manager here, and owns a theatre in Portage la Prairie, did not show the Stewardesses in Portage, did not want to show the film, but that the other gentleman, meaning Morton of Morton Theatres, showed it, and this is not the case. It's true that Mr. Ferguson did not show it at Portage but Mr. Ferguson showed it at one of the Famous theatres here. I know he didn't like it, but this is the way it happened, and I don't think it's fair if we don't correct this fact.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. BOROWSKI: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the honourable member have support? Call in the members.

Order please. The motion before the House is the amendment by the Honourable Member for Thompson declaring a three month hoist on Bill 70.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Asper, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Blake, Borowski, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Adam, Barrow, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller Paulley, Pawley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26; Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it; I declare the amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the main motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in order to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I have declared the motion carried. Call in the members. A division shall take place.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether it would meet with the agreement of the House that the same division in reverse be accepted. If not, then of course, Mr. Speaker, then I would call for the division as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: In order that those who examine the votes and the proceedings of this House, I ask for ayes and nays.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay fine, we're agreeable.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Asper, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Blake, Borowski, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 27; Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the ayes have it; I declare the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Bill 108, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment on report stage of Bill 108. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that Section 10 of Bill 108 be amended by adding, after section (e) thereof; "(f) to members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 108 is the Health Sciences Centre Act which amalgamates or combines the facilities of the General Hospital and the Childrens Hospital, the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba, into one and we find that a new board has been set up. No doubt many of them are new members or newly names to this Centre. At this time we don't know just what direction this will take, what this means by having new members put on to the board. As a result I feel that I would like to propose the amendment that has just been read out. Mr. Speaker, we are spending a lot of money on this particular facility and on this Centre and no doubt it will increase in the years to come because costs of health have been increasing over the years, and the projections are that it will increase very heavily in the next several years - so that I think it is up to us to provide extra care as to how the monies are spent.

Mr. Speaker, the parties named in Section 10 which is dealing with the notice of annual meetings are the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba, and the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba. These boards never in the past have appeared before a Standing Committee of the House; we have never had a chance to examine them; we have never had a right to question them on the costs, on the monies that are being spent. And especially now that this will be a newly constituted corporation, I think we as members should have a right to examine them, and I think the best way we could do it is by at least being able to attend the annual meeting. And under the amendment that I am proposing we are asking that members of the Legislature be included in the list who will get notice of the annual meeting, so that they can attend and participate in the meeting that will be held.

Surely this is not asking too much from the government to provide for this in the act that we are now discussing and approving, to notify members of the Legislature so that they can attend; I think it would be very valuable not only for the members of the House but also for the parties involved who will be getting notice. I think it's a matter of reciprocity here that both can gain from such a meeting, and therefore I strongly urge that the government give consideration to the request and I'm appealing to them to give accord to the passage of this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to just put it on the record that I support the amendment proposed in this instance by the Honourable Member for Rhineland for the reasons outlined by him.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A further amendment.

MR. FROESE: Yes, I have another amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: We have the main motion. Pardon, where, has he given notice?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson, that Sections 38 to 41 be renumbered 39 to 42, and that a new Section 38 be inserted Section 38 report tabled "upon receiving the report, the Minister shall if the Legislature is then in session, lay it before the Legislature forthwith and if the Legislature is not then in session, lay it before the Legislature within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker this is a provision so that members of this House will get a copy of the annual report. We have many statutes on our books where we have corporations, our Crown corporations all, I think in all cases have to provide annual meetings with the annual report, and we are certainly not asking too much by asking for an annual report of this new Science Centre because as members of the Legislature we are accountable to the people who elect us to this Assembly to see to it that proper stewardship is given of the moneys that are being spent. We are accountable to them and when one way of doing this is by seeing to it that we get copies of the reports, this I think is the very minimum that we can ask for. This is a special act that we are passing now and I think it should be incorporated in this very bill, so that it is a matter of course that we do not have to ask for statements, for the annual

(MR. FROESE cont'd) statements, but that this is a matter of course that we will be getting it, that it will be tabled in the House and so that we can peruse it, and when we discuss the estimates be more able to assess the situation as to whether the moneys are well spent or not.

This is certainly the practice that we have with other Crown corporations and I think that we should make no exception with Bill 108 when we establish this Health Science Centre. The members, the government has just denied us to attend the annual meeting, or even get notice, I think this is in very poor taste. I think at least they should have given the reason why not; why we would not be able to do this; why they don't want us to attend, and at least I hope they have the courtesy to reply, why we as members should not get an annual report from the government, and therefore I urge and I plead with them to at least accept this particular amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that the Conservative Party supports the amendment put forward by the Member for Rhineland. We think it's reasonable, and I would like that to be on the record.

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

MR. FROESE: Ayes and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the honourable member have support? Call in the members.

The Motion before the House is the Amendment by the Honourable Member for Rhineland on Bill 108.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Asper, Barkman, Bilton, Blake, Borowski, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs; Adam, Barrow, Beard, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Malinowski, Mackling, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it; I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Chairman, I was paired with the Honourable Member for Wellington. Had I voted I would have voted for the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

BILL No. 108 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Report stage, law of Bill No. 110. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, that Bill No. 110 be amended by deleting Section 30, Subsections (1) and (2) from the bill, and that Sections 31 to 44 be renumbered 30 to 43.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 110 is the Statute Law Amendments Act of 1972 and we have a similar act coming up every year which is more or less called the Act of Sins of Commission and Omission, and I feel that this particular section, Section 30 is an Act of Commission. Certainly why didn't the government come out with a bill on this important piece of legislation. It was purely to hide it so that it would not draw the attention to the people of this province as to what was happening. Section 30 of Bill 110 provides to increase the number of students to be on the Senate from six to twenty-eight. This is a very large increase. In fact a few years ago when the act was changed to bring in students for the first time on the Senate Board to put six students on it, there was a lot of argument in the House, and especially in the Committee, in connection with this matter, that they thought that this was far too much, that we were going far too much in allowing students to be on the Senate Board. Now we find that this government is going to increase from six to twenty-eight and I certainly cannot go along with it. I do not subscribe to this. I think the increase is unwarranted. We have not heard sound reasons, any logical reasons, for the increase and I think if we were going to do this, this should have been brought in by special act so that we could have properly discussed that particular part of the bill on second reading.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

The matter of putting that many students on the Senate Board certainly means that they have to accept large responsibilities because under the provisions of the act, of the University Act, the responsibilities of the Senate are very large and numerous, and far too many for me to enumerate here tonight, and I certainly don't intend to do that. But they have the power to make recommendations, not only recommendations, at the heading of Section 30 (4) (1) which provides for the power of the Senate, starts off and reads this way. "The Senate has general charge of all matters of an economic character and without restricting the generality of the foregoing the Senate shall" - and then it names the various provisions of which there must be at least 30 to 40 different subsections under that particular section, which describes the duties and the responsibilities that the Senate has to accept.

Now what this means that we put such a large number of students on the Senate - these students have an organization at the university; they get together daily; they can organize and they can co-ordinate --(Interjection)-- and make recommendations, sure but they can get together and draw up recommendations and policies that they want to implement, and when they get to the meeting of the Senate they know what is going to happen, what they have to place before the Senate, and sure enough they are in a much better position to argue their points than other senators of the board. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the House Leader says hear, hear. I would just like to remind him what has happened in some of the other universities where we had student riots. What happened in Berkley in California? --(Interjection)-- In Ohio. The Columbia University. The Sir William University at Montreal, where they demolished the computers and had thousands of dollars of damage which had to be which had to be paid by the taxpayers. I feel that we need people on that Senate Board that can reason properly and bring sound judgment to the recommendations that will be brought forward and that will be implemented.

We also have in the act provision for a community council. But what do we find? The same people that are on the board are on the Senate, and a lot of the people that are on the Senate are also on the community council, and who decides who's going to be on the community council? And, Mr. Speaker, 50 persons having an interest in the university and appointed by vote of those members of the council referred to in clauses (a) to (m) present at a meeting of the council have the power to elect them. That means that the people that are on the Senate, have the right to appoint the community council, and this is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, I feel if we have a community council it should be representative of the people of this province and that the members of the council should be drawn from right across the province, not just from people who are closely associated with those of the Senate, and that they bring in their friends and appoint them to the community council. I think this is a ridiculous situation; I'd like to see this changed, so that we have a council that will be representative of the people of this province. Certainly I would like to see a change brought about in that connection and the Minister of Universities and Colleges I think had much better bring in the recommendations for a change on that matter than to increase the student representation on the senate as he is proposing. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this doesn't mean that all students in the university are bad people - not by any means. But, Mr. Speaker, who do we know will the government appoint to the senate from the pupils attending? And I am rather leery about this point because what students are bringing out - the paper, the Uniter and the Manitoban as it's so-called, the filth that came through those papers; and these were more or less the leaders of the university, of the student body. And if people of this kind are going to run the senate and bring in recommendations to the governing board for endorsement, I think we can expect trouble, and this is why I take so much exception to what we are doing here tonight. We find that the act says that as long as there are 50 senators appointed, they can operate, and if we have 28 students out of 50, they would have control. We have no way of knowing the representation or the attendance at the senate meeting. Again, here if the senior senators don't attend and the student body attends, they could out-vote even with the number that they have now, or will have; they could be in control of the senate. And this is not an impossibility, and certainly with the help of a few of the other senators that are inclined that way, they could put through their recommendations that they wanted.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we're going overboard by naming that many student senators to the senate. The government can talk as much as they like; they were trying to hide this in Bill 110. Why didn't they bring a bill forward which would be open for all people to see, to know that this is happening. If it hadn't been for a small article in the press, I am sure people wouldn't even know about it; but it was a small article in the press that caught my friend's eye

(MR. FROESE cont'd) and made me aware of this, and certainly this is - otherwise probably it would have gone unnoticed --(Interjection) -- The bill passed second reading I think the day that I was out of the House attending a funeral, and as a result I didn't speak on it on second reading. Otherwise I would have brought it to the notice of members at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly take exception to what is being proposed in Bill 110. I feel that this matter should receive further consideration before the action is taken. I feel that the change is too drastic, is too large in my opinion, and therefore I ask members of this House to support the amendment and vote down the increase from 6 to 28 students to be appointed to the senate.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I may agree with many of the sentiments expressed by my colleague from Rhineland, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before Law Amendments we had no representation from the university senate; we had no representation from the Board of Governors; we had no representation from the University Grants Commission objecting to this, so if we had no objection from the university community, then I would have to say that I cannot support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, this information was given to the honourable member and most of the members at Law Amendments Committee, and I'm not going to take the members' time, as the Member from Rhineland does, to reiterate all the comments that went on at Law Amendments Committee. The Honourable Member for Rhineland has done that tonight - that's his right; that's his prerogative, to make the same speech he did before Law Amendments Committee, but suffice is it for me to say that this amendment comes about as a request of the responsible people appointed, business people, people from all walks of life, who are on the Senate of the Board of the University itself - Board of Governors. This is a minority representation that is sought for to allow responsible young men and women who are adults now at law, most of them, to serve their community at the university they attend.

Now the honourable member derided what happened in other places in Canada, in the United States, where there wasn't effective representation by young people, and it's this kind of thinking that perpetuates the conflict that exists between young people and others in society, and that we want to avoid.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

BILL No. 110 was read a third time and passed on division.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 114. The Honourable Member for Rhineland has an amendment.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Section 14 of Bill 114 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof, the following subsection: Submission of report to Minister. 14 (3) Upon receiving the report of the auditor, the corporation shall submit a copy thereof to the Minister of Finance, who shall if the Legislature is then in session lay it before the Legislature forthwith, and if the Legislature is not then in session lay it before the Legislature within 15 days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 114 is the Convention Centre Corporation Act, which is a new bill under which we are committing a large contribution of money for the Convention Centre. We are contributing \$7-1/2 million from capital and the other day it was reported in the press by the Minister of Public Works that he expects that they will be asking for more money from time to time and that the government will supply them with more money.

The arrangements in the act are such that as long as the corporation is in poor shape that they may lose money from year to year, the province is left holding the bag, but as soon as the corporation makes money, then there is a provision in the bill that the city can ask that it be transferred to the city, and it shall be transferred. That's what it says. So that we are really having a piece of legislation here - it couldn't be worse, because we're simply holding the bag when they have losses but when they make money, then they can have it transferred so that the city can reap the benefits. And it reads shall, that we must transfer it, that's the provision in the act. And I feel as long as we have to contribute and are contributing large amounts of money, 7-1/2 million for the time being, that we should at least have a report tabled in the House of its operation, how it does fare. How do we know what the operations are,

(MR. FROESE cont'd) whether it's in a deficit or whether it's making money if we don't get a report? And I think we as members - and I've said this before - we are accountable to our constituents, to our taxpayers, and we are here to give good stewardship. And I think the Minister of Finance as well, he is the one that gets the report, and I'm asking that he table that report in this House.

Certainly the money that we are contributing now will be borrowed; we will be paying interest on that money for years to come, and this will be a cost to the government. We as taxpayers of the province will have to provide the revenue to pay the interest on that money that we are borrowing and giving to the corporation, and if the corporation makes money it'll be transferred to the city and we will not have anything to show on our financial statement for even the 7-1/2 million that we are contributing - the way the accounting is done and the way the public accounts are cut up, that it will not even show.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very poor arrangement, and that is why I want an accounting, that is why I am requesting that we get an annual report from this corporation as members of this House. And I don't think this is asking too much; I think the government should want to do it and not deny it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this is a City of Winnipeg operation. There are grants being given for capital construction, which has been clearly discussed in the House many times. Under this act the annual statement shall be published in a newspaper published in the City of Winnipeg. All the people in the City of Winnipeg and all those reading a newspaper in the City of Winnipeg will have the report before them. It's a public report. And I don't think members of this House or the Department of Finance should be having to deal with reports of many corporations such as Winnipeg Enterprises or any other corporation, which is operated by or on behalf of a municipal corporation.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

BILL No. 114 was read a third time and passed on division.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, they've allowed it and I don't know - I'm going to find that out in-between sessions, Mr. Speaker, when it's recorded on division, can one member say "on division"? --(Interjection)-- Don't argue with me on points of order at this time. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether you would kindly call the proposed resolution in the name of the honourable --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was addressing you, Sir, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Honourable Member for Rhineland state his point of order.

MR. FROESE: Yes. The point of order is that I was addressing you, Sir, and not the House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: I hadn't recognized anyone except the House Leader at the moment.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker, whether you would kindly call the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the adjournment to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the lateness of the hour and the fact that I have a cold, Mr. Speaker, I will not speak for 40 minutes. In fact I will only be a couple of minutes and I would ask the Minister, in the four items that he has in his resolutions, in respect to item number 2, and here I quote: "To consider such other matters as may be referred to the committee from time to time by the Minister of Municipal Affairs." Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the Minister at this time, and I would in fact plead with him, to bring the matter of the assessment practices of this province before this committee for study during the session or in-between sessions. For many years, Mr. Speaker, this problem of assessment practices in the Province of Manitoba has been a perennial point for discussion throughout the session. So far no attempts have been made to remedy what many consider to be inequities. When the Municipal Act was revised we did succeed in getting the old question of assessment removed from the Municipal Act and, Sir, I believe it is now time that that whole assessment act be studied in depth by a committee with the power to call expert advice before it and to in fact do a job that is so necessary in the revision of the Assessment Act for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I just have one very brief remark to draw to the attention of the Honourable Minister re this resolution and that is the matter that I drew to his attention by letter on two or three occasions during the course of last spring regarding the problems of the Elks Hall, the Masonic Hall, which is a real serious problem in those communities in my constituency. No doubt there are, if the Minister will take a look at other jurisdictions I think he will find that there is equally as great a problem in those communities as well. There's one that under Section 2, I recommend to the Minister as of tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a couple of points for the record. In reference to the assessment practices in the province I think it should be mentioned that the Committee on Municipal Affairs was charged with that responsibility only two years ago, did hold meetings, hearings, and in fact did involve itself with expert witnesses in respect to assessment. Arising from those meetings, hearings, submissions, did come the present Assessment Act which did bring about some changes from the earlier provisions relating to assessment. That is not to say that we should not again reconsider, re-examine all societies in the state of movement and change, and only a month ago I agreed to sit down in a form of committee with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities in the examination of the entire scope of the question of the practices of assessment. So I would not want the honourable member to feel that despite the fact that we did hold these intensive examinations two years ago that we would now sit back and do nothing.

The Honourable Member from Roblin mentioned the Elks Hall and other groups. I just wanted to be very clear on the record that the defect that he is making reference to that he feels is a defect, was passed and introduced into legislation by government of which he was a part of in the year 1966. I think that should be very clear on the record - and it is being examined. I think I should also mention that the municipality does have the power to cancel taxes as they see fit; if they feel it is in the public interest to cancel any portion of the taxes relating to these type of halls, they can apply to the municipality. And I have indicated for example to process - of indicating for instance to the Community Hall in Ethelbert that I know the honourable colleague is concerned about, that I would be certainly prepared to agree to the cancellation of taxes insofar as that Community Hall is concerned. It's really of community nature that the municipal authority passed a by-law in respect to that matter of cancellation.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the next resolution - I believe all bills have now been passed to third reading and the resolution, with the exception of the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the First Minister, I believe that the Honourable Member for Thompson has the adjournment on that particular resolution and, Mr. Speaker, I request that you call that now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak very reluctantly. I have already made one speech; I think it's unfair to have to make two speeches for a greenhorn like myself. However, it is the disposition of the House as I understand, that they want to get all the business over with and go home and I'm certainly not going to stand in the way of getting the business - even if it takes till five or six in the morning, and it may well do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I start by saying that I have waited for three long years for this day to help right an injustice that is almost as old as the injustice to the Indians. Like the smut bill, I don't expect to convert anyone here, Mr. Speaker, but I have a duty as a parent and as a taxpayer and as a Christian and as a legislator to have my uncultured, semi-literate and unbleached views recorded in this Legislature dealing with this history-making civil rights Christian rights, and parent' rights resolution. My corner store vocabulary does not permit me to adequately express my profound disappointment in the meagre and niggardly crumbs for a leper approach that we are using in this resolution. I consider it a band-aid, Mr. Speaker, where we should be using stitches. We expected a bill on a free vote; instead we are faced with a stunted resolution that'll not prevent one school from closing.

And, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that we have to go through such an exercise, and a year from now if the amendment passes - perhaps sooner - that we have to refight that same battle a second time. Twenty-five percent in this case, Mr. Speaker, and if I'm wrong then I'm sure that somebody from the government side, perhaps the First Minister will correct me;

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) but if we're talking about 25 percent then in this case, Mr. Speaker, it means zero. The Member for Lakeside was right when he complained about the whole question of procedure because we had been led to believe rightly or wrongly that we would have a bill before us and we would have a free vote. Well we certainly have a free vote but we do not have a bill; we have a resolution that is not going to really resolve anything. I don't want to be fighting an election on this issue; I don't want to spend another two months or four months or five months next winter debating this very same resolution. It would have been much preferable for all, whether one is for it or against it - I believe all of us would have preferred to deal with it win, lose or draw, that's it. Unfortunately that is not what is happening.

Now may I turn to the criticisms of the Minister of Labour. I believe he criticized the Member for Lakeside for chastising the Premier about the way he brought the whole thing in and really put the Member for Lakeside and many of us in a very awkward position as to how we should vote on this bill, because I think that we'll run into the same problem we just ran into on a previous bill. I think that the Minister of Labour should have directed his remarks and his flak to the Member for Inkster who I consider, Mr. Speaker, delivered a most unfair, undeserved, unkind and almost merciless attack on our Premier in the entire debate. I do not believe that the Premier was deserving of that type of a chastisement that he received. He is trying to resolve a very difficult issue and I don't believe that the Member for Inkster is helping any by taking off after the Premier as he did in his initial remarks - and I think it's unfortunate because he is not the type of person that indulges in that type of thing.

The Minister of Health wasn't much better, Mr. Speaker, he gave a grudgingly conditional support subject to recall at his political discretion. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because if we have to deal with this resolution before the next election, I say that subject to recall at his political discretion that that's perhaps what will happen, he will change his mind, and because of politics we will find people voting differently than they truly believe.--(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is telling me that's the same position he took in 69, but the fact is he did indicate he's going for it, so obviously he has now changed his position from 69 and is leaving the option open to change it once again - and that's not surprising.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the rationale that the Minister took - and this is the Minister of Health, and if I have his quote here correctly; Let those who want religious schools pay from their own pockets. Well, if he didn't say that then it's very close to it.--(Interjection) Well, would the member like to get up and tell us what he said? --(Interjection)-- Well, I've read the paper, Mr. Speaker, and I took notes as every member spoke in this House. --(Interjection)-- He was a shotgun bride.

Mr. Speaker, if one is to use that kind of rationale that the Minister of Health is, I suppose we could say to the criminals in our society who we're going to give approximately a million dollars through the legal aid bill - we can take the same position as he is and say we object, we object to paying our money for criminals. He objects to someone paying for using tax money to teach religion. Is it illogical or inconsistent or unreasonable for us to say why should we pay a million dollars to defend self-confessed criminals. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that was originally set up to help the poor but somehow along the line it got diverted where it's not really doing that. I believe the original intent was to help the Indian and Metis and our very poor. We agreed to it reluctantly because we were afraid that there would be abuse. In any case, Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make is we can defend our position there on the same basis that the Minister of Health is trying to defend his; and all I can say to him, at least when we're considering this very important resolution, treat us, treat those who want aid for schools at least as well as you're treating the criminals because you are putting up over a million dollars.

Is the Minister prepared to say to the woman who wants an abortion that we have an alternative - as the people that want to send kids to school have an alternative - have contraceptives, use the contraceptives; if you do not then you pay for your own abortion. Or better still, Mr. Speaker, he could use the argument, we will give you a bed in a hospital, pay the blood transfusion if there is any, pay the medicine, pay the doctor if you want to have childbirth in other words if you want to give birth to a child. But if you want something special, something different, like the people want religion in education, then you - and that is abortion - then you pay for it yourself. Is that illogical or unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to her that the hospitals are really there to save lives and to preserve health, they're not there as a human abattoir, they're not there as a human abattoir; and the Minister could very easily say: "Lady, if you want to have a baby, we'll pay for it, but if you want an abortion you pay for it." Is that

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . . being inconsistent, Mr. Speaker, or is it being inconsistent? And I ask that Minister to consider very seriously because I was shocked listening to his remarks. Perhaps I was - I hadn't read his statements back in 69, I was convinced that he was really sold on the idea of justice even though you happen to believe in God. But it seems that his justice is a little different, not quite that way; if it involves the destruction of the most innocent in our society he's prepared to accept it and pay with our tax money. But if it involves teaching religion then it's a terrible thing, he's not going to have any part of it.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some comments made by some of the speakers here about the cost of this aid. Well I think we have to consider also the cost in the not unlikely but in the certain event the schools will close. And will the cost to the public purse be then? To those who want to argue, not on a religious basis but strictly on an economic basis I ask them to consider, are you doing the taxpayer a favour by turning down the resolution, knowing full well that within one year or two years, perhaps three, that these schools will close up and they will go on the public purse and no one here will be able to say or will say that we won't pay for it. We agreed. They will agree that we have to pay for their education even if it means \$5 million a year plus approximately \$15 million for capital construction initially. They won't argue against it, but Mr. Speaker, let them be honest when they argue on economic basis; let them tell the public that if you want a one-school system, if you want to help the separate and private and parochial schools, that you're going to have to pay more money, not less. You're going to have to pay more money. Let's be honest enough to tell the people that you're going to be shelling out 5 million bucks a year plus approximately 15 million for capital costs.

Mr. Speaker, if they want to save money and I know this will never happen, but let's just take this thing theoretically; if we want to save money in education, what we should do is encourage everybody to go to a private school or parochial school. Our education bill is - what is it 139 million --(Interjection)-- 139 million or somewhere in the neighborhood. If we can get everybody to go to a private and parochial school and give them aid to the extent of 50 percent, do you realize how much money we could save? Sixty, seventy millions of dollars a year. It's fantastic. You know we could eliminate the sales tax completely and still have money left over. We could pay everybody's auto insurance, free auto insurance for everybody. So, Mr. Speaker, if those who are arguing economics, I suggest that they be honest with themselves and with the public because the more schools you can get private and parochial, the cheaper it is for the taxpayers of Manitoba. Absolutely no question about it. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that most of the schools that are operating would settle for 50/60 percent. I think that they'd settle for it. I'm using the 50 percent figure because it's easier calculation. So we can save ourselves a great deal of money.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote from a report put out by President Nixon. Apparently he was in Chicago, I'm not sure now, Chicago, addressing a great gathering of school educators, and I'd like to quote some of the things that President Nixon said. And I've heard many times in this House saying, we like the American system, let's keep it that way; America made a decision long ago and it's working out well. Well I want the members of this House and I want the public to know what the problems that Americans have today and what President Nixon had to say about it. I notice our third rate professor from Crescentwood is giggling as usual - he thinks anything that President Nixon says is a big joke because he's dropping napalm bombs on Vietnamese. And this is part of the quotation: "That assistance in excess of \$300 per pupil constitutes the critical mass, the very minimum which begins to produce the results that smaller amounts have failed to achieve." We are - Mr. Speaker, may I digress - talking of approximately \$400 per student. He is mentioning that the critical mass is 300, that's the rock bottom minimum. "Now the question comes, can I guarantee that this new approach will work. As \$200 didn't work, will 300 or 350 work in breaking the barrier and producing better education? We can't be sure, but the evidence in our judgment is strong enough to indicate that we ought to try it. What we are sure of is that the old ways have failed and therefore we must move on to a new way. Therefore today in this effort to redeem the promise of public education, I come before you as educators to give us your support for this purpose. I have also come for another reason, a reason alluded to by His Eminence in his introduction. If public education in America faces a severe testing time, and it does, non-public education confronts what can be only be described as a crisis of the first magnitude, that is that grade educational system that we have had thrown at us by those who are opposed to school aid. If you had listened to these people you would swear that America has achieved an educational Utopia. Well I ask you to

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) listen what President Nixon has to say about their educational system. You are familiar with the basic statistics, but let the nation now hear what this crisis is because this is the problem of not just those involved here but of the whole nation. Taken together the non-public schools in the country educate 5.2 million children. That is more than the public school system of the whole State of California." And may I add, Mr. Speaker, that is approximately the total students we have in all of Canada. "It would be misleading to suggest that Catholic education and non-Catholic education in general are about to disappear altogether because of that fact. But at the same time it would be irresponsible to pretend that all is well, because it is not. So let me therefore outline hypothetically, not just for this audience but for the whole nation, the consequences of a total collapse of non-public education, since this is perhaps the best way of emphasizing the stake that every American has in preventing any such collapse from taking place. Let us begin: The disappearance of all non-public schools in this country would saddle the American taxpayer with an additional \$3 billion annually in school operating costs plus as much as 10 billion in new school construction."

And then he goes on - I've skipped his remarks because I believe when he delivered that it was four pages long. I'm just touching on the highlights, I quote, "I am irrevocably committed to those propositions. America needs her non-public schools. Those non-public schools need help, therefore we must and we will find ways to provide that help." This is, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not quoting, this is the first time that a President of America has gone on record as recognizing the very serious problem and is making a commitment, albeit a few months before the election, but making a commitment nonetheless to the educators and to the clergy and to the concerned parents of the United States that he is going to have funds put through their Legislature to help these people. And I quote further, "As we consider the non-public schools whether they are Catholic, Protestant, Jewish or even non-sectarian they often add the dimension of spiritual values in the educational process. Children who attend those schools are offered a moral code by which to live. At a time when the trend in education, too often toward impersonal materialism, I believe America needs more rather than less emphasis on education which emphasizes moral, religious, and spiritual values. The American people and their government cannot remain indifferent to the accelerating disappearance of such schools. No single school system whether public or private must ever gain absolute monopoly over the education of our children because such a system, one that had a total monopoly would never reflect the diversity and richness of our national heritage and character. It would lack altogether that essential spur of competition to innovate, grow and reform. It would lead inevitably toward mediocrity and dull uniformity in American education. Conditions which this nation cannot tolerate."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had some suggestions from some members about the problems that are caused by religious training and about people that have religious difficulties. The countries weren't named but we know that they were referring to Ireland and a few other places around the world. Somehow trying to make out, Mr. Speaker, that people who go to religious schools come out a bunch of wildeyed fanatics ready to cross swords with the first guy that they run into that doesn't believe in God. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider Saskatchewan and Ontario, just to mention two provinces. I have brothers and sisters in both of them and I can assure you, Sir, they're just as normal or abnormal as I am and their friends are the same. And their friends are the same. And the New Democrats that I've met there, Mr. Speaker, are no wiser or no dumber than I am. I drive across the border to Saskatchewan, which I do about twice a year, Mr. Speaker, I don't know any difference. In fact if there wasn't that marker at the border I wouldn't know I'm in Saskatchewan. I don't see any wildeyed radicals running around burning crosses or what have you. I consider it insulting to our intelligence and the intelligence of the people in Manitoba for anybody from either side of the House to come in here and somehow imply or suggest that religion really is responsible for all these problems and if we somehow get religion involved in our education we're going to turn out a terrible bunch of people, and that Manitoba is not going to be fit for decent folks to live in. That's hog-wash. Canadian history proves it, because eight out of the ten provinces has some assistance and I suggest to you that they are no worse or no better off than Manitoba is which has not had any assistance to speak of.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make further quotations, and these are comments from Edgar P. McCarren, and this comes out of an educational bulletin and they're dealing with extensively what kind of students come out of schools and universities. And there's been a great many surveys done in North America. Perhaps some of it to rebut the nonsense and the myths that

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) have been created by the atheists to show or to try and prove that really religion is a bad thing for a country. And I quote again, Mr. Speaker, "Perhaps the major interest of most Americans in Catholic schools concerns the social effects of such schools and students. For years it has been alleged by some that Catholic schools do positive harm; that they are divisive because they separate Catholic children from public school children during school hours. This is a serious accusation but no evidence has been offered to support it. Even Gerhard Lenski in *Religious Factor*, Doubleday 1961, seemed to expect that Catholics who received all or most of their education in Catholic schools and therefore had less contact with non-Catholics would have more unfavourable images of Protestants and Jews than those with a public education. Yet he had to admit that data did not support this very plausible line of reasoning, at least as it applied to those who had received all or most of their education in Catholic schools. When Catholic, elementary and secondary school graduates also go to a Catholic college however, a really significant difference in their social attitude and ideas developed. They are 12 percentage points less likely to object to a negro as a next door neighbour, 18 percentage points less likely to think that Jews have too much power, 23 percentage points more likely to defend the rights of a Protestant minister to teach things which are opposed to the Catholic doctrine. What is more, all those differences are statistically significant as is the difference between Catholics from Catholic colleges and college educated Protestants on the anti-Semitic item. The inescapable evidence that emerges from research is that when a Catholic, elementary and secondary school graduate went to a Catholic college, his understanding of the social teachings of the church tended to develop beyond the adolescent level and to attain more mature sophistication in social concerns. Specifically Fichter found that Catholics attending Catholic schools had more favourable attitudes toward negroes, refugees, aid to foreign countries and the labour movement and they were less isolationist in their views. In general, they obtained a broader social education. For instance, in May 1967 the national Gallop Poll discovered that 92 percent of Catholics expressed a willingness for a Jew for a President of the United States, whereas only 77 percent of groups other than Jewish held a similar attitude. Another survey of the San Francisco Bay area showed less anti-Semitism among Catholics than among most religious groups. This investigation conducted by the B'Nai B'Rith by Charles W. Glock and Rodney Stark was published in "Christian Beliefs and anti-Semitism", Harper and Row, 1966.

Well, Mr. Speaker, so much for the Catholic schools and what they do. Now let's have a look at our public schools which cost right now a great deal more to operate than the private and parochial schools. We already know the harvest they have produced, the bomb throwers and the burning of the university, the social disturbances. Mr. Speaker, we know the VD rate, the drug use, the nervous breakdowns, the teen crimes and the suicides which are the highest in the history of this country. Particularly in that group that come out of the public educational system. And, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that this happens because they are told by the teachers and professors that we are civilized monkeys. And may I add as an aside, did you ever hear of a monkey burning down universities or computers, or dropping napalm on another monkey. The teachers in their evolutionary bunk tell us that a person has evolved from a monkey and therefore if you can convince a student that he's really a civilized animal and he's only kept in line by the rules and regulations and laws should we really be surprised that under stress he should commit some animalistic act. But even worse, Mr. Speaker, is that our schools, our public schools, teach our children lies and mistrust. And I'd like to state for the umpteenth time the case of my daughter, Sandra, in Thompson. I don't recall the grade she went to. She came home one day and she said "Dad is it true that we come from a monkey?" I said "whatever gave you that silly idea." She said "well that's what my teacher said." Well, Mr. Speaker, do you realize the position I was put in. I had to say to my daughter . . . -- (Interjection) - Mr. Speaker, the way some of the government members are voting it's very easy to accept evolution. Mr. Speaker, as a parent, I was put in the position of saying to my daughter - I'm not the only one, I've met many others -- that that teacher is stupid or a liar. Or, I had to say you know that really mom and me and our priest have been lying to you; that really God didn't create Adam and Eve as we have taught our kids and as the priest, the church teaches.

Now what kind of an educational system is it that puts parents and children at that kind of odds where somebody's got to be a liar. Is that the kind of a system we think is great and we want to improve and expand. Is that what we want? And I suggest to those who are pushing for strictly public schools that they consider that there are many foolish people like myself who

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) happen to believe that God made Adam and Eve and that's where we come from and we teach that to our kids. Is it fair to me the taxpayer put in a position where I have to say to her that that teacher is a liar, our school system is a big lie? I resent that, Mr. Speaker, I have always resented, and I tell you that there are many people in this province that resent it also. College textbooks teach that birds evolve from reptiles; evolutionists teach that reptiles learn to fly by practice jumping from trees into bushes by the parachute method or by running fast and jumping into the air in long gliding leaps until front legs evolved into wings. Well, Mr. Speaker, to those who believe in evolution I suggest that they try that and see what happens to them. The insect developed wings by descending in parachute fashion from tops of tall plants. This is a fanciful imagination so ridiculous it is amusing but it is not in the slightest degree factual.

Mr. Speaker, I would be agreeable to even continue this farceful public school education that we have in Manitoba that pits parent against child and child against the church - on these conditions: They teach evolution as a theory not as fact. Students be given the "creation by God" alternative with full opportunity to hear both sides. Biology, geology, general sciences be taught as yet unproven theory. And to those who think that sounds very funny, let me remind you that there is a carbon, radiocarbon-14 system, that was developed for -- and this is supposed to be the most accurate measurement developed by science to measure the age of objects and things. Radiocarbon-14 dating has shown that oil and coal are thousands, not millions of years old. That's not church dogma or bologna or my own. This is science that's saying this. That carbon-14 shows that it's thousands not millions of years old. I suggest to some of the professors and intellectuals here, look back into their school books and see what they were taught when they went to school.

Example No. 2. The rocks are not arranged in ascending evolutionary sequence as taught by a university geologist. Rocks are often upside down in reverse sequence in direct contradiction to the sequence as given in college textbooks.

Mr. Speaker, I was walking down the hallway here a few days ago and we have girl guides that give tours and they show all the fossils on the wall and they try and explain to the best of their ability things about this building. You know what one of the girls was saying to these American tourists. That fossil there, I forget what she called it, it's 450 million years old. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's not important if it's 450 years old or 200 million years old. What is important is that we have taught these children bunk and lies and we are putting them in the position of going along and lying to the public. And this is not church dogma again, science has proven that these dates that they've had established years ago have fallen by the wayside since they developed radiocarbon-14 dating. They have several other dating techniques, but radiocarbon-14 is the one that's accepted by science as the most accurate.

And this is an aside, Mr. Speaker, a funny thing, and I consider it pure hypocrisy. The Minister of Health put out a book on demolishing, getting rid of the correctional institutes and substituting motels for it, but you know in the thing he quoted -- this Minister he doesn't want to teach any religion or Bible classes in school, you know what he quotes in that public document? He quotes a verse from the Bible. Here's the Minister that's saying let's not teach religion in schools. Now I'd like to deal with . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Health and Social Development on a point of privilege.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson has shown a lot of ignorance in this House. He should at least have the decency of reading my speech before trying to quote me. What I did say in my speech, and he doesn't have to take it from the press, I'll give him a copy of it. I said that I was in favour of the teaching of world religions under the public school system. If he can't accept that from me let him wait till he sees Hansard . . . stop being a bigot.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the point is well taken. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson, I think that the point is well taken. A member stands in his place in this House and states that he said a certain thing, another honourable member must accept it. The Honourable Member for Thompson,

MR. BOROWSKI: Who's arguing, Mr. Speaker? If he makes the statement I accept it, I will have to wait to see Hansard but in the meantime I accept his statement. I'm not arguing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I deal further with the man-monkey theory that's being taught in our schools which . . .

MR. BILTON: . . . on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I don't think the Minister of Health and Welfare intended it, but he did call the Honourable Member for Thompson a bigot and I would hope he would withdraw it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister, same point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Member for Swan River is trying to be helpful but I don't think he is actually in this case because my understanding was that the member, the Minister of Health was suggesting that the Member for Thompson not be whatever it was and really did not, did not in fact indicate that he thought he was putting it in -- the negative desire is not a definitive accusation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, Darwin's theory of evolution and I think that perhaps some members that have gone to school a long time ago should go back to it because one of the things that --(Interjection)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I must of course accept the opinion of the First Minister but I wonder if the Minister of Health and Welfare would clarify what is in my mind, and that is, that he suggested that the honourable member should not be a bigot.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm sorry I can't hear what the Honourable Member for Swan River has said. Will he speak into his microphone please.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the Honourable the First Minister had to say but my interpretation as to what the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare had to say in his comments he concluded by saying, that the Honourable Member for Thompson should not be a bigot and I'm sure he didn't intend the Honourable Member for Thompson to be classified as a bigot and should he not withdraw it in your opinion, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order. The person that has the right to do that would be the Honourable Member for Thompson, and the Honourable Member for Thompson accepted the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, and surely to goodness the Honourable Member for Swan River who occupied the Chair as Speaker of this House should well know that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: My thoughts are simply to maintain the decorum of this House and that was all I was attempting to do and I don't intend to be chastised by the Minister of Labour.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order. The Honourable Member for Thompson, and I have allowed for the minutes that have been taken out, you have five minutes.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for Swan River for sticking up for me. I accept the explanation of the First Minister not the Health Minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the theory of evolution: I know to the intellectuals to talk about evolution is like talking socialism to the Chamber of Commerce but I'm going to do it nevertheless. It may penetrate some thick skull and one of the things that Darwin says, that his theory of evolution is meaningless unless certain things occur, certain things had to be found. You know by the time he died, Mr. Speaker, none of those things had been found in his lifetime. They have not been found since. There have been some findings and on these findings, Mr. Speaker, the whole foundation of evolution has been built. And I'd like to read, Mr. Speaker, the foundation on which they're teaching in our schools, and I think that some members of this House may be shocked that it is based on fraud, part of it anyway. I am reading from a book called: "Original Sin", Page 34. "The Piltdown man was a case of pure fraud in which leading English scientists were involved. Charles Dawson in an article in the Manchester Guardian announced that a human skull with a mandible in all respects like that of an ape except that the teeth were worn in the same manner as human teeth had been found by men working in a gravel pit at Piltdown. Subsequently a number of primitive tools and fossil bones of various extinct animals were found in the same place by Teilhard de Chardin" -- that is the one that I mentioned regarding another bill here -- "a French Jesuit student who was studying at the Jesuit College at Hastings. The claim was made by Dawson, who died in 1916, to have found the missing link. It was published in every country in the world and was used by evolutionists for over 40 years as evidence for the theory of human evolution. In 1953 the truth leaked out that the Piltdown man was a case of forgery. Evolutionists became alarmed and decided to disown the Piltdown man now that the facts were known to a large number of people. Experts, all of whom

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) were evolutionists, were called in to do the work of disowning. In the account of their investigations made by them, which they published, they admitted what was already known that the mandible which was that of an ape did not belong to the skull for the skull was several thousand years old while the mandible of the ape was a fresh specimen only a few years old. The experts admitted also that the mandible had been stained to give appearance of age and that the teeth had been filed to give them the appearance of human teeth - the fraud consisting chiefly of removing the human mandible and substituting the apes." Now this may seem insignificant except, Mr. Speaker, that this very thing is still in the books on evolution today. And this has been proven not by the church but by science itself as being fraud. The other one has to do with the Peking man like the Piltdown man is a case of fraud but of a different kind.

The following is a brief statement of the facts of the case. "After some preliminary investigation by various experts which began as early as 1912, Dr. Davidson Black an American surgeon in 1926 obtained a grant of about \$20,000 from the Rockefeller Institute for the purpose of carrying out excavations at a place called Choukoutien 37 miles from Peking. He put a native Chinese named Dr. Pei in charge of the excavation. Fossils or other objects of interest were to be brought to Peking for examination. The excavations consisted of removing thousands of tons of limestone which had fallen down from a limestone hill in a landslide that had occurred thousands of years ago when a portion of the fallen limestone had been removed, beneath it was discovered: (1) an enormous heap of ashes; (2) thousands of dressed stones which had been brought from a distance, presumably for the purpose of constructing lime kilns to burn the limestone; and (3) a number of skulls which probably were skulls of monkeys because fossil skulls of monkeys were found in abundance in the district. Dr. Black selected one of the skulls found in the ashes . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Churchill,

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of my colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is it the wish of the Assembly to grant leave to the Honourable Member for Thompson? --(Interjection)-- It has to be unanimous; there are noes therefore the question is out. The honourable member doesn't have the --(Interjection)-- Order please.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . at the completion of my remarks since the Minister says that I cannot have leave. Can I move an amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. I believe we indicated he had five minutes when the Honourable Deputy Chairman was in his seat. I indicated a little while ago that there was two minutes left to the honourable member. His time is completely used up now. The honourable member for - order please. The Honourable Member for Churchill,

MR. ASPER: On a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well the Honourable Member for Wolseley state his points of order.

MR. ASPER: Am I correct that the time, the 40 minutes is a precisely measured - is it precisely measured? --(Interjection)-- And there is no leeway available?

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill. --(Interjection)-- Order please. The Honourable Member for Churchill may proceed.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Well, Mr. Speaker, if we can get the House Leader to let me get the floor for a few minutes I'll see if I can shorten this up a little and maybe we can stop burning the midnight oil. And I harken back to the Roblin era, and I suppose he was the first that posed the conscience probing fact when he said that if you were entitled to the whole apple, then you should be entitled to a portion of that same apple. I believe that was close to what his famous quotation was and those of us who sat and heard him say that had quite a problem in quarreling with our conscience when he started to lead us through thorny paths of assistance to parochial schools. And in confessing at this late time of the night or early morning, I might say that as I one of the caucus at the time, I believe I was the last one that consented to accept the proposition that he had put before us. And it was with a smile when I listened to, I believe it was the Member for Birtle-Russell tonight, when he said how gallantly the party had followed Mr. Roblin when he led them into Shared Services. He dragged us through Shared Services I would say, Mr. Speaker, just as I would say the First Minister is taking his group or any other leader will have to unfortunately. And I suppose that they are going through the same thoughts that we did at that time, and after it was all over, and after our peers had - we had waited for the barbs and the spears to arrive, time passed and really nothing happened. Not because the program wasn't good enough but it was because people accepted it as far as I was concerned. And they were prepared as far as I was concerned, in their own mind to accept the theory that people are entitled to any portion of that apple; they were entitled to take a fair look at it.

It is only the fear of those 57-odd people in here who take a tug at their own hearts, or what they think is their own hearts, or their own fears possibly is a better word, their own fears; and we covered that up by saying it's our conscience that bothers us, or what we feel is right. But nine chances out of ten we're fighting with the ammunition that was used 80 years ago, or 50 years ago, or in the Twenties, and that is just as obsolete as the horse and buggy days in respect to the thinking today. And I suppose I've used that type of argument in many a thing that I have tried to protect, but I say when people use these types of arguments on this resolution they are in fact flogging a dead horse and they're certainly swimming against the current.

I think when you look at education I think you have to accept it as an important part of our history and I think unlike the others, many of the others that have spoken, I believe that education today is no more important, Mr. Speaker, than it ever has been in the history of man. --(Interjection)-- Say that again. I don't believe education today is any more important than it ever has been at any time in the history of mankind. I also believe that along with education we have had religion as an important part of our history. Certainly both education and religion are generally considered important foundations of what is generally looked at as the new world. And this close association has been good for children, better than those who advocate no religion, the non-believers, and in fact those that advocate the withdrawal of the rules, of all the rules during off work hours. I believe that religion is good. And I believe that most of the people in the North American continent believe that religion is good. It's the very foundations of our life and there are a few that do not believe in religion today, they do not advocate it, and if they want to work against it that is up to them. But I believe that it is very important that those of us who still believe in religion must be prepared to stand up and fight for it just as strongly as those that would advocate that religion should take a second place to other things in this world. And I can't say that too strongly. I don't think we can leave it to the church, I think it's going too far, and I think once we start to admit that there is a position in this world, of our part of the world for non-believers, for atheists, then I think that we've got to make sure that we protect the armor which is the religion in our life. And I do not want to pretend to preach to you tonight, Mr. Speaker.

But I think parental control is important over our children's education but unfortunately that control has been eroded over the past number of years, and this is not necessarily the fault of the parents. The advent of TV, the use of the radio, the reading material, the loss of the control over the teacher, the school material, the shows at the local theatre, all too often take away the basics that are taught at home. Certainly all of these things have many more hours of a day of control of a child than the parents themselves. Certainly the guidelines must be established early in life if we expect the children to get off on the right foot. This is always

(MR. BEARD cont'd) as it has been in the past and certainly nothing has changed this type of rule. I think many parents will feel that they want their children to have an education other than that that is offered by this public school system today. And certainly if the education follows the curriculum and the regulations laid down by the government, then how can we withhold funds from any school system that opens the door to the public. Once again the policy of the whole apple, Mr. Speaker; why can't we have part of the apple, why do we have to have the whole apple? If we licence a school and recognize its educational system, then it is our duty to pay a fair share of the cost. This is the part of the apple that we have to accept. We have to grow up.

But now I want to change. I want to refer to the reference paper, the blue book, the reference paper on select topics in education. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to refer to the whole thing but rather to the conclusion which lists the alternative approaches. And I think this is something that has been missed, or we are missing it, because Page 88, and we're discussing everything but what is being offered as far as the committee is concerned, or the proposal to have a committee after the House rises. We are saying that the Premier is wrong, that he waffled, that he should have brought a bill in, and I somehow remember in speaking to one of the reporters at one time I think I said, that it would be unfortunate if this is what would happen - and this was well before the House, before March - and this is what did happen. But I was just going back and reviewing in my own mind what had happened when Mr. Roblin came in with all the good intentions just as our Leader of the Government has today, and he found resistance from every quarter. It's a hard pill to swallow when you know you are working for a very small minority of people, and this is something that somebody doesn't want to grasp, and I think we in opposition often get off in a tangent of politics or use something that's politics rather than ease the burden, and that's the name of the game as far as politics are concerned possibly. But on Page 88 it starts out "The committee field of inquiry could include a number of alternative approaches". And I believe this is very important because this opens the field, Mr. Speaker, to not only those that are for assistance to aid to alternative school systems, or private school systems, or parochial school systems, or whatever you may wish to call it, for those that are for it and those that are against it, but it is also for those that want a change in the public school system, and I would hope that they would listen again to the four conclusions that are arrived at. First of all of course is the retention of existing Shared Service arrangements, or variations of them. Second was the alternative forms of government support to private schools. Third, an expanded concept of public education that would embrace diverse programs to meet a variety of needs and really find relationships among the Provincial Government school divisions in all eligible elementary and secondary schools in Manitoba. Fourth a combination of the above. I believe this gives you some idea of the scope that they could have.

I heard the little birdie from Charleswood, I think it was, chirping that I would have something for the Port of Churchill. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can find easier ways than this to do it. --(Interjection)-- If I'm going to trade my vote it's going to be for quite a price.

But surely this does not indicate the single approach to one problem, Mr. Speaker. It opens our public and private school system for review by the taxpayer, the professional teacher, members of school boards, and all other interested Manitobans. I believe the resolution offers all an opportunity to support their own views on what policy should be used in our Manitoba school system. And you know, Mr. Speaker, this even offers the opportunity for people like maybe the MLA for Charleswood to get up and say, I don't want anything changed, or maybe he may decide he wants something changed. Maybe he doesn't like the way the principals are elected to his school. Maybe he doesn't like his school board but it gives him a chance to air his views where they're going to be heard. --(Interjection)-- And he won't even have to sell his vote, Mr. Speaker, he won't even have to sell his vote, all he'll have to do is get somebody to write a speech for him and then he can deliver it to this committee that is going to sit after the session. And then he'll be able to get others in the Conservative Party and his friends, if he has any, and the Liberals, and people from the New Democratic Party, but people from all over Manitoba, because there'll be many that will have various points of view, not only on whether it should be aid to alternative school systems but the very problems that we have in the public school system, in the high school system of this province. And I imagine there are a lot of people that would like to get something off their chest in respect to the school system, and this is a wonderful way for them to do it. And this is a good sounding board that they haven't got. Certainly they can go to their own school boards and say something, but there are policies that are started by the

(MR. BEARD cont'd) Provincial Government that their own school board hasn't got any control over. Maybe they want a change in the Teachers Society; maybe they think that there is something wrong with that; maybe they would like to pat them on the back. There'll be ways of doing that because they'll be able to talk and they'll be able to be heard by the news media, and if they've got a factual case I'm sure they'll be recorded. Certainly they'll be heard by the Department of Education, and that after all is the name of the game. If they've got a good case they'll have a place in which they can sound off, in which they can be heard, but more than anything it's fair. It's fair to many and all people in the Province of Manitoba. I think it's a wonderful opportunity.

Certainly we've had a lot of complaints about the Department of Education. We've heard a lot from those of us on the opposition side, and I think this was a good opportunity to carry on the debate. Granted it would be a one-sided one but that's a wonderful chance to say it and I think that if there is a valid case to be made, then it's a good opportunity once again for somebody to get up and make a case for assistance for the people that are operating the private schools, the alternative school systems in the Province of Manitoba. It's an opportunity for those that think the public school system should be opened up for new, different types of approaches to our educational system. There may be ideas for new and different types of schools in the Province of Manitoba, and certainly there will be those that will want to talk about the different types of schools that are already operating outside of the regular public schools that we commonly refer to when we think of education.

At this time I would like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Mr. Schreyer be amended by deleting all the words in the last paragraph and the preamble and the operative part of the motion, and substitute the following

"Therefore be it resolved that this Special Committee of the Legislature be appointed to consider the advisability of granting to the private, parochial and independent schools the foundation grant as presently described in the Public School Act, or its equivalent in the future, and any other special grants that the Provincial Government provides for elementary and secondary education from time to time.

"Be it further resolved that this Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in the recess after prorogation and to submit a report with recommendations to a special session of the Legislature to be called at the end of this year."

MR. PAULLEY: I haven't had the opportunity of reading the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Churchill but I listened with a great deal of attention to his proposition and I question whether or not it is in order because as I listened to the Honourable Member for Churchill he made certain propositions insofar as the preamble of the resolution, then he went on to indicate some consideration insofar as grants was concerned and then was positive in the calling of a special session of the Assembly before the end of this year. Now just today I believe that we ruled out of order a similar resolution by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. Now I believe that it is a well-established rule of parliamentary procedure that if one part of a resolution is imperfect, or not correct, that rules out the resolution as a whole. If I am wrong, and again, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity of reading the exact resolution, then if I am wrong I stand to be corrected, but it does seem to me as I listened to the proposal of my honourable friend that on the basis of the resolution that was proposed by the, and the decision made at this Session, proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that this resolution is out of order insofar as calling a special session of the Legislature for this year.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Swan River wish to speak to the point.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the expression of opinion given by the Honourable the Leader of the House. I wonder if we could take a five minute recess in order that he could read the proposal put forward and probably give an opinion from that point on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may continue now that I have the resolution before me. It is in two parts, one part dealing with the instructions to the committee which I believe, Sir, may be in order, and that part of the resolution says: Therefore Be It Resolved that this Special Committee of the Legislature be appointed to consider the advisability of etc., etc. But, Mr. Speaker, the resolution does not content itself with that. It goes on with a further resolve without any question of advisability at all for consideration: Be It Further Resolved that this Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation; and to submit a report

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) with recommendations to - and here is the key, Mr. Speaker, here is the key of where the resolution is not in order in my opinion - submit a report to a special session of the Legislature to be called at the end of this year. Mr. Speaker, a ruling was made the other day in respect of a similar resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage which was ruled out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On the resolution as I have it here, in the second "further resolved" there is advisability of sitting during the present session and recess thereafter, but I would concur with the Honourable Minister of Labour that it does refer to a special session of the Legislature; it does not say "the advisability of" and I must concur with him that this calls for a message from His Honour and consequently I must rule the amendment out of order.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I'm sorry but since you -- could I ask permission to change the wording to "the advisability of sitting during the present session".

MR. SPEAKER: It wouldn't make any -- I do not wish to debate this question with the honourable member. It wouldn't make any difference because the message from His Honour, you can't ask for advisability of having a message from him, it's just out of the question.

The floor is open. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, if I were a wise man I probably wouldn't speak on this resolution and if I were wiser still I would probably support the opposite side from that which I hold; that way I wouldn't alienate anybody. However I didn't speak on the resolution when it was the resolution which was before the House in 1970 on aid and therefore I would like to --(Interjection)-- At any other time, I'd take the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Morris but I have listened to a great many of his speeches and I have never accepted them as read.

The Member for Churchill interpreted the resolution before us in a rather wide fashion and I would simply like to state my interpretation of the resolution as I read the resolution. The parameters in it are quite narrow and it seems to me from reading it that the committee that is appointed can only recommend one of a number of varieties of aid to separate schools. Now whether we call them aid or use some other term they still in effect give aid to separate schools. And I don't think I could support an amendment which would broaden the resolution because the thrust would be the same. If you take the context, the circumstances from which this resolution developed, the thrust is very clear; it's an attempt to give some sort of aid to separate schools and I would think that almost inevitably any committee that is appointed will recommend some form of aid.

Now this resolution and the events which led up to it has caused some rather emotional public fights and has caused a great deal of soul-searching on the part of some members of this House. Some members are voting on this resolution according to their consciences; some on this side are voting for the resolution out of loyalty to the Premier - and I think they have good reason for this loyalty to the Premier; they're voting for the resolution out of the loyalty to the Premier even though they may oppose the concept of aid to separate schools; they're on the horns of a dilemma and I really can't blame them for the choice that they make and I would make no attempt to blame them. I've had to fight conflicting loyalties myself; on the one hand I would very much like to support the Premier to vote for this resolution by which he is trying to wipe out what he considers to be a terrible injustice - it's been called 80 years of injustice. The Premier did with Bill 13 - pardon me, Bill 113 - wipe out one of the two Acts of 1890 which threatened the existence of the Franco Manitoban community, which then of course was a minority in Manitoba. However in my view with the passage of that bill the Franco Manitoban community is no longer -- the viability, the existence of this community is no longer really threatened - and if one looks at this House, the Franco Manitoban community certainly has assumed, I would say, a rather leading role, a very active role, so I would say that the original problem no longer exists.

I can also say that I feel sympathy for the plight of some of my constituents who feel that they are compelled to send their children to private schools and who have to suffer financial hardship because of their religious beliefs. Now the Honourable Member for Churchill pointed out the fact that we should adopt a generous attitude, and some people have said that when making public policies it was to err on the side of generosity. On the other hand, I am convinced in my own deepest conscience and judgment that public aid is the wrong public policy and it's the wrong thing for the people of Manitoba. And I would quote very briefly from Edmund Burke,

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) Edmund Burke in 1774 stated to his constituents and I quote; he is referring to a representative: "His unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man or to any set of men living. Your representative owes you not his industry alone but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion". And this is the position that I have adopted on this issue.

I think it's important to concentrate on the question of desirability of aid rather than constitutionality and most speakers tonight have concentrated on that, and I would like to point out a few facts about desirability. Over the past 80 years there has been consistent opposition to public aid and there is a consistent constitutional usage - 80 years of usage - to support this. The present state of public opinion would seem to be still opposed to public aid. Some members of the NDP caucus for example polled their constituents and the overwhelming majority of those who responded were opposed. In the case of my own constituency the response was 4 to 1 against aid so it would seem that until some really scientific poll is done there is still a very strong public opposition to aid.

The Honourable Member for Inkster has made a further argument and I think it is a very valid one, that this Legislature has no mandate to deal with this question. No party, no individual here campaigned on the basis of supporting aid to private schools. I didn't, and I know of no other member who did. We have no mandate to bring this in. The Honourable Member for Lakeside for example mentioned the fact that he approached the First Minister and pointed out the fact that - this was some time ago when the government was in a minority position - that that would be an appropriate time to bring in aid. This was in effect an attempt to sneak aid in the back door without having to submit the question to the people, and that sort of policy I couldn't approve. In my view responsible government doesn't include referendums, but it does include the necessity of mandates; otherwise you have a situation where people don't have an opportunity of influencing government and they acquire a distrust of politicians and government.

I'd like to state relatively briefly some of my basic reasons for opposing aid, and they arise I guess out of my background and out of my experience as a teacher. My basic objection is that I don't like, I would not be prepared to approve the public expenditure of money to place a student within a closed system. I think that the public school system for all its imperfections - and some members have referred to imperfections in the system - none of us who oppose aid maintain that the public school system is perfect. As a teacher who taught ten years I would be a fool to say that the public school system is perfect, I know that there are many imperfections. However the public school system is basically an open system which is designed to give the child an intellectual training which will develop his critical abilities so that he is capable when he grows up of making moral choices.

Now, several members mentioned the importance of developing a code of morality, and I agree with them that it is vitally important that we produce individuals who have a code of morality; but to develop a competent and a good code of morality you have to have a foundation - and to me, for me, the role of the public school system is to provide that foundation. Several members have referred to the fact that the public school system produces people who are cast from the same mold or it produces a dull kind of uniformity. I think all you have to do is look at this Legislature. I would imagine that most members here --(Interjection)-- it's late in the session. I would imagine that most members here are products of the public school system and if anybody can say that this group is one of dull uniformity he should be committed very quickly, because it's very obvious that one thing that this Legislature does have is a pretty interesting variety of people.

Now I have never questioned the right of private schools to operate and this is not the question. I support the right of private schools to operate and I think those who think similarly to me, or at least in some way similarly, have expressed the same viewpoint; that's not the problem. What I do object to is one of the aspects that has developed in our society which is pointed out by John Porter in *The Vertical Mosaic*. One of the things he points out is the fact that when you look at the elite in the political system, in the civil service and in the business world there is a very strong preponderance of people in the elite who were produced from private schools - I'm not talking about parochial schools, I'm talking about a certain elite group of private schools like Pickering College, Upper Canada College, Lower Canada College in Ontario and Quebec and perhaps St. John's Ravenscourt in Winnipeg --(Interjection)-- Pardon? --(Interjection)-- From Ravenscourt? I said perhaps, I don't have any statistics on St. John's

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) Ravenscourt but certainly Porter had statistics on the number of graduates from these elite private schools who were members of the elite groups in this country.

Now, if we extended public aid - and the suggestions that have been made would mean extending aid to these schools - this would mean that they would give additional privileges and additional advantages over to this group of students who already have an advantage over the graduates of the public school system. And I personally could never --(Interjection)-- they have the advantage for a number of reasons, family background, business connections which they acquire through attending these elite private schools. Now, there is something to be said for preserving some schools only loosely connected with the public school system on the grounds that this will produce initiative, experiment and diversity of education types and I have never opposed this. However, there is nothing to be said for the public financing of schools whose distinct characteristic is that they are recruited almost exclusively from the children of parents whose incomes are higher than those of their neighbours. This sort of system is unfair to the children and it's injurious to society. Children learn from each other, through informal contacts far more than they learn from even the best teacher who teaches them, and anybody who's taught in a public school system I am sure will agree with me. Children learn far more from contact with their classmates than they ever do from teachers who are presumably, according to some members opposite, teaching Godless atheism or evolution.

One of the problems of extending aid is that it will inevitably lead to 100 percent aid and the Premier, for example, has given a number of options in his resolution, one of which is 25 percent aid I believe on the Saskatchewan-Alberta models, and the immediate response of the Honourable Member for Thompson is to ask for 100 percent aid, and I think this illustrates my point as well as anything. If 25 percent aid is given this won't solve the problem, the schools that receive 25 percent aid will simply press for more later until they get parity with the public school system, and as the Honourable Member for Inkster pointed out, they would probably press for this out of a sense of injustice.

When private schools do get 100 percent aid the public will be placed in a very peculiar position, and that is that they will be financing a privileged position for the private schools, because invariably when the private schools get a 100 percent aid the parents, the alumni, the supporters of the school will enrich the budget. They will pump additional funds - because they are already pumping funds into these schools, they'll pump additional funds into these private schools and the public will be placed in the position of financing the placing of public schools in an inferior position to private schools.

Some members have mentioned the fact that of course there is rising opposition to increasing education expenditures and of course one of the great opponents of these rising education costs is the Member for Rhineland. Now inevitably public aid is going to increase educational costs. --(Interjection)-- I would like to be shown that it wouldn't. Perhaps the committee can produce this documentation. I think that inevitably there will be -- the initial cost would be an additional four and a half million for full aid to the private schools, perhaps less a million or so for 25 percent aid. Once some aid is granted there will be pressure for capital funds. I think this is inevitable. For example, the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation pointed out the fact that some private schools have inferior facilities to those of the public schools. This will require capital funds being infused into the private schools in order to bring up their facilities. There are practical problems involved. The Premier's position has been that aid should be restricted to presently existing private schools. You run into certain practical problems. What happens if one of these private schools establishes campuses or branches in different parts of a city or in different parts of the province? Do you grant aid to those branches? What if a school starts out with an enrollment of 200 and wants to expand? There is usually a natural expansion of enrollment. Do you limit the aid to the 200 or do you allow for an expansion up to 500, a thousand, two thousand, three thousand? At what point do you draw the line on expansion of this present school system?

There are certain injustices involved in limiting aid to existing schools and I think these have already been discussed at some length but I'd like to point out just a couple once again. It gives preferences to some religious organizations over others; it, for example, gives financial support to those denominations, those groups in society whether they're churches or non-churches who happen to have schools now. It doesn't support groups in society that don't have schools right now; it doesn't support the expansion or the existence of their particular faith or ideology.

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) Some citizens I'm sure will feel that their beliefs are being violated because they're required to pay tax money to support a religious belief which they don't accept.

I think that there inevitably is some danger to religious freedom. Now the Member for Inkster has dealt with this on numerous occasions. I think perhaps that he overplays the danger; I happen to think that Canadian society in most cases is quite moderate in its actions. It never reaches the heights that American society may reach but it never sinks to the depths that American society may sink. --(Interjection)-- I'm almost finished. The danger would be that under our system of responsible government, the whole system is geared to make the government accountable for the money it spends, and the Honourable Member from Rhineland should understand this well because he is one who is very keen on making the government account for every penny it spends, except for reports. Inevitably the government if it grants money will want to exert some control over that money. Now that may not happen immediately but it will develop I think inevitably. I think this is the nature of the institution that we have and I think that private schools would have the greatest freedom if they would forego aid.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I've already been too long I realize, I'd like to simply read the statement of the New Democratic Party in 1965 on this issue, and I think it's as good a statement as can be made for my point of view: "It's the collective responsibility of all citizens to provide for the education of our children. No person is relieved of this responsibility because he disagrees with the program or because he makes no use of it. I do not believe that the school system supported by the public should be used to teach people what to believe. I believe that it is to the ultimate advantage of all beliefs and faiths that the State neither interferes with nor supports any of them. By attempting to place such matters into the category of State responsibility, the principle that such groups must have complete freedom of expression will be endangered rather than fortified. The church and the home must share the responsibility for the spiritual development of the child."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not even going to apologize for getting up at this hour. I don't know that it will make much difference if we leave this Chamber at 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the morning since we've decided to go through and finish our business at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to support the Premier on this question. I don't have as strong a view on this issue as some other members; I am certainly open to compromise. In fact I have a vested interest in State aid to parochial schools since all of my children who are in the school system -- and there are three of them, and there will be a fourth in two years -- are in the parochial school system and it takes a fairly substantial portion of my budget to finance this so certainly I have a personal interest in extended aid to parochial schools.

Mr. Speaker, I could also go on to say that my experience with the parochial school system has been a very positive one in that both myself, and particularly my wife, have been extremely active in the parochial school that our children have attended and have been given an opportunity of involvement which is far greater than I think is available through a public school system. So I have both a positive experience to the parochial system and certainly a vested interest in extension of aid. So that I would like to be able to for these reason support the Premier, but for reasons which I shall indicate I am unable to do so.

I want to deal with a few of the comments made by some of the members. I want to say first that since I agree with almost everything the Member for St. Matthews has said I won't touch on ground which he already covered. Many members have spoken on this resolution; the Minister of Education, the Minister of Health, the Member for Churchill, and I think others have all indicated that what they would like to see happen through the special committee would be an examination of the possibility of the incorporation of various subjects into the public school system. The Minister of Health mentioned comparative religious studies; the Member for Churchill mentioned that this would give an opportunity for school board members, for teachers, for parents and so forth to express their criticisms or suggestions with regard to the public schools or other matters; the Minister of Education thought that this would give an opportunity to find ways of incorporating religion in the public schools; and if that were true I would have a much easier time supporting this resolution if I thought that that were really possible.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have to here simply emphasize the point that the Member for St. Matthews was raising and that is given the context in which this resolution comes to us, given the pressure of time which there will be to deal with this matter according to the reference of

(MR. GONICK cont'd) the resolution, it seems to me to be very clear that these matters could be dealt with, and perhaps they could be dealt with even easier if the resolution were amended and I was giving some thought to amending it myself. Nevertheless, I think that these matters would be thrust aside as being matters which could be dealt with sometime in the future, and the urgent matter, the one which I think is the main matter of contention, which is public support to the parochial school system in one form or another would be the one that will be dealt with and the other ones will be pushed aside for some future discussions. And were I not convinced that I would myself have placed an amendment to this resolution to allow for freer, broader discussion of the general problem of education including many subjects, and I had given very serious consideration to bringing forth such a resolution,

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I was impressed, as I always am with the arguments of the Member for Inkster, though in some instances less impressed after some thought with some matters, some arguments, and I want to express some differences with him and then distinguish my own position. A major contention of the Member for Inkster, and one which I think the Member for St. Matthews was also repeating, was a notion that an education financed by the State should not teach dogma, should not teach us what to think but how to think. Mr. Speaker, I would like it if that were possible, but it seems to me that there has never been such a thing as a value-free school system; and furthermore I don't think there ever could be a value-free school system; nor do I think that it is even desirable which is I think the way in which my position differs from the Member for Inkster. I think that schools are necessarily ideological in the sense that they reflect usually prevailing ideas of how things are, how they got to be that way and why it's best for all concerned that they remain that way. And if you examine the textbooks, if you examine what teachers talk about you'll find that over-all, with all kinds of exceptions to be sure, the ideas of competition, of free enterprise, of the profit system are all assumed to be right and just and effective and the way things should be. Rich people are rich because they work harder or because they're more intelligent. Democracy means voting every three or four years and everyone is as equally influenced on what happens regardless of their wealth. These are assumptions which are expressed in a school system. It doesn't surprise me that they are expressed in the school system, they have been expressed in the school system for a hundred years and they are certainly anything but value free. They express a definite sense of values, they're not religious values in the narrow sense of the term, but certainly are values which are pushed onto students in any number of ways and it's not only in the textbooks, and it's not only in what teachers talk about, it's the way schools are governed. The competition for grades, the prizes that are rewarded to students for learning well, the whole way in which the school is structured, where you have students at the bottom of the rung; you've got teachers who instruct them, and you've got principals who rule above all, where students are taught to obey. You have a kind of undemocratic system functioning in which students learn obedience so that they can work well into the world of work where they will also be placed in that situation of obeying instructions of their bosses and working according to how they're told to work. I know there are exceptions to this. I think these exceptions are rare overall, but it seems to me that if we look at the school system, whether they're religious schools or not, this kind of a dogma exists and it's a kind of social dogma of competition.

Where in Manitoba are the principles of co-operation taught, are the principles of say trade unionism taught? In fact in my experience students are basically taught to fear trade unions and to despise work - I mean blue collar work, work with their hands - and hope to escape that kind of work if that's what their parents or fathers and mothers -- kind of work that they did. And where are classes run co-operatively without competition for grades, where students work together, to learn together, without competing against each other, and helping each other rather than working against each other? Where are the principles of socialism taught anywhere in Manitoba except to ridicule them? Mr. Speaker, there are any number of other instances where you can show that through the public school system there is dogma. The girls are taught to be nurses, boys are taught to be doctors; the men are encouraged to become executives; the girls are encouraged to become secretaries; the girls are in home economics, the boys are in engineering. --(Interjection)-- Well I know that that accords to the views of the Member for Rhineland, it doesn't surprise me, but I am suggesting that this is a particular creed and it doesn't surprise me that it is taught in the public school system. Now I don't think we should strive for value-free schools; I don't think that's possible; I don't think that schools can be neutral in a value sense. The only question to my mind is which values should be taught?

(MR. GONICK cont'd) What kind of behaviour should be encouraged, competition or co-operation? And this disagreement I have with the Member for Inkster doesn't mean that I therefore would support state aid for private schools or parochial schools, whether they be religious schools, or socialist schools, or teaching of any other creed, it means that now that we have a social democratic party in government, I think it is obliged to thoroughly examine what is being taught in the schools, in terms of assumptions, in terms of values, and how these things are being taught, and make some effort to change these things. That doesn't mean over-running the schools in any short period of time because I realize of course that isn't possible nor desirable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to another major assumption of the Member for Inkster, which I also want to disagree with, and that is that if we allow all cultures to come together, or all ethnic backgrounds, all religious groups to come together in the public school system and we try to incorporate them in the public school system and nurture them, and so forth, that this will aid, assist in the preservation, contribute to the preservation of the ethnic mosaic that is Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that is possible either, I think that's the Utopian dream. I don't think it will ever happen; I don't think it has happened. I think that the public school system creates common values, and I don't argue against public schools for that reason, and the common culture, by it's very nature it is a melting pot, and I don't believe it can be otherwise, and an hour or two a week of a foreign language or looking at world religions, I don't think is going to change that very much.

I understand, I think, what the goals of the Catholic groups, or Jewish groups, or Socialist groups for that matter, would be in what they would like to see happen in the separate distinct setting, and that is a different atmosphere, different songs, different holidays, different heroes and heroines, a different interpretation of what happened in the past, a different commitment - a commitment to a different set of values. I think I know what is aimed for --(Interjection)-- I don't say it's bad at all, but what I am saying is that I don't think that that should occur at public expense. I think that if people want to preserve these things, and I encourage them to do so, they should put their time into it, their energy into it, and I think they'll do a better job in doing what they want to achieve in that way than having it financed through State funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the arguments that I do think are important for me - the one mentioned by the Member for St. Matthews - that this government, that this Legislature and this government has no mandate to bring in a program of this importance with all of its ramifications; and secondly the argument that the Member for Inkster made that all people do support public institutions, whether they be highways or parks or defence or firehalls or the police or public swimming pools, and if those people who provide their own facilities, whether they be security guards, their private camps, or their private swimming pools, nevertheless they're obligated to support the public facilities, and without getting any rebate, and they don't consider themselves to be double taxed; and that if we allow this for our schools, for people who finance private schools, who come to us and say they want a discount, they want a rebate for this because they're being unfairly treated, then we'll have to say, if we are going to be consistent, to those people who say that I am providing my own swimming facilities for my family and I'll never use the public swimming pools, therefore I want a discount on the amount of money that goes to support the public swimming pool and all other public facilities, including the police, I will have my own private guards, I don't need the public police, we'd have to listen to them seriously to be consistent. I think what this does if we accept it at this point is threaten the whole concept that people are taxed in common to support common facilities, common services. And I think that once we break away as the resolution would lead to, as the principle of aid to parochial schools, private schools would lead to, we'd have to re-examine the whole principle of public taxation and the financing of common services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface talked about inequality; that this was a problem for him that some students in the province attend the public school and get much better education in terms of the amount of dollars that go into their education, whereas kids in the same neighbourhood who go to parochial schools get a lesser quality, or quantity, of education in terms of money and that inequality and equity is a problem. And I mumbled or made some gestures to him, which he didn't understand, and I didn't blame him really for not understanding what I was meaning that if inequity was really the problem, there are much bigger areas of inequity in education, if that is the main issue then the inequity is between public schools and private schools. And I'd like to illustrate some of these.

(MR. GONICK cont'd) .

If we look at the education of our native people, particularly young people, according to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood less than eight percent of Indian students achieved Grade 12 standing in 1971/72, compared with 72 percent of other Manitoba students, and the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood has projected this into the future and they would say that by 1980 unless something radical occurs to alter these projections that less than 11 percent of Indian students will have achieved Grade 12 education by 1980, compared to 90 percent for other Manitobans. Now here is a matter of gross inequity if that is a major concern in terms of educational opportunities, in terms of where we'd want to have an input of public money to correct that kind of injustice - to me an injustice which is at least as great as any injustice that could be made for say the Catholic population, if one even accepts the notion that there is an injustice there.

If we examine even the inequity which exists in education between rural areas in the province and urban areas - they're gross, they're enormous, and they're growing, and they have grown even with the advent of this government. In 1967 if you took the difference between the lowest and the highest expenditures of school divisions in Manitoba, in 1967 the difference was \$150.00 per pupil per year between the lowest expenditure per pupil in the poorest school division as compared to the richest school division. Today the difference is close to \$400.00, the difference per pupil - more than double than it was five years ago. So that the per pupil expenditure gap in education has grown and continues to grow, so that children in the richest school divisions, which are the urban, urban Winnipeg and suburbs, are getting a much better education, much better quality education than children in the poorer school division in the rural parts of the province and the northern parts of the province. And this gap is no accident; it's built into the way in which our foundation program operates - and I do not want to get into the detail of that - but if inequity is a matter which we should be dealing with, and I think it is, this to me is far more urgent and deserves greater priority than the inequity or the injustices which have been raised in respect to those people who are financing our parochial schools.

For example the instructional grants of the Foundation Program is really an incentive grant for hiring teachers of higher classifications and since the poorer school divisions are unable to pay the additional salaries required for these teachers, the relatively poor school divisions receive less instructional grants within the Foundation Program. For example if we take the five poorest school divisions in the province, these were also amongst those receiving the lowest per pupil instructional grant, if we just compare the Winnipeg School Division and their instructional grants within the Foundation Program, and that is most of the Foundation Program - and the Member for Emerson was talking about this, I think during the Estimates of the Department of Education - the Winnipeg School Division gets \$355.00 a teacher salary grant per pupil; Fort Garry would get \$323.00, almost the same; now Duck Mountain during the same period would get only \$276.00 of teacher salary grant. So the wealthiest school divisions are obviously being subsidized the most by this government even. The richest people in the province receive the greatest provincial assistance in their education; the poorest people receive the least assistance from the general welfare and the common revenue. So here is a gross inequity, if that's what we're concerned with, and had this committee been instructed to investigate and to suggest solutions to this kind of inequity, I would have been the first one to support it.

Now there are many other anomalies which we could examine even in the City of Winnipeg. Why are the schools in the poorest parts of the city in so much poorer condition, and that's obvious from the most superficial examination of the school. They're the oldest, they're the most dilapidated - you don't have rats running around the schools in River Heights but you have them running around in the core area of the city - they're the last ones to be torn down and replaced. We would never tolerate the condition of the schools in West Kildonan or River Heights that we allow in the City of Winnipeg. Now that should be a matter of concern to members. So, Mr. Speaker, if these were the subjects for investigation by a committee, I would not only be willing to support it, I would be willing to work very hard in the committee to deal with these kinds of questions.

Now there are other matters which are important, to me far more important than the question of aid to parochial schools which I find, you know, by any order of priority, sense of urgency, discussion of the general problems of education, the question which we are now focusing on, aid to parochial schools, is probably among the lowest in order of urgency and priority, but if we were dealing in order of urgency there are many other areas. The question of the budget, the budgets that are being allocated to education are skyrocketing. People are beginning

(MR. GONICK cont'd) to wonder whether or not all this spending is absolutely necessary and because of the post-war baby boom we have thousands of new classrooms which have been built and now that the school population is levelling off, there are empty classrooms. The Member for Thompson and others have mentioned that if the parochial school system broke down and all these kids had to be brought into the public schools, we'd have soaring costs, and I question that, and I think studies have been done, although I could be corrected, by the Department of Education which would indicate that most of the kids in the parochial schools could be absorbed in the public school system with very little additional cost because of the existence of excess capacity in the public schools at the present time. But there are all kinds of pressures for the multiple use of schools which we are barely beginning to take seriously. For example, there's the whole question of dental and medical services which could be provided for school children within the school system; would be I'm very certain the most efficient way of providing free dental and regular medical care for children, for people of school age. Hot lunch programs could be investigated. These are programs which would be particularly germane to children in the poorest parts of the province.

Some of the schools are being used for recreational purposes during after school hours, many are not. In many parts of the city recreational space and recreational programs are sorely inadequate. I think that investigation is needed to discover how the schools and the school grounds could be better used to meet this need, because with the kind of investment which we have in the schools, the plan to allow them to go unutilized for as many hours as they are, for as many months as they are unutilized, most of them during the summer period, is really very uneconomical. So we have to be thinking of these kinds of questions, and I would wish that this committee could be dealing with those kinds of questions, because there the Member for Churchill would be so right. We should be hearing from teachers, from principals, from school trustees, from students, from members of the community, from so-called experts on these kinds of questions and get a real dialogue over a period of time to discover ways and means of getting more value out of the education dollar.

Now, in the last few year the schools have begun using many expensive educational devices such as audiovisual aids, and the reference paper that the Premier has provided us demonstrates a concern that many of these very expensive tools are being used inadequately and ineffectively; because teachers have not been trained properly; because the parents don't understand the new concepts of new maths and so on. Here is an area where it surely requires investigation, the many new techniques, open classrooms, I don't know if they work. They're costly because schools have to be restructured. I think that this is something which we should be getting into. I don't know if these things should be left to the so-called experts. I think the members of the Legislature should be getting involved to find out what is happening really inside the school system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are so many other questions when we get into the area of education which one could legitimately and even urgently ask a Legislative Committee to examine over a period of time. There is the whole quality of education question. It seems ludicrous to me that children should be stuck in the schools for ten or twelve years of their lives within four walls, getting a kind of education which is cut off from the real world - a real ivory tower type of education - rather than spending time, time during the school day in factories and refineries, on farms, at the stock exchange, attending trade union meetings, attending meetings of business, boards of directors, finding out how the real world operates, spending time in courtrooms. Now I know this happens occasionally in some of the schools because I've received reports that this is occurring; but it's very uncommon at this point, it's still the exceptional situation. But it seems to me that that would provide a much more exciting kind of education to the bulk of our school children than the kind that they get listening to teachers and requiring to regurgitate their message for so many hours a day for so many days a year for so many years of their lives; it's just to me ludicrous that this is the content of most of the education which we impose on our children through the public school system and the parochial school system. They're equally bad in terms of quality as far as I'm concerned, and I've seen them both.

Well, there are so many other things we could consider in this topic. The reference paper provided by the Premier does mention, why not bring some more people into the schools; why not bring lawyers, doctors, scientists who are active in their own fields into the school to contribute on a voluntary basis? They'd be most generous I'm sure, and they would certainly make a major contribution to education. There are questions of what it means of using voluntary

(MR. GONICK cont'd) parents to provide support in the arts and music during lunch periods and so forth as a way of bringing down the cost of education and providing better quality.

Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker - I just want to deal with one other area, the quality of education. I've mentioned the grading system, the competition, the fact that students have little say in running the schools; it's a top down situation where students are taught to obey and are not given responsibility. But there's the question of what could be done with young people who I think most have a social conscience which is not utilized, is not tapped - the question of poverty, the question of pollution in their own areas. --(Interjection)-- I don't know what the member is referring to, but I'll just continue. Mr. Speaker, this social consciousness on the part of young people which exists is barely being tapped. I would like to find out from my young people in the school system what they could do, what they would like to do; and from their parents and from the communities, how they could be utilized, how they'd want to be utilized - and I'm sure that that would be a more meaningful part of their education than the kind of the content, the kind of boring repetitious content of the education which most students unfortunately still get despite the progress - and I admit that there has been progress in the public school system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on - I think I'm still at the tip of the iceberg when you come to the problems of the public school system, and I am one who wants to emphasize the problems of the public school system despite the position I take on parochial aid - and I think the reference paper would give us some assistance. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to have seen happen is not a legislative committee examining over three months whether we'll have this kind of aid to parochial schools or that kind of aid to parochial schools or a third kind of aid to parochial schools. I would like to have seen a committee of the Legislature, perhaps much the same as the Northern Task Force, which could include both members of the Legislature and others who would travel about the province; who would go into the school system, go into the communities, encourage briefs or discussions or dialogues with all people concerned; who would spend a great deal of time and energy and intensively go into these questions. I don't know exactly what concrete results would occur from this, but I know that the Northern Task Force came out with some concrete results which ended up in some good legislation and which is still being used as a guideline for the department. I think that that would be terribly worthwhile and I really hoped that during the early discussions of this resolution that the Premier or someone else would have produced - I had hoped that that would be the nature of the resolution, which might include also the question of aid to parochial schools as one of any number of questions to be looked at over a period of time sufficient to give a real opportunity to go into this matter in depth. But that is not the case, that is not the purpose of this committee.

So even to the - I know the Member for Osborne and myself last time this matter was discussed were particularly interested in free schools and community schools and independent schools outside the public school system, that these could be supported with public funds, and I even looked for this possibility in the terms of reference of the resolution but I couldn't find them. In fact just the opposite was the case because if you look at the terms of reference you find that aid would be provided to schools which would have existed for five years, at least five years, so it's not available to new schools; the schools would have to have at least 200 students; so it's not available to a smaller group which is really realistic. You're not going to get that many parents together who want to try a free school, a Montessori school in the first year; it's something which grows over time. So it rules out completely the prospect of giving assistance to non religious community type schools which I would have been interested in. So that all the things that I am interested in, all the questions I'd like to see pursued, the kind of aid which I would want to have seen perhaps provided, the only kind - and even this I'm re-evaluating as members can see - that the only kind of aid I was interested in the past which was aid to non religious schools outside the public school system, that is not provided in this resolution.

So, and after considering amending the resolution this way and that way - and I've spent many hours trying to devise a resolution which would amend it in such a way that I could support it because I wanted to support this resolution of the Premier in some amended form - I came to the conclusion - and I was urged by many people to do so both inside this Legislature and outside to find some way of amending it - I have come to the conclusion that because of the time pressure, because of the context in which this debate has arisen, because of the positions which have been publicly taken by both sides, that there was no amendment possible which would really get at the kinds of questions the Member for Churchill was asking for, the kinds of questions the Minister of Education was trying to get at, the kind of questions which the Member for Osborne

(MR. GONICK cont'd) I know was interested in; there's just no way of doing that in the time that is available in the context in which this resolution occurs. And therefore I know that whatever the resolution would say at this point, however broadly it would have been amended, the net result would have been some recommendation with respect to some kind of aid to existing religious schools and I can't - I just don't have any interest in that kind of reform,

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope I've made some contribution, I see the hour is now quarter to three, I know there are many other speakers who want to speak and I'm certainly prepared to listen to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well, I'll try to be short, Mr. Speaker. I think that I have to answer to one or two things that were said previously and give my views on some matters.

First of all I'd like to briefly refer to what the Minister for Public Works said, and if I'm correct he said that the private schools were for the rich and it was only the rich that could afford to send their children to private schools. Well let me tell him that he's very very wrong - and I think as far as the private schools in the country, he's as wrong as he could be because there's more poorer people sending their children to the private schools than those that are of means; it's a matter of conviction to these people, it's a matter of concern as to the type of training that their children get. And this is very important; this is No. 1. Otherwise what would be the purpose of having a private school? It's for this very reason that they are supporting the private schools and they're not just supporting it very lightly, they are making sacrifices to do it. --(Interjection)-- Yes if I can . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Is he aware of the fact that some private schools in Winnipeg have a tuition fee of \$1,500 and when you consider room and board that the costs for a student might be in the neighbourhood of some \$2,500 a year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I was making reference to the ones in rural Manitoba. I'm not familiar with all the ones in the city. You have the same disparities in the public school system, as was pointed out by the Member for Crescentwood, which vary to a very large degree of the cost and also the financial support given by the province.

One other statement that the Minister for Public Works made was that if this was passed that in future elections parties would be trying to outbid each other for increases. Well, if this is such a popular thing then I would agree, but it seems to me that the very reason that people or members are hesitant about supporting it is the very opposite - that it's not a popular thing, that it's a minority that wants it and that the majority is opposing it. How can he then make that statement? I can't put it - the reason really behind it, because it just doesn't add up in my opinion, Mr. Speaker.

I was just discussing before the matter, the concern that parents have for their children and for their children's training, and that this is their big concern and this is why they're willing to make the sacrifice - and a very large number I would say of the people in the country that are supporting these schools have very low incomes. I'm sure that many are working at minimum wage and that for them to provide the funds to have their children attend private schools is very very difficult. And as far as I know the schools that I am associated with are high schools. The children are attending the public schools at the elementary level, but when it comes to the high school education they send them to the private schools. And I think this is for a certain reason too; that while they are attending the public schools they are at home more of the time and they are under the parents care but as they grow older and attend high school they tend to be away from home more, and also they get to the larger centralized schools where you employ different types of teachers, whereas in the smaller school it's more a matter of local control and the local people have a greater say and a greater influence as to the teachers that are being employed. At least in my part of the country we still require that pupils respect their teachers, show respect for their teachers, and that the teacher be an example and certainly be one with high morals and teachers that will try and endeavour to do a job, and who are capable of making it interesting to the pupil so that he will want to study and he will want to go to school. This makes all the difference. And in this way I think you also have greater people involvement and this is one thing the resolution stresses, the involvement of people, and also parent involvement.

Mr. Speaker, one of the chief reasons I opposed centralization of schools when the divisions

(MR. FROESE cont'd) systems were brought in was for this very reason that I felt that as long as you had the more localized schools you had greater influence, the parents had greater influence, the people in community were more involved, and this all added up, and for that very reason I did not support the centralization to the extent that it is being practiced today, or in many areas, and I still feel that way, I haven't changed my mind about it because I believe that the teacher is the all-important; if you have the right teacher, a teacher who will do a good job, fits in with the community, they can do a much better job. In my opinion today in many of the larger centralized schools teaching, or education has become a business. It's not what it was in the old days. And too often I think as I heard a speaker on Sunday over the radio of a certain broadcast that since money is coming from the government that education is a matter of the state. Well, I certainly don't subscribe to this at all. This is wrong, this is basically wrong. Children belong to the parents and they should have the right to determine the kind of education the children should receive and --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Including the movies. Because I don't see what's wrong with that. I think also a lot depends upon the philosophy that the educators have and the textbooks that are being used in their schools today. Certainly education is not a neutral thing. If some people think that education is neutral, I think this is a myth that I certainly don't subscribe to, because whatever philosophy your teacher will have it will rub off on the children and no way can a teacher be teaching his pupils without instilling a certain belief in his children that he is teaching. There's no way this won't happen because. if I have certain convictions and stand for certain things, for certain principles, and if I'm teaching in a classroom, certainly this will be conveyed in one way or another to the pupils and they will accept this. And I think that if we refer to the scripture on the Old Testament which says in Proverbs 22 (6) to the effect that, "train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it". And I --(Interjection)-- Pardon? That's Proverbs 22 (6). --(Interjection)-- Well that's the King James version.

Through the public school system, Mr. Speaker - and I note that we have a new Speaker in the Chair - parents are surrendering a certain right to the professional educators. This cannot be helped, it's a natural development that we have experienced through the system through the years, and here again I must point out that so much again depends on the teacher in this respect. What does he represent? What kind of --(Interjection)-- because it rubs off on the children; I've pointed that out. --(Interjection)-- Yes, and that's very important, because if parents have a Christian home, try to educate their children in a Christian way at home, and then send them to a school where this is not furthered or where the very opposite takes place, certainly this will create disharmony in the home and it will not add to the child's education in the best way. And particularly those that have a strong faith in the Bible, in Christ, and if this is not recognized in the school, certainly it will not work to advantage. And we as people of this country, we call ourselves a Christian nation; we pride ourselves on being a Christian nation, and I think for that reason we should also make sure that we are living up to it and acting up to it.

In our Social Credit principles and objectives, the last one in the booklet, and I would like to read it. It has to do with the spiritual rarities and under this section, and I'm quoting now: "No nation can be truly great or permanently strong unless its people recognize and acknowledge the eternal deity, sovereignty and righteousness of God and his meritorious right to man's worship and allegiance. The voluntary acceptance of this individual and collective responsibility is basic to enduring progress and the dignity of man." I certainly subscribe to that. I feel that if we do not subscribe to this that society will degenerate and values will go down, and we will not be able to maintain the standards that we have in the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, I've met quite a number of people over the years and especially the last while. When you approach them they may say that they are opposed to aid to private schools but when you start questioning on what grounds, or what reasons, and you discuss the situation they turn around and they don't have any objection. I think it's a matter of educating to a large extent the people of this province and enlightening them on many of the things because we in this House have been discussing this from time to time and from all the various sides and aspects of it and we have come to know a lot of the things that are involved, but many of the people in this province haven't had that exchange and that discussion and therefore they may come out with the flat statement they're opposed; yet when you discuss it with them they really are not opposed to aid to the private schools. And certainly I as an individual of this House and a member of this House, I'm quite willing to stand up for aid to private schools regardless of the political

(MR. FROESE cont'd) consequences that it may have because I believe in it. I believe in the freedom that the people should have; I believe in the people if they have a certain belief, and believe in it strongly, and are willing to work for it and sacrifice for it, that they should be able to have this right.

There was - I forget who mentioned it - about democracy, certainly even in a democracy you have a hierarchy. This is true in the church because you have to have a certain group who will do the homework, who will learn, and who will take the time off to be well instructed, to be well learned in scripture, and so on, so that they can carry on a job, and they form the hierarchy of a church. We in our democratic system, what do we have, well we have a Cabinet here. They have the power, they have the controls, they are the hierarchy of our democratic system of government. And I think we must recognize this that in so many cases that you must have a hierarchy; you must have a group of people who will be in control even in a democracy.

The Member for - Oh, I forget the constituency - Matthews I think, mentioned that the pupils in private schools have all the advantage. Well let me tell him that this is far from the truth. The pupils attending private schools, at least the ones in the schools that I know, have to do with much less in the way of facilities than many of our public schools are having today. The public schools have much more in the way of facilities than the private schools have, and let me tell him that certainly the pupils in our private schools do not have an advantage over the public schools.

Another point that has been made is the matter of the furor of fragmentation of our public school system. I have no fear of that happening because the public school system has been built up, has been in existence for many years, and it certainly won't fragment overnight. If the private schools should be so much superior and even if they were given some aid, if they think that as a result of the little aid that they may get that the public school will fragment, then surely this is an admission that the public school system is operating very poorly, is poorly administered, and certainly leaves much to be desired. And if that is the case then I think we better take a good look into our public school system if that fear is there; it should never be there under the provincial administration that we have here and the amounts of money that are being spent on the public school system.

I do not want to spend too much time - I had more points that I could mention, but coming to the resolution before us I notice the different whereas in the resolution; the reference made to other provinces and their practices. The principle that was adopted by this House a few years ago, I felt definitely that by passage of that resolution at that time that the principle had been adopted and was being subscribed to; in fact, I had thought that because of that a bill could have been introduced and could have been dealt with in this House at this Session.

Going to the resolved part of the resolution reference is made to the paper that was distributed regarding greater community and parental involvement, and so on, then there is mention made of the Shared Services Program and the assistance presently being given and how it can be improved, and also other documentation and information that has from time been laid before the committee. So I really have no quarrel with the references made in the resolved part. Certainly my preference, as I have already stated, would have been that a bill would be placed before the House and that we could have dealt with it right here and now and gone ahead, but if it is felt, and if the House agrees, that further study should be given before we implement such a program and also get the views of the people in this province as to what their wishes are, and in what way and in what manner aid should be given, because if a bill had been introduced certainly this would have to be incorporated in the bill as to how it should be administered. And probably these were some difficulties that were there that for that reason the bill might not have been introduced, I don't know. But anyway, I will not object to the resolution; I will support it. However I would have liked to have seen it happen much sooner. I would also have given support to the amendment which is not before us now, that we could have dealt with this matter in a special session this fall rather than to delay it to the next regular session, because in the regular session we have so much business to conduct that very often things are left to the latter part of the session, and for that reason I think a special session would in my opinion have been a preference to leaving it to a general session.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I think I've given my viewpoint. I had a good many other points that I could have dwelt on but that will suffice for the moment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that I feel rather impelled to indicate

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) my views at this time. I will endeavour to be brief so as not to inflict what obviously is redundancy in argument that had probably been better made at a more rational hour. I do in approaching the question, Mr. Speaker, recognize that there have been some very excellent contributions to the debate even this evening, despite the lateness or the early hour. But I approach this problem, or the question that's involved in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, not necessarily in the cold hard crystal pure logic that perhaps some members would prefer to deal with the question, and I do so in all humility because in much of life and in much of the systems of man I don't find reflected the pure clear logical construction. This institution, for example, the institution of Parliament, the institution of many of our systems I find difficult to rationalize in very concise logical terms. Systems have grown, societies evolved - and when we talk about the evolution of society, our society has changed.

The Honourable Minister of Education who is reflecting on some other thoughts at the moment, drew to our attention that the Public Schools Act was evolved in a different era, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that when I joined the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation many many years ago I was motivated not by finding within the principles enunciated by that political party, and latterly the New Democratic Party, the kind of program for the development of institutions for man that necessarily I equated with, but what threw me into the concern for political systems in society was the humanitarian concern that was the over-riding attitude I found in the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. The people who espoused those views were motivated in large part by the concern of the well-being of their fellowman in society.

So I admit to the human frailty that I have in approaching this question in a very careful, logical and precise way. I have been torn emotionally on both sides of this question. I find it difficult to necessarily weigh all of the pros and cons of a particular course of action. I feel impelled by suggestions of inequity, yet on the other hand is there any basic injustice that people who want to receive extra educational nourishment in some form should not pay for it? I am concerned that any very serious attempt to enlarge the sphere of private schools would diffuse the pressures that exist within our society for a more effective public school system. I know of people who are concerned with what they see as weaknesses in the public school system and they have withdrawn their children and placed them in private schools because of what they consider to be an inadequacy in the public school system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it should be possible within our society to so adapt the public school system that we won't have those pressures for diffusion. I would regret a diminution of the strength of the public school system. I don't think anyone in this Chamber wants to see that occur. We approach this question from our own particular views; some have very strong black and white views on this question. I am much more indifferent to the pressures in respect to this question. Our society has changed, and I suppose I've mellowed with it on this question. When I first joined the CCF, Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, to suggest -- I heard a "shame" over there. Well, of course, I'll forgive it at this late hour of the morning -- for anyone to suggest in the 1930s, the 1940s, that we would have in the world society Roman Catholic priests leading poor people, peasants, in armed insurrection in defiance of organized authoritarian government, I just couldn't believe it; I wouldn't accept it. So our institutions aren't the same, the public school system needn't be forever the same. Surely we have the capacity to change that system to reflect not only the majority needs but the minority needs as well. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are those who will argue, well reform of the public school system - and we've heard it in this Chamber - is a governmental question why do you need to bother with a resolution, the government can go ahead and do that. And I think the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell said words to that effect.

But what this resolution does contain within it is --(Interjection)-- in the Resolved portion - is that --(Interjection)-- well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I've been very tolerant of the Honourable Member for Morris, particularly latterly when he was elsewhere than in this House, and I stayed here and suffered through and I wouldn't mind him suffering through just a few more minutes with me. --(Interjection)-- Well, when he says suffering with a smile on his face, I don't feel so bad, Mr. Speaker. But I won't be diverted. The resolution does provide for an analysis of technique to permit the integration of private and parochial schools into the public school system. The reference papers indicate the nature of the progress in respect to some of that. And I suggest that the committee will be able to come up with proposals for variations in the public school system to permit that integration to take place, and it's with that in view and with a faith in the committee being able to come up with realistic proposals that I support this resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's 3:15 in the morning. We've had a number of speeches and I want to make a contribution and I'm happy that I have - well, if the Honourable Minister of Labour will allow me to, and I hope he will allow me, I think we've been rather lenient in the way we've simply allowed people to make a presentation. I hope the same courtesies will be given to me by the House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy in a very real sense that I have prepared notes that I'm going to be referring to to a large extent, because I think at 3:15 it's rather appropriate that I refer to prepared notes and I think in this way I will be able to put in perspective not only my position but a great deal of what has been said already. And I listened with interest to the words of the Honourable Member for Thompson when he talked about an injustice as old as the problem of the Indian. I listened to his remarks about the awkward position that he and many others are put in as a result of the resolution that is before us. I listened with interest to the statements of the Honourable Member from St. Matthews and the Honourable Member from Crescentwood about the question of no mandate with respect to the New Democratic Party, and I was very happy for the contribution that the Honourable Attorney-General made to the debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, the question of support of private and non-secular schools is, as we all know, as old in this province as the province itself. The social attitude, the ideas and the dogmas which relate to this question are so intertwined with our history that it is no longer easy to separate cause from effect or even fact from fiction.

The question has plagued the history of this province, people of good will have wrestled with it for over a hundred years. It has divided us on racial lines and on religious lines; it has often been a device of force. All of this can be said and understood and agreed with without taking sides on the issue. I hope too that we can agree that honest people of good will have attempted to resolve this question for the last ten years; and can we not also agree that honest people of good will are trying here in this province and in this House to resolve the question today. And finally, surely we must agree and acknowledge that our views on the method of solution vary and fall into three groups. There are those who would resolve the problem by opposing all aid. Opposing them are those who insist that justice will not be done until aid in major and in considerable form is provided. And the third group, Mr. Speaker, and I am one of these, seeks compromise, and to express my view, Mr. Speaker, I must depart from the narrow confines of the issue for a few moments, and discuss it from the broader perspective of our own history and our political philosophy. And I do so without apology. The issue now so much a part of our history and our society should first be seen from these broader perspectives. And, Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear to you and to all here present, that if I seem critical at times of the current plan, I'm critical only of the ideas and not of those who hold them. I know that many hold their beliefs with passion and emotion, and we all must know that beliefs so dearly held are honestly held. And of course we know that we do not all agree one with another on this delicate and dangerous question. Notwithstanding the emotions and passions which this question raises, let us all attempt to restrain our language and to respect the honesty with which our opponents' views are held.

And just to put what follows in proper context, I want to, Mr. Speaker, reiterate my personal attitude toward the question. My personal position on further aid to separate schools has been stated repeatedly. It was declared by me during the leadership campaign of the Progressive Conservative Party in 1971 and was again declared during the debate on the Honourable Member from Rhineland's 1970 financial assistance resolution. Mr. Speaker, it must be understood that the Progressive Conservative Party has no position other than the shared services policy introduced by Duff Roblin in 1964, and which we still believe provides the best basis for the solution of the aid problem.

On August 13, 1970, in this House, on the Honourable Member for Rhineland's resolution, I stated as follows, and I want to quote what I said in Hansard, what is contained in the Hansard: "I would like to indicate to the House my reasons for supporting the motion in its amended form. Mr. Speaker, we live in Manitoba and in Canada in a pluralistic society, and I speak as one who belongs to a minority group. We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, in passing this resolution, to move one step forward in the correction of an historical injustice to a minority in this province. Minorities ought not to be oppressed by majorities, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that parents should have the choice of sending their children to a public or parochial school without the need or threat of double taxation."

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I still believe that progress can be made in the area of extending the shared services concept. The government itself should be applying its energies to developing an enlarged shared services policy in keeping with the modern flexibility of curricula and teaching techniques, rather than making vague declarations which arouse unjustified hope among supporters of the separate school system.

However, Mr. Speaker, we are not debating the issue today. Instead we are supposed to be dealing with the Premier's resolution and we will do so knowing full well that we are actually being asked to preserve a political life raft which the Premier has used to navigate the stormy seas of his own disunited party. The tensions which surfaced at the New Democratic Party Brandon Convention and culminated in the fiasco of threats, withdrawals and resignations this spring have thrust this absurd resolution on to the Order Paper. --(Interjection)-- Afterwards, Mr. Speaker. It is my view and it is the view of my party that a political party can represent citizens of all categories. A party can represent at one time the wealthy, the poor and those of the middle income; it can represent citizens of all and diverse religious beliefs; it can represent people from rural areas and urban areas, people of all racial or ethnic origins. There is no need for class or division, there can be community. Mr. Speaker, we have never sought, and while I am leader we will never seek a coalition of certain groups or classes or categories of people to form a power base from which to govern and impose our will on others. It is the essence of our political philosophy that we seek always to unify and not to divide. We will never go to the business people of this province and ask them to support us in a battle against labour, and we will never go to the disadvantaged and demand support in order to wring more taxes from the middle income or the rich. We will never go to those with one mother tongue or one religion to seek coalition against those of another religion or ethnic group. We believe that the true essence of democracy lies in finding those compromises which will produce harmony in the community and we believe that until compromise and agreement can be found, divided opinion on matters of conscience and belief should be left to mature or change without the irritation of public intervention or the aggravation of political activity.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps these beliefs, the beliefs that we hold set us apart from other parties. Perhaps they are well founded or perhaps they are not. We claim no exclusive franchise on truth. They are however our beliefs. It was on the basis of such beliefs some seven or eight years ago that our party took the first small step towards compromise on this old and vexed question. Shared services meant little in economic terms but in terms of progress towards community harmony it meant a great deal. And the resolution before us correctly notes that the slow but useful steps which followed, some school districts went beyond shared services to more effective forms of financial and social co-operation. Such communities found and enjoy less division than before. Democracy did not collapse; individual freedom was not restricted; there were few if any complaints. The possibility of compromise, respect and understanding was demonstrated and, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba grew a little, and ask the people in Brandon. It is true surely as the resolution notes that success was far from perfect as some communities found compromises, disparities occurred between communities. But after almost 100 years, Mr. Speaker, some thousands of Manitobans in many communities improved their understanding and tolerance for each other quietly, locally and satisfactorily. And, Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be progress. Imperfect perhaps because it is not province-wide, but progress where it occurred and precedents are usually followed where results are satisfactory. The delicate fabric of shared services was re-enforced a little by such local initiatives. Time was slowly providing an answer. One could honestly conclude that a new initiative towards more general provincial assistance could find support. Some of the passion and some of the emotion was fading from the argument and the fact noted in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan and Alberta had devised province-wide formulae was also encouraging to those who sought compromise.

Mr. Speaker, it was at this point about a year ago that the First Minister made an error in judgment and let us not judge him too harshly. His beliefs are honest beliefs. I suppose that he sought only to accelerate what he saw as slow progress. I suppose that he believed he would find enough support to take the next major step, some form of provincial-wide financial assistance. But, Mr. Speaker, he was obviously wrong. We know now that he lacked the support of some of his colleagues. Instead of a step forward he has created a confrontation, an angry public confrontation in the press and later in this House. The old wounds were cut with the rasp of angry

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) rhetoric, charges and countercharges were made, there were resignations and rumours of resignations, confrontations, alliances and cliques confounded him. And now each day each of us, Mr. Speaker, receives letters and calls demanding drastic action one way or the other. The question has become again a political nightmare. The limited progress we have made those last eight years is threatened and the possibility of further compromise is lost for the time being. We are set back ten full years, Mr. Speaker, to 1962 and this is not progress. Well, Mr. Speaker, what now? We are back to 1962. We are now searching through numbers and names and histories for the answers to questions which really don't matter. We are stalling and fumbling and at this time there is nothing else we can do. We do not govern the emotions or passions of others. We do not control their beliefs. The community, Mr. Speaker, is divided and our discussion only emphasizes the division. The government cannot bring in a bill. We cannot consider a bill which does not exist. We cannot ignore the question, it has been loosed to plague our community again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking back at the origins of this resolution, recognizing that the Premier could not present a bill from the government as was requested by a resolution of the Legislature passed in 1970, I would imagine that the Premier was faced with a choice between two alternatives. He could have proposed to submit the entire aid question to thorough genuine and impartial study or he could have formulated an official policy and presented it to this Assembly as a government bill. The unhappy fact, Mr. Speaker, is that he chose neither alternative. His political dilemma was that he could not reconcile his public declaration with the known attitudes of his caucus. He has painted himself into a corner, a corner from which he is trying to emerge by means of this resolution. But just in case the Member for Inkster did not make the matter clear, this resolution is a political gamble which must ultimately fail.

Now let us examine for a moment the two alternatives rejected by the Premier. The most courageous of the two, namely a clear announcement of government policy is well established in precedent. It is the method chosen by the Roblin government to bring about ahred services in 1964. The contrast between the Roblin method and the Schreyer method is striking. Speaking on the introduction of his aid proposal, Duff Roblin said and I quote: "We deem it advisable and necessary that at the very earliest opportunity" and this is it, "you should be informed of the exact nature of this proposal. Not only is complete and accurate knowledge the essential basis for sound judgment, but when a measure is proposed which is likely to affect sensitive areas of a body politic as concerning fundamentals, it is incumbent upon the sponsor to declare his policies and his reasons". Now I want to repeat those last words: "it is incumbent upon the sponsore to declare his policies and his reasons". Duff Roblin was under no illusion that he could manufacture an artificial consensus through the use of subterfuge. He revealed as much when he said, and I quote: "I am not so foolish as to expect universal approval for what we suggest". Mr. Speaker, he showed the responsibility that a leader of government is required to discharge. The essential difference between the Roblin approach and the Schreyer approach is therefore this. The Roblin government announced its policy before establishing a committee to finalize the details, while the Schreyer government has proposed a committee to determine whether it is expedient to announce a policy which is currently accepted by only a portion of the government members.

The other choice spurned by the Premier was to establish a genuinely wide-ranging study committee. The Premier and some of his sympathizers may deny this charge but no one who has read the terms of reference for his proposed committee will believe the denial. These terms of references are obviously designed to make a favourable vote appear to be approval in principle for whatever aid policy the Premier may subsequently introduce. This really is the crucial challenge posed by the Premier's resolution. We in this Assembly must not be manoeuvred into ratifying a measure we have not even seen. To do so, to do so and to permit this would be to deny the tradition of the Prime Ministerial responsibility and to hamstring the efforts of the committee. We must remember that regardless of the impression that the Premier and some of the honourable members opposite are trying to create, a vote on this resolution expresses no position on aid to separate schools either in principle or in practice. Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that point. A vote for the resolution cannot be interpreted as a vote for increased aid nor can a negative vote be interpreted as a vote for reduced aid. Only when the Premier introduces a specific and detailed policy, backs that policy with the authority of his government and submits it to this Assembly can we as members actually contribute to the solution of the aid problem. Constitutionally we have no other choice, we will not issue

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) blank cheques to any government especially one so disunited as the present government.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with profound regret and with despair after having wrestled with one of the most difficult decisions I've had to make in political life, I conclude that I must oppose this resolution. This resolution is a thinly disguised declaration of a policy which the Premier hopes members of other parties will endorse because an insufficient number of his colleagues support it. The Premier hopes to have his position validated without his ever having to announce it. He wants to say to the supporters of aid, I have always been with you, I have even been willing to resign to further your cause - and yet he also wants to tell opponents of aid it was with the will of the Legislature, free of party restrictions to establish the committee, and it was the decision of the committee within its terms of reference to recommend such and such a scheme of aid, while I am regrettably bound by the wishes of the Legislature and the recommendations of the committee, I bear no personal responsibility for the policy they have chosen. The fact that the Premier has policy on aid to separate schools is revealed by the contents of the reference paper. The fact that he has not the courage to implement such a policy is revealed by this resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, we cannot condone such duplicity.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, approximately in the last 60 seconds the Leader of the Opposition was - I'm not quite sure, attempting to quote me. What source was he quoting me from when he was stating that I would say that I was being bound with regret, I was bound by some decision of the Legislature, etc. I'd like to know what source he's quoting from or is he attempting to sort of make a prognosis of what I might say at some future date, in which case he better make it clear that that's what he's doing.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe he was expressing an opinion.

MR. SCHREYER: Well no he was attempting to say . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I assume it was a clear to you as it was to everyone else what I was attempting to do. Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The Leader of the Opposition was not speaking for himself, he was either quoting or attempting to paraphrase something I allegedly had said, or was he attempting to put words in my mouth as to what I might say at some future date? Let him make that clear.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: . . . the Leader of the Official Opposition would clarify his point?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, well let me make it clear in case it is misunderstood. Realistically I am for the purpose of debating explaining what I believe will be the position of the Premier with respect to both situations. I think that was clear and if it wasn't, I apologize to him. Certainly I'm not quoting him from any particular passage that he has expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the effect of the resolution represents false hopes not only to those who like the Member for Inkster oppose aid but also those who like myself support aid. In fact we do not even know whether the recommendations of the committee will be any more acceptable to the Premier's caucus than were his previous proposals and that, Mr. Speaker, is the basic futility of this resolution. As long as the Premier refuses or is unable to bring in a bill and the vote on this resolution will provide no guarantee but rather a proof of impossibility, we can have 100 committees and 100 recommendations and we'd be no further ahead than we were at the beginning of this session. It's for this reason that I cannot in conscience support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding I want to make one further point, if indeed this resolution is a portion of the government's education policy, and we are not prepared to grant that it is, it is but a minor part of the meaningful educational reform this province requires. Education policy has been an increasingly contentious issue in recent years mostly because of spiralling costs. We are deeply concerned about the cost aspect of the education problem but we are equally concerned that the government has failed to exercise sufficient initiative in making our primary and secondary systems more relevant to the society and to the individuals they serve. If we have two priorities in education they are firstly to introduce a degree of imagination and flexibility into our system which will permit it to better encourage our young people to learn, providing them with appropriate source of knowledge and assist them in adapting to the complex realities of modern society. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, the necessity of developing a program for native children in the core area of Winnipeg to teach them in their own language, to help them

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) out of the mess that society has placed them and their families in. To have ignored this problem as one of the top priorities in education is to admit sheer ignorance of a problem which has also plagued us for a hundred years and whose lack of solution is found in our provincial jails. You can produce a White Paper on corrections, as was done a few days ago, but that will not solve a basic priority question in education, that of educating our native children to cope with the problems they will encounter in modern society. Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier may I say, Mr. Premier you've had your priorities in education all mixed up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland. --(Interjection)-- Order please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I'm a plain and simple man and I have . . . hamburgers too. You know the flag on your right is red and white and that fern is green and the Member for Ste. Rose is partially bald. I try and look at things the way they are, see them as they are, and I think there are two issues facing us in this resolution. One of them is the issue that the resolution deals with and that's really state versus parental control of education. The second issue is a power play within the New Democratic Party. I intend to deal with both.

The Member for Inkster I think has stated that when one has a goal one should support any measure which leads towards that goal and I intend to do that.

I'd like to start by reading into the record, because I think it's worth reading into the record, a letter that appeared on the Tribune today that deals with the issue of school aid and goes this way. "The issue at hand is not aid to non-public schools whether religion oriented or not, it is an issue that concerns human rights; the right to educate belongs to parents, and they have a right and freedom to implement this education in any way they choose. The issue then is compounded with justice to children and their parents; just so long as we permit the issue to be wrongly stated as it has been, just so long shall we delay the advent of justice.

"The basic idea behind the so-called public school system must be conviction and acceptance thereof that the education of children in primary and secondary schools shall be at the expense of society as a whole. The educational fund of every community raised through a so-called school tax is for the education of every child in the community, therefore every child in the community has an equity in the educational fund. To confiscate a child's equity because the child attends a school where religion is taught constitutes a penalty on account of religion. To confiscate a child's equity in the local educational fund for all children because that child attends a non-public school constitutes economic coercion in the direction of the public school in violation of the spirit of equity. A right that supposedly belongs equally to all ceases to become a right, and the exercise of it includes a penalty, and the penalty, the double school tax on parents who wish to exercise their right to send their children to a school of their choice other than a public school". And it is signed "Gerald Morrisette, Pine Falls, Manitoba".

The fundamental issue in education it seems, the issue that we are dealing with right now, is whether the State should control the education of the child or the parent should and the logical conclusion of stating that the State does is to end up with a monolithic and a totalitarian system that we have in communist nations. I suggest to the Member for Inkster that that is the normal, the rational conclusion to his argument. The only alternative is parental control of education, and I wish to state here that I regret, I regret that the resolution is couched in the terms in which it is, that it is, in my opinion, narrow, that -- the Member for Thompson says "ambiguous" -- and certainly it's very limited. I find myself very often surprised that I agree in as many things as I do with the Member for Crescentwood. I certainly agree with him that I would prefer it, as I think he would, if the resolution read something to the effect that the committee would be instructed to examine all the possibilities in education insofar as parental involvement and insofar as diversity is concerned.

I agree with him when he disagrees with the Member for Inkster, when he says that there is no such thing as a non-value educational system; there has to be some value, and the value of the public school system as it now exists is a rather materialistic, individualistic, value system which I think jars with the values of a great many people in our society. I again agree with him when he says that it's ridiculous to assume that the public school system in its monolithic approach can help to sustain or develop diversity. The only logical conclusion to the system we have is a melting pot and with the disappearance of those qualities which make us rich as a society.

Now, I said, Mr. Speaker, that I am a plain and simple man, and I intend to deal with the

(MR. ALLARD cont'd) other subject as plain and as simply as I can. I think it was Brutus who said - it's become fashionable to quote Shakespeare here - Brutus who said, "It is not that I love Caesar less but Rome more". It would seem to be the argument of the Member for Inkster. Mr. Speaker, I have some respect for Brutus. He was frank about what he was doing. He was an assassin, and an assassin is a treacherous murderer according to Webster. He was an assassin but he did not pretend not to be an assassin, and so I have respect for him in that measure. Certainly his name is passed down to history as one being less than perfectly admired by all of us but certainly I respected him for his honesty. It is interesting to note that we soon find Brutus leading a civil war on one of the sides, and when Brutus stated that it wasn't that he loved Caesar less but Rome more, his concern was with a leader who had somewhat of the qualities of a megalomaniac. He was a great man of heroic proportions, respected for those reasons, and he had done great things for Rome. If I remember correctly he brought great spoils back from the wars. Caesar felt that he was gaining too much power, that he was - or Brutus felt that Caesar was getting too much power, and getting to be ambitious, so he should be murdered, and Brutus joined in the endeavour. I want to kill no one; I'd like to state though that I believe that the Member for Inkster quoting Shakespeare well deserves to have these words of Brutus quoted to him, "It is not that I love Caesar less but Rome more" and I stated before the member came in, that I have some respect for Brutus in that respect that he accepted his role as an assassin.

Now I personally don't feel, I personally don't feel . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I suggest that the honourable member is making reference to me as having taken a position not because of that position, but because I am trying to destroy somebody or assassinate somebody. The position I took, I took in 1964 and 1965, and to impute that kind of motive, Mr. Speaker, is to demonstrate a baseness and lowness in debate as to demonstrate that the honourable member does not have an argument left, and I would ask him to withdraw that reference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if the Member for Inkster would listen carefully to what I had to say, that I was first stating an opinion, and secondly, that I was stating that Brutus when he did what he did, did so out of conviction that Caesar was ambitious and dangerous to the State, and that he did it out of honest motives, but that he stated that he accepted that those were his motives. I think . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that reference is beside the point. The fact is that I am talking about the issue of public aid to private schools; the honourable member suggests that I am using that issue for the purpose of attempting to assassinate somebody who is getting too much power. I suggest that that demonstrates a lowness, a baseness in debate which demonstrates that he has nothing left to say to argue for his position and therefore is resorting himself to an attempt at character assassination, and I would ask him to withdraw the reference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I made myself reasonably clear. I am not questioning the conviction of the member in terms of his position on schools. I am not questioning that any more than I question that Brutus was honest in his belief that he was saving the State. Now I don't deny that, but what I am saying is that Brutus did say "I am doing this" - he recognized his role for what it was. He did not pretend it was not so. That is what I'm saying; that is my opinion, and I'm stating it, and I don't deny the good faith of the member when he states his position on schools. What I am saying is what the logical result of his position is, that is my opinion and I state it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to further add that Brutus was dealing with what a great man, what a hero, but with a man who is seen by historians as possibly having been somewhat of a megalomaniac. I do not believe that the same epithet or the same name can be applied to the present Premier of this province. I said I was a simple man; I see that fern to be green; I see that flag to be red and white, and I said something about the head of the Member for Ste. Rose, and I also see, you know, that Maureen Horsman is very pretty. I just state things as they are, as I see them. Thank you.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, at five minutes to four I resist the temptation to read into the record the defense by Clarence Darrow of the theory of evolution in the Scopes Monkey Trial, however, the growls, Mr. Speaker, of the House Leader are inaudible to me and I'll ignore them. The unfortunate part of the end of this debate is that as we end it, and I hope we end it in a few minutes, is that the issue before the House has become obscured and I've looked at this resolution; I've psychoanalyzed it; I've put it under the microscope, and I'm unable to understand how so many of the contributions have been based on things that I'm unable to find in the resolution. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to establish a committee, to inquire into questions, that is a question of some public concern, the method of the delivery and handling of education, Sir. When this was first raised and the subject came up some months ago, I held a news conference in which, not being a member of the House, I stated the position that the Liberal Party would follow and that was that it would be treated as a free vote, and so it shall. What my colleague from Portage la Prairie was trying to say this afternoon is something that I think this House ought well to have taken notice of, when he suggested that he was going to support the committee because of his willingness to look into the question, but he was not prepared to permit the establishment of a committee, or the protraction of the timing of its report to become an issue before this House in the months before what normally is expected to be a general election at the end of the four years, or four and a quarter years of a government term. There is no stating that that will happen but what my colleague from Portage la Prairie was trying to say, and my sympathy, or rather a thought with which I sympathize, is that we are not prepared to permit this kind of debate, and we've seen in the past few hours and the past few weeks, this debate raise issues which divide people rather than unite them, and threaten the province with a very serious dislocation, so we will be saying that whatever happens when the committee reports the people who support the Premier's resolution tonight are looking to him that should this committee be established that it be his personal responsibility, his personal burden, to make certain that the affairs of my colleague from Portage la Prairie are not realized, because should that happen he carries a heavy weight on him, and should that happen people who will be supporting him tonight may very well find themselves forced for the unity of the province to withdraw that support at another time.

Now as I read the resolution, having been frightened into thinking several times during this debate that maybe I had misread it, this is not a resolution to grant or deny aid to private and parochial schools, it is a resolution to investigate an issue. To me, Mr. Speaker, there are two basic issues that the Premier draws to our attention, and two that are peripheral. The peripheral ones I dismiss; the peripheral ones being, should we grant aid, should we grant no aid, should we change the form of aid, and I stress that the vote, and I urge honourable members to adopt the view as I have, and as the Liberal Party has, that a vote as the Leader of the Official Opposition said earlier, a vote for the establishment of a committee can in no way be considered to be a vote to grant aid, and a vote against can in no way reasonably be construed, except by some who would be opportunistic, as a vote against aid but merely what I said before, that we who vote to establish this committee, those members who do, are simply saying that there is an issue that requires exploration. The real issue to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the First Minister has said that the present system isn't working and he documents his case, and I'm not going to engage in an analysis or evaluation of whether the First Minister has done his homework or presented his case well, but he says the present system isn't working and it therefore requires adjustment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The honourable member has tried to be fair and accurate so far in his remarks; I hope he doesn't spoil it. My point in rising is that I don't believe that I stressed that the present system wasn't working so much as that I stressed that there were to my mind very serious anomalies, unfair anomalies.

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

MR. ASPER: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. What I meant to say was that the present system of Shared Services is not working in the manner in which it was envisioned and that some are obtaining advantages under it, while others aren't, and that it therefore had anomalies in it. I didn't mean to if I misrepresented the First Minister's position but that's how I read what the First Minister has said for some several months now. At the same time the chief opponent of this resolution - if I may characterize him as such - the Member for Inkster makes precisely the same point, for very different reasons obviously, that the plan of Shared Services enacted

(MR. ASPER cont'd) in 1964 is not working as he would have thought it should have worked, as it thinks it was intended to work, but there's no difference between the two positions, both make the point that one way or the other for whatever reason it is not working as envisioned, or as they would like it to work, and so the First Minister proposes a resolution. And I think as you read the three key lines asking for a committee to explore methods whereby we can achieve greater community and parental involvement within the system, the public school system, who can quarrel with that? A program to consider the possibilities of integrating private schools into the public system - how can one quarrel with that? Or the advisability of revising the program of Shared Services when both the leading protagonists in this debate acknowledge that such is required, but for different reasons admittedly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when the opponents of aid to private schools make this their forum, I say it's the wrong forum. And when they say that the First Minister has let down his party because he's not in agreement with many members of his party; and when the supporters of aid, as opposed to the opponents, say that the First Minister has not been aiding his cause, I say that's an irrelevant issue. There is one issue. The First Minister of this province regardless of who he is, and what party he represents, perceives a problem, whether it's real or imagined cannot be ascertained; what he's entitled to, as of right, is an examination as an entitlement of office. So when the First Minister of this province says he perceives a problem he asks for it to be explored, he suggests solutions, it comes with no difficulty to the Leader of the Liberal Party to say, regardless of whether I agree with his perception, that he is entitled to have that problem resolved or studied at least.

And so the Liberal Party states that it is not afraid to focus attention on something that is thorny, that is controversial. We are not afraid to put under the microscope any problem that's confronting the community. And in stating that we will vote for the establishment of the committee proposed by the Premier, I again make our point very clear. I not only will be voting for it but urging all members to vote for it, reserving all of their rights to make their final positions after they have had the benefit of hearing the information that the committee receives, generates itself, researches, but in no way have we suggested that we are voting on aid to private and parochial schools here tonight. And while stating that the Liberal caucus is free to vote on this matter of religious, if it is religious, or conscience, I'm urging them and all members of the House to see this thing in the proper perspective. We are establishing a committee to explore a problem. We do not know what it will produce but certainly let's not be afraid, let's not fear to explore.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, at five minutes after four in the morning I want to participate in the debate and I was going to say that I probably would only be speaking to the Hansard workers and I was going to give them my felicitations and regards thinking only the persons listening to the Hansard recording would know what I was about to say; but I am pleased to note that even at this hour a large number of the members are present in the Chamber and are listening and participating in the debate.

I want also to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am happy that in the dying moments of this Session after having shared this Chamber with the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party for two weeks, I suppose or thereabouts, I am now in a position to compliment him on a speech, which privilege was denied to me until just in the last half hour. I felt that his presentation was both reasoned and well made and therefore one which I can endorse.

We've heard some pretty good speeches throughout this debate and not too much invective and as the Leader of the Official Opposition put earlier in the introductory remarks, without too much violence, or - he used nicer words because I think he had more time to plan them out, I mean more appropriate words, but I think the debate has been carried on on a fairly high level, so I may now lower the level somewhat by commenting on the speech made by the Leader of the Official Opposition which was really a very well put together speech and sounded very good. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it was a phony speech, and I think it was a phony speech because I heard the Leader say certain things which contradicted in my mind not only what he was saying but what I think was in the minds of his own caucus. I wonder how many noticed that he said "I am in favour of aid to private schools" and he said "we are in favour of a Shared Services Program as being the program, and to me he made a clear distinction, and if I am wrong I hope he'll correct me so at least that the Conservative Party will have a clear idea.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no misunderstanding on the part of the Honourable Minister of Finance, I indicated my own personal position, I indicated as well that the only position that the party has was a Shared Services Program and I indicated that that was the policy that was evolved in 1964 by Duff Roblin and has been the policy of the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite satisfied that the explanation just given is clear: The Conservative Party has not expressed an opinion on the question of aid to private schools. The Conservative Party has expressed a support for the Shared Services Program introduced in 1964 and the Leader of the Opposition in speaking about his support for aid to private schools talked about the fact that quietly over a period of time things have developed to the stage where they're working in the direction which he believes is the right direction, and therefore to me is a complete contradiction of a Shared Services Program.

I don't have the program before me, I don't have the resolution before me, but I do have some notes on the general principles enunciated in the resolution on Shared Services -- and this is not verbatim from the resolution as it is verbatim from what I said about it in 1964. (1) The separation of Church and State (2) The use of public funds for a single public school system. (3) The right to maintain private schools supported by private funds; and the fourth, Shared Services could only be acceptable if they are provided without detriment to the public school. Those are the four principles. And now, Mr. Speaker, I have to refer to my memory of eight years ago when it was clear in my mind, at least it is now, that at no time was there supposed to be any method whereby private schools would themselves be the beneficiaries of any public funds, but the students who attended private schools would be given the opportunity to take advantage of certain curriculum, certain classes in the public school system in order to relieve the private school system of the need to teach, let's say English or French or Mathematics, and it was clearly stated by Duff Roblin, who was quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, that it is not our intention in any way to aid the private school system but it was our intention to assist students who are attending. Because he said that was their right and he was standing very close to where I'm standing now and he said "that is their right, they have a right to go to a private school and demand certain services from them. It's the individual student's right."

Mr. Speaker, I'm convinced now that eight years ago the Shared Services Program was not designed to gradually, quietly, without too much fanfare evolve into the method whereby there would be some measure of aid to private schools. And I'm saying that in the presence of members of the political party, some of whom were present in 1964 during the debate and who

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) may find that my report is inaccurate. But I want to say that I believe there's a distinction between what the Leader of the Official Opposition believes and wants and what his other party members believe and want in relation to what we're dealing with. That's why I called it phony. And that's why I wonder why he says it's been set back ten years. Because if the Shared Services Program was clear in 1964, the Shared Services Program should have been clear in 65, 66, 67. There should not have been any need for a quiet, calm, gradual evolution to some goal. That is my dispute with what was said by the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard some pretty good speeches in this House. The Minister of Public Works I think made a very clear, concise statement. Other members did as well. I think the Member for Portage la Prairie made a very clear, concise, logical presentation, as did his Leader this morning.

Now some of the members chose to attack the Premier for his procedure and I for one cannot fault him at all. When Duff Roblin, who I believe was straining at the bit to do something to satisfy the demands made on him from private schools, when he started to work on this program he set up a committee, a legislative committee. I believe the Minister of Labour was a member of that committee at the time. I believe a member of the Liberal Party was a member of the committee. The committee met, I was not present, I think the - I'm sure that the committee was set up prior to my being in the Legislature. At least I was not involved in it. Though when the Shared Services Program came in it came in following the studies of that committee.

The Premier faced up to the fact that there was and has been a growing demand for certain types of aid and a growing rejection of the thought of aid and the Premier said, brought it out into the open, open for everyone to see; and now came to the Legislature and said let's study it and declared a free vote as everyone knows. The party, our party, did not have a policy, does not have a policy, did not agree to form a policy on the issue and declared it a free vote. And that to me was a healthy sign. And as indicated by the Leader of the Liberal Party this morning, he accepts that as being a healthy sign because that can be an opportunity for us to discuss the problem and hoped to arrive at a solution in a non-political sense in terms of sitting down as members of the Legislature in our individual capacities without political motivation in order to try to deal with the problem. And that problem, as mentioned by the Leader of the Liberal Party may well be an approach to some method which doesn't tie anybody in advance and which has been interpreted around this room as either you vote one way then you must commit yourself in that way; you vote the other way then you're obviously committed the other way. I don't like either to read things into what is before us to discuss. It's easy for people to whom everything is black or white. And, Mr. Speaker, I've been party to discussions on this matter for many years - many years preceding 1964, and in 1964 I spoke at some length on the Shared Services in this House - and I'd love to feel that I had the time and the attention of members of this Assembly so I could read to them Pages 1807 through to 1810, my entire speech, I'd love to do it but of course I wouldn't dare. Maybe members would be interested in reading it on their own. I notice it was April 13, 1964. I prepared that speech because I was so very much concerned. Now I've gone back to reread it to see whether I've matured or grown or learnt more; what's more important, have I changed my mind. And I must say I have not changed my mind in my general approach; and I won't quote it to any extent.

I said that we have a long way to go in our educational methods, but I am convinced that since education is a preparation for life in adult state we must work together to build and strengthen our educational system so that it will make it possible for us to share with each other the unique contribution that we can make based on a knowledge of the background of our own people. And I talk there rather at length about the fact that each of us Canadians has something to contribute to the Canadian social milieu which should be valuable each to the other. I feared then the thought that a complete separation in the educational process could be damaging to that effort that we ought to be making to learn about each other, appreciate each others background, know something about each others traditions. And at that time again I pleaded that we should look for some method whereby we could bring our children together rather than separate them. And I spoke then - well I said then, I had no particular faith in the feasibility of the Shared Services Program offered in the resolution, I believed it to be, and I'm quoting, "only a compromise to appease the conscience of those who think that minorities are being discriminated against and a compromise to appease the demands of those who claim discrimination." I felt then that Shared Services was not an answer, but I voted for the resolution because I felt that

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) an effort should be made somehow to bring together rather than to separate our children, the children of our neighbors. But I was much more concerned about the public school system, its preservation and its objective to educate in the broad sense, and I'd like again to quote from what I said then: "I would like to think that our educational system could be improved to the extent where within the public school system itself it could provide its pupils not only with the attitude, the truth and the knowledge which it is today imparting, but in addition, give to the children an understanding of and respect for the religions of all the peoples that make up our society and an understanding of and respect for the cultural, historical and traditional backgrounds of these same people.

"I would like to think that it were possible that our public school system would provide facilities after regular school hours for private ancillary schools to teach the students the languages of their own forefathers and even more important than the languages, the history, the tradition and the culture of their own people. And yet if the public school facilities are used in this way, all students are still members of the same public school and meet together during the school day in the common interest of furthering their education. This may be a dream but it is one for which I would like to feel that I would have company in attempting to make of it a reality."

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I have to express the regret that in the eight years that we have lived with shared services, and with the changes and the gradual evolution that the Leader of the Official Opposition described, some of it so quiet, some of it so unobtrusive as not having come to my attention until we came into government, my hopes were not achieved. I believe that there is a need to review the program offered in 1964. I believe there is a need to review the program as it is now and I also have to say that I am disappointed, --(Interjection)-- the honourable member wants a bill in order to vote it down. I am certain that the Member for Roblin wants to vote it down. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, if I didn't know, if I didn't know the Leader, --(Interjection)-- if I didn't know --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, if I didn't know the member --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, if I didn't know the Member for Roblin, if I didn't know the Member for Swan River, and if I didn't have some idea of what they believe then I might say that they might be prepared to enter into a discussion on this very question I've raised. Mr. Speaker, I haven't the slightest doubt that there's absolutely nothing that I could discuss with those two members involving any move, any change, any variation in their approach to this question. --(Interjection)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order. Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: I say that, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I have spent a number of years in this House with the honourable members. I have heard their points of view on issues of this nature. Now the Member for Riel has reacted violently to what I said, but I would never say that to him because I believe, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- if the Member for Riel has a question to ask courteously I'll listen to it.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it's not a question - it's a matter of privilege. Half of what the Minister has said regarding the shared services program is completely out of context.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wish I understood what the matter of privilege was, but since the Honourable Member for Riel couldn't possibly understand what he himself said in relation to privilege then I can ignore what he said because I yielded the seat when he wanted to ask a question. He would rather yell and yelp from his seat and he will have the privilege to yell as long as you, Mr. Speaker, give him that right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, to scream for a bill is a refusal I believe --(Interjection)-- -- the Member for Riel is still yelping. Was he sleeping for so long that now it is time for him to wake up and have his farina?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to a conclusion --(Interjection)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please gentlemen, it's 4:25 in the morning, I realize that the tempers are getting a bit frayed but I think that we would like to try and get the business of the House on the road. Let's try and just cool it a bit. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to conclude my remarks and I would like to think that I was so wrong in my judgment of the Member for Swan River and for Roblin as to think that they are prepared to discuss the problems that we have been discussing in connection with the resolution. Now in order to be able to discuss it with them, we have to have the opportunity to sit down and to discuss and we have to have an opportunity to hear reports and to find out whether the Honourable Member for Riel is right when he says that I have

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) not given the proper report on the concept. The fact is the Honourable Member for Riel, the Honourable Member for Riel only knows how to yell but he doesn't have much ability to discuss. He is still yelling, and having been the Minister of Education, he is the one, he is the one who was involved in the interpretation of a program and the carrying out and putting into writing a program which is somewhat different to the one I recognized at a time when the matter was debated when he was still in school teaching somebody and --(Interjection)-- and now he's yelling again, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the Honourable Member

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, gentlemen - and I say gentlemen. I wish - that I have said to you gentlemen, it's late; let's try and discuss this topic without any rancor, let's try and get the business of the House on the road. Order please. I am just as tired as anybody else in this House. Order. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I think I was trying to suggest to honourable members that if we sat around a table in a committee room here; if we heard representations made and not confined to the question of aid to private schools, but dealing with a system of education, dealing with the policy paper or whatever this paper is called, the reference paper - which I don't think is terribly well written but still has some ideas that are worthy of review - and deal with the general question raised in the resolution before us - which I don't think is that well drafted but still raises questions that are worthy of consideration - if we could do that in a rational manner without screaming and yelling; if we could do that in order to hear what people have to say, maybe, maybe we could make some progress in dealing with the general question of the future of the public school system and education in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there's one easy way and that is to defeat the resolution and stop the discussion amongst people elected to do the job. The other way, and the more difficult way for many of us is to have a committee appointed which can discuss this and report back and then see what they have to say because I still would like to think that there is a possibility that our public school system and the educational program in Manitoba can encompass within the various diverse backgrounds and faiths and beliefs and traditions of all of us so we can share somehow in each other's faith.

Now, the Leader of the Liberal Party read from the resolution, and I too mark almost the same words he did, and I can't fight - "the need, the advisability to consider and recommend on proposals submitted in the reference paper on options for greater community and parental involvement within the public school system and the advisability of revising the program of shared services."

Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg which comprises half the Province of Manitoba has through the years I believe, removed the parents - I mean the size has removed the parents further away from the public school system delivery of education than they were 40-50 years ago. I want to see them come back. I'd like to see a revival of the old parent-teacher and I blame parents and teachers for the fact that, it is my belief they have failed considerably. I would like to see a better relationship between the home and the school, and I'm not talking about a better relationship between the church and the school - and I don't think anybody else is really. Well, I shouldn't say anybody else - most are not - and the shared services program which the Conservatives say is still their program, clearly in the first principle separates the question of church and school.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside may have come late, but I must tell him that the very first principle in the resolution on shared services presented by Duff Roblin speaks of the separation of church and state - and I'm saying that it's the home and the school that I'd like to bring closer together. I'd like to study how it's done. The Member for Riel was Minister of Education, he must have some ideas that may be still worthy of consideration to send around; the Member for Lakeside certainly has ideas that are worth discussing. I would like an opportunity to do it not on a political confrontation basis but on an honest effort of all of us to do a job. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, and without too much hope and too much promise of anything really strong and really effective coming out of the study, I cannot refuse the suggestion that there be a study and therefore I intend to vote for the resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, at this hour of course I understand full well that nothing that I can say is likely to materially affect anyone's thinking on this matter and not likely to affect the outcome. Nevertheless, certain things have been said, some of which definitely do require some response if only to try once more to keep matters straight. And I would begin in

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) a sequential way with the Member for Lakeside who has made it quite clear over the years that he favours aid to private and parochial schools and made it clear to me two or three weeks ago when speaking on this resolution that he is now in a dilemma; he's not quite sure what to do, not sure whether to support this resolution because he is disappointed that there is nothing - because there isn't something more definitive with respect to aid to parochial schools.

Then we heard the Member for Riel say that he favours some concept of integration of schools that are non public at the present time, those that would voluntarily want to opt into some form of arrangement or relationship with the public school system, but because he has that particular priority or preference in mind, he does not want to support the resolution because it makes reference to other alternatives as well.

Then we have the Member from Fort Rouge who as I understood her believes that shared services is in effect aid to parochial schools. And as such it really makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether these three persons, these three members really should have any difficulty in supporting the resolution because the resolution it has been recognized - and I'm thankful to the Honourable the Member for Churchill, to the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party and others who have spoken, who have acknowledged and recognized the resolution as being perhaps not a very sophisticated but an honest attempt to try and bring forward something which can serve as a forum, as a basis for further exploration and analysis of options that might be open to us in which there would be sufficient measure of agreement upon which to proceed.

The Member from Portage la Prairie cautioned that while he is supporting this resolution, he certainly would not be in favour of any proposal which would be providing for a diversion of moneys needed to support the public school, a diversion by way of allocation of municipal tax dollars directly to separate schools. And I want to make it very clear that at no time has a proposal such as that been advocated by me or by anyone that I am aware of in this Chamber who has pleaded, earnestly pleaded for honourable members to agree to analyse and study the problems that exist at the present time, and to ask honourable members to agree to the establishment of a committee to see what options or alternatives we might wish to adopt. I'm not aware of anybody that has been advocating a system whereby municipal tax dollars would be diverted to separate school systems.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie, members of the Liberal Party, Members of the Independent Group, without exception I believe have indicated that they can find it possible, they are able to reason themselves without any difficulty to a position of support for a proposal here, a resolution which asks nothing more than that a number of alternatives be agreed upon for study and analysis in the hope that some consensus can be arrived at as to which of the alternatives would be most acceptable.

I of course was completely flabbergasted and I might say disgusted by the spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition in the way he has approached the resolution here this evening. I shouldn't be surprised, I certainly shouldn't be surprised because when I look at the 1970 Journals and I looked at the way in which honourable members voted on a resolution at that time with respect to aid to private and parochial schools, I notice that some members . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . consider the advisability of . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the honourable member interjected that because I can say in all candor that in 14 years in this Assembly and Parliament I am not aware that any member has been so cynical as to vote in favour of a motion --(Interjection)-- which he himself --(Interjection)-- no Mr. Speaker . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. GREEN: . . . but I never voted for something that I did not agree with. I never voted to consider something I didn't agree with.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. . . . to honourable members that only one person has the floor. The interjections are of no account unless the honourable member wishes to substantiate and get them on the record and have the permission of the member who is speaking and wishing to yield the floor. Let me also make it plain that at this late or early hour I do think that we should all consider whether we do want to get ourselves into a procedural wrangle as to what is the opinion of one member or the other. Let us allow the honourable member who has the floor to proceed.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that during the course of this debate I have not had to be reprimanded by the Chair on any occasion and I would hope that honourable members would want to conduct themselves likewise.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)

The point I was making, Mr. Speaker, is simply the imparting of my own experience, that of all honourable members that I have known in the past, that I do not believe that a single one of them has ever voted on a resolution advocating that a government consider the advisability of doing this or that unless they themselves were prepared to consider the advisability of doing this or that. Mr. Speaker, if that cannot stand up then it's a very sad commentary on the ethics with which we address ourselves to motions and issues here in this Chamber.

The Member for Rhineland has no problem. I don't believe that the Leader of the Liberal Party would have any problem or the Member for Portage la Prairie. That if they had voted at a given time for a motion that the government consider the advisability of doing something they were in effect letting it be known that they were supporting the concept which they were advocating that the government consider. --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't care if it was a government motion or a private member's motion or whatever, the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that there is some right to expect consistency, some right to expect that, otherwise matters can degenerate very quickly and one has no alternative but to get the very distinct impression that there is jockeying, manoeuvring going on, that the substance matters nothing. All is jockeying and manoeuvring. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm glad the Honourable Member for Swan River asked that because it would have been so simple to ask the very same kind of question in 1965. Why wasn't a bill brought in in 1964? And, Mr. Speaker, I daresay, I daresay that perhaps, perhaps there are some honourable members here, like the Member for Souris-Killarney, myself and one or two others who've been here too long, perhaps we are here too long and becoming too cynical. But I can say, Sir, and I have this distinct impression as well, that if I had proceeded to bring in a bill then the response would have been "why didn't you bring in a motion to establish a committee so we could have time to consider it in all its depth and breadth."

Mr. Speaker, I've heard that before. How could you possibly proceed with a bill in which there is no alternative, no options to consider but a specific limited proposal; in a matter of such sensitivity, of such potential divisiveness, how could you dare bring in a bill without giving us an opportunity to study it and analyze it at length. After all, after all did not former Premier Roblin in 1964 bring in a resolution to establish a committee. He didn't presume to proceed directly by way of legislation. I can just see it so clearly, Mr. Speaker; that would have been a Pavlovian response. It would have been a Pavlovian response. But now that there is a proposal here that there be a systematic method open to honourable members to consider, with sufficient time, the different alternatives that are open to us, the ones that are most likely to appeal to the required number, now there is some strange opposition to that.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said that in the last ten years there's been a genuine effort made to try to overcome some of the problems that existed in education relative to the non-public schools and their financial problems. He says, and I agree with him, that there are three groups, that there are basically three groups on this issue, the third group include those who are wishing to compromise and that he can consider himself to be one of those. Well if that be so, Mr. Speaker, I can only commend him, because I have to say in all candor that the only way in which this very thorny and persistent problem can be solved is by spirit of compromise. I don't care if one considers that to be weakness, Mr. Speaker. Weakness. What is weakness? In whose eyes is one weak and what really constitutes strength?

The Leader of the Opposition says that he is one of those who's willing to compromise. I say to him, so am I. And implicit in the resolution is the admission that there must be provision, room for compromise. That is it asking too much that consideration be given, that opportunity be given for consideration of various concepts in aid to parochial schools? Was I out of order in even allowing that into the resolution, Mr. Speaker? Well I refer again to the resolution passed in this House on the 13th of August. In light of that resolution it would have been in my opinion unwise and improper to exclude from the resolution even the possibility of having a committee look at it systematically. But I know full well that the probability is that it will be nigh impossible to get any kind of agreement let alone consensus on that avenue. And there is in the resolution reference then to alternatives which I really believe and I have come to the point where - my colleague made reference to felonious, I think I can in this context as well - I've come to the point where I really don't care anymore whether people regard it as being a valid and genuinely intended alternative or alternatives. But I know in my own mind that they are valid, legitimate, genuine and do offer meaningful prospect of coping with the problem

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) in a way which has greater prospect than insisting blindly and stubbornly on the basis of arguments of decades ago that there must be aid to parochial schools, no there cannot be aid to parochial schools. Well if we bog down on that, and I'm sure we will, there are I really believe valid alternatives, genuine ones which includes the revision of Shared Services so as to remove the anomalies that exist there, and they are offensive anomalies. I'm sure that the Leader of the Liberal Party appreciates that. And the other is integration.

The Member for Riel says - and I take him at his word - that he favours the concept of integration of non-public schools into the public school system. Obviously, I assume, on a voluntary basis. Mr. Speaker, that too is countenanced in the resolution. That too is countenanced in the resolution. So the Member for Riel should welcome the opportunity to vote for this resolution and to participate on the committee, or via one of his colleagues to participate on this committee.

It is said that the Presbytery of the United Church of Canada favours some concept of integration of the non-public schools on a voluntary basis without surrendering too much or any significant part of our public school system base as it now exists. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I ever gave anyone the impression that this was to my mind an unacceptable approach. I have said 50 times if I have said once that worthwhile, meaningful, valid alternatives to the resolution of 1970 that passed in this Chamber was the concept of revision of Shared Services and/or meaningful provision for the opportunity for voluntary integration into our public school system, Brandon, The Pas - shall I name them off? Sacred Heart, The Pas; St. Augustine, Brandon; St. Eugene, St. Vital; St. Marie Precious Blood, Norwood; Assumption, Transcona, Blessed Sacrement, Transcona, and so on.

All this has been evolving - I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that if I had been a little more sophisticated I would have just sat back and waited for things to evolve, to sort of muddle through like Topsy. And that's possible, because each year some schools were voluntarily integrating into the public school system, retaining by agreement with the school division boards some meaningful differentiation of parental committee, etc. And if enough years were allowed to transpire more and more schools would probably follow suit. But in the meantime we would have what I can only describe we would have in the interval, and that might last years, a situation in which many schools were being denied the opportunity of integrating or of availing themselves of Shared Services to the same extent as other schools in other areas or regions of the province. And if I were asked by anyone are there any problems in our school system, in our non-public school sector, I would have to say that there were, and there are, and it seems to be only right that some effort be made to do something about it.

The Leader of the Opposition of course couldn't help but seize this opportunity to say that I had erred in judgment. You know, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to accept that condemnation, that criticism, I believe I have to some extent erred in judgment, but I want my honourable friend to know that if I have, and I have, that certainly it is not without precedent. I mean would the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition want us to think that there was no error in judgment on the part of any predecessor in this office? Even on this same issue? Does he think that the way I've handled things that for the first time there is talk about divisiveness, splitting of groups and people being annoyed? I want to tell honourable members, especially those who were not here in the earlier part of the decades of the 1960s, that there are dossiers full of press reports and Hansard pages where the debate was bitter, where accusations were being hurled back and forth, that the old scars were being ripped off the old Manitoba school question, where the then Premier of the day was being accused of so many things and so many inadequacies in his proposal to try and cope with the problem as many people felt then existed. And I would like to impose on honourable members if only for a couple of minutes just to give them a random sample of the kind of headlines and commentary that was being mooted about in the press in the years of 1964 and 65, and if there can be any serious suggestion that matters are worse now I defy honourable members to say that they're worse.

The Premier at that time, and I'm quoting now from March 1964 clippings, the Premier was pleading for objectivity. It seems to me I was doing the same thing a couple of weeks ago. The Leader of the Opposition of that day raps Duff on Schools. It seems to me we just heard that tonight - Leader of the Opposition, "The Leader of the Opposition fears segregation in proposal of Shared Services." It seems to me that I probably heard that too tonight as well. No, not from my honourable friend, I don't want to be unfair. Here's another one, April 14, 1964, "Conservative Members of the Manitoba Legislature indicated Monday night that they believe

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) the controversial Shared Schools Services plan will be allowed to die quietly for the time being." --(Interjection)-- Yes, you passed it. My honourable friend knows of course that if he checks the record he will find that there was basically all party support interspersed and that was given despite the fact that the Premier of the day - and I didn't fault him at the time - I suggested he was wrong but I did not make a big issue of it. And it's here in the dossiers as well. He insisted that they would not proceed with their Shared Services plan unless they had assurance of substantial support from the other two opposition parties.

Mr. Speaker, let it be clear that I have never blustered and bluffed that there must be substantial support from any one party or another before I would try to make an effort. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside was not here in 1964, but some honourable members here - and I notice the Member for Souris-Killarney is sitting quietly and listening intently - and he will know, as I know, and a few others here know, that what was put before us was a resolution without any supporting research document, that not until the first or possibly even the second meeting of the committee, long after the vote was taken, was the first research document presented, an 11 page document, which the former Member for Lakeside - the former Member for Lakeside described as being inadequate as any kind of research and support document.

We have another headline: "Shared Services Paper will be Controversial". "Heated Discussion Expected When Committee Meets Second Time." Am I creating division and controversy for the first time in the way I'm trying to cope with this problem? "United Churchmen now Opposing Shared Services" quotes one headline. "Shared Services Spurned in Brief. School Plan illusory, says Roblin, Heads Proposal with too many Conditions".

And, Mr. Speaker, I've said here in this House only a couple of weeks ago that the Shared Services concept is one which in retrospect, despite the fact that in its practical application has proved to be, has proved to show many problems, that nevertheless the concept is one which deserves support rather than condemnation. But when it was said that the school plan, the Shared Services plan was illusory I would have to add the parenthetical comment, Mr. Speaker, that for many schools for which it may have been intended, it has been illusory and remains so to this day an illusory service, because no meaningful access to Shared Service is available to many of the non-public schools while to others of course Shared Services is quite meaningful. And so it goes: "Tory MLAs hits effects of shared services plan, Richard Seaborn. The Winnipeg School Division may have been providing illegal Home Economics courses because actually shared services was not invented in 1964 but apparently had been practiced for quite some years in the Winnipeg School Division. Shared services is not new, says Mr. Wilson of the Winnipeg School Board, Chairman. Fred Groves, another Conservative member opposed to Shared Services, says he will fight to defend the rights of the majority." How brave of Mr. Groves. And so it went. There was controversy; there was then, there is today. But, Mr. Speaker, avoiding controversy is not --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, avoiding controversy, avoiding controversy may sometimes be much more pleasant, certainly is much easier; but if one adopts that approach then one has to admit that he is perhaps not willing, not sufficiently willing to face up to such problems, that he is perhaps too willing to sweep embarrassing or difficult problems under the rug. And I would invite all honourable members not to take the easy way out but rather to face up to a problem here which is definitely capable of solution. I am proposing nothing novel here in the way of methods; I am proposing the establishment of a committee just as in 1964 to consider in fact much of the same subject matter, shared services, and just what can be done about them in their practical application. And integration - and as an aftermath of the resolution of 1970 whether there is any merit in looking at all at the prospects of a measure of aid based on the Saskatchewan/Alberta model; and if that proves to be immediately or very quickly proves to be something on which there is no possibility of agreement, we can concentrate on the other two alternatives, one of which is really the result of the bringing forward by the previous administration which if they wish credit for I'm quite willing to join in giving them credit for. In fact I have done so many times since 1964.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, the hour is approaching 5:00 o'clock, I certainly accept - I'm sorry, one other point about the Leader of the Opposition. He's saying that in 1964 the administration brought forward a program, a proposal, a policy that was completely developed, well articulated in great detail; Mr. Speaker, that is as misleading as can be. In fact that is quite false. It was brought forward in skeletal form, it was voted upon and only after it went into committee was the bringing forward of position papers. And even then, Mr. Speaker, I

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) really must, must avoid the temptation here to be too kind to my honourable friends opposite because if they would want us to think that the government was resolutely embarked on a course of action, they knew precisely what they were going to do, then why is it that in March and April of 1965 - correction, February and March of 1965, the government of the day, Premier of the day, was suggesting that perhaps they were going to drop the whole thing unless they were ensured of substantial support from the other parties. That is the kind of bluster which I wish honourable members would give me credit for I have refrained from doing. The approach we have adopted is one of a free vote and if in the opinion of the Legislature and the Legislature's Committee if there should be one, a certain course of action is recommended, then we will proceed as far as the Legislature's will will take us.

And I accept in good faith the caution voiced by the Leader of the Liberal Party that in proceeding as we have we do run some risk of causing rather deep differences of view which may spill over into an election campaign sometime in 1973. But I say to my honourable friend, that surely a matter of a few months cannot be that crucial, surely not, because what is crucial here, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not there are any individuals who wish to take advantage of that kind of possibility for sowing seeds of division and rupturing relationships between people. And if there are people with that kind of mood and intent, they will be able to do so 14 months after a matter has been dealt with just as well as four months after.

So the matter of two months, four months or six months is not the key onus that weighs heavily on us. What does weigh heavily on us is that we act only as responsibly as we did, as we all did in the entire period of the sixties because the matter certainly did get heated up to high temperatures but it never became a matter of election campaign animosity and deep-seated division. So if it was possible then it is possible in the future. In the meantime, we have certain specific proposals and honourable members have an opportunity now I hope that they will see fit to vote for a course of action which allows for study and analysis. Because, Mr. Speaker, I can't think of what alternative in this circumstance can be better.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the nays louder than the yeas.

MR. SCHREYER: Ayes and Nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The resolution before the House is the resolution of the Honourable First Minister.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Asper, Barkman, Beard, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Girard, Gottfried, Hanuschak, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bilton, Blake, Borowski, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Gonick, Graham, Green, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Pawley, Sherman, Spivak, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 30.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the noes have it, I declare the motion lost. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, whether it would be convenient to the House just to delay for a moment, I understand His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor awaits outside.

RÖYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour the Legislative Assembly at its present session passed several bills in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

No. 22 - An Act to repeal An Act to validate and confirm a Certain Agreement between The Town of Dauphin and The Rural Municipality of Dauphin.

No. 53 - An Act to amend The Mines Act.

No. 54 - An Act to amend The Farm Machinery and Equipment Act.

No. 58 - An Act to amend The Water Supply Board Act.

No. 59 - The Mineral Acreage Tax Act.

No. 70 - An Act to amend The Amusements Act (2).

No. 74 - An Act to incorporate The Native Alcoholism Council of Manitoba.

(MR. DEPUTY CLERK cont'd.)

No. 81 - The Labour Relations Act.

No. 84 - An Act to Incorporate "The Icelandic Festival of Manitoba" or "Islandingadagurinn Manitoba".

No. 93 - The Clean Environment Act.

No. 98 - An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act.

No. 102 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club.

No. 104 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

No. 106 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

No. 108 - The Health Sciences Centre Act.

No. 109 - An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act.

No. 110 - The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1972.

No. 112 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2).

No. 114 - The Convention Centre Corporation Act.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK: In Her Majesty's name His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly, the work of the Fourth Session of the Twenty-ninth Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the members for their faithful attention to their duties, including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in the Committee. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for the carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Fourth Session of the Twenty-ninth Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness, and the well-being of all our people.

MR. MACKLING: It is the will and pleasure of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.