

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 p.m. Thursday, May 17, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to my gallery where we have a number of ladies of the Altrusa Club. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

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. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I would like to know if he is going to take the same benevolent attitude toward the 10,000 government workers presently negotiating for an agreement as he has indicated he will take towards the 30,000 minimum wage earners.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would repeat his question. I didn't get the full significance.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was asking the Minister whether he is going to take the same generous or benevolent attitude towards the government workers which are presently negotiating, the MGEA which are presently negotiating, is he going to take the same benevolent attitude towards them as he has towards the 30,000 people who are living on a minimum wage in Manitoba, which is the poverty line?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my honourable friend is aware that the employees of the Manitoba Government have a collective agreement and negotiations are going on between that association and the government. Unfortunately, most of those who work under the provisions of the minimum wage are not under collective agreements. I hope they will be before too long and that there will be no one in Manitoba not represented under a collective agreement.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he had taken a survey, or his colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce has taken a survey to determine the cost of living since the last increase in the minimum wage, and how it compares with the proposed increase in the minimum wage.

MR. PAULLEY: First of all, may I answer my honourable friend's last portion of his question. No announcement has been made insofar as any proposed increase in the minimum wage by the Government of Manitoba, and secondly, statistically we are aware of certain increases in the cost of living.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, a final question. In view of the 11 percent increase given to welfare recipients I wonder if the minister will consider the same type of formula for the minimum wage workers.

MR. PAULLEY: The formula will be announced in due course and the government hopefully, within the next day or two, will be indicating what it will be doing insofar as the increases in the minimum wage are concerned.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS 53, 42

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether you would kindly call the Adjourned Debate on Second Reading of Bill No. 53 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, Bill 53.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this. The bill is very short; it just makes one amendment, changing the date of the appealing of the Act. I remember so well when this bill was being discussed a year ago, I told the government at that time that there likely would be occasions, unavoidable occasions that had to be dealt with after the 31st of March, that I was pretty sure that there would have to be an extension made on this particular bill, and I can see now it's extended after the 30th, so this actually just looks after

## BILL 53

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . the amendments to last year's bill and I can see nothing wrong with this bill and we'll agree to pass it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 42.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield) presented Bill No. 42, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly, in a few words, explain the principle of the bill and what is intended by the passage of this bill. This actually changes a number of definitions in Section 2 of the Act in order to clarify them. These are the definition of foster homes, group foster homes and institutions. The changes are to clarify who places a child, and the number of children that may be placed. The definition of detention home hasn't been changed but is simply renumbered for those members who would like to make reference to the Act itself.

A number of new definitions have been added, namely children's boarding home, day care centre, nursery school, and retarded child. Children's boarding homes are defined to enable standard setting and licensing to protect children placed by their parents in the homes of private persons not related to them. It is an attempt to regulate the private home operator who may be more concerned with money than with the welfare of children.

Day care centres and day nurseries are included to facilitate the establishment of licensing procedures and standard setting mechanism. The new definition of retarded child as well as the addition of subsection (10) to Section 19(1) of the Act as provided in Section 4 of this bill, is to allow for a retarded child to be placed under the care and supervision of the Director of Child Welfare, thus placing all the resources of the child welfare system at the disposal of the child. The change to the definition of "shelter" in Section 2 m of the Act is only to correct the reference to the two sections referred to in the definition itself. Presently the definition refers to Section 123 or 124 of the Act, whereas it should properly refer to Section 124 or 125.

Section 2 of the bill, the amendment to Section 11 of the Act is for the purpose of clarifying that the Director of Child Welfare or a Society are to be notified when a child is apprehended, but that both need not be notified.

Section 3 of the bill, the amendment to Section 16 of the Act is just housekeeping. Section 16 (2) of the Act should refer to Section 22 (1) rather than Section 22 (2) as it does presently.

Section 19.1 (8) of the Act is amended to indicate the responsibility of the Director of Child Welfare to reimburse societies, Children's Aid Societies, for the cost incurred by them in maintaining children who are placed in their care. Sanction for such reimbursement responsibility lies in Section 5 of the Social Allowance Act.

Section 22 of the Act is amended to give the Minister the authority to fix the rates that the Director of Child Welfare shall pay these societies for children in the care of societies as per section 19.1 (8) above.

Section 22.4 (1) of the Act dealing with the appointment of the Review Board, is amended to make the appointment of a family court judge to the board optional rather than mandatory as it is in the present act.

Section 7 of the bill provides for an amendment to Section 22.5 of the Act to ensure that an order of the court for the admission of a child to a rehabilitation centre is carried out and not ignored or countermanded by the Review Board.

Sections 8, 9, 11 and 12 of the bill, these provide for amendments to sections 102, 113, 115, 116 of the Act, and are for the purpose of correcting present inconsistencies in reference to the court. Instead of using the terms "Juvenile Court" or "magistrate" the amendment will provide for these terms to be replaced by the words "Family Court" which, according to the Corrections Act, includes Juvenile Courts and Magistrates in its definition.

Section 10 of the bill provides for the amendment of Section 114 of the Act. Provisions are made within the bill in regard to an amendment section so and so of the Act, to clarify a

## BILL 42

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . possible confusion in the present wording of the section. (I can't really go wrong with the dean being right in front of me). By separating the section into two parts, it becomes clear that an order can be made by the court for the maintenance and the education of a child either (a) upon application by a parent, or (b) without an application. The last section that we will be dealing with in this act - this provides for an amendment to the act, to allow for a standard setting and licensing for all the various types of child care facilities that are defined in Section 2 of the Act.

There has been a lot of discussion, Mr. Speaker, during the estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development, pertaining to child caring agencies and the amounts that are now available through my estimates for the year 1973-74 and the passage of these amendments to the Child Welfare Act will allow us to actually go forward with the intent of government to really launch into a very significant input into encouraging child care agencies of all types in the Province of Manitoba and I encourage all members of the House to give their support to these amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 11 - the Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund Act; No. 22 - An Act to authorize the expenditure of money for capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE - BILL 11, BILL 22

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 11. Section 1(a)? The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, just one question on Section 1 in which they outline definition. I note that in subsection (c) of Section 1 the defined municipality includes a Local Government District, a School Division and a School District. I presume that also means an incorporated town council, that they would be eligible for the provisions contained in this Act as well as the municipality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, an incorporated municipality, whether it be a town or otherwise, would be entitled to the benefits of the moneys under the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): What about cities? Do they come under the same category?

MR. PAWLEY: The same thing - any incorporated municipal entity is -- R.M., corporate villages, towns, or the city.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Section 1 was read and passed.) 2(a)--passed; (b)--passed; The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the Minister could outline the types of programs that they envision will come under this particular piece of legislation. I note that they provide for the welfare and employment of the people of the province for unforeseen emergency and uncontrollable expenditures. I know, and I know the minister also knows, that according to the results of the RAP program that has been conducted by the Department of Industry and Commerce, one of the classifications that come highest on the list of those things that are required by municipalities and towns, is forms of recreation, and I wonder if the Minister could outline just whether or not recreational facilities do come under this classification.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this program would come, yes, as the Honourable Member for Morris has requested, recreational programs, arenas, etc.,

## BILL 11

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . also the construction of bridges could come under the program, and other municipal work - sewer and water installation projects, for instance, and as long as it is a project which comes within the authority of the municipality to proceed with. I think I should just add for the benefit of the members that we have developed a criteria as well as to the amount of an allotment per municipality - the amount of funds available. We've divided them by the population and we are allowing about \$15.00 per head. So any municipality that requests moneys under this program is receiving population times 15, and we are also finding that some municipalities will join together in order to combine common projects. We've had towns, for instance, that have been able to persuade neighboring municipalities to join their populations together in order to obtain larger sums than they would otherwise receive individually. But certainly, recreational projects are important and there's been considerable interest by municipalities in obtaining moneys under this program for recreational projects of one type or another that the entity would like to proceed with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: What about interest charges? Have any rates been set, or what rates are going to be used?

MR. PAWLEY: The interest rate is provided for in the act. It relates to the amount of interest that is charged at any one time to the province by the federal people, and it varies under the Canada Pension Plan and it varies from month to month, but the interest rate will be charged according to that interest rate in the month in which the project was committed by the province to the municipality. So if it's, say, 7 5/8, that will be the interest rate for that month if the project was approved in the month of, say, September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the Minister: Then, when you're waiving the responsibility of the municipality to apply through the Municipal Board to get these loans, what guarantee is there that the municipality is not getting itself over its head in debt and go beyond the point where they can survive and pay back?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may, just before the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs responds, I think he may know the specifics, but I was asked a question -- well I was asked similar questions this afternoon and I've now confirmed that the provisions -- and really, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering whether we ought not to wait - or Mr. Chairman - to wait until we get to that section which I believe is Section 12. I think that would be better. I think the Member for Charleswood agrees. So possibly we should proceed to that stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): I think it's probably partly under this section. It's just a matter of -- is there a time limit set on this loan as to how long it can run?

MR. PAWLEY: I think the Honourable Minister of Finance might be able to correct me on this. I believe, though, that the loan extends over a 20-year period. It's my understanding, 20-25 year period, . . . whether the Minister of Finance has that in his documentation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Act itself does not stipulate the time. It's a matter, I presume, of negotiation and government policy. Now that develops through the department as the projects are applied for. I'm looking now at the guidelines for the administrative procedures. I have not yet seen an indication of the length of time. If I find that it is in the guidelines, I will indicate that before the bill is passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? (Sections 2 to 4(2) were read and passed). 4(3) -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think there was a figure quoted earlier on in the afternoon as to how much money there was being transferred on the old act. I don't know, is this correct the figure that was quoted here? Could the . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really had the impression that it was something over \$2 million but I really also accept the statement by the Leader of the Liberal Party, who seemed to have checked it recently, and I can but I haven't yet located it, when he said \$1.8 million. And I wouldn't question his statement because it couldn't be very much more than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 4(3) to 6(a) were read and passed). 6(b) . . .

## BILL 11

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I now have the answer -- the honourable member asked about the length of term, and it reads for a period of up to 20 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Section 6 was read and passed). 7 -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Dealing with Section 7, I am very sorry if -- when I was talking to another member of this Chamber the Minister of Finance indicated that he was going to call this bill at this particular time. I bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the fact that this bill was only passed today into committee and I had, immediately after it was passed, gone to legal counsel which is provided by this Chamber for the assistance of the members, asking advice to draft an amendment for Section 7. Legal counsel is working on that and so far I have not received the amendment. We are in a rather particular difficult bind here at the present time, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister of Finance could maybe help us out of it at this particular time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the honourable member is not referring to Mr. Tallin, when he speaks of legal counsel. That's correct isn't it?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Balkaran.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, firstly I would like to suggest that the honourable member is probably thinking of a reintroduction of the old section 7. I don't suppose he wants an amendment to the Section 7 here, which is practically identical with Section 6 in the old act. So I'm guessing that the honourable member does not object to passing Section 7 in this bill, and now I'm wondering if what he has in mind is something about accountability as referred to in Section 7 of the old act. Well if that's so, I'm wondering if he was present when I reported this afternoon that the Legislative Counsel felt that that section was redundant. I don't know if he was present. I could read the note, but in any event he wishes to propose it. Well, Mr. Tallin is here and I believe he could discuss with the honourable member the kind of amendment he wishes to make. Would there be any objection -- should we stand it aside or can we proceed with the other sections on the understanding that we could come back to the item which the honourable member would like to introduce, which I believe is reintroduction of an old section. Either way is satisfactory and we could even move to the other bill if honourable members would agree, because I think the Member for Birtle-Russell should have the time he needs for this purpose.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, may I indicate to the Minister of Finance that what is proposed is a subsection 7(1), which brings back the accountability in the form -- and the legal terminology I can't give to you but Mr. Balkaran was drafting it -- which would make the fund report to the Minister annually at the end of the fiscal year and give a report within four months of the activities of the grants that are made under the fund, the number of loans that are made and number of loans that have been repaid and the amount outstanding. In other words, Mr. Speaker, a report of the activities of the fund reported to the Minister within four months of the end of the fiscal year, and that report being tabled in the Legislature within 15 days of the next sitting of the Legislature, or if brought into the House at that time, if the House is sitting at that time. This is the general proposal of a type of amendment that is being suggested. An amendment, I may say, Mr. Chairman, which is consistent with other acts dealing with the special allocation of funds, which is prevalent in many other sections of legislation within the Statutes of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, if we may discuss -- I don't know if it's in order but I think, if you will permit, I would like to discuss the proposal by the honourable member. He is dealing with Section 7?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? 7(1).

MR. CHERNIACK: I understand. Well I would think it probably would be a separate section like Section 8 and renumber all the others, or the Legislative Counsel could advise on that.

Mr. Chairman, I'm only held up in my mind about the statement made by the honourable member, whether or not that kind of a section does apply in any other funds that are directly under government. Now I'm certainly not opposed in principle to what the honourable member proposes but I wouldn't like to change a procedure without being able to consult with my department. If it were a Crown corporation or an agency or a commission of government, then I wouldn't even have to consult with anybody, I would just agree to the proposal. But if this is

## BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . really not like all the others that do fall into that category then I think it would be wrong on my part to agree (although as I say I agree in principle), to this proposal and thus possibly have a unique one. Now I'm really not prepared to upset the procedures we now have by agreeing quickly to a proposal with which I have great sympathy. So again, I would like to appeal for help. Possibly the House Leader of the Opposition would care to assist me in my proposal, which may be to keep the bill in committee. It may be that the best thing would be to deal with all the other sections of the bill but leave it in committee to give me an opportunity to speak to members of my department to see whether or not his proposal is in conflict with the general procedure or not. And I will be influenced only by the general practice. If it's acceptable that this be proposed, if it's not out of line, then I'll go along with it. If they think it is, then I will oppose it, and possibly -- I wonder if my proposal for procedure is acceptable, and that is deal with the whole bill, keep it in committee, and I can come back with my response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, anything can be done, by procedure or no procedure, anything can be done by unanimous consent. But I don't think that we on this side would have any particular objection to the course of action proposed by the Minister providing that the opportunity for the introduction of this amendment remains open; and if there are no objections from anybody in the House, that we proceed with the remaining sections of this bill, and assuming that there are no more amendments to be proposed, then we could by all means leave the section open so that the Minister would have an opportunity to examine the proposal made by my colleague the Member for Birtle-Russell, and if it is acceptable we could come back into the committee again, or remain in committee depending on how long it's going to take him to get that information, and then deal with it at that time. I see him looking up in the gallery. I assume that he has some of his officials up there or is he just hopefully looking up there or was he looking up in the sky for some other kind of guidance? But whatever he's looking for, if there's a possibility that the Member for Birtle-Russell can be accommodated, then whatever proposal is made by the Minister is quite acceptable to us, and if that means that we can go ahead with the rest of the bill that's fine with us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we proceed with the bill and just leave the bill in committee and report progress?

MR. JORGENSEN: There is only one condition here: the possibility of numbering of the sections, that's all. But I think that can be taken care of by simply remaining or leaving Section 7 as Section 7 and numbering subsection (1) and subsection (2).

MR. CHERNIACK: Well we can straighten that out.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, I don't think that's a real problem. --(Interjection)-- Well, whatever course of action is suitable to honourable members is fine with me. I see no real problem in continuing on with the rest of the bill, going into 22, and then whenever we have the decision on Section 7 we can come back to this.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'll give my undertaking that I will not agree that this bill be reported out of committee until after we have settled this question one way or the other, today or tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have agreement? 7--passed. 8-- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under 8 we're dealing with the interest received from the loans that will be made, and it seems as though there can be different categories, that certain moneys can be credited or go to the Consolidated Revenue Fund and other interest received can be credited to the account of this particular fund. What has been the practice to date and what does the government envision in this case?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, just half an hour ago I was telling our Legislative Counsel that it would have been much simpler had I left the War and Post-War Fund as it was and brought in the few simple amendments that we needed rather than my accounting to honourable members for what was in the minds of the legislators back around 1948 or so, when the Member for Rhineland and I were just young fellows.

Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that there is no change in the proposal from the old fund to this. I know that governments in the past have been influenced by the situation as occurred at the time as to whether they felt that it was desirable to keep the fund up to a certain

## BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . level or let it drop down and use the revenues for general revenue of the province. It's still people's money either way. The point I made earlier today was this is a vehicle; this is only a method by which we are able to accommodate to this special emergency project, such as Winter Works Project, and therefore I've not touched this section. I am not aware of how it was devised earlier nor how it has been used, but I can see from it that there is some flexibility which apparently has stood the test of time over many years, twenty, twenty-five years or so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, my reason in asking the question is I take it that it is more or less going to be a revolving fund, and as a result that we could probably credit as much of the interest received to the fund itself.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was conceived as a revolving fund and yet, as I reported earlier today, when the centennial projects were accepted by the previous government, there was money put into it; and theoretically if the centennial project became self-sustaining and made money, then they would be paying back the capital advance for the construction of the buildings and interest thereon, and would go into here, but let me tell honourable members that by the method by which the previous government advanced the moneys to the centennial corporation, at the same time they provided that the earnings of this fund would be credited to the corporation to apply "on account" of the indebtedness of the corporation to the fund, so that they did use, they did have that kind of flexibility and, as I say, I don't fault Duff Roblin for that -- that was a method by which he could get a job done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8--passed? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: I want to deal with 8 and 9 and possibly even 10 in the same general context, and that is we have to deal with -- our House Rules state that we have to deal with what is under consideration -- all right, I'll deal with 8, Mr. Chairman. What I want to talk about, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that there is apparently here an attempt made to keep the moneys in the fund separate and distinct and yet at the same time to apply easy access in and out of the fund; we're at one time increasing the ease of input and outflow which I think is the intent of the government and on this side there may not be too much objection, but what we are doing is increasing the activity of the fund. If it's easier to use it and easier to replace it, it's logical to assume that it will be used more, and if it is going to be used more the fund will become more and more important, and I think the case then arises or the case is strengthened, then, for a separate and distinct report of that fund to be tabled in the House at the earliest opportunity for the members of the House to peruse, and I think this is basically the reason why I had suggested an amendment of the nature that I have already suggested, although the wording hasn't been drafted yet.

So I hope the Minister of Finance will understand the reason why I am asking that we consider the suggestion that we intend to propose, to have a separate and distinct report tabled in the Legislature as a separate report rather than just a consolidation of the public accounts report which it has been up to this time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I understand exactly what the honourable member says and I have already indicated my point. There are still limitations on the way in which this money can be used. It was not abused in the past, there is no intent to abuse it in the future, but I think honourable members will come to the conclusion that it's a useful device for these special programs and we'll discuss the reporting -- the method of reporting is what is our mutual concern now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8--passed; 9--passed; 10--passed; 11--passed; 12(1)-- The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Honourable Member for Charleswood asked a question. I want, firstly, to respond by telling him that the provision in this section is, I am informed, similar to Section 4 of the Winter Employment Act which was enacted in 1971. I can read this section there -- possibly I will, rather than describe it. "Where a municipality is required to pass a by-law for the purposes of carrying out an approved project, if an Act of the Legislature requires that the Municipality obtain the authorization or approval of the Municipal Board before passing the By-law, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may exempt the Municipality from the requirement of obtaining the authorization or approval of the Municipal Board before passing the By-Law, and where that exemption is granted, the by-law is not invalid solely by reason of the lack of that authorization or approval, and the validity of the By-law shall not be

## BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . questioned in any action, suit or proceedings in any courts for lack of that authorization or approval."

It's also pointed out to me that the original Winter Employment Act, which was passed in 1958, contains similar waiver provisions and I have copies of that 1958 Winter Employment Act as well. So that this is in line with previous proposed -- well previous legislation, and the concern expressed by the Member for Charleswood would, of course, be the concern of any lender, and in this case the government being the lender, and the Department of Municipal Affairs being involved, in assisting the municipality, it would be incumbent on the department, the Minister and indeed the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to see to it that they don't go overboard, but bear in mind that the program also contains forgiveness features on labour content, so that in the end it means that the municipality will be greatly assisted. The main point here is not to put them to the trouble and expense and the delay involved in going through a mechanism that would be needed if they put out a debenture for the public. I think there is quite a difference between borrowing from daddy, which in effect is what municipalities do when they deal with the provincial government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I think that pretty well answers my concern, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering, if the Municipal Board very quickly tells you that they will not approve, whether you advertise and get approval from the people or such for capital works programs, if it's going to take the per capita debt of an area I think in excess of \$250,00 or \$300,00, and that's what I was concerned, that this wouldn't increase that from what it has been with the Municipal Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12(1)--passed; 12(2). The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when I was speaking on this bill, I must have sounded like I was fairly annoyed and when I was down in the --(Interjection)-- No, no. When I was down in the hall later on I heard the Minister of Finance when he was speaking on second reading or closing debate, say the Member from Sturgeon Creek has probably gone out to cool off. And I guess you could say that I'm cooled off now. A nice meal and a little bit of sleep during the supper hour does certainly help from a cooling off point of view. But, Mr. Speaker, Section 12(2) is similar to 12(1), but what it says is that we eliminate -- you don't really have -- there is no necessity, the Municipal Board can be eliminated here and the municipal Board can be eliminated here, and the Minister has often brought up the fact that this bill was very close to being the same as it was during other administrations -- I'll buy that but it doesn't mean to say that everything is right and we have one concern with this bill the way it is now being proposed. It's now a bill to support and help the municipalities in what is, I guess, we would call emergencies.

Do we really say that municipalities wanting to go into debt or into some debt to do some project which they call an emergency, is really the same as what this bill was before, Emergency War and Emergency Act it was, and I don't think anybody would have any quarrel with the words "emergency", "flood", "fire", "war", people in very definite distress - anything of that nature - nobody would quarrel about this. --(Interjection)-- Grasshoppers - if you want to call it that.

Well now, I am going back to say to the Minister, you know, I quite agree with what has been done before but I'm not saying it is entirely right. Here we are eliminating the Municipal Board - if the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council so desires and the Municipal Act, when they deem it as an emergency to a municipality, maybe for a road, or sewer system, or something of that nature, and that isn't really what I would call emergency, and I think, I think that, you know, you could conceivably say that you wouldn't deal with the municipalities and give them money any other way. You could put all kinds of money in this fund and this fund would be the one now to deal with the municipalities, and it's the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, it's the Cabinet room down the hall, that will make the decisions as to what will be done as far as this Act is concerned.

The Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell has brought up the point that he would like to see disclosure of what was done with the money, and the Minister agrees with that but, you know, we are not talking, we are not talking emergency when we are talking about this Act at the present time, and nobody is quarrelling on this side that there has to be some way to help a municipality when it's an emergency, but what have we done for the reason for the Municipal

## BILL 11

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . Board and the Municipal Act is basically to look at the financial situations of many municipalities and cities and make sure that they don't get overly into debt, and we are eliminating this. Basically we are saying that that doesn't have to happen any more, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can just decide what the emergency is, that the municipality wants, and do it.

Now to me there should be a better way of doing that rather than being done by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council making a decision in the Cabinet room and doing it; and as I say, I probably have cooled off, Mr. Chairman, but that's really what I am saying, and when I said that the government could go from town to town during the next couple of months, and the Minister got up and he used the thing, the word, the intimation that I meant during an election period, I didn't say it, he did. I didn't say it, but he did, and I'm not intimating that they are going to go from town to town looking for election platforms or passing out money during elections. I can accuse this government of all kinds of things and get very annoyed with you, but I didn't accuse you of that. If I intimated that, I'm sorry, but this is what basically can happen.

Now we are all here as politicians; we all represent different areas. When somebody comes in or a town comes in with an application or something of that nature, and the representative of that nature, believe me, it will be an emergency. If he wants it, if his area wants it, it will be an emergency. There's no way that it won't, and he'll be pressuring away saying this is an emergency and we should spend this money.

Now, there just has to be a better way of doing it than this and that is what really my point is. You're eliminating the Municipal Board, the Municipal Act, and you're dealing with -- we're getting into politics here and we want to keep that out of it completely. There should be a better way of doing it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I think that there's a certain stream of valid points that have been raised by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek and certainly there is need for caution whenever using the provisions of Section 12 subsection (1) and (2). I would just like to reassure the honourable member that in no instance would the provision be used against the advice of the budget and finance people in the Department of Municipal Affairs. They scrutinize the applications very carefully and certainly where there was any area of doubt or greyness involved, then the department would so warn, and I'm quite satisfied the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council would not under any circumstances then exempt. To not have these sections in could certainly when we are concerned about winter works, we're concerned about the urgent projects in municipalities, they could in fact create delays that would not be in the best interests of either the province or the municipality, so certainly you have two areas of concern here but I'm satisfied with the advice and the involvement of the department in all these applications and their warnings, where appropriate, that this exemption would not be used recklessly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I'm almost compelled at this stage to rise and say something about this particular section. I can understand and perhaps in some respects share the concern expressed by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, but at the same time, having had some experience with the piloting of legislation through a House and having had some experience in the administration of legislation, I sometimes wonder if the best legislation is not the legislation that enables a government to react to situations that arise from time to time on the basis of the emergency that arises rather than by some prescribed formula that might tie their hands and prevent them from doing something that could be very worthwhile. I think one of the ways that this can be prevented, any abuse of such a fund, is essentially through the suggestion that was made by my friend the Member for Birtle-Russell. As long as there is a proper --(Interjection)-- Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: We've just arrived at an agreement and his amendment is acceptable to me.

MR. JORGENSEN: That makes the rest of my speech redundant and deprives me of the opportunity of making a point that is now already made. All I can say now, Sir, is that as long as that provision is in there, that there's a proper accounting procedure, then the government can be called to account on any measure or any expenditures that have been made, and as long as that is in the legislation I don't think that I would have any objection to this particular section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12(2)--passed? The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

## BILL 11

**MR. MOUG:** Mr. Chairman, I'm still speaking on 12(2). I was quite concerned about the Municipal Board being by-passed in 12(1) but I think that when 57 members of the Legislature sit down to set up a Municipal Act in Committee and put it together, something to live by, and simply a Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can waive that and by-pass the Act for something that there can be no emergency to whatsoever, I can't see why there would be any emergency, and I think it does leave the vehicle there for the government that was brought up today by the Minister of Finance, because after all, the powers behind the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council are all of one political faith and certainly favours would stray and waive away far quicker than would be if it was governed by the Act in itself.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 12 -- The Honourable Member for Charleswood, or for Rhineland, pardon me.

**MR. FROESE:** Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that particular section. I don't really have the concern that was expressed by the Member for Charleswood but maybe I haven't -- well I haven't got the experience in municipal affairs such as he has, I admit that quite freely. But as far as I can see, certainly this fund will never be really that large that all the municipalities of this province can go to it and get loans under this particular section that freely. Certainly I don't envision it as being that large a fund. Maybe I'm wrong but if I'm wrong I'd certainly like the Minister to tell us so, because what I envision it is as something to have available for emergencies, as was said before, and for occasions when certain moneys are needed and they don't want to go through a long procedure and in this way get the moneys rather fast. If that is not the case I'd like to be corrected.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I think the Member for Sturgeon Creek wanted to . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the comments of the Member for Rhineland -- there's another section of the bill that says the government can put money in or take it out as they so please. The fund can grow or get smaller or be left smaller any time the Lieutenant-Governor or the government decides. The thing that really does boil down, the concern is that if an emergency program is requested by a municipality -- and we must remember this, that the municipalities are the children or the government is the daddy, as the Minister of Finance says, but the municipalities and cities are created and the children of this Provincial Government. And one of our duties is to make sure that they don't get into what you might call fiscal problems. And, you know, we have LGDs in this province who cannot collect enough taxes from their area to operate themselves without having a mill rate so high that nobody would live there, so the government has -- we have Local Government Districts and we have support for those Local Government Districts from the government. Now a city or a municipality, when the Municipal Act or the Municipal Board can be waived and by the decision of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council you could conceivably have a mill rate going up in the town by a decision that is made here in this building. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs does see this problem, and I think he knows full well, as we all know full well, that towns can get into financial problems if it's not carefully watched because we're not in a city like we are in Winnipeg, they're in more of a rural area and sometimes the money is just not available, and you can start to get your mill rate to a point where it's nearly impossible.

I think there should be -- there's got to be some real close scrutiny when it comes to this, what we have kept referring to as an emergency. They're not emergencies. There has to be a very close scrutiny as to the money when it's loaned to these municipalities as to the effect, as to the effect it will have on all the taxpayers of those municipalities. Now I know that the council probably won't make application, unless it passes council by a majority, before the application is made to the government. But that is a job that we have to do here. That's a job that we are elected to do here to make sure that we see that there is not a financial problem created in municipalities that makes it very burdensome to taxpayers. That is the main concern in this bill, when you start eliminating the provisions in The Municipal Act or the provisions of the Municipal Board.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I agree that the word "emergency" does not apply to all of the scope of this fund. When I used the term "daddy" I did it, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek accepts, that all the municipalities are children of the province. But I don't think that

## BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . they're immature children. I accept the fact that they're grown children, mature children, and let's drop that analogy and talk about elected members of council who make decisions and of course they have to be a majority decision, and they have to go through their procedures in relation to their by-laws.

Now the Honourable Member for Rhineland is quite correct in his impression. I share the same impression with him. I would say that about a year ago I was prepared to bring in an act, a bill to cancel the War and Post War Fund, because it was down to a very small sum of money and I just didn't see the point to keeping it up. But it's when the Winter Works Program was reviewed and when it was felt that the province should go into a loan program with municipalities, which roughly matches the contribution the federal people make, my Department was asked to come out with a device by which this could be done. And it is proposed, as I understand, that there's some \$10 million to be paid into this fund so it will be about \$12 million, 12 to 14 million let's say, just to take care of any discrepancy in figures, that will be used for this purpose in order to lend moneys to municipalities for winter works, as has been done in the past, with a feature of forgiveness based on labour costs; the proposal as I see it is that there would be 100 percent of on-site labour costs forgiven and 50 percent of summertime on-site labour costs forgiven, so this is a shrinking fund. It's not one designed to grow, it's one designed to shrink. And, Mr. Chairman, the reason that I quickly accepted the proposal of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was that I agree that there should be accountability, but let me say this: I am informed that my Deputy Minister doesn't know of any other fund in government which comes under Public Accounts as this would, that does have that special requirement. And in spite of the fact that there is no other such fund that reports, because all the others are boards, commissions and agencies, in spite of the fact that apparently we would be establishing a new practice, which I thought we would do, I'm still agreeable to it, so that there is full accountability.

But let me get back to the fact that these councils are councils that will be considering what they want to have done. They will make a decision after proper debate, as does take place in municipal councils; they will then come to the government and another body in government, the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Winter Works Committee of Cabinet, and Cabinet itself will have to make a decision. And they don't have to waive it; they may waive it, but if they waive it the only reason they will waive it is in order to expedite the work. And that is really what this is about. You may not call it emergency but it is one that should be done quickly without delay.

Now the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council might reduce the period. I don't even know how long it is. It may be a six-week waiting period, I don't know. But they could, say, advertise for a two-week period. They can make these variations. And I think the municipalities should have that opportunity of flexibility, recognizing that they are not - they may be children but they're not babies - that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council doesn't want to deplete his fund by carelessness or by making it difficult for municipalities. And I am urged, and I do believe that to create this flexibility to make this possible, it is desirable that we do have this provision whereby we can waive or vary the requirements, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that it should be accepted and see how it works out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 12(2) to 15 were read and passed.) 16 -- the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, before we deal with the last item, may I suggest that we go back to Section 7 and propose a motion for amendment, and I must commend legal counsel and the Minister of Finance for the very quick work that has taken place here and, Mr. Chairman, while commending legal counsel I must sympathize with him. I think that his penmanship is about on par with mine and I have considerable difficulty reading mine. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake, that Section 7 of Bill 11 be amended by numbering the present section as subsection (1), and by adding thereto the following subsection: Report on fund

7(2) Within four months after the end of each fiscal year of the government, if the Legislature is then in session, and if the Legislature is not then in session within 15 days after the beginning of the next ensuing session of the Legislature, the Minister shall table in the Assembly a report showing

(a) all expenditures, advances and loans made from the fund during that fiscal year,

## BILL 11

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . and particulars as to the persons to whom the expenditure, advances and loans were made, the purposes for which they were made, and the terms and conditions, if any, on which they were made; and

(b) all amounts credited to the fund during that fiscal year, and the source of those amounts, and whether the amounts are repayments or recoveries on account of any loan or repayable advance made from the fund.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would accept that section but may I suggest that the motion might read that the Act be amended by adding a section along those lines, wherever the Legislative Counsel advises, and all subsequent section numbers be changed. I don't think it really belongs as part of Section 7. Maybe it ought to be 10 or 11 or 8, and if that's acceptable then I would agree with it.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's entirely proper to speak after I've moved it or not, but I just throw this out to the House, that I suggested to the legal counsel an arbitrary figure of four months. It was just an example, it is now becoming --(Interjection)-- I don't know whether that is a figure that is reasonable and I should just leave it open for suggestion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this was checked out with my Deputy Minister who is responsible for the production and he says it's acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Do the honourable members wish me to read the amendment out, or does everybody understand what they're moving - with the proviso that the Honourable Minister of Finance has that we renumber the subsequent sections? Agreed? (Agreed)

(The remainder of Bill No. 11 was read and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the Legislative Counsel will provide the amendment or copies of the amendments that have been accepted, and then when we go into third reading they will be there for the convenience of the members. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine.

MR. PAULLEY: It will be Bill No. 22.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just a moment. I want to know if the Committee wants to report the bill. Bill be reported? (Agreed)

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I thought that you had indicated that.

BILL No. 22

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 22, an Act to authorize the expenditure of moneys for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I say, just as a preamble, that the page is distributing a very brief memo to all members and let me just - I should have had it distributed earlier. It states that -- and now the Member for Birtle-Russell will check every word to see if I'm right, that "with the exception of Section 15, no section of The Loan Act 1973 contains any wording that was not in The Loan Act 1972." And then there's an explanation for the Section 15 provision which relates to advice received from the Provincial Auditor and the Legislative Counsel to again enable a little broader interpretation of the use of a specific fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 1 to 9 were each read and passed). Section 10(1) -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: The sections dealing with the authorizing the universities to borrow. Does this equally apply to all universities - the University of Winnipeg and Brandon and so on or are we mainly speaking of the University of Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . it's my understanding - yes.

(Sections 10 to 14 were each read and passed). Section 15 -- the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On 15, could we have the amount that is available under this particular section here that would go into this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: \$3,754,424.07.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 15 to 17 and Schedule A were each read and passed). Schedule B -- The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

## BILL 22

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on Schedule A at this time because I'm a little disappointed on what is happening in Leaf Rapids, Manitoba. I can remember very clearly the First Minister of this House standing up and pointing to the gallery, to the President of Sherritt-Gordon Mines and the Vice-President of Sherritt-Gordon Mines, and saying that on that day or very close to that day he had signed an agreement with the Sherritt-Gordon corporation in the province which would be one of the most wonderful developments that we have every seen in Manitoba regarding a mining town and it would only cost or would cost the province thereabouts \$7 million. And I haven't checked the Hansard, I'm working from memory but I am sure that it's there and I'm quite willing to look it up and if I'm wrong stand corrected.

Mr. Chairman, we have in the Accounts for 1972, ending in 1972, Leaf Rapids Corporation the sum of \$2 million advanced to them and in their financial statement which has been kindly provided for us by the Minister in the Economic Committee it shows definitely that the \$2 million has been transferred and there is no question about that and we're not arguing with that. But then we look at our accounts, we look at -- well the both capital borrowing of last year and we find that there's another \$5 million appropriated for Leaf Rapids Corporation which is the construction of the Town of Leaf Rapids. That is \$7 million and again I refer to their statement here at the present time that a further \$5 million was authorized during the '72 session of the Legislature and that is \$7 million. In this Schedule we have another \$8,500,000 appropriated to the Leaf Rapids Corporation.

Now to date, Mr. Speaker, there has been no taxes paid by the people of Leaf Rapids. When I was in Leaf Rapids in the beginning of this year there was a tax bill sent out I believe by the Bank of Commerce that was running in the neighbourhood of \$55.00 per home for taxes. But then those people in that area are paying their first mortgage - it's usually to the Bank of Commerce - secondly, to the Sherritt-Gordon Mines and they haven't to date received a tax bill. And at the present time in Leaf Rapids, Mr. Chairman, it costs a person about \$175.00 to \$200.00 and I'm told some of them, and they may be exaggerating, may be up to \$225.00 before they've even bought a sausage. They're having a tremendous amount of trouble finding people to work in that town; the houses that are being bought and sold in that area or being sold in that area are running the neighbourhood of \$30,000 - up to \$30,000 anyway, and that's a tremendous cost for houses in that northern area.

These people who go up to work in northern Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, are people who don't go up with the means of having all that much money. They go up with the idea of having a job, working in the north for awhile, either settling there or leaving. But that type of an investment is a very rough thing on them.

But to get back to the point they haven't paid any taxes as yet and in this statement I notice there is a \$35,000 made towards tax payments. Now somebody is obviously paying a mortgage payment up there or a tax bill, or when is the province going to start to have their money come back. There's a water plant, there's water, sewer, roads, a hotel owned by the government. All of these things are basically owned by the government at the present time --(Interjection)-- The hotel is owned by the government. In fact it has been called the Republic of the North - Leaf Rapids. But the thing that is really -- what is happening? Who is making that payment to the bank or are they kind enough not -- to say we don't have to make it. And for some reason or other we're getting another \$8,500,000 requested by this government for the Leaf Rapids Corporation for Leaf Rapids and yet we don't have any tax moneys coming in from the people of Leaf Rapids. I don't know that that is a good situation for other people that live in this province; I don't know of any other town or city where there's been \$15 million poured into the city and no money coming back. I think all of us in this room pay taxes, all of the people in most of the areas of Manitoba pay taxes and I'm wondering just when this is going to start to happen.

You know, you could go on forever, Mr. Chairman, you could really go on for a very long time and you could say, well you know, we'll do what we've done with Autopac, you know. We'll set it up, we'll set the roads up and the water plant up; we'll set all this money up that we've spent in Leaf Rapids as assets and equity or something of that nature. And you're not doing the people of Leaf Rapids any favor. If you think that I'm standing here saying I don't want them to have any benefits, I do, I want them to have the benefits of knowing where they stand. I want them to have the benefit of knowing how much they're going to pay for this \$15 million that is sitting here on our -- but which really is closer to 16 million, it's \$2,400,000; 5 million; now

## BILL 22

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . 8,500,000. Mr. Speaker, if by calculation or taking my experience in municipal government, if you were to now start charging taxes to the people of Leaf Rapids for the services they will receive, let's forget what the \$8 million that's been spent there, for the services they will now receive - garbage pickup, water, all of the services that we receive in the city, their taxes will be high enough. They won't be able to stand much more. So what is happening or what is going to happen to this or how is the province and how is the Minister going to satisfy this House and this province and how is the Minister going to satisfy this House and this province of nearly \$16 million when the First Minister said it will only cost seven.

Now I think there's time for an accounting to be done. We've had the statements in this House that this is the best arrangement ever. I know that it is anticipated that, you know, the Local Government District enhances and takes in the mine area that tax revenue will be such that it will be just enough to carry on. But it's not going to happen. You've got \$16 million there now. You're not going to have enough money coming in.

Now, and we've said this is the best concept and quite frankly, gentlemen, it's a beautiful area, it's a beautiful area but damned expensive. You know the roads are all through the bushes and over the hills and everything of this nature and you've got a very expensive concept. You disregarded the fact that for years the mining company can work better with the province or with an LGD on the basis of them maybe supplying the water or them having the heating plants and what have you in there. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's also been a little bit of waste and a little bit of screwballing going on somewhere. --(Interjection)-- Well screwball thinking if you'd like it that way. You know we have in the accounts of this -- we have \$311,252.64 in engineering costs - consulting costs of engineering.

Now we have a water plant in Leaf Rapids. You know the water comes in from that river at 33 degrees. You know, Mr. Chairman, 33 degrees water freezes, you know, 33 degrees, it freezes. You know you've got water coming into that system that is so cold that the oil bill for heating that water is damn near enough so that people of that town if they had to pay for nothing else, not even their garbage pickup, you've got a problem.

You've got a construction shack set up there that has been paid for sitting there basically doing nothing at the present time. That construction shack was bought from - construction camp was bought from BACM at a tremendous amount of money. All of this, all of this, all of this could have been done by a better agreement with the mine, the kind that we've had for years. --(Interjection)-- Yah, I'm talking through my hat. Well that's just, you know, I don't really know that the Member for Flin Flon is worth paying any attention to mainly because of statements he's made in this House in the past, but I don't even think he's even read the statement on Leaf Rapids and he's the mining expert in this Legislature or he thinks he is and he doesn't know a damned thing about it. I would like him to go in and sit down with the people of Leaf Rapids and tell them what I know about it just from these documents here at the present time. "I hate the company" is his motto, "I hate the company. I hate the company". Well, Mr. Speaker, if he's going to be allowed to yell at me I'm not going to stand for it. Okay.

Now let's get back to where is the accounting of \$16 million. I haven't seen it and the people of this province haven't seen it and there are no tax bills in Leaf Rapids, there's no taxes being paid. The people in Leaf Rapids tell me as late as yesterday or two days ago that they've been informed that there won't be any taxes until 1974.

A MEMBER: Election year.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I don't know. And this was going to cost this province, as the First Minister stood up in this House and said, \$7 million. And we now have close to \$16 million spent in that place and no money coming back. And if you're going to tell me that that money is going to come back so it will only cost \$7 million I'm telling you right now that if you charge enough taxes to pay back all of a sudden in the next five years or the next twenty years you're going to tax those people out of their homes and right now the cost of living in Leaf Rapids is such that the mine can't get help. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it's time we started to have some explanations about Leaf Rapids, the Republic of the North, the NDP Republic of the North.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the remarks just concluded by the Honourable the Member for Sturgeon Creek perhaps typify the thinking of those who would like to continue comfortably with the kind of arrangements that used to be made in

## BILL 22

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . years that seem now so long ago. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have other examples of other arrangements that were made by mining companies for the establishment of towns in which the people that would be working in the mines and their families would be living. And it is true that progressively over the years there has been improvement in the social thinking of the mining companies. But even the more recent examples that we have of "mining towns" that were established I think prove conclusively that even the most up-to-date thinking was not acceptable for the simple reason that those who found themselves living in communities which were built by special arrangement by mining towns and even in more recent years, mining towns established by companies as though they were feudal fiefs, no local self government, no normal assessment of tax base, no normal taxation paid to municipal government. Mr. Speaker, I say to my honourable friend, the Member for Sturgeon Creek that regardless of what transpires those days are gone forever.

No government will dare to try to reimpose, no government will dare to try to reimpose the kind of arrangements that mining companies were able to make relative to the establishment of towns that existed as late as 1960 and 61. I know that there is impatience expressed by some in the fact that the development of the Town of Leaf Rapids has, has had, and still has its growing pains. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a community which when completed will belong to the people, not to a mining company. It is a community which will have local self-government in the truest and fullest sense of the word within three years of the movement of the first family into that community. It is a community which will not have to wait for ten years and for personal demonstration and personal protest in order to acquire local self-government.

One of the most basic and fundamental of the democratic processes, that of full local self-government, was a thing unknown in mining towns in Manitoba. I happen to come from a part of the province where we have a classic example of thinking of governments of days gone by, Bissett, the San Antonio Gold Mining Company. The government didn't have to spend a cent in the establishment and development of that town but, Mr. Chairman, it was a shack town. And that has been the history of mining towns in the earlier part of this century right up until, even into the post war period. Now my honourable friend says that it's proving expensive to build the community of Leaf Rapids. Mr. Speaker, it's proving to be expensive for the simple reason that the basic proper infrastructure and amenities of life are going in there right at the start.

I don't think that we should be yearning with nostalgia for a return to those days when government could take a laissez-faire attitude, a very comfortable, simple and stupid attitude of not being involved. Didn't have to provide for capital financing for infrastructure, leave everything to the company, they will find the financing on the money markets. They will build the town as they like. They may or may not agree to local self-government when they feel like it, and if the cost of housing is too expensive make the families live in basements, make them live in tents for three years. And the most recent town, mining town developed in Manitoba before Leaf Rapids was a case where, I believe - I could be out by a few months - but it was a period of three years of construction men living in tents. That was not the case in the case of Leaf Rapids. Families that are moving in there are already moving into homes that have basic infrastructure. The servicing of the town is being provided for on a standard of quality of life that is comparable with any community in the south. If the cost is relatively high, it merely proves that in order for economic activity to be there that is paying for itself, the wages will have to be such as to sustain the cost of living there. Otherwise why go in? To go in otherwise is merely to exploit, "exploit" with quotation marks. So, Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt in my honourable friend's mind that whatever the problems, and they are manifold, I predict to him and I don't care who it is, we will never return. And I don't think any subsequent government will ever return to the days, the concept of the company town.

This company I believe to be a good company in its labour relations, in its general attitude. The assets of the mining company, however, are assessed in the normal and true sense. They will pay taxes just like any manufacturing company. That never happened before, Mr. Chairman, and it is a concept which my honourable friend finds very difficult to understand. But a manufacturing company in Winnipeg, The Pas, or Thompson pays full taxes on normal assessment. A mining company didn't pay municipal taxes. They made their own special deals. They never paid a cent into the Public School Finance Board Foundation levy, not a cent. Sherritt-Gordon, relative to its assets in the community of Leaf Rapids will be paying

## BILL 22

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . into the Manitoba Public School Finance Board Foundation levy just like any other manufacturing company in Manitoba. And right there is the matter -- right there, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of several hundred thousand dollars per year into perpetuity or as long as that community exists. Several hundred thousand dollars per year, which in the case of other mining towns, there is no payment in to the Public School Finance Board Foundation levy. And so the list goes on. The days of the special deal are gone forever. My honourable friend had better get used to it.

Now I'm not sure what point he made about the engineering fees. He seemed to imply that at \$311,000 that this was inordinately high. Well, Mr. Chairman, the engineering fees were approved on the basis of comparison with engineering fees that prevail in municipal construction, municipal services construction circles. And the reference about water being 33 degrees, and that this therefore must pose some, some cost in heating the water to hot water temperatures that is somehow abnormally high I would simply point out to my honourable friend that any community that has ground water supply as its town or village water supply is dealing with water that is in the 30 degree range. I don't know what my honourable friend's talking about frankly. It is not uncommon at all and I'll go further and tell him that in the case of Churchill, which for years has had to deal with a water system in which the water is actually supercool, it is below the 32 degree mark and in order to prevent problems of freezing they keep it under continuous circulation. So obviously, it comes into the water heating system in the homes at a temperature no lower -- rather no higher than the temperature of the water that my honourable friend is referring to. I don't know who he was talking to, to whom he has been talking that left him with the impression that this temperature is somehow an unusual problem. Mr. Chairman, it's rather embarrassing for my honourable friend but it's not unusual at all. It's a problem to be found in Flin Flon, is that not correct? The problem in Flin Flon, the problem in Churchill and in many smaller communities that use ground water supply, the water temperature is in the same range as my honourable friend is talking about. So I merely point that out to him.

Now on the general, on the general financing of the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation no doubt some of the problem of cost of accommodation could be solved if the province and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation were to reduce or somehow turn an eye to the practice of people moving into basement suites. But I wish my honourable friend would not pretend that this would be a problem first experienced in Leaf Rapids, because the phenomena of families being required by circumstances to live in basement suites is one that he can find in at least one other community in Manitoba, which I don't believe exists any more, but between 1962 to 1970 I think my honourable friend from Thompson will confirm was a very widespread practice dictated in part by the cost of housing and getting housing constructed in northern areas and associated and related problems. Now in the case of Leaf Rapids we are asking for capital supply so that we may proceed with the construction of a commercial shopping centre, the rate for which will be calculated so as to be a self-sustaining endeavour. We are putting municipal infrastructure in there in the way in which we would want to see in any modern community. And I will add a note of the aesthetic, Mr. Chairman. Maybe it is something which, if allowed to be proceeded with in the sort of old-fashioned way, the developer would have gone in with his bulldozers, D sixes or sevens, and bulldozed down every tree. But this is being done in a way in which every tree -- and I am exaggerating only in slight degree -- every tree except those within the perimeter of the house to be built, every tree is to be left in place. Violation of the environment and of the natural setting is something which is not desired. And that adds a few dollars to the dimension of things. But it's something worth doing. In fact the whole concept, Mr. Speaker, is worth doing. It is novel, it is imaginative, it is innovative, it is reformist. My honourable friends can moan and wail all they like about the government incurring additional capital expenditures and debt but, Mr. Chairman, sure there is an easy alternative. Let's just go back to the days of yesteryear. Let the mining company move in. Get a private developer. Pull in with their D sevens, bulldoze down every tree. Put up shacks and proceed without any municipal taxes being paid, only grants. Grants being paid by that amount which the company itself decides it feels like paying. Now, Mr. Chairman, the history of our province and our country is replete with examples of the kind of thing not to do again, and Leaf Rapids is a refreshing departure.

My honourable friend need not be concerned, need not be concerned about this being in some way a large money loser, because the mining company's assets constitute very roughly

## BILL 22

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . 65 percent of the total taxable assessment. Whatever level of taxation is needed to pay for the municipal infrastructure will be levied by locally elected councillors and councils. They will determine in a municipal and businesslike way what levy they have to make and the assets of the company will bear 65 percent of that. In addition, the company will pay into the Foundation levy of the school program for Manitoba which they are not required to do in all other mining agreements that exist in this province. So on balance, Mr. Chairman, there is reason to be positive about this whole approach. It has drawn positive and favourable notice and review from other jurisdictions in Canada. And I, Sir, my colleagues, my colleagues and I have no intention while we have responsibility of office of ever going back to the comfortable, do nothing mining company arrangements of the past in which the government just folded its hands, sat back and apart and let things sort of unfold like topsy. No more.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman. One of the last phrases the First Minister used was the phrase "on balance". I'm not too sure whether he meant "on balance" or "unbalance" because, Mr. Chairman, the entire Leaf Rapids Corporation and its development hinges upon a mining company and he said that 65 percent of the assessment of the Leaf Rapids Corporation will be paid by the company. He said the company will pay into the Foundation levy and in another phrase he used he said, and so the list goes on. The company will pay, the company will pay and I suggest to the First Minister that the company will pay as long as it is profitable for the company to mine the natural resources that exist in their mining claims there.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard and you can read in the Financial Post and you can read in the Toronto Globe and Mail in any mining report, the concerns that are expressed in the mining industry over a report that was tabled in this Legislature not too long ago, namely the Kierans Report and the impact that it will have on the mining industry in Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, I'm not an expert on the Kierans Report, I think maybe the First Minister might be, I think maybe the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources might be, I think they are certainly familiar with the implications that it has for the mining industry and the possibility that exists if the full implementation of the Kierans Report is implemented in this province. Mining in this province will continue as long as it is profitable and if it's no longer profitable will government then insist that it continue? Will they insist that it continue, Mr. Chairman? If it becomes unprofitable, if wages increase - and they will; the First Minister said that wages will increase. He said if the amenities that exist under the Leaf Rapids Corporation dictate that those living in that area need higher wages, then those wages will have to be paid or words to that effect; I can't just remember his exact words. And if, Mr. Chairman, if the Leaf Rapids Corporation develops a community that dictates that a miner receive \$10.00 an hour or \$12.00 an hour or \$14.00 an hour, will the mining company then continue to extract the natural resources in that area? And again the First Minister used the term "on balance" and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the term "balance" has to be used throughout, that the quality of the natural resources existing in that area should dictate the type of community that is going to be built in the Leaf Rapids Corporation. If we can be assured that there'll be a 25 or 30 year life span of that town, or 50 years or 60 years or 100 years - I'm not familiar with the amount of natural resources there and I'm not too sure that the First Minister is either. --(Interjection)-- Minimum. What's the maximum? What's the maximum? --(Interjection)-- Unlimited. It's unlimited. Well at the same time, Mr. Chairman, the point that I'm trying to make is that the development of the Leaf Rapids Corporation should be closely tied in to the productivity of that mine, and if the Kierans Report is going to dictate higher and higher provincial grasping - and I use that word "grasping" because that is what the Kierans Report says, that the province should grasp more and more of that natural resource. When do we reach the point where it is no longer economical to extract those natural resources by paying the wages that are going to be dictated by the development that is being created by government in the Leaf Rapids Corporation?

The whole thing is tied into one big ball of wax and has to be related and balanced, and I'll use the First Minister's term again, the balance that exists is a delicate one, I suggest, and I don't think that the Leaf Rapids Corporation or the officers that are charged with the responsibility of developing a corporation of that nature are aware of that delicate balance, and I think it's the responsibility of government to ensure that they are aware of that and that the

## BILL 22

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . services that are being proposed - and we are dealing in a capital investment somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$15, \$16 million now, we don't know how much more - we have to make sure that those people that are going to be living in the area are going to be able to pay for the services they receive. So I say again that that balance has to be maintained, that the people have to be given an assurance, and the company has to be given an assurance that the financial return from the investment incurred will make it profitable both for the company, for the people that live in the area, and for the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the Kierans Report and its implications on the mining industry, and the proposals that are put forward here for another 8 1/2 million dollars of capital for the Leaf Rapids Corporation, almost dictate that government now declare to all and sundry their purposes or their intentions with regard to the Kierans Report, and I think it's incumbent on government to tell not only the mining industry, but to tell the people of Manitoba what their intentions are.

The First Minister sloughed it off by saying we are setting up a study, an internal study group to look at it.

A MEMBER: It's relevant right now.

MR. GRAHAM: But I think that he should tell us now what his intentions are, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we are in committee and in committee I understand by our rules a member can speak more than once, and so I would at this time sit down and invite the First Minister to tell us what the intentions of this government are with respect to the Kierans Report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am really in a very difficult position to speak about this particular proposition because there is some good in it and there is some bad in it, and worse, I had something to do with it when I was part of the government - that's the bad part.

Two of the things that I think have to be commended as the feature of local self-government - in other words a specific date of having the people determine their own faith in that community. The other one is the taxation of the mining property as a factory in Winnipeg, located in Winnipeg, or any other city would have to pay, but unfortunately there are some very weak features and I think there were some bad trade-offs made by the government in their almost indecent haste to sign the agreement so they could have, so they could get on with the development of the project.

First of all, the taxation on that property is not based on 100 percent value. I think the hardware on that site is around \$60 or \$70 million, I'm not sure of the figures; the Minister I am sure has them handy and will correct me if I'm wrong; and the tax is going to be based on about 25 percent, 30 percent of value, so the total tax we'll get out of that will be around \$1 million, something like that I understand.

Now in Thompson, the agreement that was signed, I understand, by the Campbell government originally and then countersigned and re-signed by the Roblin government, was a good deal in one respect but terrible in every other respect. The good part of it was that International Nickel was obliged to put in all the infrastructure - that is sewer, water, sewer treatment plant, water treatment plant, streets, sidewalks, hospital, half-baked airport but you could use it, and some buildings in there. I think they even got an Old Bailey bridge, which I used as part of my platform to run in 1969, and I think had something to do with my getting elected. There were some other things that the company put in, I think a total cost to International Nickel somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$10 million to put that in. Now we must understand that that was in the 1958-59 figures. Today, if they had to repeat that or duplicate that, it may be \$20 million. I really don't know. It would be much higher, but there was no taxing. I don't know if that agreement can be amended by the government itself. I think it would have to be the two parties agreeing, which means in this case that if they sit there for another thousand years that they will never pay a cent of tax on that property, even though they may expand their facilities to double their capacity, their output. The value of the plants and ore bodies I think are something like \$300 million, and if it went to a billion dollars they would not pay a nickel for that, and that I think is incredible in a democracy and in a society where we believe, I think everybody believes whether they practice it or not, that the rich and the super rich really should pay a lot more than the poor and the working poor and those that have just managed to crawl over that poverty line, but here we have a situation that's signed -- I think the kings in the old days probably had a similar situation -- and that certainly, as the

## BILL 22

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . Premier indicated, is totally unacceptable and I hope that that never happens again. In lieu of those taxes International Nickel is paying, I believe, and it's been so long since I've looked at their agreement, I think it's 55 percent of the operating cost per employee, and again I don't recall the figures, whether it's a half a million dollars, or \$600,000 their share is to put into the town to help pay for the operating part.

Now the Leaf Rapids - of course, the company didn't have to put anything in it. With the money, the Provincial Government went and borrowed the money, they set up the Corporation; the money I take it will go from the Provincial Government to the corporation; and they will have to --(Interjection)-- Sherritt has \$3 million. Well, that's something that must be new. I never heard of that. They are going to have to prorate it on the existing structures, businessmen, residential and the company, and right now the Premier tells us it's 65 percent and that the reason it's that figure is because there's not many homes. As the businesses and homes increase, the figure will drop probably below --(Interjection)-- it's more - that's right, it will go down as more buildings and more businesses come in there. But I think that one of the criticisms I have - and I've indicated that in cabinet and unfortunately I had very little success in most of my arguments, I couldn't convince the cabinet - is that if Sherritt-Gordon had to go out in the market and borrow the \$10 million, and at that time I think it was 9 percent, that means that it cost them \$900,000 a year to service that debt, and that is approximately what they are going to be paying now as part of their tax load. I believe that's approximate. So I think, looking at it from that point of view today, it's not a good deal, and the guys who are going to pay for that are the working homeowners and the businessmen who will be living there.

Now undoubtedly it's going to improve five years from now, but I say and I'm sure that the Premier will have to agree with me, that today it's not a good deal, it's not a good deal for the guys there. It's a wonderful experiment, it's a novel experiment, and I'm sure that it will spread throughout Canada, but I have to be selfish and say, why must you ask those people who live there to pay for your experiment? It seems to me it would have been more logical to spread the cost from the treasury. The taxes, the homeowner taxes that I have heard, are something like \$500; \$440 -- well perhaps the million and a half dollars that the Minister of Agriculture sneaked in for him may help hold that thing down. And that's another thing that I object to and I want to register that objection now, because I think that it's wrong for the government to do this. We turn around and make the deal and then in order to hold the taxes down, because that million and a half dollars that are going for water and sewer would have had to come out of the corporation, which they would have then charged on to the company and the houses, and I think it's unfair for them to go ahead and do this thing here because there were complaints from the residents of Leaf Rapids that their taxes are going to be too high. I have no objection for the government saying to those people, "We're going to give you something, for you," but I don't like them using that money to really help Sherritt-Gordon, although I have nothing against them, they are really a progressive company, but that money went in to help them more than it helped the residents. Yes, certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member aware, does he agree that the particular grant he is referring to was made under a program which is now a standard program as of two years ago, which is applicable to all municipalities, that is to say, towns, and villages in Manitoba, and that is the formula under which the cost of installation of sewer and water, or extension of it, that the province picks up 50 percent of the cost over 20 mills, and that under that same program, for example, communities like Stonewall, Teulon, Brandon, etc. have received grants of varying amounts, so it's not as though this was a special ad hoc case.

MR. BOROWSKI: I agree with the Premier and I congratulate the government for having such a program, but what I don't like is why must we help the rich while we're trying to help the poor? Leaf Rapids is really a unique situation. There is no such community in Canada. It was not necessary nor was the government obligated under that legislation to give that million and a half dollars to this corporation. They've got lots of money, and I think that up until this point Sherritt-Gordon has been treated darn good by this government. Too good. The Premier knows very well, if I was doing the negotiating, as I did on that highway, they paid 100 percent for it, and I think that the government have been too good to them, again at the expense of the residents there, and there is the additional problem. They still don't have a hospital and they still don't have an airport. Well, if they have an airport maybe the Saunders Aircraft could get

## BILL 22

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . in, but I don't know of any other aircraft that can get in. Certainly I'm not aware if the Premier tells me there is an airport then I'll accept his word there is an airport. But this is one of the deals that is included in Thompson, that they did have an airport, a good one except that it was gravelled, you know, the runway is okay except that it was gravelled and if the wind was blowing from the wrong direction you had to hang onto the wing to make sure you got down. But the other question is a hospital.

Now that is a town that has basically young people. I think when I was in Thompson the average age was 27 years, which means they have a lot of kids. They don't have abortions there, you see, and therefore they have a lot of kids, which means they need hospital facilities and I don't think that it's fair in this day and age to set up a model community and deny them the most basic needs. The most basic needs, in my humble opinion, would be the church, a school and a hospital. Now you haven't got a hospital. Now is it fair for somebody who is going to have a baby or gets sick or gets hurt in a mine, that he has to rush over that road to Lynn Lake, which I think is 70 miles away? He'd probably get shook to death at any speed because the road, let's face it, is what do they call them? Glorified moose trail. There's a lot of work -- I didn't build it, the previous government built it --(Interjection)-- and it's been rebuilt. Well I'm glad to hear that it's been rebuilt. Perhaps the next time I get up here, if I make it back, he'll tell me it's black-topped.

Well, I haven't -- we don't use that terminology on maps, as moose trails, except when you're in opposition you use that terminology. But anyway I think that the government has a responsibility to get a hospital in that place as fast as they can. A nursing station may be fine for a remote settlement that there is 100 or 200 people, but mining is a very dangerous occupation, as the Premier well knows; the compensation figures will indicate how many accidents there is, and the birth rate, I haven't seen the figures, I'm sure it is quite high, and I think that the government has the responsibility in the quickest time possible to get a hospital in that place.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that's all I have to say about the thing. I simply want to indicate publicly for the record that I am not as enthused about the scheme as the Premier is, although I must admit that it is better than probably any other scheme in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, normally I wouldn't speak twice on the same subject but the Honourable Member for Thompson has made such a reasoned analysis of it that it just invokes some response. I'll try to be very brief.

First of all, I would say to the honourable member that his analysis is one which largely I can't quarrel with but there are two or three misapprehensions on his part. For one thing, the installation of sewer and water has proven to be costly as it will prove to be costly in any northern community in which sewer and water is installed. It's not as though we have snuck some provincial grant in from the treasury. We have done it under a standard universal program applicable to all -- my grammar is wrong; sneaked -- it was done under a universal province-wide Manitoba program applicable to all towns and villages, and I might tell my honourable friend the Member for Thompson that the formula is that the province picks up 50 percent of the cost of that which exceeds 20 mills for sewer and water utility installation, and those grants have gone to a number of communities now that are undergoing expansion or installation of sewer and water. And furthermore it was done in a way in which all of that benefit accrues to the residential tax rolls and does not accrue to the industrial tax roll of the company, so that should be of some comfort to my honourable friend.

Number 2 - and here I'm really a little embarrassed for my honourable friend, he says that there is inadequate transportation access. I would advise him of two points: No. 1 - there is an air landing strip -- and I'm sorry the Member for Portage - oh yes, he's coming in -- he would be interested to know that there is at Leaf Rapids an air landing strip which is in a rough way, in a pioneer sense, sort of equivalent to the airstrip at Gillam, which my honourable friend the Member for Thompson knows is a very substantial airstrip indeed. Now the reason it was possible to do so is not because of any particular brilliance on the part of the government or the Manitoba Government Air Service but there happened to be a gravel esker, or ridge, just a couple of miles north and to the west side of 391, and so an airstrip was put in there which just required the most inexpensive of blading in order to get it to a good standard. There is no air terminal building but that will be taken care of in a matter of time, and short

## BILL 22

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . time at that.

And furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the entire road from Lynn Lake to Leaf Rapids has been reconstructed, I mean completely reconstructed, so that it is no longer a pioneer tote road or moose trail but rather a road that I would think, Sir, is sort of equivalent to the best of the P.R. roads that we have in Manitoba. Now I know according to some of my honourable friends that doesn't mean very much, P.R. roads aren't in very good shape they say, but be that as it may, 391 Leaf Rapids to Lynn Lake is now of a good substantial P.R. standard; it's been reconstructed, and the Member for Thompson would be interested to know that even though it's a purely P.R., or Provincial Road, that the Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company contributed I believe \$1 million towards the reconstruction. So that is something which will offset some of his doubts as to how much they really ought to have put into the townsite proper.

And I should also advise my honourable friend that there is a medical unit going in. Now I know that the Member for Thompson is very dubious about health units, or what he calls nursing stations, but this is not a nursing station in the sort of historical sense, kind of an outpost with one or two nursing sisters and not enough medical equipment, this is a modern community health centre. Yes, a community health centre in the controversial sense of the term, and it has not only a registered nurse in attendance it also has - I am advised by my colleague - it has, or will very soon have, a medical doctor on site, and will in addition to the sort of standard equipment have a number of beds and as such it really comes - it's a new concept. It's a quasi hospital, something more than a nursing station, certainly something more than that, and coming just short of a pretty standard modern concept of a hospital. So for that reason, plus the fact that there is a completely reconstructed modern up-to-date provincial road now and an air landing strip, and last August the Province of Manitoba started patient air transportation in the north, when you combine all these things I really believe, I really believe, Sir, that there is no lack of modern up-to-date health care and transportation access and amenities available to the residents of Leaf Rapids.

. . . . continued on next page

## BILL 22

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule A--passed--the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, it's all very well for the First Minister to get up and go through his usual oratories about what happened 100 years ago--Thompson is not like that; Snow Lake is not like that; Flin Flon has improved considerably with the housing program that has gone in through there--but if he wants to go back and talk about basements and what have you that's up to him. We're talking about Leaf Rapids at the present time, and it seems that every time the First Minister gets up to speak and he says, you did it; that's okay, I can criticize you for it, and that's what he did during the election, but then he gets up and does it, and then he says you did it. So that's his excuse for most of the things he speaks about in this House. What he was really talking about right at the present time is pie in the eye little boy socialism, is really what we had. --(Interjection)-- Yah. Well the fact is this: now we're up to \$17,400,000, when we find from the Honourable Member from Thompson there's another 150 million, or 1.5 million gone in there. And the point is this: that a person living in Leaf Rapids today, you have built it, you have built it, and the cost to them is the first mortgage about \$150.00 to the bank; the second mortgage to the company is probably about \$75.00 or better, and he hasn't bought a damn thing, or he hasn't paid any taxes yet, and he doesn't know how much taxes he's going to pay. And you say that's fair to employees. You really say when the Member from Thompson gets up and says that if the company had put in \$10 million that would have been, - that would have been worse, that would have been worse. What you're saying is you're saying is you're putting it in, and you're going to have a tax structure that puts people in the position of not being able to live there. It's all very well to talk about your dreams. Let's talk about the people living there who have trouble living there and existing, and let's talk about the mine who has trouble getting people to go there to work because of the cost of living in Thompson--I mean in Leaf Rapids.

Now also you've got \$8 million. You say \$8,500,000 for a shopping centre. Well I'm going to now look up the quotes on that shopping centre because it must be a whale of a shopping centre. Where is the accounting of all the money going in Leaf Rapids? Really right at the present time everybody in this province holds the mortgage in Leaf Rapids because there hasn't been any payments made by the people, and they haven't been told what their payments will be, or what their taxes will be. They don't know what their taxes are going to be. So you're talking about - you're talking about - they started out with \$7 million is what the First Minister said in this House, and we're now talking about 17.4 million being spent there. --(Interjection)-- Well if the member wasn't here when I read out of the accounts 2.4 million, 5 million, and now we've got 8,500,000 and another 1.5 million. So let's just really get down to brass tacks. You say that the mine will have to pay big enough salaries for people to live there. Well maybe they can and maybe they can't. But we're saying at the present time to live in Leaf Rapids it's a tremendous overhead for somebody to live there, and they just can't afford it. And I don't know why the First Minister is making such an issue of it because I was there with members of his party, his caucus, and got the same story - and I heard the same story they had, that the cost of living in Leaf Rapids is too high, and what are we buying, what are we paying for, is what the people are asking? They don't know; they don't know a thing about what's going on. All we know is the money keeps pouring in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit said about the relative merits of the old style agreement and the new style agreement, and the First Minister has dealt very well with some of the concepts that are involved in the Leaf Rapids site. But let me assure the Member for Sturgeon Creek if he is interested in knowing that the government did not go into this proposition on the basis of concepts, or on the basis of philosophies. We said that there are two systems of doing this: one is the Lynn Lake, Flin Flon, Sherritt system at Lynn Lake, Thompson or Flin Flon; and the other is to attempt to develop a concept whereby the mining company's share of the operation of the town will be the industrial share that it would be paying if it was on the tax base. And we said we would like the best experts that we had available to go through the two systems, and that we would adopt the second system, that is the concept of the mine being on the industrial base, because it was a sounder system only if it also resulted in more money being paid by the mining company, that that was key to the adoption of that system. And both our people and the mining people went through their computers, and they did the computer run one

## BILL 22

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . way, and they did it the other way, and the second way resulted in the greater involvement of the mining company in the town by virtue of being on the tax roll. And it's only when that was determined did we decide that we would move in that direction. And I am quite satisfied that that determination was correct because it wasn't an easy proposition, and the Member for Thompson, you know, is like the union man in the back who after the organizers come back and say that they were able to negotiate 11 cents an hour, he says, I would have been able to get 13 cents. There's always one guy who would be able to get more. There is always one guy who would have negotiated harder, and that he would have been able to get more. Well Mr. Speaker, we believe that we have negotiated the kind of transaction which result in the maximum benefit that is being put in by any mining company in any part of this province, and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, we believe that we have done better than anybody did before. And if the Honourable Member for Thompson says that he could get more, I say that it's an easy thing to say.

What we do know is that we created a new concept, and perhaps the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't really know how important that is. He says that the people in Leaf Rapids are going to have to pay taxes. The people all over Manitoba are going to have to pay taxes and --(Interjection)-- The first - what has occurred, Mr. Speaker, is that in the first year of them being there because taxes have to start at a certain point, and because when you create a new town, and even when the Town of Thompson was created or any new town is created from scratch, not as a matter of growth, when an industrial townsite is created there has to be a point at which you start. The same amount is going to have to be used to make capital and current expenditures and to amortize them over a period, but there has to be a starting point. And the people in Leaf Rapids have been told that this year is not the starting point, they start paying next year. And secondly, they've also been told that as long as the government still operates it as a local government district that the taxes in Leaf Rapids will be comparable to the taxes in similar other northern communities.

Now let's look at what the old way was. The old way was - and we went through all the agreements - that the company said that it would build a hospital, or the company said that it would pay a certain percentage, or a certain number of dollars - I think the Thompson agreement, and I'm talking from memory, was a certain number of dollars based on the number of miners in the town and the number of children that they would thereby have going to school, and that dollar figure was fixed, and it continued on and on, and at one time it came to the point where they would have to build a new school, or in the Town of Flin Flon the same thing, that the company was responsible for certain things and beyond that the responsibility was the community responsibility. We said figure out how much the industrial tax base of that company is, see how much they would have to pay on that industrial tax base, and then run the community as a democratic community. If the people want a new facility, such as I think they are now asking for a swimming pool in Leaf Rapids and that is the request, the old system - Member for Flin Flon knows it - is that since the company was not on the tax base, and since therefore the residential tax base couldn't pay for recreational or other facilities, that the gentlemen from Flin Flon would go to the company with their caps in their hands and they'd say, would you please give us a skating rink, or would you please give us a swimming pool? The community at Leaf Rapids will be able to say a swimming pool costs this many dollars; it will be amortized over a period of so many years; the amount of taxes we will be able to collect is blank dollars; the amount that that will affect us residentially is so many dollars, and we will decide whether or not on that basis we will have a swimming pool, and we will not have to go to the company with our caps in our hands and say, would the benevolent company please provide us with a swimming pool? Now I think that that is important. Maybe the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't think it important but my feeling is that it is important. And it's going to cost the community of Leaf Rapids money like it's going to cost any other community, only I suggest to you that it will cost them less, unless they want more facilities, which is a reasonable desire, and in this case they know that when they tax they will get - and we're thinking of a minimum of 65 percent of that infrastructure, not infrastructure but facility, which the company will be required to pay, not which they will be able to veto but which they will be required to pay as a citizen of the community, just as the Hudson Bay pays or any other industrial concern pays, that they will pay that as a result of the democratic process.

## BILL 22

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Now the honourable member says that it costs a lot of money to live in Leaf Rapids, and he's taken the figures and tried to demonstrate that there has been an escalation of 7 million to 17 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the 7 million figure was the first estimated figure for infrastructure. It was not the figure for other things that the community is having, whether it be the shopping mall, or various other things, which I admit I can't recall at this point, but does the honourable member think that that is a bad deal? Does he think that the government putting that money in for the purpose of having the shopping mall owned by the government, and when the mortgage is paid by the people in the community, does he think that that is a bad deal? Well I'll tell him something. There were numerous people banging at our doors trying to get that deal. There were numerous private developers who wanted to put up that infrastructure, wanted to have the shopping centre in that one-industry town, wanted to be able to allocate the various places that would be in that shopping centre, wanted to rent those places out to the entrepreneurs who would do business there. Do you think they wanted that because it was a bad deal? There were many who wanted it, and I say, and the government says, well what is there that is going to be done here that cannot be done by the people themselves starting from Day One? If they're going to have to build a centre where they're going to purchase groceries, or set up a barber shop, or set up any other facility, what is there that is done that they cannot do for themselves? Charge themselves the rent and pay it off? Is that a bad deal? Would the honourable member not take that type of deal? Because I say that for the people of Manitoba it's a good deal. And it's going to cost money, nothing is free. I've never ever said that there is anything free.

But I'd prefer if I have the opportunity of doing so, and I can tell you that the chief developer on the project said, that the one that spoke to me concerning this matter was negotiating with us to try to build a shopping centre himself. And I said, you're a businessman, if you were in my position, if you owned the property, if you had the financing, would you give it to somebody else or would you do it yourself? And he said, well naturally I would do it myself but I thought that the government doesn't do those types of things. Well we said, we want to be just as smart as you are.

And does the honourable member who is a free enterpriser, think that that is a bad deal? Would he like to own that facility in Leaf Rapids and have the financing for it and have the power to charge the rents and operate the thing? Would he think that that is a bad deal, because I think it's a good deal; and I don't see how there is any possibility that the people of Leaf Rapids or the people of Manitoba can lose by that deal, because if a private developer built it, and I suggest to you his cost would be the same. There is only one thing that he would do differently, that is that he would continue to charge rents on the basis of present-day evaluation. He would charge rents on the basis of what it is worth today not on what it cost him to build it, because the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek knows that that is the case. That you must figure your capital investment on what you could get for it today. Now if it costs that many dollars today, and if that community--and the Member for Birtle-Russell says, how do you know that it's going to last? I want you to know that on the infrastructure portion which Sherritt-Gordon is required to pay they also have a guarantee, that if they stop they will have to pay the unpaid balance of that infrastructure as part of the covenant of Sherritt-Gordon, and I think that that's a pretty good covenant. I don't think Sherritt-Gordon is going to be in trouble, and I think that it is going to last.

But he says that it costs a lot to live there. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't know what happened in the other community. Does he know that in Lynn Lake where Sherritt-Gordon built the hospital that the hospital became a very very second rate facility, and the Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company went to the people of Lynn Lake and said, you are citizens of Manitoba, why do you not agitate for your government to whom you are paying taxes to build a new hospital. The Member for Thompson knows that that is what happened, and you could not tell the people in Leaf Rapids go ask Sherritt-Gordon for your hospital. You couldn't go and tell them, they were paying taxes to the Government of Manitoba like anybody else. There was a second-rate facility there and Sherritt-Gordon said, if you want a new hospital tell the government to build your hospital, and without any continuing tax program other than their agreement that they would pay so many dollars, etc., which is what was their deal before.

## BILL 22

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

But maybe the honourable member doesn't know, and I tell you that I was in Thompson in 1966, and if anything confirmed in my mind that people should not live that way it's what I saw in Thompson. I was there campaigning for, not the present Member for Thompson but for Brian . . . who was then running in the federal election. --(Interjection)-- Wilf Hudson, that's right. I was given voters lists, and I looked at a voters list and it said 185 Avondale Road, or whatever place it was, I can't remember, Sweetwood Bay, that's a correct one. Sweetwood Bay, a nice suburban community of Sweetwood Bay, and I looked at Sweetwood Bay, and it looks like Garden City from the outside, and there are side drives, and these people are terrific they don't have like one-car garages-one car homes, I see that they all have two cars and three cars. Three cars in these single family dwellings - four cars. And I thought, My God the men in Thompson are really doing very well. And then I'd look at the voters list and I notice that there's Mr. and Mrs. Brown, Mr. and Mrs. Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Borowski--there wasn't a home, there wasn't a home on Sweetwood Bay--well that may be an exaggeration but I tell you that it is almost the case--that there wasn't a home that there weren't two families living in, that many homes had three families living in. In one home there were Mr. and Mrs. of four names. That's four adult people, and if you figure on the average of two children per family, they had eight adults, eight children, 16 people living in that house, and there were eight voters, and I couldn't get to them all.

And there was one other name on the voters list. Well you know these people are rather resourceful people. I mean there would be one family living in the front half of the upstairs; one family living in the back half of the upstairs; one family living in the bottom half of the basement; one family living in the other half of the basement, and they were smart enough to know that four women can't be in one kitchen so they hired another adult person to be the housekeeper for the four families. The honourable member thinks that I am joking; I tell him that I am not joking. There was one group of people that lived in one home and bought another house across the street which they used as their dining hall, a place to eat because they could not eat in the place that they were living.

The Member for Thompson, knows that I am not exaggerating and he thinks that that was good, the mining company paid the infrastructure; the mining company built a hospital; the mining company built a school, and when the people in Thompson want to do something in their community - well I'm not sure how it is in Thompson but in other communities they would not be able to build a facility. I'm not sure of Thompson in this connection because I can't remember the details of the agreement, and I don't want to be misleading, but I think it's the same, that they could not count on the industrial tax base to give them anything.

How would the Member for Sturgeon Creek like it if the community of St. James could not get any money out of its industrial tax base. That would be paradise to the Member for Sturgeon Creek. --(Interjection)-- Well he says I should not be ridiculous, so then he says that that would be ridiculous. But that's the way it was, that's the way it was, Mr. Speaker, that's the way it was, and we have changed that, and we have changed it so as to provide a sensible base upon which these communities can exist.

And there's another thing that it does. It encourages perhaps, and I know that there is not a great optimism for it, and I'm not looking for it as a great thing, but when the mining company is a single industry company which is not on the tax base, it is in the interests of the mining company that it remain a single industry company because a new industry coming in doesn't affect its taxes in any way; it just results in competition perhaps for labour and other things which are of no benefit to the company. But in Leaf Rapids if it develops, if the mining company can induce other industries to come into the town it all affects Sherritt-Gordon's share of the base, which is a good thing.

And we had these two concepts, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I've seen them both and that perhaps the Member for Sturgeon Creek hasn't seen them, but I can tell him that it was very expensive to live in Thompson; I can tell him that the situation was such that the women of that town told me that - what is the expression? Hot-bedding. Do you know what hot-bedding means? Do you know what hot-bedding means, the Member for Sturgeon? It means that a man on one shift came out of bed, the man that came off shift went back and used his bed, and that was a prevalent practice in that community. Starting from --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't hear the honourable member; perhaps I should not let myself be dissuaded by. But I am telling you that that was a common practice. I am told that that

## BILL 22

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . situation in Thompson resulted in a terrible marital break-up rate, that we ruined families in that community at the time because of what was happening. That there were so many children living in one area that I would presume, although I can't say this, that it was difficult to know which family belonged to which. Well there were 16 people living in a single family dwelling such as the honourable member will see in one of the more modest areas of St. James. --(Interjection)-- Well the honourable member says it reminds him of back home on the farm. Maybe his own family lived that way but it wasn't four strange families that lived that way.

Now I would never pretend that Leaf Rapids is going to be a model community, that it will not be without its problems but the basis upon which it has been set up is twofold in the right direction. (1) We've ascertained that the mining company is paying more money; and (2) it provides for a better environment of life for the people who are living in that community.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments. After so many eloquent speakers it's really hard to follow them because I think everything's almost been said. But I would like to respond to the Member from Sturgeon Creek and the Member from Birtle-Russell, and their comments. I don't know what they know about mining. They say I don't know anything about it, but I must know a little bit about it, I spent 33 years in mines. One thing in a mine, Mr. Chairman, is the use of dynamite, and if brains were dynamite neither member would have enough to lift their hats off.

The corporation, their corporation favoritism, and I give numerous examples of a coal miner getting paid for digging, loading and transporting a ton of coal for 95 cents which is sold at \$22.00. I give you an example of it, and it was out here in the Legislature: eggs 6 cents a dozen, half a cent an egg a day per hen. St. Regis Hotel, one egg - 65 cents. Corporation versus labour. That's the way it was and that's the way they like it.

And let's go into union activity in these mines. Any member of a union who is active could be fired, one way or another. We did away with that. We did this. The safety record that we have that no miner has to go into a place that he thinks is dangerous or smoky or gassy. We did this for the miners. --(Interjection)-- Yes, last year.

And let's talk about company towns, because my grandfather lived in a company town, my father lived in a company town, and those company towns, it doesn't matter how hard you worked or how long, you never completely get out of debt and that's your company town. And I can give you the facts on that my honourable friend. The Flin Flon Sewer and Water - at the Manisphere they spoke on different places and when they came upon Flin Flon they said, we talk now about Flin Flon, the town on the rocks. The sewer boxes, the water, all on surface, all heated, and it's feasible and it works.

The problems at Leaf Rapids, and I attended the same meeting as my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek, and the complaints were many, and I will admit that, and they were varied. One problem that they seemed to take a lot of time on was a barber problem. And it was a very simple problem. There just wasn't enough people getting their hair cut to make it feasible for him. For two days he offered his services and the payment went to a minor hockey league club. He had two haircuts. So it's not feasible for a barber to go to Leaf Rapids. But I ask you the question, Mr. Speaker--I'm going to get ahead of myself a bit. In Flin Flon we have grants in lieu of taxes and this puts the council in one - I almost said a bad word - heck of a position with an arrogant paternal attitude of the company who give just what they want, no more, no less, puts the council in a position of a slave-servant attitude. The feeling of the people towards Leaf Rapids, and I can quote this because I asked the question. "What do you think of Leaf Rapids as a town?" The spokesman was voluble, articulate, and he said, "We wouldn't want to live anywhere else. We realize we have growing pains which will be ironed out in time. We love this town." And he was there. It's in the records. This was the answer of the Leaf Rapids people. So we were speaking to different people.

I was going to mention the production versus safety which was your philosophy when you were in power. But I won't go into that again because it's very embarrassing for the Member of Lakeside--he's not in the House, is he? So I won't do that. But that's your philosophy, and you were part of that government my honourable friend.

And let's talk about safety records with this mining gentleman who is the head of all mining companies bragged about his records. We exposed that in committee, a farce, a fake.

## BILL 22

(MR. BARROW cont'd) . . . . There were more accidents covered up; people going to work with broken legs and sitting all day doing nothing to keep the safety records intact. My honourable friend from Thompson - he's gone; probably out performing an abortion some place. But I suggest to the Members from Birtle-Russell and Sturgeon Creek he'd be accepted in the primitive brethren. There's a group for you, you'd be charter members. The slave-master relationship which was your attitude. You know when I speak about mining, and it appalls me to go back to the strike situation where those miners wanted an increase in their pension, and I can quote almost the exact words, but I won't. But the pension plan as such, if you had \$5,000 in that plan and had worked 40 years, the company would give you \$200.00 a month - \$200.00 today, a month. Now when you talk about miners, you also go to the top, which I did, and Sandy Morris who is the man who controls that company receives \$96,000, or \$50.00 an hour, four hours work, equivalent to a miner's pension, a bathroom interlude \$12.50. Now what does a miner really want? Not too much my honourable friend. He wants his own home, a cabin, a boat, a motor and security. And is that asking too much? I don't think so.

And let's go to Snow Lake and the company brags about the houses there, and they did build nice houses. In 1959, a 3-bedroom house, \$13,200; one-tenth down, 15 years to pay, but they didn't build enough of them. So what happens. Basement suites, Mr. Chairman, against all safety regulations. Everyone knows it's illegal, but where are they going to live? They live in those basement suites. And I can give you a better example. I looked for work back 20 years ago, and I went to Sudbury - we hoboed then - 18 boys in one room, 18 people in one room, 50 cents a night. But it wasn't too bad until an old lady on the corner started taking in boarders.

Mr. Speaker, when I listen to those honourable gentlemen, and it hurts me to call them honourable gentlemen, words just fail me. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule "A"--passed. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman -- (Interjection)-- it really doesn't, I don't know what he's talking about half the time.

MR. BARROW: Darn right, you don't know.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: We get on to a subject and he really goes kind of funny. I don't know; I am going to start bringing a net in with me because I can't really understand him.

Mr. Chairman, the member said, what a miner wants is a house, car, boat, and something to enjoy life with. Well what I have been saying all night - I haven't argued with the concept of the company paying money and the way the tax structure is. The Minister of Mines and Resources went around in his usual circle and got into St. James. Then he got into the fact whether the company, whether the private enterprise builds the shopping centre or the government, he got into all of that, and would you know what I have been saying all night is your concept is the basis of the miner will not have a house, car, boat, or any of those things in Leaf Rapids because he is presently paying about \$250.00 a month to live there --(Interjection)-- mortgages and he hasn't paid any taxes yet, and he doesn't know what his tax bill is going to be unless--tonight I have heard that it is going to be no more than \$440.00 or \$420.00 a year, and we keep--he says one year, the town has been operating for two years now. It's grown, sure, from the first year to the second year, so don't let's get any ideas that you fellows could get up and say that you've got a marvellous concept that is a better cost of living for the people living there, because you haven't got any better cost of living for the people living there and you are pouring money in continually. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he gets up and he says \$7 million. Do you really believe when the Premier said that, that that's all it would be? Well the Premier didn't say that that was going to be more. He got up and he pointed to the gallery and said, "I've signed the best agreement in the world for \$7 million," and now we're looking at an awful lot more money being pumped into Leaf Rapids.

The honourable members from the other side get up and keep wandering around the fact, but the fact is that the people living there have got a cost of living where they will probably never own their houses, never have any savings, and will be just about controlled by that town because their costs are too high to live there, and nobody will get up and admit, not one person on the other side will get up and admit that a fellow that goes up to Leaf Rapids without too much money in his jeans, with his wife and his family, hasn't got a cost of living that's ex-orbitant in that town, so let's not get fooling around on the basis that you've got the marvellous thing. You've gone ahead, probably too fast. You know, that's just about basically what

## BILL 22

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . you've done, probably too fast, and now, you know, with planning that it is not proving to be the proper planning. --(Interjection)-- You know, I'll sure be glad when the election's over, Mr. Chairman, and he'll be gone - when he'll be gone. Quite frankly, you know, it's impossible, and he keeps talking about what miners made back in the years and, you know, he's forgotten about the terrific advances that unionism has made in this province, in this country. He's forgotten what's gone on in the past few years, but just because he personally has a vendetta from a few years back, he's forgotten and won't admit that things are better now because of unions. Yeah, because of unions. It's finally time you started to admit it, that things have happened because of unions and you can stop having your personal vendettas against everybody.

Now, Mr. Speaker, now all I'm saying, and I've said it all night, we had \$7 million announced, we've got 17.4 million, and the cost of living in Leaf Rapids is still such that the man cannot save any money or have a good life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule "A"--passed - The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we pass Schedule A I just want to put a few things on the record.

A MEMBER: Another martyr to be heard from.

MR. FROESE: The Minister of Labour said, hear, hear. Well you know, I enjoyed the discussions that went on between the First Minister and the Member for Thompson. In fact, it was so amiable that I was wondering whether he'd invite him back into Cabinet. --(Interjection)-- So it was good indeed to hear the conversation.

You know when we talk about the mining industry and taking a look at the estimated revenue to be received from mining, it doesn't show an increase, in fact, we show a decrease. Are we not to receive any revenue from Leaf Rapids in the ensuing year? Well you know the information we've been getting on Leaf Rapids has been interspersed. We get something one day and then probably in another two or three weeks we might get a little more. It hasn't been in a package form so that we can really study the program and see and analyze it --(Interjection)-- no that's a fact. At least I haven't seen anything concise and precise put before the members of this House so that we actually know in what terms we are talking of. When we look at the Kierans Report, certainly in that report there are statements to which I have spoken to on a previous occasion. Certainly when the private mining companies that we have, they won't come out with a statement of telling us we have so much ore for future use for the next 30, 40, 50 years - no; it's a limited amount probably enough for the next 10, 15 years, and on that basis they can capitalize on the market much better; and is that program going to be continued under the provincial corporation, or to what extent has the mining area been, well how do you say, explored to indicate that this is going to be a good project and will last over a good number of years. I have still to hear from the Minister of Mines to tell us over what period of years he expects that the mine will be operating, and that the deposits are sufficient to take care of.

But really, what I stood up for was in connection with the Manitoba Development Corporation amount of 39 million. I have dwelt on this before and I don't want to take up much time, but certainly I feel that we are putting too much money into this corporation and not getting value for it. We have losses year after year, and very large losses, and the people of this province will have to pay for those losses, and what we are doing is we are paying for them through borrowings and that sooner or later this will catch up with us and the people of this province will have to dish out. We are just delaying the day of reckoning by just borrowing to cover these deficits, and this is something I take very strong exception to and I don't agree with. I think this should be taken care of out of current revenue so that the people will know what we are doing, unless the government can tell us that these deficits will be taken care of eventually, that we expect earnings of such extent so that they will be taken care of. If the First Minister thinks that that will be the case, well I would love to hear that, but I don't think it will. Certainly from the revenues that we are receiving from our mineral resources as a total in this province, do not indicate that and do not pay for the cost of operating the department. --(Interjection)--

Well I would certainly like to see that we get a greater share. Look at the provinces of Alberta and B. C., they have been getting much more in revenue from their natural resources than we are. International Nickel has a large surplus every year and what do we get? It's next to nothing; it's a pittance --(Interjection)-- no I did not. I think the Minister of Mines

## BILL 22

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . should not say that I voted against it because the record will show that I voted for it, and he'd better check it, because --(Interjection)-- no that was something that we have come out very strongly in Social Credit, we feel that the natural resources belong to the people and that they should benefit from them, and I feel that we have large wealth in the north and that the people should benefit from those resources.

We also have an item here under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation of \$4 million, and here I would like to make one comment. The Act was changed a few years ago to guarantee certain loans rather than to have the corporation make the loans direct, and I would like to know the experience that we have in this particular way of guarantees and whether the Manitoba Development Corporation - if the experience is so good in that whether we should not rather change to just guaranteeing loans instead of making direct loans. If the experience is much better then that would indicate that management in the private concerns is better than in our provincial corporation, and therefore that the practice should be changed. I don't know what the experience has been in the guarantees, how much was guaranteed, and whether there have been any losses, or whether it has worked out very good. We know that the Federal Government has been in the loan improvement through the banks where they guaranteed the banks, and certainly their record was very good indeed, and if ours has been that good in guaranteeing loans rather than in direct lending perhaps this is an avenue that should be explored to a greater degree and that we change our legislation in that way.

So with these few comments I don't want to belabour the point any longer but I certainly have to vote against the Schedule because of the experience that we've had in some of these corporations, and I don't believe that we should just be pouring money down the drain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule A--passed. Schedule B--passed. Preamble--passed; title--passed; bill be reported.

MR. GREEN: . . . just before we go back into the House I want to apologize to the Honourable Member for Rhineland. He voted for the Mineral Royalty Tax increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 11, has directed me to report the same with amendments. The committee has also considered Bill No. 22, and has directed me to report the same without amendments, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call the Concurrence Motion please.

CONCURRENCE

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I said at 5:30 that I would be very short. I was dealing only with the problem, and I say it is a problem, of the administration of the Liquor Control by the Attorney-General a man who has many responsibilities in the House. He's responsible for the administration of the Liquor Control Commission; he's also responsible for the Manitoba Police Commission; he's responsible for the administration of justice as well, and we find the Manitoba Police Commission recommending more stringent controls on government liquor stores, and the Minister responsible for the Liquor Commission is in fact doing the opposite, he is extending the hours of government liquor stores while he's tightening up the - following another recommendation of the police commission, and he is rigidly enforcing more stringent inspection of existing licensed premises, and it leads one to ask the question of the allegiance then of the Minister.

He is certainly concerned about more stringent controls of those that make their living by private enterprise and yet he is relaxing the control over the operation of state enterprise.

I pointed out as an interesting fact, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister is probably following a general philosophy here, a philosophy that is becoming more apparent all the time to the people of Manitoba that when the affairs of the state are concerned, there's a different

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . approach taken than there is to those when it concerns private enterprise. And I think it's a situation that as long as the people of Manitoba are aware of that situation occurring, then the choice is really up to the people of Manitoba, but let them be aware of what system they are in fact selecting, because we see the evidence here. So far it has not been too prevalent but it is showing signs more and more and as long as we know it, and the people know it, then we as politicians have to accept the verdict of the people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I shall be hopefully as brief as the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell but I want to again appeal to the Attorney-General re the application that was made by one of my constituents for a liquor outlet in a restaurant in Pine River. I spoke on the Minister's estimates. I spoke on a grievance. I phoned my constituent today, nothing has happened, nobody has been out there to see her, and I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many times you have to raise your voice in this House for word to get through the Attorney-General to the Liquor Commission that there is a problem. And this lady in all sincerity, in all good faith has done everything she can possibly do to get it across to the Liquor Commission that she would like a licence to sell some beer and wine in her restaurant. And, Mr. Speaker, it's the only restaurant between Dauphin and Swan River which is a matter of some 140 miles and if you can give me any justification why that lady shall not have the kind of consideration that she deserves as a taxpaying citizen, somebody that's trying to move this province forward, this government's talking about rural development and making everything equal across this province, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any justification because I'm very uptight about it - I understand in talking to my constituent today that there was a letter came from the Chairman of the Liquor Commission saying that people would be out there to help her set this in. Nothing has happened, so that's my appeal and I am doing it for the third time on the concurrence motion and hope that the Liquor Commission will go out and try and assist my constituent to do what she would like to do out there now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. --(Interjection)--

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Tourism says that I'm not supposed to do certain things. --(Interjection)-- Well I only want to comment on two items or two matters and that one was on the matter that was introduced by the Member for Thompson. I thought he had some valid points that he raised in connection with the staffing of the University of Manitoba and the person that he named, I forget the proper - the . . . --(Interjection)--

And you know I think greater care should be taken as to who is appointed to the staff of those universities. I know of people who are presently very hesitant to have their young people go to the universities because of certain influences; and this is not an isolated case, this is becoming pretty widespread and I feel that - I feel that an image was built up by the University of Manitoba over a period of years and that we can tear that image down very fast. And I think it is happening, especially the last year or two and now with this incident coming along I am sure that it will have a further effect on the university and I feel very strongly on this. I had hoped that the Minister of Universities would certainly stand up and make a statement on the address made by the Member for Thompson. I think it's incumbent on him to do so, that this thing should not be left unchallenged. Certainly the Minister of Universities has certain responsibilities and I think he's the one that should be speaking on behalf of the universities in this House and if charges are being made I think he should reply, not only the Attorney-General but I think it's incumbent on the other Ministers as well.

The other matter I would like to raise is on the Human Rights Commission and here again the experiences that I've had are not pleasing indeed. I'm not sure, I haven't followed these things through the way the Member for Thompson has that he feels that or says that the commission only makes recommendations, it's up to the Attorney-General's Department to take action and we know from the report that numerous actions have been taken according to the report. But I know of incidents that were reported and which were not brought to a proper conclusion and this certainly in my opinion takes away from the commission itself and I don't really know whether we're getting our money's worth and whether the people of this province really put confidence into the commission. At least this is not the experience I have. And therefore I feel something will have to be done either to give the commission itself more power so that they can take action on their own in certain areas of operations or that the thing be rectified in some other way. And maybe the Attorney-General will be making some comments

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . on closing the concurrences and if he has some further statements to make in this regard I'd be happy to hear them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my local problem in this same field of the Liquor Commission and it does with--in rural areas there's many dine and dance permits asked for and got and the problem seems to be the price structure. They do demand that they only charge 40 cents an ounce and have to supply the mix. I approached on one of these occasions Mr. Syms, I said, or not him, someone under his department, if we charge 50 cents and include a drink, included the mix--and he said well you're--really it's not legal. You might get away with it. And the question is these dine and dance permits in the rural area put on by agriculture societies, ball clubs, hockey clubs, community clubs and they're all done for the genuine purpose to make some money for some particular local project; and I just wish the Attorney-General through his department would consider raising this price so there's a few more bucks in it for those clubs because with the mixes going up and labour, the area of margin of profit at 40 cents an ounce is just pretty small when they have to take in the other things and I think it would be a benefit to all, rural especially, if this could be upped to 50-60 cents where the margin is more reasonable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. --(Interjection)--

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I'm getting a lot of advice that really I should not respond at any length --(Interjection)-- to the very learned and intellectual contributions that have been made in respect to the motion on the concurrences of the Department of the Attorney-General.

However I, like a number of my colleagues on both sides of the House, can't resist the opportunity to say a few kind words about the department. As a matter of fact I think that in retrospect I really didn't say enough kind words about my department during the introduction of my Estimates. I think I was so concerned to save all of the time for the members of the opposition in dealing with my Estimates that I was very very brief and I don't want to punish anyone here tonight because after all it is somewhat after 11:00 o'clock, but I think it would be remiss for me not to indicate at this time that I have had the enthusiastic co-operation of a very devoted staff in the Attorney-General's Department, a staff that is required to make a lot of very difficult decisions because they involve the very important consideration as to how and when certain charges are to be proceeded with against people in society. And it's a very onerous position, and frankly I make no secret of the fact that I have felt that members of my staff are deserving of much more by way of financial remuneration and I want to put it on the record that I certainly sympathize with their concerns to be well paid and that is certainly my intent, that they be reasonably remunerated for their work. Many members will note that members of my staff leave this building at - not at regular hours, when particularly their work involves litigation, litigation in court, during the course of the assizes of course and they come into this building at very very late hours and they work in the interests of society in a very dedicated way and I want to put on the record my appreciation for the efforts of my department.

Now not out of any disrespect but I do want to deal with the contributions of members rather briefly and I will start with latter contribution in respect to the observations of the Honourable Member from Virden; I want to merely say that I certainly sympathize with the argument that he makes. Policy decisions like this are made by the Liquor Control Commission Board; however I have passed along my observations to the Chairman of the Commission and I assume that the Commission Board will want to have a second look at that policy decision. But again it's a decision that they make and I don't make those decisions for them.

Now in respect to the Member from Rhineland's observations, they really dovetail with the observations of the Member from Thompson and I'll defer answering those until I deal with the observations of that honourable member.

In respect to the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell and his plea for the restaurateur that he mentioned--I'm sorry, the Member for Roblin - I have certainly drawn his observations to the attention of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission and he has indicated they're certainly prepared to give every opportunity for a person to obtain a licence. However there are certain standards that must be obtained. The standards that have been recognized to date in this facility haven't been such as to be in keeping with the standards required and

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . if though the necessary changes come about they'll certainly want to reconsider that.

Now in respect to the observations of the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, I would like to indicate to him that it is true that I have argued very strongly that the budget item dealing with the Human Rights Commission has had to be a fairly substantial one because it was certainly the intention of this government that the Human Rights Commission should have the capacity to carry on a very effective program, an effective program, in dealing with researching the areas of discrimination that exist in society; being able to have an impact by way of an advertising program to bring home to the people of Manitoba the work of the Commission, its concern to effectively serve the people of Manitoba to eliminate as effectively as possible both subtle and open forms of discrimination in the areas to which they have authority pursuant to the Act. And this kind of program does cost money. And I think that the efforts of the Human Rights Commission in respect to its advertising, its advertising has been skillful, I think it's had its impact. They have an outreach program into schools, they have been studying various school curricula and it's amazing the extent to which by passage of time discriminatory references creep into reference material; certainly school texts and the Human Rights Commission is working closely with the Department of Education to determine where discriminatory references occur and to see that they are eliminated.

Now the Honourable Member from Fort Garry indicated that there was some concern with the Human Rights Commission's efforts and it is true that there is some concern, that perhaps there will have to be some significant amendments to that Act. But I'm not going to prejudge what the court will decide in respect to the role of the Human Rights Commission and the role of the Attorney-General in making orders pursuant to their recommendations. And I want honourable members to understand, and particularly I wish the Honourable Member from Thompson were here because I would like him to understand the functionings of the Human Rights Commission.

The Human Rights Commission makes recommendations and those recommendations may or may not be agreed to by the government, and as the report that has been filed clearly indicates there are recommendations that the Human Rights Commission has made that the government has not acted on. Now that's not to say that the recommendations are frivolous or nonsensical. The government and each department of government will have to consider these recommendations as they affect that departmental program, will have to weigh the logic or the argument that is presented by the Human Rights Commission and consider--will have to consider, will have to consider whether or not that change should be brought about.

Now I want to draw the members' attention to that because the honourable member, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition--the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made much of an argument that the Human Rights Commission should somehow be separate and apart from government. Now apparently he doesn't appreciate that really the government does not hide the work of the Human Rights Commission; the Human Rights Commission is free to make its recommendations and here are the recommendations in this report and whether or not the government accepts those recommendations is another thing. But the recommendations are there and the honourable members of the opposition or others in society can badger and hound the government if they believe those recommendations ought to be pursued.

Now the Honourable Member for Thompson seems to be critical of some of these recommendations. Well it appears that some of his thinking is certainly the thinking of some members of the government on this side because some of the recommendations have not been accepted. So I would just like to reassure the Honourable Member for Thompson that simply because these recommendations are made doesn't mean to say that they're necessarily silly. The government is free to accept or not to accept those recommendations and I would like him to consider that what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was saying is that this vehicle should be even more--even more powerful, even more effective and freewheeling in society. We think--we think that they're effective now. They can make recommendations and I draw the parallel for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he were here--perhaps his colleagues will draw it to his attention, that we have a Law Reform Commission and they pursuant to the Act enquire and investigate into laws that are on the statute books now; they can of their own initiative initiate studies and research and make recommendations in respect to change of laws, and those changes we may or may not act upon.

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

In other jurisdictions, for example the Province of Ontario, they have acted on a mere fraction of - a mere fraction of the recommendations of their Law Reform Commission. We've acted on many more of the recommendations of our Law Reform Commission. They're free, they're free to make those recommendations, they're not being restricted and hogtied by the Attorney-General of this government. Sometimes that can be a little bit embarrassing, as the Honourable Member from Thompson has indicated. Maybe some of their recommendations may appear silly to some people and you know, if they do I suppose you know that I can accept some measure of responsibility, but we don't determine, I don't determine what those recommendations are going to be and whether or not they are reasonable or proper or acceptable. We are free and they are--we are free to accept or not accept their recommendations and they are free to make them. Now I think that's as it should be.

Now whether or not in some particular instances these recommendations have more or less value is up to the government and the members of this Legislature to decide. And I don't see what's wrong with that system. I don't see why the Leader of the Opposition is crying out for greater and more effective freedom for the Human Rights Commission. I think they are free, and if he reads the report he'll see that, but maybe he didn't bother to read the report before he made his speech. At least the Honourable Member for Thompson did. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if in answer to a question earlier on today I appeared to be interpreting the honourable member's question in an improper way, then I did not mean that. I took it from the honourable member that he was critical of the assertion by the Human Rights Commission and its seeming propensity to deal with a considerable number of cases dealing with sex discrimination, and the attempt by some women to find a greater measure of equality and job opportunity, and if that is a misconception of the thrust of his argument, then I apologize to him because I did not intend to indicate that he was, you know, anti the right of an individual female to work in the labour force. I'm getting, Mr. Speaker, some rather very subtle indications from my colleagues that they want me to be brief but I do want to, I do want to recognize --(Interjection)-- I do want to recognize the arguments that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition --(Interjection)-- All right now I at least have some appreciation across the way.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was concerned about the departure from the Human Rights Commission of an executive officer and, you know, these things happen. We don't live in a perfect society; we don't have a perfect administrative bureaucracy. The departure of the executive secretary was in accordance with the wishes of the Human Rights Commission; there may have been some misunderstandings about that, but that was made eminently clear by the Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, and the Human Rights Commission were dissatisfied with the nature of his employment, and that was it.

Now the Honourable Member from Thompson was concerned about areas for which I really don't want to take too much time; I probably shouldn't take any time. The Honourable Member from Thompson for example was concerned about the activities of a priest of the Roman Catholic Church who was, who practiced civil disobedience in the United States. --(Interjection)-- You know, well now I interpret it that he was involved in civil disobedience, and now the honourable member indicates that there was violence. I don't know all of the factual accounting of those matters but let me say this, that I think in our society there are those who confront the law from time to time and maybe in a way that is not acceptable to the rest of society, but I think the Honourable Member from Thompson can appreciate that those things happen, and I am not, I am not going to condemn out of hand people that do disagree from time to time with the law. However, that's not to say I won't enforce the law if they are in breach of the law, but I certainly don't think that applies to the case that the honourable member refers to; it's certainly nothing to do with this jurisdiction, no offense, or no breach of the law occurred here.

Now the honourable member had many more things to say but I'm getting such persuasive argument from my colleagues that I should abridge my comments that I find it difficult. The honourable member did hear me during the course of my estimates and I think that I did, you know, elaborate extensively at that time. I really think, I really think that the honourable member if he will reread Hansard, during the course of my estimates I dealt with, I think, almost every one of the items that the honourable member mentioned. I certainly put on record my position in respect to --(Interjection)-- you know the honourable member wants to ask a question.

## CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say the Attorney-General making a long-winded speech, which his colleagues don't want him to continue, could he tell me whether he's going to allow or deny hotel operators to advertise for male bouncers, and will women be able to advertise for women baby-sitters because they want a woman, not a man.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. --(Interjections)-- Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the assistants at hotels--the honourable member chooses to call them bouncers--I guess that they are waiters or waitresses extraordinary. I think that there are instances when it would be preferable in mixed beverage rooms for a well muscled or a well proportioned female (Hear, Hear) to escort in a ladylike way any female in a mixed beverage room that might be a little unruly. I think that would be preferable than being manhandled by a male.

Now, I think there certainly may be instances where it would be desirable now--particularly in mixed beverage rooms--I am certain that if an advertisement is run for a waiter in a "male-only" beer parlor, then I'm sure there's no problem there. Now, if that is technically in breach of the act as it now may appear to be, then I think that that stands to be corrected, and I'll certainly want to look at amendments to the Human Rights Act at the next occasion to rectify that, and the problem which - I admit it exists - I think during the course of my estimates in respect to the baby-sitter situation that the honourable member raised at that time. He did point out, he did point out, and he pointed out quite correctly as I recall, that this is an anomaly, and I think that there must be provisions made in the Human Rights Act to provide for this kind of exemption from the provisions of the act.

Now I don't think that that is unreasonable and I would assume that --(Interjection)-- I would assume that if I continue to get these interjections I might lose my good humour. But I assume, Mr. Speaker, that in due course when the act is again before us, and I didn't want to review it at this time frankly because that we are awaiting the decisions of the court; it may well be that we'll want to make some significant changes in the act arising from the considerations the court has had of particular actions that have been taken pursuant to its present provisions.

Now I think that they deal with the essential matters that were raised. I could have dealt at greater length, but given the particular hour and the mood of my--of the colleagues of the House generally, I will let that suffice.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed. (Passed) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4, 616, 100 for Civil Service--The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the Civil Service, you know there are times when certain points are brought to your attention by somebody or other, and when the matter of the Civil Service was before the House previously I was not aware of a situation that has been brought to my attention since that time, so I want to raise it at this particular time for the benefit of the Minister.

It's a little problem; I don't think it is very serious, but I think it deserves attention. It was brought to my attention that there seems to be some attempt made in certain places in the civil service anyway to eliminate the grievance procedure in the carrying on of the everyday affairs of that particular department.

And another thing that was brought to my attention was the fact that compassionate leave has been reduced from five days to three days --(Interjections)-- and it only applies where it's your father and mother. And I would bring it to the Minister's attention at this time for his perusal.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed? (Passed) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$75, 529, 700 for Colleges and Universities Affairs, Resolutions 31 to 34, separately, collectively, passed--(Passed)

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1, 945, 100 for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services, Resolutions 35 to 41--passed--(Passed)

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$721, 100 for Co-Operative Development, 42 to 44, separately and collectively, passed--The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

## CONCURRENCE

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry the Minister is not here at this time, but it's been some time since the co-operative movement has been brought in as a department and really we haven't had much opportunity to look at the various affairs of the various co-ops and their annual statements are not available to us. I was wondering if it was possible for the Minister to give us some indication of how the new Co-Operative Development programs that have been announced are actually progressing. --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Labour says "favourably", and I ask him if he is fully aware, and if that is a true picture. We can take that as the --(Interjection)-- Very good. I'll accept the gospel as according to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution--passed. (Passed) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$134, 727, 400 for Education. Resolution 45 to 49 passed--The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I had a few matters to raise on Education. To save the time of the House I was discussing the Colleges and Universities' question in the coffee room with the Minister of Colleges and Universities . . .

A MEMBER: We've passed it.

MR. CRAIK: Well, we passed that out in the other room, Mr. Speaker, to save the House a little time. But the question of the Department of Education . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CRAIK: Well, we'd better discuss the Department of Education, Mr. Speaker, in the House because this is where most of the meat lies in the whole question of education.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I think that we have to comment on still the rising costs in the whole Department of Education. I think perhaps there is maybe more question about the escalation of costs in Colleges and Universities inasmuch as the enrolment is almost completely static in terms of total numbers, and still the costs continue to go up. In the Public School System the enrolment as well is staying now reasonably steady but still the costs continue to escalate, and we have before us this year a substantial increase over last year again in excess of 10 percent, so, Mr. Speaker, we haven't had an opportunity to deal with education in detail but there are questions, general questions, that I think the Minister should undertake to look at and answer to the House.

I think the one question is, since we're talking about the total amounts of money in concurrence, first of all: What does the Minister see in the continuing cost of education in total? What are the plans of the government with regards to transfer of costs of property and onto the general tax base? What will be the split in costs this year? We had some figures given by the First Minister in a statement to the effect that the Foundation Program was going to reach 80 percent of costs on 80-20 split, but, Mr. Speaker, I think the First Minister in that statement was using the Foundation Program as misnomer here, he perhaps meant that the total contribution of the Provincial Government to public education may be reaching the 80-20 split, but I don't believe that the "Foundation Program" has been altered that substantially itself. Perhaps the moneys coming into the public system by other means through per capita per student grants--but could the Minister give us a breakdown --(Interjection)-- could the Minister give us what the total expenditures are for Public Schools Education in the Province of Manitoba, and what portion of that will be covered by provincial grants, plus what portion will be covered by the Foundation levy, and what portion will be covered by the Special Levy on Properties? In other words, could we get a complete breakdown on the cost-sharing to tell us where this 80-20 split comes? If we take the First Minister's statements earlier in the year as verbatim we would assume that 20 percent of the cost is coming from the Special plus Foundation Levy. Would he clarify that and tell us the--pardon? 78-22? Well, could he give us the breakdown on what the 22 percent is and what the 80 percent is? That's on the financial end, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of other questions --(Interjection)--

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interrupt my honourable friend's train of thought, but the--I should point out that the practice of trying to answer questions in this period is not the same as when we are discussing estimates, that generally the Concurrence Motion was a time when a member spoke to the department, made a position, for

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. GREEN) . . . . which he either concurred in or did not concur, that the Minister can't answer, and then hope to answer somebody else, so I'm not saying that he can't do it, but if he's expecting the same procedure that applies in committee to apply here, I merely tell him by way of a point of order, that that is not the case.

CONCURRENCE (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that's true. I guess the only way around that though is for me to make an inaccurate charge and then for the Minister to correct it. So rather than do that I thought I'd approach it, and we didn't have a chance to get at the estimates and so --(Interjections)-- maybe I can dream up a big lie here or something and we can get it corrected, then we'll--so perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could say, how come the government has let its subsidy of the public school system fall below the 50 percent level for the first time in 50 years, and then let them go back and correct it and give us the details. But if he would supply us in his reply, whenever that may be, with some more information it would help, at least partially make up for the fact that we didn't have the estimates become available to us.

Now other than that I think that we'd like to know what he's doing with this Planning and Research Department of his. He essentially put in a massive graft onto the Department of Education and taken into it a large number of people, essentially leaving the present department and the people that are in it there, but adding fantastic costs to the whole operation of the Department of Education by adding in another branch, Planning and Research, and having assigned to it a lot of the normal duties of the department. For instance taking the old Evaluation Board for new school construction, which was a five man Public Schools Finance Board before and the Building Projects Committee. All of these responsibilities have effectively been relieved of them, and in terms of the new project, Mr. Speaker, it's impossible, has been impossible over the last couple of years for the school boards to go to the normal School Buildings Projects Committee and get an answer on the basis of rationalization. Instead of that they're continually referred to one person, one lady in the department who seems to have the powers almost of - coming in from - almost completely inexperienced in the business of evaluating the new schools, but still having the decision-making powers. So almost in every case that I've heard of where people approach the Department of Education with regards to a new building, and if they have to deal with them in detail and there's any question about first of all whether they get the building or not, they always end up in Mrs. Reed's, or Miss Reed's, office trying to persuade her that they need a new building. Now, Mr. Speaker, the old system was that they knew that they were dealing with the School Building Projects Committee and ultimately that on this they had access to the Public Schools Finance Board which had a high degree of authority to make these decisions. Ultimately the thing comes to the Minister's desk for decision, but in the meantime the lineup of requirements for new schools goes directly to that committee for approval. But the boards now find that they're having to go to this lady to get approval. Now, Mr. Speaker, it raises the question here as to how the--debates the question in the operation of this as to whether the method is as impartial as it was previously in deciding what new schools should be constructed and what additions should be made.

Mr. Speaker, we had a case in St. Vital where the Member for St. Vital told the people in the Glenwood area that he was going to go to the Minister and going to get them a new school. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was on the St. Vital School Board for several years; I was Minister of Education for several years, and we evaluated these things at all times. And I don't ever recall an MLA coming to me and telling me that they needed a new school in their area because they'd promised the local school board they were going to give them a school. But the Member for St. Vital said, "I'm going to get you an addition to Glenwood School", he walked in and voilà, he's got a new addition to the Glenwood School. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's--perhaps Mr. Speaker, they were very deserving. I know that they attempted for years to get the addition, and I suppose he can take a lot of political kudos for having promised them a new addition to their school, and in a matter of weeks, yes, they had a new addition to their school, and the school is in a fairly stable area, it's not a growing area, it's the older area of the city. It hasn't moved, hasn't moved in enrolment in many years. It's a very fine school, very fine tradition, but what you have in this case is an aborting of the normal process which is a

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . priority list set by your school board, then processing it through the School Buildings Project Committee, receiving justification for the school, and then if the financial resources are there, that the province says he gets it.

So how does this operate? Mr. Speaker, there's a very clear indication that what's happening is that you have - this is an example - where the member of course can go back and say, look what I did for you, got you a new - but it's aborted the system. It means that a government backbencher has come in and said, we got you a new school, we were going to get you a new school, and we got it for you. Mr. Speaker, that's the old Duplessis system personified when you have this sort of thing, and we haven't experienced that in the past in Manitoba. I've never had a charge made against me, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the only charge I ever had of suspected interference was made against me when we moved a school from the intersection of Nairn Avenue and Highway 59, a technical-vocational school, and everybody got up in arms because they thought I was going to move it south and, Mr. Speaker, where did it go? It ended up in your constituency, Mr. Speaker, when you were the member. There wasn't a politician at the municipal level or school board level east of the Red River that didn't think that there was going to be some hanky-panky go on there and that school was going to end up somewhere down south, and it ended up, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, in your own constituency and it's one of the finest comprehensive schools now in the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I never recall anyone saying at any time that there was--the previous administration - that there was any political input into the location of schools, and never to my knowledge, and never in the school board experience was there ever a school board--was there ever a school board that ever suggested - school board that ever suggested that that took place. But that can't be said now, that can't be said now. Mr. Speaker, the word is out far and wide, the word is out far and wide through St. Vital that the interference is going on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister can also tell me who is in--if the Planning and Research body is also responsible for the curriculum work that is going on? Has this now been transferred also to the planning and research department? Because, Mr. Speaker, I have not in the last four years, I have not in the last four years had any cause to ever say that I ever felt that the government was in any way influencing curriculum in any way, shape or form. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been a natural tendency to be watchful of this with the establishment of his branch, which has plenty of political appointees on it and naturally being a political animal you watch that sort of thing. So, Mr. Speaker, we now have the condition where we have to ask the Minister if some of the curriculum coming out isn't actually showing a political bias.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I can't ask the Minister a question, I can only make the charge at him. Let's take for instance "Political Studies 201, Teachers Guide." Mr. Speaker, this says--let me read you the section on Units for Ideology, which says - Number 4 section of this, "At this point different contrasting ideologies should be explained using the expository technique plus any other methods that will work with the students in the class. Attempt to get at the underlying values, beliefs, goals, attitudes and assumptions of the ideology." And it gives the examples, Mr. Speaker. "Documents would prove quite meaningful at this time. Four examples: (a) Nazi Platform; (b) Regina Manifesto; (c) Guidelines for the Seventies; (d) Communist Manifesto." --(Interjection)--

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware that the Guidelines for the Seventies was intended to occupy that exalted position along with the Regina Manifesto and the Communist Manifesto, let alone the Nazi Platform. But, Mr. Speaker, it's right in the middle, right in between them. Mr. Speaker, what is serious about this though, what is serious about this, are the ones that are missing. Mr. Speaker, this is tremendous political fodder obviously, eh? Because anybody . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rhineland have a point of order?

MR. FROESE: Yes, could the honourable member indicate from what report he's reading from and whether he would table it?

MR. CRAIK: This is the Teachers Guide to go along with the outline for Political Studies 201 of the Department of Education - Unit 4 ideology. Well, Mr. Speaker, after Nazi Platform, Regina Manifesto, Guidelines for the Seventies and Communist Manifesto, there is

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . no J. S. Mills on there; there is no British Parliamentary System and its Influence on Western Democracy. There is nothing here about the Judeo-Christian Influence and Ethic on Western Democracy. There's none of those on there. All there is is those four, those four references.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Honourable Member for Lakeside contain himself.

MR. CRAIK: Well my friends you better take a look at it. Then if you don't know what's in here you better start checking out what's going on through your Planning and Research. Well, obviously Mr. Speaker - I give the Minister credit for one thing, he's familiar with the document. He's familiar with the document.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews state his point of order.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Would the member please table the document?

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Riel. If it's a public document, then he has to table it.

MR. CRAIK: I'm required to table it by the rules of the House and I recognize that, you can have it. --(Interjection)-- That's right. If I thought I wasn't I'd certainly be hauled up very shortly by the Minister of Labour. Let's go on to Clause 7: "A concluding activity could be debated between students on topics which concern the preference of one ideology over the other. Here there's two examples: Example (a): The Government of Manitoba at present ('NDP') is not a socialist government.

SOME MEMBERS: Ohhhh! Second example?

MR. CRAIK: Second example. "The government of the Soviet Union is not Socialist." Mr. Speaker, they're in good company. Those are the only two examples that are given.

A MEMBER: Read No. 3, John.

MR. CRAIK: No. 3 is not here. --(Interjection)-- No. 3 on the first page. That's right. "Set up different situations in which decisions have to be made by governments proposing to have a definite ideology. The students must then take or play roles in order to make decisions. Examples: (a) Nationalization of natural resources. (b) Food and price controls by the government." Not bad. "(c): Abolition of private property (landbanks)"--

Well, Mr. Speaker, - Mr. Speaker, as I say, this document is not bad if you have the checks and balances in here. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, there's no balances in here, it's all one-sided, it's all lopsided. There's nothing in this document here that says that you should look at the abolition of socialism. There's nothing in this document here that says that "resolved that, the cost of government is too high"; there's nothing in here, Mr. Speaker, that says that you should debate whether the Judeo-Christian influence has been instrumental in changing our democracy as we know it today; there's nothing in here that says, Mr. Speaker, that the British parliamentary system has any small contribution to the system of government we have today.

Mr. Speaker, there's none of these topics in here that have values which offset the topics that are in here. I'm not criticizing the government or their drafters or researchers of saying that they should look at nationalization of resources, they've already done that. We've got the Kierans report, it's a good debating issue; there's nothing wrong with looking at food and price controls and there's nothing particularly wrong I suppose in looking at any of the items listed here, but there's no checks and balances built into it. It's a one-sided document. The implications stand out like a sore thumb. There's no way here that you couldn't say the NDP is a socialist government, there's no way you couldn't say that, you could say it if you like, but each debating topic and each suggestion for background material always is put in the other direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have here is clearly a sign that may not necessarily be at this point government policy, but it's a sign obviously that's coming out of the Planning and Research Department, that they are prepared, at least, some individual or group of individuals are going to work this up as a proposal, and knowing how proposals go, it comes in through the government and the backbenchers and everybody else can decry the fact that this is not government policy but it's obviously there and the gun is loaded, the pistol's loaded before the Public School System ever gets it. The only hope of screening that sort of junk out, the only hope of screening that sort of junk out of the school system, thank God, is the fact that the local school boards may in fact take the time to point out what's going on and stop it. Either that or your

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . Teachers Association or your Superintendents Association or somebody else. But what are you supposed to do when you get a missile that comes down from the Department of Education that recommends this as a teacher's guide for teaching political science, political studies?

Mr. Speaker, this is the first sign - and I stood up in this House before and I said on more than one occasion that I thought that there was plenty of flexibility in the public school system and there wasn't any great deal concern to be had about whether or not the system is too rigid because it varies from one school division to another - but this is the first sign that I've seen of a document in the way of curriculum direction that has a particular bias to it - and this, no question about it has a bias, if you look at it in view of what is not there and not just what is there.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the honourable gentleman is laying on the table the document that he referred to.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have the Citation if you want to argue with me.

A MEMBER: . . . public document . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, you can see why of course --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker --(Interjections)-- Mr. Speaker, we've now got . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel proceed.

MR. CRAIK: . . . one teacher, one lawyer, and one half teacher, one half lawyer looking at the document and I suppose we'll get some sort of an analysis of it before these Estimates are done.

Mr. Speaker, there was a comment behind here by the Member for Morris that I think shouldn't be dropped without going on the record. It's not hard to see where the defenders and promoters of the private school system and parochial school systems can get themselves plenty concerned when they see themselves as being the offsetting force against this sort of junk going into the public school system. (Hear, Hear) I think if the government is going to adequately defend a principle of keeping ideologies out of school whether they're one way or another--and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the whole business is the question of what kind and how much of ideological debate and input do you allow into the public school system--then this provides plenty of ammunition for those people that feel that there should be a higher possibility of getting the religious input into the schools. And, Mr. Speaker, many of those people--Mr. Speaker, those people who are bound to argue the strongest against, who are determined to argue the strongest against that principle ought to well examine whether or not the subtle influence of an ideology is not going to creep into the school system because of an over-zealous planning and research department that comes under the Minister of Education.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to drop it at that point. --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to drop the topic at that. The Minister has a very satisfied look on his face now, he obviously has an answer to it and I'd be very happy to hear what his answer is.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I only have a few comments to make and on one particular department, in the Department of Education, but I might say that I'm really shaken at the document that the Member for Riel has exposed to the members of this House and I hope it will be exposed across this province. It's going to be my intention, if the Member for Riel doesn't do it, to mail a copy of that document to every school board in this province so they know what's going on.

A MEMBER: They've already got it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, I think the school board members across the province should know about that, and if the Member for Riel will not take it upon himself to do it, I will do it. I think that people across this province should know what's going on in the Department of Education.

May I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the 1968 estimates, and of course in relationship to spending from--rather, 1969--the relationship of spending from 1969 to 73 in the Department of Education, 136 million roughly in 1969, and of course that included the universities, to today

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . 135 million which is for the school system excluding the colleges and universities. I do not quarrel with the increase in the cost of education, but I took it upon myself to look at the Directorate of Research in 1969; the salaries then totalled \$40,200, the Other Expenditures were \$30,800 and the Research Grants were \$29,000.00. This was a total of \$100,000 for the Directorate of Research in 1969.

I refer you now to this year's estimates for the year 1974. Salaries went from 40,000 to \$329,800; the Other Expenditures, whatever they are, went from 30,800 to \$461,300; and the Research Grants went from 29,000 to \$400,500.00. The total for 1974's expenditure in this department, Planning and Research, \$1,191,600, an increase of about--what is it? Can someone help me?--it's about elevenfold, twelvefold - roughly an increase of twelvefold.

What has the Planning and Research Department done? I'm sure that the Minister will not be able to sit silent after what has been said tonight. When he gets up I don't want him to tell me what they're trying to do, I want him to tell me what they have done, what are the results. To me this department has turned into an NDP senate; the Burrows, the Goodmans and the Orlikows and gosh knows who else is there; and what have they been doing to the Department of Education? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they've been a disruptive force, they have been put in over top of the professionals who have been working in that department for years, very competent people, but the NDP senate has been put into the Department of Education under the guise of Planning and Research. And I would like the Minister to tell me what are the results of the spending and what has been accomplished. I'm sure he will get up and tell us what they are trying to do or what they're attempting to do, but their travels to Switzerland and the United States and Europe and wherever they go, I want to know what are the results, what has this group done for the Department of Education? And I look forward to the Minister's comments.

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

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I won't take up too much time and I know that the Minister is anxious to answer some of the rather ridiculous statements that have been made from the other side, but the Member for Riel, who is really not paying too much attention at the moment, made some remarks about me and my position as a member of this Legislature, remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not sure weren't bordering on the privilege of this House when he reflected upon my conduct as a member of this House.

What the Member for Riel said in this House was that I had made promises to people in the constituency of St. Vital and made them a promise that they would get a new school and that I went to see the Minister and the Minister did exactly what I told him to do and he's building them a new school. Well that's patently ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. If he thinks that I have that sort of influence with the Minister of Education or any other Minister he's sadly mistaken and as an ex Minister himself I'm sure that he knows how ridiculous that statement is.

A MEMBER: That's what he used to do, that was his type of game . . .

MR. WALDING: The facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker, are that there was a meeting at Glenwood in my constituency, where a group of concerned parents got together, held a public meeting. As a member of that constituency I considered it part of my duty to attend that meeting to see if there was anything that I could do for them to assist them in any way. At that meeting there was several points that came up and one of them included the state of the gymnasium in that school--and that particular school happens to be over 60 years old, at least the original building, there have been more recent additions to it, there have been some renovations made to it. And it was pointed out to me the condition of the gymnasium in there, the gymnasium which was approximately the size of one and a half classrooms, and this for a school of about 550 students; a gymnasium which is quite obviously inadequate for a school, and the school was obviously in need of a new gymnasium. I made them no promise that they would get a new gymnasium, I made them no promise that there would be a new school, I made them no promise that there would be renovations. The Member for Riel was not there and he does not know what I said; if he wishes to misrepresent me in this way he may do so. All that I said to the parents at that meeting was that I would speak to the Minister and bring it to his attention the state of that gymnasium and that the school really deserved a larger and a better gym.

Now, I subsequently did this, brought it to the Minister's attention and he was aware of the situation. And apparently the Member for Riel thinks that this is somehow bad that a

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. WALDING cont'd) . . . . member of this House should take an interest in his constituents and that he should be prepared to do what he can for them and to speak up for them. Now he might think that that's not the way an MLA should conduct himself, and maybe that's the way he conducts himself.

The Member for Riel further went on to say that this is somehow bringing politics into it, that there are rules and regulations and procedures. Well, certainly there are rules and regulations and procedures, and the school board in St. Vital had applied to the Public Schools Finance Board for certain renovations to be done to the school, and they had also applied to the Public Schools Finance Board for a new gymnasium. Certain of those renovations had been approved, others had not, but as far as the gymnasium is concerned the Public Schools Finance Board has a sort of a rule of thumb - it's not a regulation, it's not in the statute books - that the Public Schools Finance Board would not build a new gymnasium unless new classrooms were necessary. This is a rule of thumb that dates back for many years and I'm sure that the Member for Riel is quite well aware of this as a past Minister; but he should be equally aware that the Minister has the discretion to overrule decisions of the Public Schools Finance Board if in his opinion it is deemed necessary. And that is precisely what had happened in this case.

He knows also I'm sure that when the Public Schools Finance Board refuses an application from a school board that there is an appeal procedure which can be gone through. There is a further appeal from that to the Minister himself. The St. Vital School Board had not appealed the original decision and they had of course not appealed it any further to the Minister; it had stopped there when they got their first refusal.

Now it's true that I did speak to the Minister about it and bring it to his attention and I understand that quite a few months later when further study had been done into this project that permission, approval had been given for a larger gymnasium to be built on that particular site. And I'm very glad that the Member for Riel says that this is public knowledge and it's well recognized around St. Vital what the Member for St. Vital had in fact accomplished for his constituency; I'm very pleased that he should say that because I certainly had not publicized it, and if the word had got around that this had come to pass then I'm very pleased to hear it. And if the Member for Riel had anything to do with publicizing that, then I'm very grateful for his contribution.

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I must confess when the Honourable Member for Riel spoke I was also shocked --(Interjection)-- that's right. So was everybody else. But I took the trouble of reading it - I took the trouble of reading it and I think if we're going to look at this, let's be a little honest before we start panicking the people of Manitoba.

I think that first of all maybe we should read a little more about it and try to find out what this document is all about, what it's trying to do. There's no doubt that it's trying to bring controversy to show certain examples to prove a point and I think my honourable friend should know it. And let's read some of the things, not take two or three things that were under lined here and try to make a big case out of that and get everybody excited, because my honourable friend did succeed--when he read it I was shocked, but let's look at this.

First of all, it is entitled "Ideologies": -- Propose different situations which require decision on the part of the individual student. Examples: (a) A person is at a party and must decide whether or not to smoke marijuana. " All right, one of the two, that's obvious. Does that mean that they're suggesting that you should smoke? "(b) A person is in high school and wishes to drop out. (c) A person is under age and is asked to attend an adult movie or go to a beverage room for some alcoholic drinks. Each person in a group will respond differently to each situation because of his beliefs, attitudes and values." This is what my honourable friend was saying about it, it is to have a confrontation to see what the people would do. And it's the same thing as if we introduced here the question of pornography in this House, for classification. You'd get all kinds of ideas--or aid to private schools. "A group having similar beliefs, attitudes and values have common ideology. Thus, a lead into an explanation of ideology is provided through these decisions which have to be made. "

Now 2. - this was one that was supposed to be quite tricky. "Have the students obtain or devise questionnaires to be answered by a wide sample of people." - a wide sample of people. "The questionnaires should make apparent different beliefs", it's not just slanted on

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . one side, "apparent different beliefs, attitudes and values and will supplement the explanation of ideology. Many basic questionnaires which can be developed are found in the Canadian Political Studies book entitled 'Ideology' by Riddell and Lynch." I can't see anything wrong with that.

No. 3, that was one my honourable friend was shouting, "Read 3". Well, I'll read 3: "Set up different situations in which decisions have to be made by governments proposing to have a definite ideology." How many governments propose to have definite ideology. --(Interjections)-- "The students must then state or play roles in order to make decisions. --(Interjection)-- All right, but the way you read it. "Examples: (a) Nationalization of National Resources." That means for or against. You're playing different roles, you're not slanting this, you have something that is controversial and you talk--you're either in favour or you're against it. '(b) Food and price controls by the government." It's the same thing; are you for or are you against price control? --(Interjections)-- It certainly does, take the trouble of reading the damn thing. "Set up different situations in which decisions have to be made by governments proposing to have a definite ideology. The students must then take or play roles in order to make decisions." You divide them, you do what you want; some are for it and some are against. See, you are panicking too.

"(c) Abolition of private property" - for or against. --(Interjection)-- That's right, for or against. --(Interjections)-- Certainly it's an example that they're giving you; if you can't read the damn thing there's something wrong with you.

"Simulation games could prove quite valuable in this situation. 'Caucus' is one simulation game that could be employed. Also a Model United Nations Assembly could be set up in order that students assume the role of the government in different countries."-- free enterprise, socialism, communism and so on --(Interjections)-- . . . Its not slanted, not a damn bit.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: They are asking you to play the role of the . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. I wonder if I may have the co-operation of the honourable gentlemen, I want to hear what's going on. I have one member on the floor and ten shouting and the Chair can't hear what the debate is. Would the honourable members please co-operate? The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right another one: "The Manitoba Association for World Development could also be useful for course material." We'd let the people come, the students of Manitoba use this place and pretend that they are an NDP government or a Liberal Party or a Conservative Party. This is what is being suggested here. "Throughout this section answers to such basic questions as to what is the function of the government and the individuals that appear. Contrasting ideologies should be used to emphasize this point. Also, it is important to point out that ideologies do not operate in a vacuum. Thus, other concepts such as how does an ideology affect an economic system should be developed." Then you can bring in the TED report, you can bring in any report that you want. --(Interjection)-- No it doesn't - not on this - not in what I'm reading, I'm not up to there yet. Well all right, I'll get there. I won't just pick and choose, I'll read the whole thing. But this is No. 3 that my friend was shouting "Read three". Well, what's wrong with three? So far there's nothing wrong with any of them.

"No. 4. At this point different contrasting ideologies should be explained using the expository technique plus any other methods that will work with the students in the class. Attempt to get at the underlying values, beliefs, goals, attitudes, and assumptions of the ideology. Examples: optimistic or pessimistic." Optimistic and pessimistic, you know, that could be this side and that side, fine. "Position of the individual" --(Interjection)-- with you it could be a position of pornography. That's right. You're right, it depends, it's all the individual is left to himself. "Governments relation to the economy." Then you could talk about the free enterprise all you want. That is God and all that, you know, there's an example. Governments relation to the economy. "What it values most highly." It depends on the individual, what he values most highly. That's a darn good example. "Attitude towards minority groups." I'd like to get in that one and discuss that. Because, you know, maybe the Honourable Member from Charleswood should take that example. "Attitude to people outside the state." You know, should we sell the property to Americans or not sell it. Fine. What the Hell's the matter with that? "Attitude to opposing ideology." --(Interjection)-- Then you can bring in all of them, this is an example, you're using them all. "How the ideology envisions change coming

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . about within the state and within the world. Can the ideology cope with change. How does the ideology perpetuate itself. Documents would prove quite meaningful at this time. Examples: Nazi platform." That's an example.

Well who is a Nazi in this House? Who is a Nazi in this House, eh? Well it's . . . It's Nazi because this is something that the young people know what the Nazi did, the role that it played in history not too long ago. It doesn't mean that you favour this. It is something that the people want to discuss. It is something that is controversial and that could be controversial or that can be shocking. So what a better way than to say, all right what did the Nazi do and look it - for a while it worked. Look at what it did to the world. What's wrong with that?

"Regina Manifesto." --(Interjections)-- I don't know I never read it. I'm not interested in it. I'm not interested in it. Guidelines to the Seventies, Guidelines - an open government. You've had people that work on it. You're either for, your against or you'll accept some and you'll reject the others. My honourable friend wanted to know, my honourable friend - Graham, he's gone - wanted to know the government - the First Minister should tell him right away - what about the Kierans Report. Maybe they should have put the Kierans Report here. So Guidelines for the Seventies, what's the matter with--I want to chastise my honourable friend, they should have put their Guidelines for the Seventies and the TED report. And I think you remember that and amend this to put the TED report, and it'll satisfy everybody here. And Communist Manifesto. Half the world is a communist world and there were how many Nazis, so you're giving ideologies. What other strong ideologies that you have - maybe they should have said Christianity --(Interjections)-- hey, you better sit down and find out what they're talking about because . . . That's right. What is the other half of the world? You tell me. --(Interjection)-- eh? I'm not defending these guys, that doesn't mean that you're slanting a thing, you're giving an example. Why don't you sit down and keep quiet, you'll be shaming yourself, don't tell me when I'm going to be ashamed. --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Again I'm going to appeal to all the honourable members. The Honourable Member for Lakeside kindly refrain. I will name every member from now on in. I think it's early, my tether is getting short, and I mean it. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well it might be that whoever prepared this wasn't perfect. When you give an example you don't list everything, like my friend listed a bunch of things. No doubt that if he'd prepared this document he would have used other examples. But let's not make a big thing out of it, that this is slanted. And my honourable friend wants to send it to every . . . go ahead send it. Send it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes I will.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well the Minister is making a valiant effort to defend the document. I don't fault him for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well my question is Mr. Speaker, that the document encourages study of the Nazi platform, the Regina Manifesto, The Guidelines for the Seventies and the Communist Manifesto. My question is: Does he not think we should encourage the children in our school system, to also include the study of a democratic system?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the way I see this, this is something for the teacher I would imagine. --(Interjection)-- All right, I'm right. This is something for the teacher, it's giving them an example, and I would hope that we give a little credit to the teacher. I know damn well if the Member from Thompson was there, if he was a teacher he'd use different ideas, what he believes in. I would use - I'd probably, maybe I'd include the Bible or something, that's fine. That doesn't mean that you are approving that you are saying that you're going to study the Nazi platform and you're going to drive it in their brains that this is the thing to do. --(Interjections)-- I'll read everything. All right. "Once ideologies have been explained, speakers who represent different ideologies" - different ideologies --(Interjections)-- different . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

## CONCURRENCE

MR. DESJARDINS: Aw, how ridiculous and asinine can you be when I just said . . .  
 --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. I am naming constituencies. I shall be naming names. Please gentlemen. Let us contain ourselves and let us allow the person who has the floor to debate the issue. There is plenty of time. Everyone will have the same opportunity. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to answer my honourable friend. He's shocked because it says here: "Once ideologies have been explained, speakers who represent different ideologies should be obtained in order to speak." They even call it a mock parliament for one thing and you have debate, you have people, they've have - what is the name of that cup that they have?-the McGowan trophy - some people were given a subject, either you're for or against. What does that mean? Does that mean that a guy that's going to study, somebody, are remembering--in school I was in a debate like this and I lost the toss of the coin and I was going to prove there's no God. --(Interjections)-- I can see you'll have to explain things a little better than that. "Once ideologies have been explained, speakers who represent," not who believes, "who represent different ideologies should be obtained in order to speak, answer questions and enter into discussion. And let us say that somebody would believe in a Nazi platform. Let's say that somebody who is so - are we so barren of ideas, are we so afraid that we're going to let a fellow defend that when he's going to be in front of a class and the others are going to refute that? What a better way to prove that the Nazi platform was wrong. Let's not hide, we're talking about teaching we're not trying to hide.

In-depth research papers (according to the ability of each student) should be attempted at this point. A concluding activity could be debates between students on topics which concern the preference of one ideology over another. --(Interjection)-- All right. "Examples: The Government of Manitoba at present NDP is not a socialist government." --(Interjection)-- Well, all right, this was read as if it was a statement. --(Interjection)-- All right. I saw when you underlined. This is it. The thing is not - "A concluding activity could be debates between students on topics which concern the preference of one ideology over another." Read your Free Press, read your Tribune and for four years the people of Manitoba of Canada have been saying the Schreyer isn't a socialist government. You think it is. You try to exaggerate that. If you can have the people believe that it was a communist government, you'd be happy. Well you'd have your chance now. You'd have your chance. You'd have your chance. All right. And these are the kind of examples.

Now my honourable friend from Riel thought he had something real good and this is going to be sent to everybody. Read the whole damn thing. You are basing your case on two paragraphs where they're talking about examples. Well damnit this is a pretty . . . case and I would ask my friend before he gets too excited to really read that and then come back with it. --(Interjection)-- Well damn you can't read then.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution pass? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I rise to observe that at the hour of 12:30 because of a relatively brief speech made by my colleague the Member for Riel, that all of a sudden we have the benches of the government well occupied. We have probably a greater representation in their seats now than we've had all day. --(Interjection)-- We were witness, Mr. Speaker, we were witness, Mr. Speaker, during the course of my honourable friend and colleague the Member for Riel's dissertation on this subject, the hurried conference that took place over the shoulders of the Minister of Education. I imagine that after having been apprised of the seriousness of the subject matter that the Honourable Member for Riel raised, that it was then decided to pull the old war horse out of retirement, after all, he's been having a pretty, pretty easy time in the last little while, in fact since he's come into the Cabinet insofar as being called upon to give us one of those old time blustering bombastic, you know, bombastic jobs you know, that in essence, in essence, Mr. Speaker, in essence must have been a red herring --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . a red herring of the subject matter introduced by the Member for Riel. I can well imagine the speech that would have emanated from him if he were still occupying this side of the House, in this side of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I really,

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . you know I have some compassion for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation when he on such short notice was thrown into the breach so to say to hastily dig the trench for the government and prepare, on his feet you might say, a defence of the indefensible. A defense of the indefensible. Mr. Speaker, the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest we are discussing a particular item. I have given the honourable gentleman some latitude for four minutes now to introduce the topic of education or the item that was under debate. So far I've only heard some discussion in respect to the honourable gentleman himself. Now I must adhere to the rules of order. I would hope the honourable gentleman would co-operate.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm always obliged to listen to your advice and will pursue it of course diligently.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with Concurrence of the Estimates for the Department of Education. The subject matter that we're now dealing with specifically is the activities of what appears to be a very important, although a small cell-like group of the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, their activities are only now beginning to surface and unquestionably it is in the interests of the government particularly on an eve of an election to attempt and indeed to pull out of retirement all the horses available to the government to attempt to subvert the legitimate effort of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in bringing to the full light what my colleague the Member for Riel has just made public in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, let me put this into some perspective. The mentality of the members opposite has often been expressed to us in this Chamber or in private discussions about their feelings about the fact that their philosophy or their ideology has not been properly represented in the school systems.

A MEMBER: No, No.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that has been the case. I can recall the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or the Member for St. Matthews and others objecting to the fact --(Interjection)--

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. GREEN: I've never made a statement to the effect that the ideology that I represent has not been properly reflected in the school system. I've never made such a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let me attempt again. I have heard statements and references made that whereas such organizations as the Junior Achievers or the Junior Chamber of Commerce or the Chamber of Commerce itself from time to time is permitted, or has in fact had literature distributed through the school system purporting their position, the free enterprise system, and it was in this sense that I was mentioning that I have heard objections from members opposite from time to time, that in that sense the school system as it presently operates does not offer a fair spectrum of the various political ideologies in our society. Now I think up to now - I see some nodding heads, that I'm not offending members opposite, that that is in fact stating a position that they that they would concur with.

Mr. Speaker, I might even agree with that, because after all, Mr. Speaker, that should not be so surprising, that up until the last few, relatively few years, the inroads of the socialist parties of this country have been, to put it charitably, relatively insignificant. The country as they so often remind us has been ruled for the last . . . 99 years by a progression of Conservative or Liberal administrations, and so, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared I'm prepared to acknowledge that in this context, in this context that a non-bias or a completely even dissemination of political bias of whatever kind that just automatically comes from people from my own society, is and has been to some dissemination of political bias of whatever kind that is, that just automatically comes from people from our own society, is and has been to some extent biased against their particular political philosophy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what has occurred in the past has been but a normal and very understandable reflection of the norms of our society as we have lived in it, as we have watched it change. What is different and what is significant about the Guidelines that the Department of Education is now sending out to its teachers, is that they wish to now formalize to a far greater degree political activity, political discussion, political study, in our high schools. And to this extent - this is a new step forward, this is one of those bold steps

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . forward - they wish to formalize a degree of political education in our high schools. That's what this thought meant and that's what the intent of this planning committee is. And there is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. There's nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- No it hasn't been done for many years. Well the Honourable First Minister says it has been done for many years. I suggest that it may have been done in an ad hoc way but it has not been done in an official manner that has been recognized in the curriculum as such. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, then let's examine the kind of Guidelines that are being offered. And then, Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of the objections raised by the Member for Riel has a great deal of meaning for all of us and more particularly for the future of this province, more particularly for the future of our children.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation in his hurry to make some bombastic remarks about it, probably didn't realize just how stupid his remarks were because after all, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the saddest reflections of this kind of political interference by state, by determined state, is perhaps best recognized in that ignoble experiment carried on by the Nazis in Nazi Germany, where it was all too often the very young, the Hitler youth brought up through that kind of education process who were the most fanatical. So, I mean, to suggest that somehow our youngsters, our school children, are to have that mature approach to politics, that surely they can be -- that there is no danger involved in this kind of indoctrination, and that it would be readily leaned, backed away from, is of course utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

And then, Mr. Speaker, look at the exact actual examples, look at the actual examples that our teachers are being instructed, and I don't want to look particularly at the more flagrant ones, but the one that again the Minister of Tourism and Recreation raised, the example being the kind of activity of debates to be conducted in our schools, that the Government of Manitoba at present, NDP, is not a Socialist government. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a very clever subject for debate to be introduced, because on the one hand this government spends a great deal of time and a great deal of money convincing the people of Manitoba that they are not socialists. They're a democracy of some kind or other, and on the other hand for those who embrace socialism, outright socialism, to a greater degree, they are quite satisfied with sufficient representation in that government that they are in fact a socialist government. So what kind of a debate, what kind of a debate do you have when you present that example in the classroom to be debated? What kind of an example does that have? Well, Mr. Speaker, I maybe wouldn't even make the objection if it was . . . decided and if the second example was: Is the Progressive Conservative government a free enterprise party or is it not? Frankly, I would think it's a fair question. But that's not being suggested to our teachers in Manitoba today that that is a suitable subject for debate in our schools. --(Interjection)-- No, it is not suggested. It is not suggested, Mr. Speaker. It is not suggested, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. --(Interjection)--

MR. ENNS: The second subject --(Interjection)-- the second subject, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Gentlemen, we can only have one speaker on the floor at a time. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has the floor.

MR. ENNS: The second suggestion: Is the government of the Soviet Union socialist or not? Mr. Speaker, far more insidious, and I recognize, without too much difficulty of course, what, what is the real purport of this. And that is that compared to the Nazi platform, compared to even the Regina Manifesto or compared to the Communist guidelines, the Guidelines for the Seventies at least show up reasonably mild and acceptable. But, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way. If in that kind of company, if in that kind of company, if the Guidelines for the Seventies can only look good by comparison in that kind of company, then Mr. Speaker, we are in far more serious difficulty than we have heretofore even dreaded or were prepared to believe--were prepared to believe, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the subject matter that has been brought up in the House tonight, subject matter in the House that has been brought up tonight is witness to the contribution that an alert opposition can and always --(Interjection)-- Yes, they laugh, they laugh, although I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that their laughter is not anywhere near as genuine as they would attempt to show in the House tonight, because I would suggest that the issue raised in the House tonight will take on considerable understanding and considerable concern by the people of Manitoba in the very near future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. ORDER! The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was a real performance by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. He's once again, once again dragged up the Red Scare as he usually does when he gets short of argument, rational argument, he resorts to the Red Scare.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER! I'm not going to tolerate this shouting across the floor. Now I think we're all honourable gentlemen in this House. If you're not going to behave there is a remedy. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes, the Honourable Member for Thompson is always very concerned about freedom of speech for others. The Honourable Member for Lakeside, when he was talking about the great plot that was being hatched . . . by the way, he'd make a good member of the Social Credit Party. They, of course, have their Turko-Mongolian plot. He has the same kind of mentality; he'd fit in very well. But the honourable member referred to the fact that this was an insidious plot to indoctrinate teachers. Now, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- No, no. This outline is an outline for teachers, not for children. Now, Mr. Speaker, the teachers in this province who are teaching these courses are usually people who have university degrees, and when the member makes a statement like that, when the member makes a statement like that he implies that the teachers in this province have no capacity for judgment. He is insulting the intelligence of the members of the teaching profession who are teaching these history courses. Mind you, the Member for Lakeside usually insults the intelligence of the members of this House with his speeches. He - and of course the members in the Opposition benches really gave us a remarkable example of how history should not be dealt with - dealt with a selection of evidence on a remarkably narrow basis, and one thing that a history teacher must always guard against is an unnatural selection or an unfair selection of evidence, and of course the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Riel both indulged in this sort of thing.

They brought--they quoted part of one outline for one course, one unit for one course out of the whole high school program. And, Mr. Speaker, I understand, and I used to teach these courses in high school, I understand that the high school program still includes the British heritage - on the Grade 9 course I believe. This course deals with the inheritance that we benefit from in the field of law, in the field of parliamentary traditions, in the field of social customs, social organization, the inheritance we get from Britain. The Member for --(Interjection)-- Okay, I'll cut it short.

The history courses that are being offered, also I understand include a U.S. history course which I used to teach in Grade 10. The Member for Riel was saying that there was nothing being taught about our Judeo-Christian heritage and yet U.S. history is being taught and it's --(Interjection)-- Just a moment. We're talking about the entire spectrum of courses offered. When you talk about what children learn throughout their school years, you're not talking about what they learn within one week out of twelve years, you're talking about what they are learning over a period in which they are in the school system.

The Grade 11 courses, I understand still involve the selection of a course on Canadian history which deals with our entire development as a nation, the Grade 12 course still I believe has a Modern Problems course that deals with a whole variety of issues, including free enterprise and all of those subjects so beloved to the members opposite. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: You're being used . . .

MR. JOHANNSON: Oh nonsense that's a stupid remark. --(Interjection)-- That's the remark of an ignoramus, who doesn't know the field in which we're discussing.

A MEMBER: Your shadow.

MR. JOHANNSON: There's one final problem, there's one final problem with the argument, the total argument presented by the members opposite. They have been attacking the Planning and Research Branch. They've been attacking the Planning and Research Branch. But the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that these curriculum outlines that we're looking at don't come from the Planning and Research Branch, they come from the Curriculum Branch which is basically the same old organization that existed in the Department of Education when members opposite were the government, the same old organization basically. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there's another problem with their argument and that is that the whole process of course formation, curriculum formation, involves teachers.

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) . . . . Every time a course is developed, every time a course is developed and it's usually developed over a period of years, a large group of teachers and university people are brought into the whole process of forming that course, and then the course is subjected to test or pilot teaching in the schools. So the honourable members opposite have simply been demolishing a straw man.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for --(Interjection)-- all right, fine. I'll speak, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and lost.

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

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Guys who believe in freedom of speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The motion before the House is to adjourn the House.

All those in favour please rise.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Barkman	Messrs. F. Johnston
Borowski	Jorgenson
Craik	McGregor
Einarson	McKellar
Enns	McKenzie
Ferguson	Patrick
Froese	Spivak
Graham	Mrs. Trueman
G. Johnston	Mr. Watt

NAYS

Messrs. Adam	Messrs. Johannson
Barrow	Mackling
Boyce	Malinowski
Burtniak	Miller
Cherniack	Paulley
Desjardins	Pawley
Doern	Petursson
Evans	Schreyer
Gottfried	Shafransky
Green	Toupin
Hanuschak	Turnbull
Jenkins	Uruski
	Walding

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 25.

MOTION lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed? (Passed) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty . . . The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, we're not through with them yet.

Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Riel got up and started his debate on Education, I think at one point he said, "The only way I can get answers out of the government is I'm going to have to make some outrageous statement, or charge him with lying or something like that, and then I'll get a rise out of the government." And later on he went to this document, I really thought that that's precisely what he was doing, that he was saying that this document was a figment of his imagination, and he was just kind of making those statements to get a rise out of the government. And it took him, I suppose, five minutes--maybe I'm a slow banana learner--it took about five minutes to sink in that he was really serious, that such a document existed. What's even more shocking, Mr. Speaker, is the attitude on that side. That is more shocking

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . than the document, because anybody can make a mistake, and the Minister doesn't have to feel bad about that. He could say, "I never knew the thing existed."

The departments do all kinds of stupid things; I know as a Minister departments did something, departments did things that I didn't know about, and I'm sure that every Minister sitting here has his people doing something he doesn't know about and he's embarrassed, but under the legislative process he has to answer for it. But that is not what we hear. They say it's nothing. They heard the member read out the material out there and, Mr. Speaker, they say it's nothing. And they're pointing fingers and laughing at the Opposition as if there was something wrong with them. I've never--yeah, I'm 40 years old. I've never seen a document like this in my life in school. I've seen all kinds of bad documents and I've read all kinds of stories about Nazi atrocities and how Stalin choked off 21 million Ukrainians after the Bolshevik Revolution, and all the other atrocities that took place, and you understand that in the context of reading history. But to find that they're going to teach some of this in school, you know, it's enough to make a person faint.

And the Minister sits there and he thinks that it's nothing. The Minister of Cultural Affairs gets up and he tries to defend it. I know damn well he thinks that's terrible.

MR. DESJARDINS: Not the document . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . taken out of context; you can take it out of context and put it in the context, or put it under your kilt, it's about the same thing. --(Interjection)--

No. 1. Purpose: propose different situations which require decisions on the part of the individual student. Example (a). If a person is at a party and must decide whether or not to smoke marijuana. (c). If a person is under age and is asked to attend an adult movie -- (Interjection)-- (b) is not serious. A person under age is asked to attend an adult movie or to go to a beverage room for some alcoholic beverages. Mr. Speaker, it's dealt in such a fashion like it's saying; what is the best way to defeat the opposition? Should we turn around and spend a lot of money? Should we bribe the voters? You know, discussing it on a basis like that it's a normal thing and it's acceptable to everyone. I wonder what would happen if we had two debating teams come in here and say, "Well, one way to get rid of the opposition or a sitting government is to (a) shoot them; (b) hang them; (c) bribe them, buy them off." I mean if anybody got up in this Legislature and talked in that way of defeating a government, for getting rid of an opposition, I think they'd lock him up. --(Interjection)-- Because we know that that is not the normal way in our society that you get rid of governments or elect governments. You talk in terms of knocking on doors, putting out leaflets and putting up bill boards; but they're discussing this thing here--I wonder if the Minister of biffies would mind listening for a while and if he doesn't like to listen he can leave, go and sit in his biffy that's up there.

They're discussing this thing, Mr. Speaker, in terms like it was the type of a discussion that happens every day in every home, in every school. Now, I'll just give you an example, Mr. Speaker, about a book that I mailed out to all the MLAs. This is another thing, the sex education that they're bringing in, and it is using exactly the format - perhaps that's where it comes from - exactly the format that's suggested in a . . . program that is coming into Manitoba --(Interjection)-- You're the Minister; you answer the questions, I ask them. --(Interjections)-- I'm reading from Page 23, Mr. Speaker. Here is how they're going to deal, how a teacher is going to deal with kids. How do you reach pupils even as young as 7 or 8 years who may have had sexual experiences that you yourselves may have only read about? What are the myths about needless sexuality? Now, Mr. Speaker, is this a normal thing to talk to Grade 1 kids? But that is precisely the format they use in there; they're going to discuss it like it was a normal thing for kids of 7 years or 8 years to have sexual relations. Precisely. And this is going to be taught in the schools this fall. I don't know how many schools, but you tell us, smart Alex, you're getting the \$25,000 --(Interjections)--

Mr. Speaker, Page 27 --(Interjections)-- Page 27: "Intercourse occurs when a man places his penis in a woman's vagina. Men and women sometimes engage in this activity to create babies, sometimes for pleasure and sometimes for both reasons." Well, they should know.

The Teachers' Guide lists the following questions which are typical of those asked during the presentation of how babies are made. Precisely the same format that's used in that. --(Interjections)-- No. 1: When people lie down face to face each other, does a woman get

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . pregnant? 2. What is intercourse? Does my Daddy do that to my Mommy? 3. Does intercourse hurt? 4. Why can't I watch my parents have intercourse?" Now, Mr. Speaker, get a gander of this. A colouring book of copulating animals is also available for the kiddies, as is the Teachers' Guide which explains how babies are made. How Babies Are Made hopes to create an atmosphere of honesty and freedom of discussions concerning matters of reproduction and to promote understanding and correct usage of names for body parts. Also the term 'intercourse' does not appear on How Babies Are Made. It may be needed to be introduced in those words by the teacher.

Mr. Speaker, they're using this format --(Interjection)-- I'll tell you one school. The St. Norbert School Division, and you know very well because I've given you copies two months ago. They have that course there; they've got the books there; I have the books in my office and the Minister has seen them. The same format that's in this teachers' thing is taken and transferred on here, and they're going to say, "Well, let's not be prudes. Those things, after all, do happen--and queerism and rape and murder. All these things happen. I suppose we should teach that to Grade 1 and Grade 2 students because it does happen. --(Interjection)--

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister when he was defending, the Minister of Tourism was defending the Nazi platform --(Interjections)-- He says, well --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would ask my friend to withdraw that, because he knows damn well this is not what I was doing.

A MEMBER: Withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, perhaps that's a wrong phrasing. He was saying, "What's wrong with discussing Nazism?" --(Interjections)-- Yes, there is some difference. I'm sure the reader will find it with a microscope and I will leave it to the reader.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to get a bill in this House to discuss religion. Did you hear what those bigots said when we tried to get that? "Not a chance. Discuss religion in schools? Or support religious education?" You know, they look at you like there's something wrong with you. But there's lots of money, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of money to turn around and discuss the Nazi platform, the Regina Manifesto, Guidelines for the Seventies, the Communist Manifesto. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they got money for that, I would like to know how many Ministers, particularly the First Minister who I know is probably sick when he's seen that document, I'd like to know how today they can't find money or they feel it somehow an imposition on the public or the students not to give money for teaching religion, but it's all right to teach the things that 50 million people died to defeat.

A MEMBER: Nonsense.

MR. BOROWSKI: Nonsense? Well, Mr. Speaker I can--let me, let me visualize the course that this Department of Education would bring in under the heading of Nazi platform. They're going to teach a mock parliament and perhaps they may even go further; they may have a "Do it yourself kit" like they recommend in the Seek of Sex education. Let me read from the Langford Report on Pornography, which deals with other things than pornography, and I want to show you about how you'd have to discuss the Nazi platform and the Nazi philosophy if you're going to use the format that they have here. And it's left for the teacher. Now, the Minister of Tourism was saying, "We leave it up to our teachers." That is nonsense. The government makes the rules. The teachers are employees who must carry out the direction of this government, and if he is going to tell us that if each teacher in every school is going to decide how they're going to teach, then Mr. Speaker, we're going to have chaos in the schools, all over the province, and that has never happened anywhere, and if it's going to start happening I would like them to get up here and tell us that each teacher is going to be their own liturgist. They're going to turn around and write their own curriculum and liturgy, and they're going to teach what they want --(Interjections)-- Well, the way they present it. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism is saying, "the way they present it." I suppose if you took that a step further, and he could turn around and talk about religion, which would be clear violation of what the government wants. Is that what he is saying? Could they do that? --(Interjection)-- But you would do that.

A MEMBER: What?

MR. BOROWSKI: You would do that. You would teach religion under that course.

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, you see that, Mr. Speaker? --(Interjections)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for St. Boniface doesn't know what religion is, I'm certainly not going to waste time explaining it to him.

I want to read about how a course would be constructed under the Nazi platform, and I'll leave the votes to the platform to one of the defenders; they could probably come up with an adequate platform. I'm quoting from Page 46, The Langford Report, which has just come out from Britain: A lot of good Socialists were on that committee who wrote that report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of order has been raised. The Honourable Minister.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is clear that the member is bringing in his normal lengthy pronouncements on pornography, and is not in fact dealing with the topic at hand but he is making a speech on pornography, which we've all heard ten times, under the guise of commenting on a history course under the Department of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: It's obviously the ex-teacher and it's a good thing, as an ex-teacher he doesn't know very much about education or he would know what I'm talking about. We are in the Department of Education and perhaps he can't tell the difference between pornography and the kind of education he'd teach, and that wouldn't surprise me. --(Interjections)-- "It is surely" - Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote this here, it's not a very lengthy article, just 15 pages: "It is surely important that discoveries about violence should not be suggested, that we accept savagery and cruelty and pain as proper entertainment, and we are returning to the mores of the Gladiatorial arena. It is very clear that for some of the anchoritic elements in our western society, violence is not only necessary in order to bring about political change, but desirable and justifiable, and better human conditions is the result. Peter Grosvenor points out in his contribution to our report, that pornography because it can be destructive to the existing political situation as seen by some . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I fail to see where the topic the honourable gentleman is reading is relevant to education. Secondly, I should like to indicate to him that--and I am sure he is aware of it--he is supposed to use his own arguments and not something out of a book or any place else. He may refer to it but not read it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am doing precisely--I am referring to it. I was joking when I said 15 pages. And it has to do with the document that's before and we are in the Department of Education, which includes political science and political discussions, and Nazi platforms apparently is considered of because this document comes from the Department of Education. So one must assume that it's considered education in Manitoba, and therefore, I want to deal with that: ". . . pornography can be destructive in an existing political situation, it is seen by some of the young to be a useful weapon; we need hardly stress that many of them; political writers' currently fashionable, to justify the use of violence in the same revolutionary grounds. Perhaps it is indeed a measure of condemnation of the society we have created that it is often very hard to differentiate between the advocacy of political liberation involving violence and that of sexual liberation involving pornography, if one is confronted by some of the visual propaganda that's circulating in the underground press. And here we read what must be for the purpose of our enquiry the most important aspect of violence in the media. Anyone reading our report will have come across frequent references to the overlap between violence and sexual material. The reader has only to look at the window display and still more in a back room of any pornographic book shop to see that probably more than 50 percent of the publications offered for sale show whip scenes, threatening and aggressive figures with cowering victims rather than images that convey the benign and loving impulses associated with sexual pleasures or even cheerful nudity. In any list of mail order book titles, almost as high a proportion deal with still more obvious violent and cruel stimula, torture and Nazi brutality, occult rituals, extreme savagery and gruesome bestiality. We cannot ignore the lesson to be learned here from what is perhaps the most historical instance where pornography was deliberately and conscientiously used for political ends. The activities of Julius Striker, hanged as a Nazi war criminal in 1946, in violent stimulation of anti-Semitism by means of his magazine Der Schtreiner.

"We are indebted for information on its historical importance to Mr. Heinrich Frankel,

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . the distinguished biographer on many Nazi leaders. The magazine, which contains stories about how the Jew was ordered by the Talmud and the elders of Zion to despoil Arian maidenhood, to slaughter Arian children for ritual and use their blood in Passover. In Passover, baking depended chiefly . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again I implore the honourable member to get with the topic of education and not read a book.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I just have a paragraph to go. It deals with the Nazi platform that can be discussed under the Guidelines. This material that I am reading can be very easily discussed, because it happened. Depending chiefly on lurid economical cartoon style drawings.

"The cover with sickening monotony would depict a revolting ugly old Jew lecherously leering at the breasts of a blond girl whose last shreds of clothing he was about to tear away. The Jew's unshaven face was emphasized to imply that his fiendish sexuality was intent only on rape. Der Schtreiner, which began in Nuremberg in 1923; rapidly grew to a circulation of hundreds of thousands, and even this is no true indication of its readership since after Hitler's ascension to power it was publicly displayed all over the country in glass-covered boxes on the walls. At the same time, with Schtreiner a self-confessed sadist who boasted he frequently used the whip he always carried, rose in a Nazi hierarchy. His magazine became a means of denouncing any Jew alleged to have had sexual relations with an Arian girl, to be mentioned; and no pornographic detail of evidence was left out of the description."

Mr. Speaker, this is just a sample of how you can discuss Nazism under this Department of Education program. Now I am not going to suggest that teachers are going to set up a course and tell each child to get a book, whether it's this one here or the one "Mein Kampf" or some other books written about the atrocities against the Jews and the Poles and other ones, and have them have a kind of mock parliament or a discussion about Nazism or Communism. But Mr. Speaker, there's nothing in here that forbids that, and if we look at some of the teachers that we have in our province - and I've met some of them - who are in school peddling abortion or suggesting to the children that abortion there's nothing wrong with it, and they can do that because there happens to be a law passed in Ottawa that abortions are permitted under certain conditions. What is to stop a teacher, or indeed a school board or this government, once this thing here has been accepted, from doing this in the various schools? If the Opposition says "nothing", then it must be assumed by the government that they don't think there's anything wrong with that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there's a hell of a lot wrong with that. We are brought up in a Christian country, we are brought up in a democracy, and those jackals sit there because of that democracy, but there's nothing in that paper to talk about how you elect a socialist government or a free enterprise or social credit, how you defeat him. There's nothing in there. They tell us about Nazis, the Regina Manifesto, Guidelines for Seventies, which has nothing to do with democracy, Communist Manifesto.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if it wasn't so close to election, I would have the audacity to stand up here and ask them to resign and go to the people, on this incredible document. Absolutely incredible. I don't think such a document has been presented in any Legislature in this country. And I hope the Premier takes the strongest action possible to stop this nonsense. I know damn well that he doesn't agree with it. It's the most incredible abuse of power by a Minister or by his department or by some school board than has ever been seen in this province, and Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier to take action regarding this document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, yes dispense. I think we should dispense at this time in the evening, or at this time in the morning, yes I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition would be glad if we moved the adjournment and I would have liked to have had the adjournment an hour or so ago. And I can well imagine why the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would be prepared to agree to an adjournment after the tirade of the Honourable Member for Thompson because the Honourable Member from River Heights is one of those individuals, one of those characters, who is so wont to listen to utterances and then move off and apparently he is moving off now, and I would ask my honourable friend if he would only come back and listen to a few words of wisdom that he does not possess, I think he is incapable of assessing or giving consideration to the discussion that has been taking place in this House for the last half hour or so. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because it is so easy for all of us to listen and to

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . leave, and that is what has happened to the Leader of the Opposition Party. I wonder whether or not he has the intellectual ability to assess the full significance of the debate that has taken place here at this hour this morning.

The Honourable the Member for Riel attempted by a document that made reference to certain studies, to impugn motives to the Department of Education that they were only concerned with certain subject matters of consideration in the field of education.

The Honourable the Member for Thompson has used the opportunity to give a tirade of certain idiosyncracies that he happens to have, and I don't fault him. There are many people who have had idiosyncracies, not only today, Mr. Speaker, Friday the 18th of May, but Rasputin had idiosyncracies prior to the revolution in Russia. Someone along the line, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend would invoke, my honourable friend from Thompson, would invoke today if he had his way, and what was the net result of the red priest, the red monk Rasputin in Russia but a revolution, the spilling of blood all across Russia, Petersburg and all of the areas. From time to time in this House recently we've had the Member for Morris, we've had the Member for Arthur pleading for rain in order to feed the ground to raise crops. The Honourable Member for Thompson by his tirade tonight forgets that a red priest in Russia caused fields to be flooded by the blood of the people of Russia. Rasputin, of course he did. That is the type, that is the type of propaganda that is being suggested by the Member for Thompson.

A MEMBER: Tell us about Berrigan.

MR. PAULLEY: Tell you about Berrigan? I'll tell you about Berrigan but I want to tell you something else, my friend, that you are wont to pick out of some dime novel or some ten cent publication by one of your fellow travellers across the line in the United States that you hate, to try and establish the position, the idiotic position that you take and suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this should be gospel. And I say to my honourable friend, I'm prepared to accept some of his idiosyncracies, and I have, but there is a time, Mr. Speaker, when one has to stop being so compassionate on behalf of the Member of Thompson. I wonder, and this would also deal with the Member for Roblin, who every time he shakes his head I can hear it from here, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend from Roblin, my honourable friend from Thompson and some others, including the absent leader of the Conservative Party, would take a note of past history of the approaches that were made, we are condemned because of in the curriculum on studies for our students, that we make references to past history. We are condemned apparently for it.

The Member for Riel took out of context the complete curriculum. He concentrated on a certain area of studies that are recommended to the students of Manitoba. I wonder if my honourable friend from Thompson, or indeed the Honourable Member for Roblin, ever knew what happened with the Spartans years ago because they happened to be lame or maimed. There was no social welfare in those days. All they did in those days would take them up to the top of the abyss and throw them into the dungeon. Mr. Speaker, I say to you, isn't it worthwhile that the students in our schools in the Province of Manitoba should know of the approach of Rasputin, the Red Priest of Russia, and those of Athens and Sparta and their approach to those who happened to be handicapped? Isn't it worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, that our students in our schools in Manitoba should be able to assess the different approaches to the human factor? They condemn this brochure, these studies, insofar as the Regina Manifesto. Isn't it worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, that our students in our schools today should know that characters similar to some that are in this Assembly today were shotgunned off of trains as they travelled across this country in search of employment or in search of food? Isn't it worthwhile . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Point of order . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that under the Regina Manifesto as being taught in the schools . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of order has been raised. The honourable member raise . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the Minister is not discussing the subject. You admonished me and I think that the Minister should be put on the track also.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to be put on the track. I believe that the children of the Province of Manitoba should know past history and that through knowing past history that they can advance to a better world. My honourable friend from Thompson isn't prepared to accept that. By his orations in this House he would be prepared to put, what is it,

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . the yoke around the necks of those who didn't agree with him. That is what he's proposing, Mr. Speaker, in this House. He would have them massacred, he would have them with that yoke around their neck paying penitence because they dared to think differently than he does.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you and to the honourable members of this House that my ancestors, my ancestors happen to come from a little country or county in Dorchester, England and . . . (hear, hear). Yes, hear, hear is right. And some of my ancestors were put in chains that the Honourable Member for Thompson and indeed Roblin as well, chains in a ship that were sent to New Zealand and Australia because they dared to go against the landlord to ask for a tuppence of wheat rather than a penny. That's right.--(Interjection)-- That's right. That's right, and that's what my honourable friend - you know, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Thompson is so sanctimonious that he stands up before Orders of the Day today, asked me questions about the application of the minimum wage for 30,000 people and then he damn well turns around and a little later tonight - or this morning - and criticizes the Department of Education because they dare to suggest in their curriculum that the students should know of days gone by. I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what my honourable friend the Member for Thompson is endeavouring to do is to turn the clock back to the dark ages of Joan of Arc and the likes of that, and he does it in the spirit of sanctimony and the likes of that. And I say that it's damn near time that my honourable friend realizes his incompetency.

And when we attempt, Mr. Chairman, when he attempts, when the Honourable Member for Riel attempts to take out of all context parts of the curriculum in the Department of Education dealing --(Interjection)-- oh shush! dealing with certain factors in the field of education, so that our children today know--yes, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend read about Nazism. Is he suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it's improper to let our children and our grandchildren know of the atrocities of Nazism? I say, no. I say they should know and religion--don't you talk to me about religion because there's nobody in this Assembly that's more religious than I am, and I . . . I say that to you too. But I don't wear it as a mantel or a halo around my head. I practice it. --(Interjection)-- Yes I'm a free mason and I'm damn well proud of it and make no apologies at all for it, Mr. Speaker. I don't carry a sanctimonious halo like my honourable friend there. I don't have to do penance as he has to do. I don't have to go, Mr. Speaker, to confession early in the morning and late at night, because I conduct myself from early in the morning till late at night as an ordinary human being who is concerned with humanity

And what about Nazism? You know, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Member for Thompson suggests that maybe we should not teach our children what happened in the war years from 1939 until '45, or go back to 1930, Hitler and his tribe arose in power in Germany. Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend suggesting that we should not teach our children what happened then in order that they may be in a position to offset a repeat? Is my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that we should not teach our children of the rise of the Mao Tse-tung empire in Japan and the atrocities that they committed. --(Interjection)-- Yet, Mr. Speaker, at the same time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to the honourable member that keeps interjecting, it makes it very difficult for me to hear. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say to my honourable friend who attempts to put on the halo of Christianity. Should our children not know what has happened in the past? And that is the purpose, as I understand it, Yes that's right. There were thousands of people slaughtered in Russia. There were hundreds of thousands of people slaughtered in Germany. There were hundreds of thousands slaughtered in the East Indies as the result of the rise of the Nippon Empire. Mr. Speaker, there are still hundreds of thousands of people suffering today in many areas of this universe of ours as a result of intolerant and dictatorial oppression. Bigotry? Yes, bigotry. My honourable friend there very facetiously - I hope it was facetiously - said that there are people suffering in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that there are. I suggest that there are people suffering in all of Canada. But if one would be content--yes even in Morris. If one would be content, Mr. Speaker, to accept the approach of the Honourable Member for Thompson, we should hide it under our carpets and do nothing about it, and we should not try to educate our children in school of the atrocities that are going on. We should not, Mr. Speaker, draw to the attention of our children in school what's going on in South Africa or Rhodesia or Vietnam.

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, isn't there a comparison between what my honourable friend would throw under a rug insofar as Nazism is concerned, and I'm sure all of us abhor it. I wonder if, Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friend the Member from Thompson would suggest that we shouldn't talk about the situation in Bangladesh and Pakistan and some of the out countries. --(Interjection)-- Yes, or South Vietnam or North Vietnam. But my honourable friend with his Christian yoke --(Interjection)-- but my honourable friend with his Christian yoke and his Christian halo would slough it under the rug that he would not allow the students in our schools to hear about it. He would not, Mr. Speaker, allow our school children to know of the situation that prevailed in France at the time of the burning of Joan of Arc and the march on the castles there.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and I say to my honourable friend, for goodness' sake, if you have any, will you not use some intelligence to realize and to know the objective that is being used in the Department of Education? It's so easy, it's so easy for my honourable friend to pick up books on abortion, pornography, yes, and the rest of that, and to read them to us, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber. I suggest that the Honourable Member for Thompson would do a greater service to Manitoba, to its youngsters, and to Canada, if he would join in a crusade to indicate the deficiencies of the past, the deficiencies of the present. And even if he wants to include pornography and abortion, I would not disrespect him for that. But, Mr. Speaker, until and unless my honourable friend from Thompson is prepared to take other matters under consideration, the diabolical treatment that is being awarded to some of the tribes in South America and Central America, in Vietnam, in India, Bangladesh --(Interjection)-- I'm doing what I can but I'm not sloughing it under the rug, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend would attempt to do it. I am trying to draw it to the light but my honourable friend from Thompson, with his idiosyncracies and lack of perspective, is trying to indicate to us that that is the problem today. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend the Member for Thompson would only take the time out to consider why it was deemed necessary to bring in . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I see a sick animal in this building. Would the Sergeant-at-Arms see if there's an animal in the Chamber.

MR. PAULLEY: Harry, your pup is at loose.

A MEMBER: It's your pup, Harry. --(Interjection)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Thompson, I heard that and I think that's an unparliamentary remark.

MR. PAULLEY: I heard it. I'll accept it, coming from him, Mr. Speaker. Don't worry about it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I am so used to my honourable friend making such utterances as that that I accept it, coming from whence it came. So don't worry, Mr. Speaker. Don't worry, because I think that this is the inclination of the trend of the mind of the Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, if I may in conclusion try to summarize what I'm trying to say, that I think it is so necessary for the well-being of our community--Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition want to make a contribution? --(Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I think it would be well for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to listen --(Interjection)-- That's right. That's right, because then the people of Manitoba would be in a far better position to assess the differences between the idiosyncracies of the Leader of the Opposition and the true facts. We have travelled a long way, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba.

A MEMBER: What school were you educated in?

MR. PAULLEY: I wasn't educated. --(Interjection)-- I didn't go down, Mr. Speaker, I didn't go down, as I understand the Leader of the Opposition did, to get a law degree across the border. --(Interjection)-- You got it here? I understand, Mr. Chairman, that they're still wanting to give it to him because he hasn't shown up because of his marks in school to obtain the same. But apart from all of that, and I don't mind the insults of my insulting friend, I do say this, Mr. Speaker, that I think that it is well . . .

A MEMBER: To go home.

MR. PAULLEY: That you go home? Yes, because you're just--I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was nearly unparliamentary because of my contempt, contempt for the Leader of the

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . Conservative Party, and how anyone else can have anything but contempt for the Member for River Heights I do not know.

But Mr. Speaker, I do want to say this, that I think that it is well for the children of Manitoba --(Interjection)-- I think it is well, Mr. Speaker, despite the idiotic interruptions of the Leader of the Conservative Party and the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party, I think that it is well for the students of the Province of Manitoba to know of days gone by. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that I didn't receive a great education. I only went to Grade X in our educational system. I have no degree. I do think, however, Mr. Speaker, that despite that, I have a greater comprehension, I have a greater knowledge of what is required for the future well-being of our youngsters in Manitoba and Canada than the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, whom I understand was given a mail order degree in Law.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed? The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.  
--(Interjection)-- Winnipeg Centre.

. . . . . Continued on next page.

## CONCURRENCE

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I'm sorry once again at this late hour I would ask to impose upon you for a few moments. But I'd like to get back and perhaps less emotionally than some others have been, to address myself to the problem of education.

There is apparently circulating in this Chamber a typewritten sheet of paper which is purported to have been an outline or a guide which has gone to the teachers in the school system. I haven't seen it but what I have heard in the past hour or two in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is one of the loudest, longest demonstrations of lack of confidence in the teachers of the province of Manitoba that I have ever heard.

Four years ago, Mr. Speaker, when I came into this Chamber, the Member for Fort Rouge had occasion to comment that many people were infiltrating the school system and inculcating or indoctrinating the people in the school system with their ideology. And I rose and defended her point of view, in fact it's the only time that the newspapers have ever mentioned my name in a small headline in the paper, "Boyce Defends Trueman," because I said then, and I say again, that I am diametrically opposed to the inculcation or brainwashing of any children in any school system with any ideology. How little seen has been demonstrated. The Member for Portage la Prairie--and I'm sorry to see that when the Member for Portage la Prairie in his emotional involvement at the moment hurled an invective, I hurled back. Because many people in this House fought, as it were, against the imposition of ideologies from one country to another including Nazism, Communism and a few other things. It just so happened that I learned about war not through history books but for a period of a year and a half I served in the Mermansk run to Russia with two Polish destroyers, with two Polish destroyers, two American destroyers, four Canadian destroyers and four British destroyers but, and I don't want to re-fight the war, I wanted to get back for just--the Member for Radisson please keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOYCE: I don't want to get back into the fighting of the war, but Mr. Speaker, I felt it incumbent upon me as a teacher to teach honestly, and when a student asked me, "Mr. Boyce, what do you think?" I felt it was my responsibility to tell that child what I thought. The best way for me to make my point, I believe, is to get into this sex education that the Member for Thompson is so prone to project his own hang-ups into debates, and I asked the students, "When does life begin?" And I asked them to put their comments on a piece of paper. And, Mr. Speaker, the children themselves taught each other respect for life. They didn't come up with some answer that life should be aborted, as the Member for Thompson is so fearful of. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOYCE: Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson from his seat errs. I didn't vote for abortion. I had nothing to do with establishing abortion. It's a federal jurisdiction covered by criminal law. Now the Member for Thompson may have some vogue among some elements of our society by hurling this grand lie around, that people on this side are Sodomites and all the rest of it, but he dooms the people of Manitoba not, and as far as him saying, you know, that democracy--in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, there is no other member in this House who did a greater disservice to the expansion of the aid to Private and Parochial Schools than the Member for Thompson, because in his demonstration as democratic process, he said he would teach not what people wanted, but what he wanted. I firmly believe . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: On a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member state his privilege.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, the member has indicated that I said I would teach what I wanted. The fact is that the Minister of Tourism made that statement when I questioned him. I said the very opposite, that you must teach what the government establishes, not what you believe. I would ask the member to withdraw that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, on the point, I wasn't referring to the debate just a moment ago, I was referring to a point asked of the member by the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, if the member would support schools which taught Communism, schools which taught anarchy, schools which taught this, that and the other thing, and the member said No, he would only support schools which taught his idea of what should be taught insofar as religious studies is concerned. If I err, and I think the record will show that I do not err, I

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . . will be only too glad to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker, I have sublime faith in the process that we have in this province, this educational process and its parliamentary process, and what I say is that if this system that we have, if this system that we have is to survive, we have to demonstrate that Nazism is not dead as the member for Arthur, I think, said a few moments ago that Nazism died in 1945. Nazism is alive south of us. If you don't believe me, get up in the morning and listen to the Watergate affair. How do you think these things happen? They're political appointees. They are political appointees. The Member for Fort Rouge is absolutely right, is absolutely right. They're political appointees.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOYCE: And unless the educational process keeps people vigilant it will happen here. Surely to God the system that we have in Manitoba will stand any buffeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOYCE: The Member for Lakeside said in his speech that it used to, was--he didn't use those terms, those are mine; that what was taught in the school reflected the majority opinion of the time, and what he said was true. I would ask him to check back with some of his ancestors and check with them the bigotry that was taught in the schools when his ancestors first came to the country. Thank God that was dispensed with, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Souris-Killarney, from his seat, said that our universities are hotbeds of Communism. --(Interjection)-- . . . University; well I'm sure it was the Member for Souris-Killarney. University of Brandon? Can I have a glass of water, please? I know it's late fellows, but I'd like a glass of water. I'm just going to be a couple more minutes. I've got just one more point to make.

But why is it if--in the heat of the debate I said well, what about Junior Achievements? I think it's a terrific idea. It's a fantastic thing - the younger people who have been involved in this, learning how business operates, buying shares, all the rest of it, it has done well and and should be supported. Can we not in this day and age evolve a political system, an educational system, where the best system will evolve? If what you're proposing is the best, it will survive. If it is not, it will die. The same thing is true of the people on this side, because as we help people read--the Minister of Labour said that he only had Grade 10, the Minister of Labour has learned a lot outside of school; not all education takes place in the school. The Member for Thompson has learned a lot outside of school, but as we help people learn and learn to look around and evaluate systems, surely to God they will, and should it not be so, that the best of system will survive. It's ten past two and I said I would just be a moment, but I--some of my colleagues once again were saying, you know, "Sit down." They hoped I'd sit down.

But I'm not going to keep on going, I am going to sit down now, but the only reason I spoke at this late hour, I could see people's feathers getting ruffled, getting emotional, but let's put some confidence in the teachers that are in the school. If when it's reported to be a directive from the Department of Education to the teachers, what do you think would happen to that when it hits the school system? Do you think that the--oh yes, that is the question; that is the question. The Member for Lakeside from his seat says that is not the question. My argument, as badly as I'm making it, is that the question has been made. You have not been addressing yourself to the question. When anything like that hits the school system, the teachers are professional people and they are trying to help your children, yours included, develop an evaluative system in their own minds where they can pick and choose. They can separate the wheat from the chaff.

Well, you know, some people still think that education means cramming stuff down kids' throats, even if it is a bunch of lies, such as the History of the Western World or How the West was Developed, and we are learning that we have to solve some of these problems that have been with us a hundred years. But, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we can pass this resolution and get on to the rest of the business of the House, because the issue that was raised I don't think is an issue because it isn't something that is going to do anything. No teacher in the school is going to brainwash your children with this or any other ideology.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's quite evident in this debate the Minister is not going to rise and defend himself or defend his department, or try and explain to the members of the House where this document came from, who's behind it, and how we can find out if there's some more skeletons in his closet, worse maybe than this one.

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

And, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that we didn't find the time during the course of the estimates to deal with this department, and now I guess it's regrettable that we didn't take the time, because my gosh, if this is the kind of stuff that's coming out of the Department of Education today, I say, God help Manitoba. God help Manitoba.

What about the kids? Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to stay and debate this thing all night if necessary until the Minister of Education will stand up on his feet and be a Minister and explain to us where did this document come from, who prepared it. He knows where it came from and he sits over there and grins like a monkey on a stool and is not even going to respond to us in this debate, so therefore I'm prepared to stay here all night if necessary to get some response from this Minister. Mr. Speaker, as I said, it's most unfortunate that we didn't have the time to deal with the estimates of this Minister in the Department of Education, but I wonder, the way that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface took off in orbit tonight. You know, it's easy, he's only been over there a matter of a year or so and now he's indoctrinated with one of those guys. He's one of the Socialists now. He talks like them, he responds like them, he acts like them, he shouts back and forth at us all the time. They are just all, you know, every one of those guys . . . if you really hit them where it hurts, they just react and they start to shout and scream, and here he was tonight dragging red herrings across the floor like he used to do when he sat over in this chair right here, spearheading before his deskmate there, who still hasn't stood up and responded to the allegations that were made by this paper, which I have in my hand, and the Minister of Tourism and Recreation comes to the defence of Manitoba tonight for their Minister of Education, who apparently hasn't got the guts to stand up and tell us what this is all about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder. I really became very alarmed when I saw the Member for St. Boniface stand and try and prove to us how he was so surprised that we become uptight because we happened to have had a document on our hands for a few days and trying to get some information on who prepared it, where are we going to go with it, what are we going to do with it? We have it and we are not going to dispose of it here tonight or take it and tear it up. We want to know what it's all about and, as I say, I'm one that's prepared to stay here until the Minister of Education responds.

And Mr. Speaker, while I've been standing over here I've been very carefully going through the Department of Education, and where it's possible that this document might have come from, and I see the name of a Mr. G. Burrows here. I wonder who this man, Mr. Burrows would be? Where did he come from? Is he political? Is he an NDP? Is he a Socialist? Is he a supporter of the government? Would he possibly have dreamt that paper up maybe? We don't know. The Minister is not going to respond. I look over here, I see another name, Dr. L. Orlikow. Now I wonder where that man came into the Department of Education. How long has he been there? Is he political? Is he an NDP supporter? Is he active? Is he a Socialist? Is he practising politics in the Department of Education? Is Mr. Burrows practising politics in Education? These are a few of the questions that I sure want to get before I leave this Chamber tonight, or if you are not going to debate the House I'm prepared to accept them tomorrow, but I want some answers. I want some answers for the people of Roblin constituency. I want some answers for the School Division, the Board that are on the School Division in my constituency, because if you don't tell them I'm going to tell them tomorrow what's going on in the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, we heard, and I know there are a lot of teachers in the NDP caucus, and I'm sure there's like the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre. He must be pretty damned uptight when he saw what's coming out of, the stuff that's being cranked out of there, you know - trash like this in this day and age in a public school system. Is there any way that that type of a document can give the public system, where there's public tax dollars going in to try and improve the quality of education for our children when they give them a political harangue, when they start talking about ideologies. Do you ever hear anybody talking about ideology today except the Socialists? No. The dreaming Socialists. They're the ones with the ideology. Do you ever hear anybody talking about the Regina Manifesto? That was a great document. Or as my friend, from Thompson, the Nazi platform. Who cares today about the Nazi platform? It's history. It's in the record. It's in the record. I'm not - that battle is over. --(Interjection)-- So do I but the battle is over.

## CONCURRENCE

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) . . . .

Then we talk about this great document, the Guidelines for the Seventies, Mr. Speaker. And now, why would that leak into the Department of Education. We only got this Guidelines what? A month, six weeks ago? But already, Mr. Speaker, they are in the curriculum of the Department of Education for the ensuing year. The Communist Manifesto - isn't that wonderful? Now what help would that be for the students in our educational, in our public educational system today? Is there any way that they would be better students because they read the Communist Manifesto? Why isn't there something in there about the Conservative Manifesto or the Social Credit Manifesto or the Liberal Manifesto? Or what about the Birch Society? Not a word - not a word. There are no comparisons whatsoever offered to the students of this province and I take great issue with that. If you want to be slanted and keep your little selves off by yourself and put them in the educational system, I'm going to quarrel with it and the people of my constituency are going to quarrel with it; they are going to be very unhappy when I unveil this document to them tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the budget, the spending estimates of the particular department of research and planning, and I just wonder if the Minister is going to reply and give us some information as to what he is doing, who is the lady that my colleague the Member from Riel that has apparently taken over the planning of the schools or who is going to get the schools. The Member for St. Vital replied tonight, in a very quiet way tried to say that, well, Craik was drawing a red herring across the floor. That didn't give us the answers that we're seeking. We're wondering why all these changes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with this subject matter in a very rational way. I want to deal with it in a meaningful way, and I'm very surprised that the Minister has not rose to his feet. Everybody all around him has rose to their feet in his defence but why hasn't the Minister rose and replied, and I wonder if we cannot deal with this matter in the way it should be dealt with and if the Minister's not going to stand up and give us the answers that we're looking for, then I'm prepared to stay here all night until we get the information that I'm seeking in this debate at this moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Colleges and Education, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and the House adjourned until Friday at 10:00 a. m.