

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 11th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 100 Grade 5 and 6 students from Centennial School under the direction of their teachers Mr. Pawlychka, Mr. Labun and Miss B. Larter. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the First Minister regarding the Hansard. We have just received on our desks this afternoon the Hansard for last Wednesday 8:00 o'clock session. I realize that with three sessions a day it makes it much more difficult for the Hansard staff to keep up, but this is really making it very difficult here in certain of the debates - for example the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources which was made on Thursday, and which would be very helpful, and it is now almost a week behind. I wonder if he could indicate when we may expect the following Hansards.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I'll enquire of the Hansard staff, Madam Speaker.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Minister of Mines and Resources if he is able to reply to me as yet to that question I put to him a few days ago, namely, whether or not the question of access on Highway 59 was a point at issue in the settlement of some of the claims along Highway 59, Pine Ridge Park area.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): . . . my information, although I haven't detailed information on each owner, but in a general way I have not heard of that being an issue. I can enquire further if there are particular cases that my honourable friend would care to tell me about.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to reply to a question that was made of me this morning by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, who asked some information concerning By-Law No. 272 of the Local Government District of Consol. First of all, under the Local Government District's Act, the by-laws of a local government district are sent in for approval by the supervisor of local government districts before they are given third reading. In the case of tax cancellation by-laws, or by-laws for the borrowing -- or by-laws for the establishment of a reserve fund under Section 639, those by-laws are always approved by the Deputy Minister or the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Department. In all other cases they are approved by the supervisor or the assistant supervisor of local government districts. The by-laws as a rule are not compared with other jurisdictions although in some cases, where the department's assistance has been requested in the drafting of by-laws - and this does happen occasionally - precedents are used from by-laws in other jurisdictions including other local government districts, and in some cases municipalities.

With particular reference to By-law 272 of the Local Government District of Consol, our local government district office received a complaint from Mr. C. J. Bowles of Cranberry Portage in a letter dated January 29th, 1965. This complaint was followed up by a letter from the Cranberry Portage Chamber of Commerce which was addressed to me but was handled by the Assistant Deputy Minister in April of this year.

In 1961, representations were made to the resident administrator of the Local Government District of Consol requesting some form of licencing and regulation of taxicab operation in that district. In the Wabowden area particularly a petition was signed by 92 residents requesting supervision and control of taxicab operations. As a result of these representations the Administrator did pass a by-law on December 18, 1964, which by-law is essentially the same as the by-laws governing the same matters in the Local Government Districts of Churchill and Grand Rapids. The fee schedule imposed by By-law 272 is the same as that imposed in Churchill and in Grand Rapids, and represents a fee of \$100.00 for the issue of the first licence

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd.) . . . to a taxicab operator and \$50.00 for each annual renewal.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement. The complaint as I have it is that the fees charged in local government districts are substantially higher than those charged in towns and cities; for example, in this particular case, Cranberry Portage, which is covered by the figures the Minister gave, whereas in Flin Flon I understand that the charges are half that, where the licence fee is only \$25.00; in fact, the operator's permit is only \$1.00 compared to \$10.00 in the local government district. Should there not be some relationship in this case where -- because the local government district is directly adjoining another municipal corporation, should they not attempt to have their fees somewhat close?

MR. SMELLIE: I think it's a matter that the Administrator should take into consideration when he's preparing a by-law, in the same way that probably the City of St. Boniface would like to consider fees that are charged in the neighbouring City of Winnipeg when they are making a similar by-law, but there is no control imposed. Both are autonomous bodies. If the City of St. Boniface wants to charge a higher fee than Winnipeg, there's nothing to stop them from doing so, and the same thing with the local government district as compared with neighbouring municipalities.

MR. MOLGAT: But, Madam Speaker, the local government district is not an elected body. It's an administrator doing this who is an employee of the local government district but basically it comes back to being an employee of the government, so has the government when they get some of these -- does the government check to see to it that they are in relationship to others?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the government given any consideration to honouring the Manitoba Champions, or Dominion Champions, such as Leo Johnson, Terry Braunstein, Peggy Castleman, for bringing honours to Manitoba during the past winter?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): On at least those occasions that my honourable friend has mentioned, some member of the government has met them at the station. There are no further plans under way at the present time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . some consideration to holding a dinner for them?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I'm afraid the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce was not completely informed. The Manitoba Championship rinks have all been invited to attend a dinner sponsored by the Province of Manitoba on the 19th of May.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, would the First Minister entertain a question having to do with the debate that is raging or would he prefer me to wait? Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that we have, in my opinion, reached sort of a stand-off, a conundrum stage in this debate, I was wondering whether the Premier has considered the possibility of bringing in legislation treating pensions, indemnities, research assistance, etc., in the future, in the same way as electoral boundaries are treated. That is, remove it from this House entirely. I just wonder if he has considered this as a possibility for future action.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for the question because I think it is a matter that has been causing us I think quite evidently deep concern on this side of the House, because with respect to the present measure that is before us it is obvious that there is a very deep division of opinion as to its advisability. There seems to be, if I judge the tenor of the debate correctly, there seems to be some disposition on the part of most of the members to accept the idea of some kind of a pension plan in principle -- I think that can be fairly said -- but that there is the deepest division of opinion as to whether the present one is one that is satisfactory in the interests of the legislative process in the province, and as a result of that situation which has become an impasse -- I think one can fairly say that -- it would not be the intention of the government to call the motion for resuming work in the committee, that we do not intend to proceed with this bill although we believe that the principle of it is sound. We think, in view of the problems that have arisen in connection with it and the state of information in respect to it, that it would not be advisable to proceed with it, and we are giving consideration of ways and means of dealing with this matter in such a way as to place it outside the realm where we might be thought to be acting unrestrainedly in our own self interest. I think that that suggestion is one that has been giving us some reason to think the matter over, and it would be our hope that we could find some other system of dealing with this matter so that it would not be necessary to have it dealt with in the way that it's being dealt with at present. So that is the position with respect to that matter.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. I know the Premier doesn't probably wish to indulge in idle speculation, but as to the specific suggestion of mine, has he any proposal or thought?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . a very interesting line of thought. I take it that your suggestion is that matters of this sort should really be dealt with by an independent body such as the Electoral Boundaries Commission, which would make a recommendation to this House which we in turn would consider. I think probably that is a very fruitful way of going into this matter, because it is apparent that the present system is not producing a satisfactory measure of agreement.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, do I understand it correctly then that the government is not going to proceed at all with Committee of the Whole insofar as Bill 110 and there'll be no further debate on that issue? Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: We do not intend to call the item.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have the privilege of the House to make a statement in respect of this particular matter if this is the case.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member leave of the House?

MR. MOLGAT: Provided other members will have the same . . . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I might state before I allow this that I do not intend to let this develop into a debate, that every member in the House would have the same privilege; otherwise I must refuse it to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . that would be quite all right. I would withdraw my request to be able to make a statement in the House if that is the case, but I want to say that I will be preparing one as to our position, so that it would be given publicity elsewhere on this particular matter.

MR. ROBLIN: We will now proceed to the debate on Ways and Means, Madam Speaker.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. MOLGAT: The honourable member, I think, was part way through his speech the other day when the House was called and I presume that he is not finished. He is not in his seat right at the moment. I think he'll be prepared to go on. If someone else wishes to go on in the meantime, there is no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I'm sorry that I have temporarily held up the proceedings. I take it that we're on the Budget Speech and they have solved the other problems relative to the pension.

Well, Madam Speaker, the other evening, after speaking for about 10 minutes on the amendment that is before us, I think that I clearly pointed up that there had been a steady and substantial increase in real property taxes since 1958, and I pointed up too that the \$50.00 rebate which I and every other real property owner in the province could look forward to receiving shortly would not nearly meet the increase in real property taxes since this government took office. I also pointed up, I think quite clearly, that the provincial taxes paid in total by the taxpayers of this province had more than doubled since 1958, because the budget of this province in 1958 was in the neighbourhood of 80 million and presently it is 185 million, so certainly it's more than double and nobody is so naive to believe that they do not have to pay sums of this magnitude. Therefore the people of this province will have to pay this year \$185 million whether they like it or not, and I suggest they don't like it.

I also pointed up that there had been a huge increase in the provincial debt, and quoted an article where the First Minister had admitted that the interest on the debt was 850 times since he took office. Well, if the interest is up 850 times, I suggest that the debt would be up by the same token. -- (Interjection) -- It wouldn't be up by the same token? Well, then I would be interested to know why it wouldn't be, because if I had to pay - unless the interest rates are -- there's a difference in interest rates or something, I can't see why it wouldn't, because my honourable friend the First Minister, in replying to the Member for Lakeside on this very matter, I thought had admitted that the province was more or less debt-free when he took office.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . more or less debt-free; and now, of course, it is far from being debt-free. In fact, I don't know how much the debt picture has changed since one year ago, but a year ago when we met here I think my honourable colleague and leader of our Party pointed up quite clearly that Manitoba had the highest per capita debt load of any province in Canada, and I would be interested to know whether that has changed substantially since a year ago.

Now, Madam Speaker, another interesting news article that I would like my honourable friend to explain when he gets up, because I suppose that my honourable friend the First Minister will be replying to me, and that is for him to explain how it is that the debt left by the Liberals was the only debt that was not actively working for the province - I'm quoting what the Premier said at the \$10.00 a plate dinner that they had here awhile ago - "The only portion of the provincial debt which is not actively working for Manitobans is a charge that was inherited from the previous Liberal Government, Premier Duff Roblin said on Wednesday night." And that's quite a statement to make. And of course it is fairly safe to make a statement of that kind at that kind of a meeting, because surely there's not going to be anybody get up at a Conservative convention and question any kind of a statement that my honourable friends would make - that is that the Cabinet would make. I know that they questioned my honourable friend the Attorney-General on this heat tax. He was kind of hard put for an answer, but on this one surely there is some way of answering that - that the only portion of the province's debt which is not actively working for Manitobans is that part that they inherited from the previous Liberal government. Perhaps we could have a clarification of that.

Well now, Madam Speaker, according to information that has come to our attention it appears that we are still in for considerable more taxes. Here is the Home and School Association of Manitoba - Dr. W. C. Lorimer speaking. He said that "there doesn't seem to be many other sources large enough to support the rising cost of social services and education other than a sales tax." And he's warning the people that a sales tax for education is foreseen. At least he can foresee it.

Here is another one about the same day February 26th: "Property owners face more taxes. Big jump in the city mill rate. An increase of 5.71 mills in real property taxes for 1965 was the outstanding feature of a preliminary draft budget for the coming year unveiled Thursday at the meeting of City Finance Committee." So we certainly haven't seen the end of it yet. "This," it said, "would mean a tax increase of \$22.84 on the average Winnipeg home assessed at \$4,000." Half of the \$50.00 is gone out the window in one fell swoop.

And, Madam Speaker, the Alumni Association, University of Manitoba - my partner has been associated with them for 30 years I guess, and annually they approach him for a donation, and no doubt my honourable friends opposite they are approached likewise. This year they are after funds again and I want to read you what they say; and no doubt, Madam Speaker, you will have received one of these. "Alumni Fund Facts". A blank cheque for you to sign, return envelope stamped, everything. It says: "What is the typical gift? The problem has been made more difficult for many prospective students this year because of a \$75.00 increase in tuition fees. Many applicants who deserve assistance will not find it from any source because there will not be enough money available. Last year the Association was able to provide for only 40 bursaries." Well, Madam Speaker, that's quite a statement. I guess my honourable friend the Minister of Education likely got one of these because -- (Interjection) -- Certainly I'd like an answer to this. He can answer it now or after I sit down and if he would like to make a donation I will send this over with a blank cheque. -- Well these people apparently were very concerned over the fact that they will need extra assistance this year, and they are putting on a special drive for more money.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Let them do it. I'm a member of that. What's the matter with it?

MR. SHOEMAKER: And then, Madam Speaker, here is a fellow who is looking for assistance and he really feels sorry for the people of this province, and who do you think it is? Who do you think it is? It's the Honourable Nicholas Mandziuk, the Member for Marquette, and shortly after the special session that we had last August at which \$20 million of new taxes were imposed on us poor people in the Assembly that need a pension - shortly after that - Mr. Mandziuk got up in the House of Commons, on Orders of the Day I think. I think he got up before the Orders of the Day, and I'm going to read it - it's a short one - because it points up that my honourable friends' friends are feeling sorry for us: "The Federal Government was urged on Tuesday to revise its mail contracts upwards so that the mail contractors in Manitoba

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . . would be able to offset the additional burden of the Manitoba Government's increased gasoline tax. Nicholas Mandziuk, P. C. Marquette, said that the Manitoba Government's recent hike in gasoline tax had imposed a hardship on mail contractors using trucks in Manitoba. He asked if Postmaster-General J. R. Nicholson had issued instructions for an upward revision of the Federal mail contracts to take care of the higher gasoline tax in Manitoba. Mr. Nicholson said he did not think the effect of taxes of the different provinces on mail contracts was a question before the Orders of the Day. " So that proves what I said. . . . ."

Mr. Mandziuk protested because he said the Postmaster-General was quite prepared to answer the question and should have answered the question. He said if he placed it on the Order Paper it would not be answered for months, and that's why he asked it on Orders of the Day. So Mr. Mandziuk considered it so important and the effects of this new gasoline tax on the mail contractors, that he raised it in the House of Commons, and wanted to know what they were going to do about it down there. And, Madam Speaker, my honourable colleague, the leader of our Party, raised a question on the Orders of the Day. I believe, just earlier - no, last week, I guess it was - relative to municipal machinery and the fact that presently municipal machinery, owned and operated by the municipality, was exempt from the 15 cents a gallon tax levied on diesel fuel, and asked whether the Honourable the First Minister and Provincial Treasurer was prepared to give the same consideration for gasoline used for the same purpose. And my honourable friend the First Minister said that this was being taken care of, or something to that effect. I wish that before we prorogue he would make a statement in that regard.

Talking about taxes again, here is a fuel tax -- it is suggested that the new imposed fuel tax adds \$26,000 additional cost to city schools. Now, Madam Speaker, we -- the other part of the resolution deals with -- the first part of it says that "the House regrets that despite the steady and alarming increases in debt and taxes" - I have dealt with them to some extent. The other one says that the government has failed to promote adequate economic growth in Manitoba. So I will try and show that we are not keeping up with the national average. And in order to do that, I have to refer you to one of the -- I think one of the best publications in this regard is the Survey of Markets, 1964-65, put out by the Financial Post, and it devotes considerable space to all aspects of markets and growth and sales and two-car families and so on, all across Canada. And on Page 211 of that famous document, it says that as regards markets, Manitoba is four percent below the national average; and it shows the retail sales per capita. And the next one is the income is four percent below the national average. Per capita income in Manitoba - we were talking about that this morning. According to this it's \$1,510 - four percent below the national average.

On the next page, on Page 213, under Building Permits and Construction, the number of employees -- and this is rather an interesting one, Madam Speaker. Do you know that in 1964, according to this, there were 1,800 less, 1,800 less employees in the building and construction trades in 1964 than there were in 1959 in Manitoba. In fact, they have gone down every year since 1959. There has been a general decline in the number of employees in the building and construction trades. And then, so much has been said about the net farm income -- I was going to refer to that but we dealt so much with that on agricultural estimates that it would only be repetition to say anything about it now. But it was clearly pointed up that the farm net income - and that's what we're concerned about, is the net income - is certainly anything but satisfactory. And even my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, in the big survey that was made, and the figures that he tabled in the House proved that a farmer with something like \$51,000 invested received \$6.60 a day net income for a 10-hour day or 66 cents per hour. Well certainly that is below the national average and certainly it is not satisfactory by any stretch of the imagination. Even my honourable friend the First Minister admitted under cross-examination that Manitoba has "a deplorable growth rate for industrial employment." That's what he said himself. "Our gains in the last few years have been distressingly small, Mr. Roblin said." He admits that.

Madam Speaker, I have two or three more indications that Manitoba is not keeping pace with the rest of Canada. On Page 17 of this famous document put out by the Financial Post, the whole Page 17 is devoted to the provincial markets, by province, by province, and the personal disposable income in Manitoba was up 17.7 percent since 1959, but Saskatchewan was up 50.1 percent in the same period; Alberta was up 26.4 percent in the same period; and British Columbia was up 18.8 percent in the same period. So who is behind?

The retail sales in 1963 - and my honourable friend always likes to use the three prairie

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . provinces, or the four or five western provinces, when he's comparing tax loads and everything else - and here once again. In 1963, the retail sales per capita: Manitoba \$950.00, as I said before; Saskatchewan \$1,120; Alberta \$1,110; B. C. \$1,120.00. Where are we again? Two or three hundred dollars below all the other provinces in retail sales, and this is a pretty good measuring stick. If you haven't got the money you can't spend it. Well you can, but you can't keep it up very long.

The farm cash income - I said I wasn't going to talk about it but it's interesting to note here, that since 1959 - this is the gross income - it's up 16.9 in Manitoba; it's up 25.9 in Saskatchewan; 21 percent in B. C. - still away up over Manitoba. And in consumption of electrical power -- and this is a pretty good indication of the expansion of industry, the consumption of electrical power. Because after all is said and done, we use a certain amount in our homes but it's construction and it's industry that uses a lot of it. The percentage increase from 1959 to 1963: in Manitoba it's up 12.7 percent over '59; Saskatchewan 95 percent - just about double; Alberta, 43.6 percent; B. C., 23.4 percent. So where are we again? Just half as much, half as great an increase as the lowest one of the four prairie provinces.

And so, Madam Speaker, I think that I need say nothing else to clearly point up that we have had this alarming - because there's no other adjective that I know that can describe it better than the one we have used in this amendment - we have had steady and alarming increases in debt and taxes, certainly we have. Every taxpayer will agree with that. The statistics that I have read here, the Financial Post, the business institutions, will tell you we have not kept pace with the national average in growth and therefore -- well I don't expect my honourable friends will - they may agree with it in part - they will not vote with me, but I recommend that every one in the House who has felt the impact of these taxes should vote with the resolution that is before us.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

A standing vote was taken, with the following result:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Stanes, Steinkopf, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17; Nays, 27.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, is this on the main motion?

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. GRAY: May I say a word please? Approximately two years ago I made an announcement in this House to the effect that I had no intention of continuing as a member after the new election was called. I shall make sure that I shall not change my mind. I have enjoyed the modest service which I have been able to render to the people of Manitoba. At my request the Inkster constituency, which I have had the honour to represent during the last two terms, have nominated a very fine gentleman to take my place. At the outset, I wish to thank the electors of Winnipeg who have on all occasions elected me to represent them in various capacities. With this fourth session of parliament, I conclude 40 years of publicly elected service. The electors have been most kind to me during my political career. I was nominated and elected each time. I was a candidate for the New Democratic Party in both public and communal life, and I allowed my name to stand. As I already stated in this House. I arrived in Winnipeg as an immigrant, along with thousands of others during the early part of this 20th century. I have enjoyed every minute over the years, in fact for more than half a century, the freedom and democracy which are so much a part of the Canadian way of life. I wish these few remarks to tell those of the new generation of the vast number of immigrants who at that time came to add their contribution to the progress of our entry in an endeavour to compensate for the privilege and freedom accorded them in their new land of adoption. As one of the senior immigrants, I speak, although without official authority, on behalf of those many thousands who have contributed so much towards making our lives in Canada happy.

(MR. GRAY cont'd.)

And now, Madam Speaker, as a member of a new progressive movement in this Legislature, may I recite a brief history of our movement in Canada and a suggestion for progress which we have made and which we were for a time ignored but later adopted. Several days ago I was re-reading the Friday, September 28th, 1934 edition of The Manitoba Commonwealth, the official organ of the then CCF in Canada. The paper contains the manifesto and the program of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation as adopted at the first annual convention of the Federation in Regina in July 1933. I happened to be there. It was extremely interesting to me to find in this historic document many of the progress we Canadians today enjoy and will in time be enjoying.

Since my special area of interest has always been that of social welfare, I am going to restrict my comments to this part of the program that dealt with social welfare in 1933 and much earlier. The program of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was totally rejected by government in Canada. It was only after ceaseless efforts to educate the public that the CCF and its successor, the New Democratic Party, have succeeded in persuading Conservative and Liberal administrations to adopt these enlightening measures.

In 1933 the CCF advocated a national labour code. Years later they got one. Perhaps not perfect, but on the way. In 1933 the CCF advocated insurance covering illness and accidents. Most provinces and the federal government now have Workmen's Compensation legislation on their statute books. In 1933 the CCF advocated old age pensions and got them. Since then we have constantly pressed for increases in pension, to allow pensioners to live at a decent standard. We have not had complete success, but at least now it's an improvement on the \$20.00 a month which they originally received at that time. In 1933 the CCF advocated publicly-organized and financed health, hospital and medical services. Saskatchewan has now these provided, and other provinces are rapidly moving in that direction.

Before the City of Winnipeg planned to build its own municipal publicly-owned Hydro system, the rate for electricity was approximately 20 cents a kilowatt hour. During the time between when the plans were started, construction underway, and until it was completed and ready for the distribution of electrical power, the rate dropped gradually to less than one cent per kilowatt hour, thus enabling our people to utilize the power not only in their homes but in industry as well. Many of our rural areas have now benefited too, enabling our farmers to remain on the farm and get some of the privileges of the city people. This is so essential for our economy. I would also mention that while water was being sold in Montreal at that time, for instance under private ownership at a high cost, the City of Winnipeg under public ownership built its own water system giving our citizens water at the lowest cost, as \$3.00 for a three months' supply.

We now have a school for the deaf, a dental college, a Bill of Rights, and many other progressive institutions which were rejected by most of the governments in Manitoba and others for the years since 1933.

These are remarkable achievements for a party that, with the exception of Saskatchewan, has never held office unfortunately, because it was not a Labour-oriented party in Canada which implement these much-needed pieces of social legislation. The public think that the legislation has not been as beneficial as might have been expected. The legislation was passed because the governments of the day could no longer resist the demand of Canadians for a guarantee of a decent standard of living and reasonable security. The legislation was introduced on a piecemeal basis, and because of this functioned ineffectively and inefficiently.

Social Welfare legislation in Manitoba is no exception. I think it is about this, Madam Speaker, that we re-examine the reasons for having the numerous pieces of social welfare legislation that we now have on the statute books. What we are trying to do is to guarantee each Canadian a decent standard of living. I want to suggest to the government that the cost of ensuring each Manitoban a decent standard of living could be vastly reduced if the government would now determine the amount of income that each person required to maintain himself in a manner considered to be acceptable by our society, and simply guarantee each person this income of a single statute, at the same time raise our standard of living.

Madam Speaker, the promise of Manitoba is reached now by putting in all the main utilities in the hands of public ownership. We have not made any failure in taking over the Hydro power in the province. We have not made any failure in the Telephone System. We have not made any failure in other utilities from which we derive a profit and at the same time protect the people of this province.

(MR. GRAY cont'd.)

This will no doubt be my last comment in this session, and I want to extend to all the members who will be going home today or tomorrow or Friday a very healthy and prosperous year. May the crops be good. May everyone be well. And believe me, I would like to see each and every one here next year as healthy and as peaceful and with the same ability to talk for two days on one bill - or three days on one bill. I think it's wonderful, although sometimes it was a little bit tiresome, but every one in their own interest and in the interest of what they think is good for the people that they represent, their constituencies, have done the best they could.

I want to announce one more thing, that I have a sideline. Not a profitable - no more profitable than Bill 110, but at the same time it gives me a chance to be the representative not only of the Legislature but be a representative of my synagogue. I usually am an amateur Cantor, and when I do my praying down there on the Day of Atonement and other holidays, I shall remember each and every one here.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, will you ask the Honourable Member for Brandon to take the Chair for the Committee of Ways and Means.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the Honourable the Member for Brandon please take the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March 1966, the sum of \$172, 148, 869 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various capital purposes, the sum of \$39, 527, 327 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

#### IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has passed certain resolutions and asked me to report the same.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March 1966, the sum of \$172, 148, 869 be granted out of Consolidated Fund. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for the various capital purposes, the sum of \$39, 527, 327 be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, by leave, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name, and I will read them because they are not before the Members.

1. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Revenue Act 1964, by providing among other things (a) for a method of determining the purchase price of a taxable product under Part 1 of the Act in certain circumstances; (b) for the repeal of Part 2 of the Act respecting the imposition of a tax of land transfers; and (c) authorizing the school tax rebate under Part 10 of the Act be paid to occupiers of land who are liable for the payment of municipal taxes.

2. That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Income Tax (Manitoba) Act 1962, by providing that Corporations with foreign income be allowed in certain circumstances to make a deduction from the tax payable under the Act in any year in respect of taxes paid to

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) ... a foreign country, in respect of income earned in that country.

3. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Tobacco Tax Act by providing among other things for a procedure by which the Minister may make an estimate of the amount of tax imposed and collected under the Act in certain circumstances.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. ROBLIN: The Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: First resolution passed --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, will there be an explanation from ...

MR. ROBLIN: These three bills, they are by and large procedural bills, and the members will have the bills in their hands for second reading in a minute or two, but I would like to give a brief explanation as to what's in them.

The first has to do with the Revenue Act, and in that particular section we are making some amendments to the way in which the value for tax purposes is calculated with respect to electricity that may be transferred from a parent company to one of its subsidiaries. This is a problem that has arisen in the course of working out the tax system. Secondly, we are repealing Part 2 of the bill which had to do with the land transfer tax. That's being repealed by this bill. And thirdly, we are making an addition to the definition respecting "parcel" to make sure that it is particularly clear, particularly with respect to railway rights of way and gas pipelines. Railway rights of way and gas pipelines do not attract the usual municipal taxation which is about 43 percent of the assessed value, but they attract a rate of taxation between eight percent and twelve percent of the assessed value, and under the circumstances it was thought that they should not be eligible for school tax rebate because they don't pay the regular school tax as other property holders do, so those amendments are being made to The Revenue Act and that's the first Resolution that's before you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed --

MR. MOLGAT: ... is it, that deals with that resolution, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBLIN: No, an Act to amend The Revenue Act, Bill No. 2.

MR. MOLGAT: Bill No. 2?

MR. ROBLIN: Right.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it is pretty difficult for us to --

MR. ROBLIN: Well, what I was going to propose was that perhaps we should have second reading this evening, if my honourable friend wants to read them over the supper hour, or else we could proceed with them now. It's a matter which I leave to him to suggest.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, we'd certainly like to have some time to have a look at them. I was just wondering, is there some reason why these were held until this time?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, they traditionally can't come in until the Ways and Means Committee has been disposed of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. The second resolution before the Committee.

MR. ROBLIN: The second resolution is one that we are passing largely at the request of the Federal Government because it deals with the allowance for taxes paid in foreign countries by Manitoba corporations. Under the present arrangements, this does not affect our own tax position here in Manitoba, but it does give a benefit to the Manitoba corporations who can now claim the credit for taxes paid in foreign lands. This is already being done in some of the other provinces, and if we don't do it it will place our taxpayers at a disadvantage and we're doing it to keep in line with them and at the request of the Federal Legislature, but it does not really affect our own tax position here at all. I regard this as a procedural amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed? The third resolution before the Committee.

MR. ROBLIN: The third resolution before the committee, Mr. Chairman, deals with Bill 66 which the honourable gentlemen may have before them now. This has quite a number of amendments to The Tobacco Tax Act and are designed to incorporate into our Tobacco Tax Act the enforcing sections which we find in the tobacco tax acts in other provinces. At the present time, we find that our present Tax Act is incomplete as it does not allow us to go in and check over a man's books and see whether he's paid his tax or whether he hasn't, in the

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . way that we should do to administer the Act properly. So these amendments - there's quite a few of them, they take up five pages in the bill - are designed to import into our Tobacco Tax Act the same enforcement provisions which we find in similar legislation elsewhere.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, is this vindication of the information that was forwarded to me and I in turn drew it to the attention of the Provincial Treasurer, that there may have been - or the information I received that there was a certain amount of possible tax evasion going on in respect to cigarettes and these vile things . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: This will help us to take care of that.

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

#### IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and has instructed me to report same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 2, an Act to amend The Revenue Act (1964); Bill No. 40, an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba) 1962; Bill No. 66, an Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act.

MR. ROBLIN, by leave, presented Bill No. 2, an Act to amend The Revenue Act (1964), for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, under the circumstances I have no alternative but to ask that the debate be adjourned so that we can have a look at these bills during the recess.

MR. ROBLIN: I just wonder if there is any further explanation, before we adjourn, that I might make on the bill, that I might make to help my honourable friends to consider. Are there any questions arising? The amendments to Part I which cover electricity, telephone service, natural gas, coal and steam, are procedural and intended to cover certain special cases which may arise other than normal transactions. The amendments to Part II repeal the land transfer tax. The amendments to Part X, which is the school tax rebate part, are also procedural and deal with definitions. "Parcel" is redefined to make it clear that the definition covers each entry in the real property tax roll as a separate item, but excludes property subject to special assessment. It is not considered reasonable that these taxpayers who are assessed at much below the normal level in relation to actual value, should receive this benefit, especially as they are assessed as individual parcels in each school division through which they pass. The level of assessment of railway rights-of-way, covered by the Subsections (3) and (4) of Section 1003 of The Municipal Act, are assessed at between 5 and 18 percent of actual value. The average level of real property in Manitoba is 43 percent of average value. The properties of the Telephone and the Hydro do not come under Clause 3 of the amendment, as they pay grants in lieu of taxes and do not qualify as taxpayers under the Act. The definition of taxpayer has been broadened to include occupiers of land who under the Municipal Act are responsible for the payment of taxes, such as rentees of Crown property. The definition also clarifies the status of property held in more than one name.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may ask a question. Would it be possible to get a copy of the statement that was read by the First Minister? If that were possible, it would speed up the study of the bill.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . use my statement.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine. The other question I would have, Madam Speaker, is with regard to the last point that the Minister brought up, that is the occupier of the land. Did I understand correctly that someone who leases Crown land would be entitled to the school tax rebate on that lease?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . paying municipal taxes.

MR. MOLGAT: If he's paying municipal taxes. Now, what about the situation that has arisen, for example, in the City of Transcona, where there are people who are leasing land on which their home is situated, but not from the Crown. They are leasing it from a corporation. Will they be entitled to the rebate directly?

MR. ROBLIN: Well if my honourable friend will look at Section 4 (b) of the new Act, he

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) . . . . will find the details set out there and I think it covers some of those borderline cases.

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Well, Madam Speaker, the Premier invited us to ask questions in order to facilitate this matter, so I just wanted the opportunity before the motion was heard. I am wondering if the Premier could indicate to us whether there's any appeal provision in the Act itself dealing with the Minister's ruling in the proposed first portion of the amending Act, . . . . here the Minister is given the power to deem a purchase price, and I would like --

MR. ROBLIN: If my memory serves me - if I may answer the question - if my memory serves me, I think it will be found that in the original Act where there is dispute as to value, it can be referred to the courts.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then I'll look for that, Madam Speaker. Secondly, there was in the third portion, there was the addition of the words "real property". I presume that might be for clarification. I don't think that was really dealt with, but I am wondering if it could be - at a later date. I don't ask for the answer now. And a fuller development of just what is meant by the addition of the phrase dealing with occupier of a parcel. Would that be limited only to Crown owned lands or could it be anybody who is the occupier and by his lease becomes obligated to pay the taxes?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . covered in the wording.

MR. PAULLEY: One question, Madam Speaker, on that very point. The Leader of the Liberals raised the question as to leasehold occupiers in Transcona. I was going to raise a similar question, but as I read it - and I must say that it'll be subject to study during the recess - but as far as I'm aware, that on the assessment roll of the municipality, the land is still in the name of the land holder - the real property rather than the occupier under the leasehold agreement. And if my information is correct, that as far as the leaseholder is concerned in Transcona the assessment for the taxes is figuratively paid in the monthly payments to the developer, rather than their name being entered into the municipal tax roll as an occupier. So I think maybe over the recess the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer might look at that aspect as well. But offhand, this appears to me to be the situation insofar as those under leasehold agreement in Transcona, that their names are not entered on the assessment rolls and it does seem to me, from the Minister's statement, that this is the situation that they want to cover. So it may be necessary for some. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . assessment roll.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, on this, and I'm not sure, Mr. Minister, if that is so. I will endeavour to find it out from my municipal office during the recess.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I was moving the adjournment, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

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

MR. ROBLIN, by leave, presented Bill No. 40, an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba) 1962, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, there's really nothing I can add to the explanation I gave at committee. This is a procedural amendment, as far as we're concerned.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN, by leave, presented Bill No. 66, an Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): . . . . the Minister intends to make a more lengthy statement in connection. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I'll be glad to give some more information about this, Madam Speaker. It is proposed that power be granted for the making of an estimate of the tax payable where no

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)... return is filed or where records to not substantiate a return, and for the making of an assessment for tax where an audit discloses an insufficiency of tax. These powers of estimate and assessment are standard in the case of many revenue statutes in other provinces and in federal legislation.

In the proposed amendment to the Act, ample provision for appeal against estimates and assessments by citizens to the courts is contemplated. The present law provides a minimum fine of \$25.00 for any conviction. It is proposed to bring this into closer line with the Gasoline Tax Act by providing a minimum fine for second or subsequent conviction of \$100.00. We also propose that a time limit of six years be provided for prosecutions under the Act, except that in the case of false declarations or false returns, no time limit would apply. This follows the practice in other provinces. At the present the Act permits the entry and search without warrant of any premises other than a private dwelling for the purposes of tax enforcement. It is proposed that this power be extended to trucks and other vehicles so that the shipment of tobacco through unusual channels or in unusual hands may be ascertained more easily. It is not the intention to search private automobiles for casual purchases of tobacco.

From time to time where other methods of obtaining tax compliance may not be effective, prosecution for wilful tax evasion may be contemplated. In order to protect the destruction of evidence that would substantiate the case for the Crown, the seizure of the evidence may be necessary. Accordingly, it is proposed that the Provincial Treasurer be empowered to authorize specific persons in specific instances to seize records or other pertinent evidence or to make photographic copies thereof. This power is similar to the power already granted by the Legislature under the Income Tax Act, (Manitoba) 1962.

There are a number of minor amendments that clarify certain definitions and what not, but are of no real consequence in the Act.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the honourable the First Minister be willing to give me a copy of that statement.

MR. ROBLIN: I would be glad to Madam Chairman, but I would ask my honourable friend, as I asked the Leader of the Opposition, to let me have them back in the course of the debate so that I may have these in front of me when I'm listening to their comments.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I propose that we should now proceed with the rest of the Order Paper, starting on the second reading, the adjourned debate on the Second Reading of Bill 112 and the amendment thereto.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 112 and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Swan River. I have had this motion under consideration. The proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Swan River is a resolution declaratory of a principle differing from the principle of the bill and expresses an opinion as to its prosecution. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, 1958, citation 382 states: "That it is competent for a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move an amendment to the question by way of a resolution declaratory of some principle or expressing an opinion as to its prosecution."

Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, at Page 526 refers to reasoned amendment as follows: "It is competent for a member who desires to place on record any special reason for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move what is known as a reasoned amendment. This amendment is to leave out all the words in the main question after the word 'that' and to add other words, and the question proposed upon the amendment is that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question." This procedure has been invoked in this House on other occasions. Examples may be found in the Journals of 1959, the first session of the 26th Legislature, at Page 156, and the Journals of 1960, the second session of the 26th Legislature, on Page 255.

In the light of these authorities and our practice, I must rule that the amendment is in order. Any honourable member wishing to speak may do so.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Madam Speaker, first I would like to say that I am surprised to see that the government has decided to treat this bill the way it has. I do not suppose that I would have to stand and explain how I would vote on the bill as it first was

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd).....introduced. I think my accent and previous statements in this House would lead members to believe that I would support this bill in its original form. However, at this time I would like to express some of my own personal opinions, some of my own personal experiences in life, which lead me to think the way I do. In order to be understood clearly when I make reference to the Province of Quebec in the course of my speech, I would like to point out that I have very little blood relations with the people in the Province of Quebec. My father was from France, came to this country at the age of ten, and my mother is from a Belgian father and a mother who came to Manitoba at the age of three. The point I'm trying to make, Madam Speaker, is that I'm a full-fledged Canadian and Manitoban, whose mother tongue and culture is French.

The first thing I would like to say in speaking on this subject is that the intention of this bill was not to force anybody whose mother tongue is not French to learn the French language. Also, I would like to say that I appreciate very much the efforts being made by the Department of Education to make it possible for whoever wants to learn French to have at his disposition the necessary programs. However, I would like to make it clear that as far as I am concerned, this is not the answer to those of us whose mother tongue is French. I want to say that I was impressed the other day when I made a tour of the building at 1181 Portage with the Honourable the Minister of Education and some of the leading personalities in his Department. I was very impressed with all the programs there available to people who want to learn French and I was also pleased to see that so many of them have made themselves available to these programs. I think this will contribute very much in improving relations between French-speaking and English-speaking people in this province.

And while I'm on this subject, I would like to congratulate the members of this House who can express themselves in French.

I ci il me ferait plaisir d'offrir mes félicitations premièrement à Monsieur le Premier Ministre qui s'exprime très bien en français, aussi à Monsieur le Ministre de l'Industrie et du Commerce avec qui j'aime toujours à causer, monsieur le député de St-Vital qui nous a déjà donné ici quelques courts petits discours en français, à monsieur le député de Brokenhead et mon ami monsieur le député d'Emerson qui peut causer assez bien en français. Tous ces gens j'en suis sûr sont fiers du fait qu'ils peuvent s'exprimer dans les deux langues et nous l'apprécions beaucoup.

( Translation: Here it would give me pleasure to offer congratulations firstly to the First Minister who expresses himself very well in French, also to the Minister of Industry and Commerce with whom I like to chat, the member for St. Vital who has in the past given us a few short speeches in French, the member for Brokenhead and my friend the member for Emerson who can chat quite well in French. All these people I am sure are proud of the fact that they can express themselves in two languages and we appreciate this very much.)

I suppose one has to speak more than one language to really understand the meaning of this bill. It is not a matter of forcing French on somebody else. It is as far as I am concerned, making it possible for people of French origin to learn their mother tongue in school correctly, a right they had prior to 1916. How can one learn his language if the only place he speaks it is at home? By the same token if it is the will of the majority of the people to see that the French language remains a spoken language, I think it should be permitted to be used as a language of teaching. And here I would like to make it very clear that it is not the idea to force these schools where there's only a few French pupils to have the teaching in French. The idea is simply to give those people who are of French origin the facilities to learn their language as perfectly as possible. And here I can think of my own personal case as one of a few thousand. I don't mind to say, who learned his French illegally in the one-room school. I remember very well when I was in the one-room school, there we were, 100 percent French-Canadian, French-Canadian teacher, French-Canadian school trustees, and in those days we were not even allowed to have French books in the school.

I would like to point out again that it is not a matter of learning French instead of English that we are asking for. Even if I put a lot of emphasis on the learning of French, I should also point out that it is not a matter of learning one against the other. Certainly in this Manitoba of ours today it would be ridiculous to think that anybody would want that. Even though I'm very proud to speak French, and I want my children to learn it, and I don't think that we have all the facilities that we would like to have, I want to say that I am proud to be a Manitoban, I am happy to live in this province and I am certainly not a separatiste. I am trying to evaluate the

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd). . . . . the situation in a clear, practical and unimpassionate way.

Madam Speaker, I am speaking as one who has experienced what I am preaching today. At the age of 20 I was the oldest of a family of nine when my dad died suddenly and I made it a point then that I would make myself responsible for the education of my brothers and sisters in both the French and English language. Today, I am very proud of my accomplishment because I am convinced that I was successful. At that time I had three brothers who were still young enough to receive an education and all three have graduated from St. Boniface College where they were taught mostly in French, all three have graduated with B. A. degrees. One now holds a B. Sc. from the University of St. Andrews, Scotland, and I am sure my Scottish friends in this House will be proud to know that one of their universities could teach to a Frenchman from my family, and may I say that he is very proud of his stay at the University of St. Andrews, and really appreciates his years there. I would now have another brother with a B. Sc. from the University of Manitoba had he not been called back.

Madam Speaker, I am not trying to publicize my own family but I want to point out that by receiving an education in the French language such as I've just mentioned, one can continue his studies in an English university and by doing so it permits us to develop ourselves more fully, make us better and more knowledgeable Canadians to do a better job for our country. I would like to point out that as far as I am concerned, if the situation does not improve in this province, although it is improving, but it'll have to improve a lot more, it will be practically impossible for us in a few years to have our children learn the French language, and therefore will have to be sent outside of the province, a thing which I would not like to see happen because I don't think this would be a tribute to our education system in this province.

One last point that I would like to make is that I don't think the members of this House realize the importance that will be attached to this kind of legislation by the people in the Province of Quebec. Yes, Madam Speaker, there are in Quebec a few separatists, very few; but there are also a great many people who I call level headed people who want this Canada of ours a country where people of different origins enjoy themselves a life of freedom, a life where they can develop themselves according to their language and culture. There are people there who are very interested in seeing that their fellow man who speaks the same language be given the same freedom as they give the English-speaking minorities in their province.

And here I would like to relate a little incident that I lived myself not too long ago, as a matter of fact last fall. I was visiting a brother in the City of Montreal. He had just moved there for about a year and the night that I was there there was a parent teachers meeting at the local school and he did ask me if I would like to attend. In that school district there is a twenty-four room school which serves about 1,100 families out of which 100 are English-speaking and about a thousand are French-speaking. And it so happens that in that school there are four classes which are controlled completely by the English-speaking section there where they do teach according to their desire in the English language and they have their own teachers and their own inspectors. And that very night when I was at that meeting a spokesman for the group asked that an inspector who had been promoted be replaced not within two months as had been suggested but immediately because they did not think they should have to wait two months. Well I just relate this to say that when there are charges that people are not getting the treatment there, it is not always a fact. I could have stood up that night and made quite a speech trying to say that we as a minority in this province were not getting this kind of treatment but in order being afraid of getting the wrong publicity I did not. The members of this House I am sure do not realize how this bill is important if we are interested in unity in this country. I cannot emphasize enough the point that it is not a matter of trying to force French on anybody else, it is a matter of us trying to learn our language better, to speak it better and write it more correctly and therefore making us better citizens.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, j'apprécie beaucoup les vœux exprimés en français par mon collègue de La Verendrye.

(Translation: Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the sentiments expressed in French by my colleague from La Verendrye.)

That's the extent that I'll go to. I have had the privilege and honour of learning French in Provencher School here in St. Boniface, right through high school. I would like to be more conversant, more fluent in the French and I still do hope that some time in the future I will be able to accomplish this. I do not want to proceed any further in French because it is a beautiful language and I'm afraid that with my ability or my pronunciation I might just murder the language. Therefore I'll say the few words that I have to say in English.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....

I did mention that I learned some French and I can still read it and understand the books, in Provencher School. But I regret that in this school at the time when we did study French there was not enough conversational French, I would say that if our schools, there was one more school that I had attended French too in Grade 9 besides Provencher, if we would have had conversational French, or if we would have had this language taught in the French tongue at the time I'm sure that I would have been much better in French than I am at the present time. I for one, cannot see any harm if some of the subjects were taught in the French language in some of the schools where this action is justified, where the majority would wish. I see no harm whatsoever and I would say that the amendment as it was proposed in the first place was one that I would have been able to support. I realize that this country is not a homogeneous one, that this country of ours is - we have people from every race and every country in the world who are trying to work together to make our country a great Canada. We have recognized the contribution of all these people, just as we recognize that there must be partnership between the founding races of our nation, and I for one accept this as the foundation for unity in Canada, as I mentioned before, unity and diversity, more than just two, and in this spirit of co-operation I believe that we would be able to work out our difficulties. It seems to me that if we took the attitude, not the selfish one, took the attitude that we do to others as others would like us to do to them, and we took the attitude that this is not going to cause disunity, we took the attitude that we live and let other people live and build up this great province and this great nation of ours, that we'll go ahead not as two or three or four Canadas but as one strong united nation.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, there are those who will say that this bill before us is a controversial one and I believe that it is; but I don't think that it's our duty to avoid controversy; in fact I think it is our duty to engage in controversy if something important is involved. I may say too at the outset that I represent a constituency which I believe - and I don't think there is any particular distinction - which does not contain to my knowledge one family of French-speaking Canadians. I support the bill, Madam Speaker. And why do I? For a very simple reason, it's because as I have watched and read what has been transpiring in our country in the past five years I have come to the conclusion that this bill will if implemented be one of the things, one of the many things that can be done to settle much of the unrest and help maintain unity in our country. I think as all members here I love my country. I'm a Manitoban, but I consider myself first a Canadian and it surely must distress members here to see the prolonged disenchantment and dissatisfaction on the part of many people in our country - and with some justification I must say - because many of them have come to the opinion if not the conclusion, at least the opinion, that many of their rights which they thought they enjoyed under the constitution seemed to be vaporizing, seemed to be of insufficient substance. I'm referring to the French Canadians, particularly in Quebec, but outside Quebec as well. That the BNA Act, our constitution, did provide certain fundamental guarantees of minority rights back in 1867. The rights may not have been openly broached or abrogated but in the interval between then and now, the rights of French Canadians in our country have seemed to become dissipated slightly year by year. And we must not think of the minority right provision of the BNA Act as applying only to the French Canadians in Quebec. They are, I am convinced that the spirit of the BNA Act in those regards, with regard to section 93 and 133, are intended to apply to the minority all across Canada. I believe that this bill is seeking simply to restore a right that was once enjoyed here in this province, but which was, for whatever reasons which we needn't go into now, abrogated and taken away back in 1888, 1890, and at that time I believe that that action was wrong and I think that now in 1965 it is not too late to show, that no matter how long the lapse of time we are prepared to restore at least some of this right once taken away.

Now some will say but the proportion of the French-speaking element in this province is too small to warrant this kind of provision. I would point out that when the French language rights were taken away in Manitoba in the 1890 the French-speaking element was precisely the same proportion as is the English-speaking minority in Quebec today, and yet there is no thought whatsoever on the part of the people, the Government of Quebec to abrogate or rather to take away or deny these language rights because these rights are provided for in the constitution and they intend to honour the constitution and its spirit. I suggest that we should do the same thing here, even though this right was broached at one time, it's not too late to honour the spirit of The BNA Act and The Manitoba Act which is in a sense our provincial part of our provincial constitution.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd), . . . .

Madam Speaker, it's obvious from what I'm saying that I am a believer not in the compact theory of confederation, that is to say that the original provinces made a compact, but rather I am a believer in the compact of two people in confederation and because I believe it was a compact, or intended that way, that we must today act as though this compact exists; in fact it does exist. Let us give some substance then to this compact which underlies Canadian Confederation.

In case some members are rather doubtful as to my opinions on the propriety of what was done to the French language rights in this province way back. I want to quote just one excerpt from perhaps one of the, perhaps the, certainly one of the five top constitutional lawyers in this country Dean Frank Scott of McGill, and he has this to say with regard to the French language provisions in Manitoba, and I quote: "Strangely enough the validity of Manitoba Statute of 1890 abolishing French as an official language in that province was never tested in the courts. Had it been, I personally do not see how it could be upheld. It has always seemed to me that Manitoba was placed on the same footing as Quebec and that if the Manitoba law of 1890 establishing English as the sole official language was valid, then there is no security for the English language in my province. The abolition of the use of French in the Territories was on a different footing since it occurred between the creation of the provincial government in Saskatchewan, Alberta, etcetera, etcetera. So there you have, Madam Speaker, the considered opinion of certainly one of the top constitutional lawyers of our land and he is firmly of the opinion that this was a wrong which was wrought at the time, and I believe this to be a fact. I think that we here in Manitoba can now take the initiative to show French Canadians in other parts of Canada that we are prepared, because Canada means this much to us, we are prepared to extend to a minority - one of the two founding groups - to extend to this minority, the rights which they enjoy in their home province which is the only province that is now the bastion of French Canadian culture. The less we do in other provinces in this regard the more the French Canadians will come to think of Quebec as being their bastion, and naturally that breeds separatist thinking.

There are some things that the Federal Government can do to show French Canadians good faith and they are doing it - bilingualization in the civil service insofar as it is practical, etcetera, etcetera. At the provincial level these sort of things we cannot do for practical reasons, but there are some things we can, and I would like to read to you, Madam Speaker, some of the suggestions that I put to an audience that I was speaking to in January, a University Conference on the two nation theory, and I said this: "The Federal Government can carry out bilingualization more pervasively than it is at the present; it can go beyond parliamentary records, menus and wine lists; beyond court pleadings and issuings."

The Federal Government must carry bilingualization more pervasively into the Civil Service as to recruitment and promotion policy. There are certain obvious practical limitations naturally. I mean here, the entire public administration not just the civil servant per se. Second, the opportunity must be provided for public servants to learn French or English as part of their in-service training. This is being done too now, Madam Speaker. They have mobile vans, language laboratory mobile vans; so the Federal Government is starting to move in what I consider to be the right direction.

Now (b) Provincial governments; 1. Provincial governments can be persuaded to acknowledge two language groups as having some sort of constitutional parity. Hopefully they could be persuaded to allow the use of French as a language of instruction in school districts where the French Canadian population is of significant size. This would not preclude English speaking students from attending such schools, nor need it impede the current intensification of the teaching of French in our Western Canadian schools; that is to say, those in non-French speaking areas. And this is the point I am coming to, Madam Speaker. If we were to show even the slightest inclination to move in this direction it would be, it should be and it would be interpreted as an act of good faith on our part by the French Canadians in Quebec. If it can be shown that one or two provinces some distance removed from the bastion were prepared to extend more graceful consideration of their linguistic and cultural rights it would, perhaps more than anything else, help to break down separatist thinking because it would put the lie to the talk that is current in Quebec that the other provinces really don't care, that it's only here in Quebec that we can hope to maintain and protect our culture, etcetera. If we show them otherwise, separatist thinking will be curtailed and eventually cease.

So, Madam Speaker, for all these reasons I do not find it difficult really to support this

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . . bill. Now then of course we have the amendment before us, which advocates that this should not be proceeded with but rather that it should be held in abeyance until we have a chance to look at national policy and to look at the particular circumstances of our own province. Madam Speaker, I have no intention at all of being unkind to the authors of this amendment but I suggest that surely by now we know in what direction national policy is trending in this regard, and surely by now we know the particular circumstances of our own province. And I suggest, and I don't know if the mover of this bill, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I don't know if he had this in mind at all but it seems to me that the bill really while, quite stark and simple, I have the impression that the mover has in mind that this would only apply to those districts where the French speaking families, the population, is of substantial size. That being so, and with that reservation and that reservation only, I support the bill. I support the bill without any reservations other than that.

Now then it could be said that if we were to proceed with this that it would really be doing a disservice to the French, to the students of French parents, because then they would lose on their learning of English and that they need English in order to prepare themselves for life after school, for the business world and so on. I certainly concur with that view but it seems to me that if French were allowed as a language of instruction, that it would be up to the local boards and the parents etcetera to work out the ratio and proportion. It need not be suggested that French will be used as the language of instruction right from Grade 1 through to 12 without any instruction in English. It's all a matter of balance, Madam Speaker, and I think it must be said that some instruction periods must be allowed in the French language, otherwise the students will lose the language. They cannot get it from one period a day, learning French as a subject onto itself. The members here surely must have received this brochure by Tim Creary of Southam News where he gives some interesting interpretation and data on the status of the French language in Manitoba and they are suffering from the problem of dissipation and drainage, you might say, of the language and it cannot, this problem cannot be met in any way, in my opinion, except by allowing it as a language of instruction at least a significant part of the time. These details can be worked out later.

Unlike my friends to my right, I believe details can be worked out. I don't filibuster on a bill if I agree in principle with it, I support it whatever the consequence. I may say that there is no particular political motivation pushing me with regard to this bill as members can obviously see, so if nothing else I would hope that members here would take my comments on this bill as being the result of my own conviction in the matter and not because I hope to win votes somewhere, because this is the sort of thing that really need not be partisan at all. It involves the broadest question of national unity, national goals, and restoration of rights under the Constitution. So with those remarks, Madam Speaker, I wish to indicate that I will oppose the amendment and support the bill.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I resolved at the very beginning not to involve myself in a debate at this stage of the session where we are all getting ready to close up and go about our ways, and I was prompted to make a few comments mainly because of what the Honourable Member from Brokenhead had to say that one should not avoid matters that are controversial, one should face up to them. Well I realize of course this is a controversial measure and I must say that I have grave doubts as to whether the solution is so apparent before us. I believe that bringing this matter in at the tail-end of the session makes it impossible to deal with it in the proper context and in the proper light, and I'm not sure whether this Legislative Assembly is the place where on should deal with a matter like this, separate and apart from all the other factors which influence the attempts at solutions to a major problem which was indicated by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I am sure that he does not suggest that the institution of French as a language of instruction will go very far in doing more than, as he put it, evidence of good faith.

I have other thoughts, or fears rather, about this which I would like to explore much more and I really don't feel that we have given this matter the proper airing in this Chamber on the basis of which we should come to a conclusion, and although I am not enthusiastic about the wording of the resolution, and the weight given to the reasons for postponement, yet I am bound to say that the end portion of it, dealing as it does with mentioning national policy decisions now under review in this field, is something which I do think demands consideration which would not be limited to one afternoon or even one week.

I must say, Madam Speaker, that I don't have quite as much feeling as does my colleague from Brokenhead that constitutional rights and historical rights are always those which must be

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . . accepted for all time. I don't have his background in history but I do have the feeling that the importance of the study of history is that one learns from history, one learns of what was done in the past and the factors that affect it, the decisions that were made then. One must have a full knowledge of history and be guided by the conclusions one reaches from what history teaches. But history alone should not determine our decisions, which must always be made in the light of changing circumstances, in the light of various factors and the factors that have changed since the historical period of which my learned - my honoured colleague speaks, are so different, and there is such an impact. I don't for a moment, in changing the term from "learned" to "honoured" does not mean that I do not consider him learned. I honour him for his learning and I honour him for other reasons. --(Interjection) -- He feels that I am beating this a little too strongly so that possibly I should move back to my subject.

Madam Speaker, to me language is a method of communication and really not much more, and when I say it's a method of communication and not much more, I think that's an awful lot. The ability to communicate, one with the other, is the most important aspect of civilized life and of social behaviour and that ability to communicate must be one that is made available to all with the greatest possible facility, but communication in itself is what is important in our social lives, and just language for language sake, if it does not with it carry communication is, I think, a rather empty thing. Through language we can communicate backgrounds, we can transmit cultural heritages, we can transmit traditions and ideologies. And I know that a knowledge of a language facilitates this method of transmission from one generation to another and, what is probably more important, from one generation to another generation of the same age but yet of a different background. So that I think it is not enough just to transmit cultural historical traditional backgrounds of one people to its own people, but rather to all members of our Canadian society. I have had the opportunity to, as a benefit and the advantage of acquiring a knowledge of cultures, traditions, histories of other peoples - my own people. I have learned through the Yiddish language more than through any other means and therefore I have learned to appreciate the value of a knowledge and a facility in a language.

But unless I am able to communicate my knowledge and my learning to people who do not have the opportunity to use this means of communication, the Yiddish language, if I can't transmit it to them then I am stultifying or lessening the contribution which I can make to my society and if I stick only to the Yiddish language then I don't think I am doing too much in my contribution to my society.

During the war I had the benefit of learning a great deal about the traditions, the history, the background, the culture of the Japanese people. It was made possible to me through the study of the Japanese language. Through that I learned a great deal which my fellow Canadians have not had an opportunity to learn. Unless I am able to transmit what I learned about that background to my fellow Canadians, then I remain with the knowledge; I do not benefit my neighbours.

So that I feel again, that just to recognize a language as a course of instruction without facilitating all these methods of communication one to the other, is I think not enough and yet it is of course vital that people who have that French language keep it, maintain it, strengthen it. But I'm not sure that this is the solution and I don't pretend there is a solution. But I do not think that this itself is the problem. We heard the Honourable Member for Emerson speak on the importance of the Ukrainian language and the need to keep it as a live language and to keep it available. To be consistent with what he said then and what he said today, then we should in the foreseeable future be considering the question of Ukrainian as becoming a teaching language in the province and the only argument I think that there would be against it, as compared to the French language, is the history of the constitutional question. And I don't think that's enough in our changing society today.

I think that we must look at our problem which was touched on today in terms of the social barriers; and not just the language barriers; in terms of the economic barriers that exist between peoples in this province; in terms of the geographic barriers that exist in this province; the prejudices that exist, and I am afraid that by rejecting this resolution, this amendment, and by passing the bill, we might pretend that we are solving a problem, but I don't think we are getting anywhere near dealing with the problem as such.

So that I think, and I am now taking a leaf out of the book of the Liberals who have spoken in the last few days, in terms of study and review, that this is a matter which does require study and review. And I do not have too much faith that the Biculturalism and Bilingualism

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . . Commission is going to solve the problem but at least by studying it, by varying it, by reviewing it, the problem will be considered by so many people that that in itself is important. The mere discussion is important because it too, is a manner of communication and I think we should do all possible to continue this form of "dialogue" as it is often called, to continue to explore the problem and the proposed means of dealing with the problem and not feel that we are accomplishing very much by dealing with this problem separate and apart from the others.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Ayes and Nays please. Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Swan River.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Peters, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 32; Nays, 14.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 112 as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, in closing the debate, first of all I'd like to make a statement that might help my honourable friend from St. John's. This proposed bill of mine was turned over to the Legislative Counsel during the second week of this session, approximately 10 weeks ago. The first reading took place on March 31st. The bill was printed approximately on April 20th. The second reading took place on April 27th. It was called on May 6th. It didn't stand - it wasn't asked to stand at any time; and no answer of course is provided for the speech, that is, about a week ago. At this time it was amended by the Honourable Member from Swan River and he was the only member of the government side to speak. He made it quite clear that the French language had no right in Manitoba and the member of the government applauded him. As the honourable member was the only one to speak, the backbencher that spoke was the only one to speak, and as the First Minister, as well as the Minister of Education, the Member from Rupertsland, all joined the other members of their party in applauding his remarks - therefore approving what he had said - I think that the views of the government were quite clear. I felt that in something as important as this we would at least have a few words from either the First Minister, who by the way is still not in his seat - he doesn't want to vote on this - and the Minister of Education. I thought would have something to say on this. I think that this is vitally important and maybe some of the other members - one or two of the other members from the other side.

Well, Madam Speaker, I guess that I should consider that I've been put in my place. The authoritative tone of the Honourable Member from Swan River, when he made his amendment, the great joy, the pleasure, the gleam displayed by the Leader of this House, when you read the amendment the other night, and I was left standing not even with the usual copy of the amendment, to hide my shame and my embarrassment, certainly would indicate that I have been put in my place.

Well, Madam Speaker, I was gullible enough to think that this bill would receive fair consideration. I was innocent enough to believe in the sincerity of the First Minister of this Province - when he was speaking in Montreal and in Quebec - in enunciating all these beautiful words of friendship and recognition of the two founding races of Canada. I believe that the newspaper had quoted the Provincial Secretary correctly - I'm referring to the Free Press of November 15th, 1963, and I quote: "' There can be no split personality or birthday cake for Canada's centenary celebration in 1967. The question of French Canada's culture and language must be settled first', Honourable Maitland Steinkopf, Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities said Thursday. He added that he was certain the Fathers of Confederation intended to guarantee the right to instruction in the French language to all French Canadians in all provinces," and I would like to read this again, Madam Speaker: "He added that he was certain the Fathers of Confederation intended to guarantee the right to instruction in the French language, to all French Canadians in all provinces, not just Quebec. 'The French language is the key to the survival of the French Canadian culture. The right to it was secured a quarter

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . century before Confederation,' Mr. Steinkopf contended. 'And the clear intent of the Fathers of Confederation was mislaid when education was established under provincial jurisdiction; because education is a provincial matter under The BNA Act, Manitoba is tackling the problem in addition to the work of the Royal Commission.' " In addition to the work of the Royal Commission -- and this was quoted in 1963.

Well, I think that it is clear now that this was only political talk. In these days of a few years ago, well the First Minister was speaking in Quebec. Well then, I think it's fair to say that it was considered that he had a fair chance to become the national leader of the Conservative party and, of course, to get anywhere he needed the people of Quebec. But now this is all changed. We could see that he cooled off a bit on the French situation, even from the opening day of this session, when my friend the Honourable Leader of the Opposition expressed displeasure that the work of the extremists in Quebec was falling, there was a sly remark from across there, slapping Quebec down a little bit, reminding them of -- this is of the Queen -- this was all Quebec -- not just a few. And then there were -- even in other debates they were linked of what about what's going on in Montreal and so on -- to show, to try to show. Well, the fiasco that he has made of the session I think would indicate that his chances are as good as a snowball in the sun. I guess he thought then that soon he would have to be contented to stay home and collect the fat pension, and maybe vacation in Jamaica -- in other words, play the fiddle while these people of Manitoba were paying this tax heat. So why worry? Why worry?

Now I thought that the Province of Manitoba had a chance to do something to preserve Confederation. I feel that intently or not, in my feeling anyway, the Honourable Member from St. John's made a separatist speech today; this is all it is, when the people -- maybe this is what he believes -- maybe separatist is not so wrong. Not too long ago when the Leader of the Opposition in Quebec stated that from now on all the teaching would be done in French -- take it away from the English people -- all across the country, all across country we heard all kinds of cries of injustice and so on. Now we've been talking today about -- well history and tradition and so on, but I thought that we were talking about rights. I tried to keep this on a high plane -- this debate. I am often accused of not keeping things on a high plane, especially by my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who of course is a genius at keeping things on the highest possible plane.

MR. LYON: It's impossible, when you're talking.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, my friend found his voice, after two days. Isn't it wonderful? --(Interjection)-- Well, what was I to expect from a government that showed so little leadership, so little courage; from a government that voted as one in the resolution here asking that we explain what Confederation was -- an amendment that took nothing away from their resolution. And they voted as one. This was not a partisan motion at all. All the members on this side voted, thought it was a good idea to add something to this -- I'm referring to the debate on citizenship now -- to add something so that the people would have a chance to understand what Confederation means. Well what was I to expect from a government such as this one? Well, the Honourable Member that made this amendment told us in no uncertain terms that Confederation had not made this country a bilingual one. As far as The BNA Act, The Manitoba Act -- well I imagine they are only figments of my imagination -- he hasn't mentioned these at all. And mind you, this was the government speaker. We asked -- what was I asking? Did anything I do -- was it political in any way? Did I make it difficult for the government? This is something that has been asked for years. I wonder what the Minister of Education will tell these people, or the First Minister, when he hasn't had the interest, to say one word in this debate. Well, what were we asking? To spend money? No, Madam Speaker. To force something on somebody else? No, Madam Speaker. We were asking to rectify a wrong and to recognize a right, to which my honourable friends across from me had given lip service ever since their election.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): More than lip service, my friend.

MR. DESJARDINS: More than lip service, my friend, I say, rectify a wrong; recognize a right. They're turning it down, and he says, "More than lip service, my friend." I don't dare say anything to him, because I'll be told that he was misquoted.

Now, what did this do? Some member mentioned -- could we have a little order please, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . . . St. Boniface has the floor.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much. If he wants to speak, Madam Speaker, I don't

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . mind giving him a chance - I'll go on closing the debate, but while I'm on my feet I wish he'd refrain.

Well I was asking that a right that was recognized - that I thought anyway, in my gullible way - I felt that these people on their own, where they had enough to be able to do this, would be able to learn in their mother tongue and one of the official, I thought, official languages of the country. This did not hurt anybody. If the government felt that maybe we were going too far -- there were a lot of amendments - I didn't try to bring them down. They should have maybe said, "Well let's try it; let's try it a bit like Ontario; let's have maybe certain languages." There could have been an amendment in committee. They could have said, "Well, maybe in certain grades, let's try." No. How dared I, Madam Speaker, suggest such a thing? Well, I paid for my audacity and my fingers were rapped. We were told that the French had no rights - in fact, I am beginning to think that I'm very fortunate to be allowed to think in French.

The Honourable Member from Swan River talked about Ontario. He said, "And Ontario does this." I don't know why he mentioned this. But then, that was it. Then he reminded us of what they had done. Before that he said though, "But beware, don't let those so-and-sos take over. Beware. Beware of the dangers," he said. "It remains for us to be firm and do not allow this to happen." These were his words. And they applauded. I don't know why, but all of a sudden -- we have no rights at all, but all of a sudden, he reminded us of what they had done in French. But Madam Speaker, he failed to say that I brought in a motion about three or four years ago; they made a joke of this; they used the only French speaking member that they have, to bring in a meaningless amendment but three months after, they pat themselves on the back and say, "This is what we did." Well, it doesn't worry me that much who gets the credit. I had stated - I'm sure this was repeated to my honourable friend the Minister of Education - I said two years ago that if the government wouldn't do anything I would move this resolution. So I gave them all the chances in the world, the same as I did in other subjects, but when people are afraid to move, I think it is my responsibility to bring it. Of course, I'm always taking a chance that it won't go through if it's not brought in by one of their members. Well, who knows, maybe this is the start of something. Maybe after slapping me down, although they applauded all this speech and the speech of the Honourable Member from St. Vital on a previous occasion that discussed pretty well the same rights, the same people -- well, maybe in a couple of years or maybe in a few months we'll have something, so who cares if we achieve something. Well, maybe this is not what he meant, maybe he wanted to show me how the conquering hero could be good and throw us a few crumbs in this department also. And the members of the government applauded. My honourable friend said that the people of Manitoba were not ready for this, and they applauded. He told us that this is a Canadian problem, not just the Manitoba, but Manitoba was the great province that preached unity. It preached unity, and he says "wait" -- I don't think he bothered reading the interim report of the commission on bilingualism and biculturalism. I think that they've settled this point already. I don't think he's bothered. He mentioned Ontario but he said "don't do like Ontario, don't do like Quebec". Now, this is a government that was progressive though in this field of unity. It brought in a great innovation, a flag for the Province of Manitoba all of a sudden - a new flag, a flag that would distract of this great Canadian flag that we have now, but a flag that might remind certain groups who were the conquering heroes. In other words, a new flag, a new rival to the Canadian flag.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . Honourable Members, I don't think we should revive the debate that has been settled, the debate on the flag that's been settled in the House. I don't believe we should revive it at this time.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't intend to revive it, Madam Speaker. I'm just showing that this government who is waiting for the commission of biculturalism to act, did not seem to wait and show the true leadership in providing us with a flag. Take away from me as far as I'm concerned the Canadian flag, but I'll leave this the way it is.

I think that we're supposed to be reminded by the words of the honourable member that this is a great nation. He told us this was a great nation and we should all be proud of it, but we should be careful. We must remember that people with names such as Bilton, Roblin and so on were the real leaders here, were the only people that had any rights I guess. Well, Madam Speaker, if you look at the . . . .

MR. LYON: Order. . . . on a point of order, Madam Speaker, the statement that was just made by my honourable friend is not correct in any way, shape or form --(Interjection)-- and he should be asked to retract it - yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, there goes my honourable friend again. He says my

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....statement is wrong, so it's supposed to be wrong. I say it's right, and I think I'm entitled to give my views just as much as he has his, just as much as he has his.

MR. LYON: Order.....on the point of order, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend is entitled of course to give his views so long as he remains within the rules. He is not entitled to say that somebody else said so and so as he tried to imply here.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on the point of order. when somebody gets up and says that this is not a bilingual country, that no rights were given in Confederation for this. it means one thing, that there is only but one official language and that is the English language and this is the point I'm trying to.....

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member has been asked to retract his statement.

MR. DESJARDINS: What statement, Madam Speaker? Are you asking me to withdraw my statement? On what grounds?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, the Honourable Minister has asked you to retract your statement.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'm not, Madam Speaker, withdrawing -- and the statement -- I've explained the statement, and the Honourable Minister can get up all he wants and try to take away from what I'm saying. I made the statement that there's no such a thing as recognition of two founding races, therefore there's only one language that's recognized. Isn't that right, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member wish to have him retract his statement? The Honourable Minister.....

MR. LYON: The statement as I heard it, Madam Speaker, on speaking to the point of order, he tried to imply or impute that the Honourable Member from Swan River had said that only people with names such as Bilton and Roblin had any rights in this country. We all know, Madam Speaker, that that statement was not made at any time by the Honourable Member for Swan River, and I really wish my honourable friend to withdraw that imputation.

MR. DESJARDINS: He is misquoting me, Madam Chairman. He has misquoted me. I said -- I did not imply -- I said if this was his idea because he did not recognize two official languages -- this is what I did. and it's exactly what I'm standing by and he is misquoting me like he often does, and I do not intend to withdraw what I said.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend now says that he didn't say that? I'm quite happy to accept that as a withdrawal.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well if he would have listened, we would have saved fifteen minutes, but he knows it all and he's trying to detract what I said and I'll explain it again. I explain that the way my honourable friend spoke when he said that there were no rights in Confederation, when he did not recognize The BNA Act or The Manitoba Act, it meant that there was only one official language and that official language was the one of the people that I mentioned. This is exactly it, Madam Speaker, this is the way it was said and this is what I implied, this is what I meant and this is what I mean.

Well, Madam Speaker, I have news for you and for the members of this government, my honourable friends. I do not consider myself beaten at all. I have faith in the people of Canada. I've always had faith, I've never lost faith in the people of Canada. the people of Manitoba. I think that they are even learning to live with their neighbors and loving them, even their French Canadian neighbors. Mind you, I have completely given up on the leadership of this government. The first few years that I was here I thought we'd get strong leadership. The leadership that's been shown, especially at this session, especially these last few days and especially in this debate where nobody from the government except the backbencher would bring in their policy.

But Madam Speaker, we will find leadership outside of this House. such people as Archbishop Clarke of the Anglican Church; Professor Waines, Judge Lindal, Professor Jaenen, Reverend Hutton. the members of the Chamber of Commerce. the local newspapers. and yes. the newspaper from Toronto. It will take time. It will take a little more time than if we have the proper leadership, the leadership that we're entitled to receive here in this House, but I think that eventually the rights of people will be recognized. I say the rights of people, because there's no more rights of minority and majority, it's rights. This is what we fought for, the rights of majority for the last few days in another debate, and if it's the right of minorities, the rights are still existing. and I think that one day these rights will be recognized even without the leadership of this government. and who knows but maybe some day that I won't even be

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... considered in some circles as a second-class citizen; maybe I'll be the equal of some of the friends across from me who get up and lecture me on what's right and what's wrong.

Madam Speaker, I would suggest to the government that they file the speech of my honourable friend with the Committee on Bilingualism and Biculturalism who will be here next week. I think that this is a clear indication of their policy. If they don't do so. I will see that the committee is informed. I will provide them at my cost. I voted against the amendment because I felt that it had very little if anything to do with it. It says: "In the opinion of this House having regard to the recent and substantial extension in the teaching of the French language in the public school system" but it has nothing to do with what I'm talking about. I'm talking about French as a teaching language -- "and the addition of French as a second language" -- I didn't mean that, I meant French as a language; I didn't say anything about second. I meant an equal language of instruction should be studied in the light of national policy decisions. Now the light of national policy decision has not been used in other problems that this department has had. They haven't worried about what the other provinces were doing in certain other instances. And even in this. If they look at some of the provinces they'll see what was going on. but I thought that maybe we'd show a little leadership. We wouldn't wait till we'd be the ninth or tenth province. "In the field and of the particular circumstances in our own provinces." Well since when does right change circumstances? Either we have a right or we haven't a right. and the circumstances don't alter anything unless one lacks courage.

Now, Madam Speaker, I voted against the amendment in protest because I know it's clear what the government tried to do, what the government did; they certainly showed their lack of interest but I will vote in favour of the bill as amended, as my motion is out, my bill is out now, is out the window. I don't think that the government means to worry too much about these reforms, these - whenever the report comes in. in fact they don't even know that the interim report is out yet or they would have had something to say on this. So I will vote for this bill but not without too much confidence for the future.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for my colleague, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. I realized that the motion before the House is still in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, but the member for Seven Oaks did introduce the bill. I suggest to the House that he, the Member for Seven Oaks, be given the opportunity of closing the debate. I trust that this is acceptable and I draw to the attention of the members of the House that if this is agreed upon then the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks will in effect be closing the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is closing the debate. Does any other honourable member wish to speak. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will try to be brief. I wish first to thank the other two honourable members who spoke in this debate and I appreciate the remarks they made because they were well considered, but I just simply cannot agree completely with them. The Honourable Member for Selkirk, who possesses quite a knowledge of insurance, spoke on the matter and he said, and I quote from his speech -- he said, "If we had compulsory automobile insurance tomorrow. there is nothing which would guarantee to us any greater degree of highway safety than we now have," and I would just say, Madam Speaker, that we do not say that the government auto insurance will guarantee greater highway safety. What it does do however, is it prevents people from being financially ruined as a result of accidents. Madam Speaker, when an accident takes place, it is the cause of much mental anguish. I think we underestimate this. When two people have an automobile accident, it's a cause of great - not only the hardship of doing without the vehicles, but the legal aspect of proving who was at fault and the final settling of the claim.

The honourable member also said on Page 1813 that, "Saskatchewan Government Insurance policy and the damage to each of these cars is in excess of \$200.00 and each owner has to pay the first \$200.00 himself. That is something worthy of taking into consideration when you start to compare the cost of automobile insurance in Manitoba with insurance in Saskatchewan." But the difference is Madam Speaker, that in Saskatchewan, you can recover from the liable party. because insurance is paid regardless of fault. The honourable member also says on the

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd). . . . same page that, "In Manitoba, in the City of Winnipeg you have a higher rate than you have say in Arborg -- where the Honourable Minister of Education is always referring to -- whereas in Saskatchewan there's no differences of rates prevailing. Nor is there any difference in rates prevailing -- the basic rates in Saskatchewan are all determined by wheelbase; they're not determined by horsepower or anything else."

But Madam Speaker, in the report of the Automobile Insurance Office of Saskatchewan, on Page 10, it does show where there is a difference in rate. I have on Page 10, the page setting out the rates, where in Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw, there is a \$50.00 deductible and it gives the rest for the remainder of Saskatchewan. In other words, I suppose it's based on the fact that more accidents take place in the more heavily populated areas; but there is a schedule here setting out the differences in area.

I promised to be brief, Madam Speaker, because I know that the session is drawing to a close, but I did want to bring home two or three of these points. The Honourable Member for Hamiota, in speaking in this debate, said and I quote from Page 1677, he said: "I think it's also true, Madam Speaker, that under compulsory insurance, people tend to be careless. They don't feel the obligation that they do when they become financially obligated themselves." Now, I can't really believe that people would run about smashing cars if they knew that compensation was automatic. I think this is a little too dangerous, Madam Speaker.

The honourable member also said that, "Together with our safety responsibility law in this province, to cover those who are in a collision or in accidents with persons who are not responsible, we have the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and this is operated by the government. It's true that it's not always easy -- it's not just handed out to you." I would say that's certainly true. I recall a case where a friend of mine was killed and the driver of the car had no insurance, and it took, I believe two years before the widow was finally compensated from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. So while it is true that you can claim from the Fund, it certainly takes a long time. Now I don't submit to the idea that we're going to be more careful if it's not compulsory.

Again on Page 1674 the Honourable Member for Hamiota said that in New York State -- that the state had compulsory automobile insurance, "They entered that in 1957. It is estimated that they have had to hire an extra 1,000 employees to handle the compulsory automobile insurance and the cost is 3 1/2 million and they are now six months behind in trying to catch up on the uninsured motorists in that state." Now the big difference, Madam Speaker, is that in New York State they do not combine auto insurance fees with the cost of the licence. In Saskatchewan, this can't happen because when you get your plates you are automatically insured to the extent of public liability and if you wish to insure on a more elaborate scale then you can take the package policy with the government or you're free to go out and buy extra insurance from any of the private companies, but this is the big difference.

The honourable member said that in England they had compulsory automobile insurance since 1930 and "it is reported that in 1936 they had 12,452 convictions for motorists failing to insure." Well in Great Britain, Madam Speaker, new licences are not issued every year and this job of collection is complicated.

The honourable member also said on the same page that "Compulsory can't compel. It costs millions to administer. It creates an unnecessary government bureaucracy. It does not protect responsible citizens and it increases automobile insurance costs." He states further that "Three states, Massachusetts, New York and North Carolina have compulsory." I guess he means compulsory automobile insurance. But this again, Madam Speaker, is not linked to the licence cost because -- I think this is the big difference, Madam Speaker. And I have submitted all along that the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund was the wrong way to go about this, because in creating the Fund we simply charged the rest of the people of the province more money for their insurance in order to create this fund, and we had many people in Manitoba driving cars without insurance and it's not much satisfaction after an accident, to be able to say that you have the right to impound the car, after serious accidents.

Now the Saskatchewan Plan is self-sustaining. There is no charge on the general funds of the province and I have here the schedule setting out all through the years, and there have been years which have been lean and they have had losses, but the rates are raised in order to compensate for this and I have here the schedule showing from 1946 to '58. So it's self-sustaining. And the more accidents they have of course the more insurance they have to pay. But the big point is that when you buy your plates in Saskatchewan, you buy insurance, and there is no one there running around driving a car without coverage for some poor unfortunate victim whom

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd)..... he's liable to knock down.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the House in allowing me to introduce this resolution and in again closing the debate and I wish to thank the members.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 7; Nays, 41.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. EVANS: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Tuesday evening.