

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday March 13, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library beg leave to present the following, their First Report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Cowan as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that, for the remainder of the Session, the Quorum of the Committee shall consist of six (6) members.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 23 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

No. 28 - An Act to incorporate The Lutheran Campus Foundation of Manitoba.

No. 50 - An Act to amend The Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants Act.

No. 57 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee recommends that the fees, less the costs of printing, be refunded with respect to the following Bills:

No. 23 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

No. 28 - An Act to incorporate The Lutheran Campus Foundation of Manitoba.

Your Committee also recommends that the time for receiving petitions for private bills be extended to the 3rd day of April, 1967, and that the time for presenting private bills to the House be extended to the 10th day of April, 1967, and that the time for receiving Reports of the Committee on private bills be extended to the 24th day of April, 1967.

Your Committee also recommends that, with respect of The Fidelity Trust Company applying for a private Act of the Legislature to amend its Act of Incorporation, as amended, the notices of application for a private bill to be advertised under Rule 103, be reduced from four advertisements in The Manitoba Gazette and in a newspaper to three advertisements in The Manitoba Gazette and a newspaper.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the report of the Committee I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the report be received.

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

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the report of the Committee, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the fees, less the cost of printing, be refunded with respect to the following bills: No. 23, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverend Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba; No. 28, an Act to incorporate The Lutheran Campus Foundation in Manitoba.

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

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the report of the Committee, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the time for receiving petitions for private bills be extended to the 3rd day of April, 1967, and that the time for presenting private bills to the House be extended to the 10th day of April, 1967, and that the time for receiving Reports of the Committee be extended to the 24th day of April, 1967.

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

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the Report of the Committee, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that with respect to The Fidelity Trust Company applying for a private Act of the Legislature to amend its Act of Incorporation, as amended, the notices of application for a private bill to be advertised under Rule 103, be reduced from four advertisements in The Manitoba Gazette and in a newspaper to three advertisements in The Manitoba Gazette and a newspaper.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 77, an Act to validate By-law No. 214 of the Village of Treherne.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks) introduced Bill No. 74, an Act to amend The West Kildonan Charter.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 71, an Act to amend The Psychologists Registration Act.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews) introduced Bill No. 67, an Act to validate By-laws Nos. 19/66 and 4/67 of the Town of Swan River.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 79, an Act to amend The Companies Act (2).

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . Committee proceed? Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the insurance of residents of the province in respect of the costs of medical services and to provide for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund of certain amounts to defray the costs incurred in administering the Act.

MR. WITNEY: . . . . . the money resolution which will precede the first reading of this Bill. The money resolution is required because we will have to incur certain costs in setting up the provisions that are contained in the Act in order to provide for the medical services insurance by July 1st, 1968. There are, Mr. Chairman, several principles which are involved in the Bill, and I would prefer that we deal with the matter of principle at second reading of the Bill and after the members have had a thorough opportunity to read it and review what it says. In introducing this resolution I would just like to make mention of the fact this is National Health Week in Canada. It's a time when people ought to consider about health matters, and this resolution and the Bill that will be before you is of such a substantive nature that I'm sure that there will be much consideration of health matters in the Province of Manitoba and this is a good time to begin.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his explanation. I wonder if he could tell the House, though, at this time what are the financial implications insofar as the Province of Manitoba. Has he established a budget for this yet? What does he expect will be the cost during the course of the coming fiscal year with which we are dealing; that is, if we have some preparatory work to do prior to the 31st of March, 1968, what he expects we'll be spending during the course of the next fiscal exercise; and then, of course, what he expects to be the over-all costs of the program once it gets into operation on the first of July, 1968.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I am unable to give the initial costs of getting started for this program. We will have to employ staff and we will have to have so much in capital for the corporation, which is called for by the Act itself. When the program is in operation, by July 1st, 1968, we anticipate that the initial cost of operation will be in the neighbourhood of \$35 million for the first year of operation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether the program is going to be a voluntary program or a compulsory program?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the fact that the resolution that the Honourable the Minister of Health introduced today is one on which he does not normally outline what the proposition is in detail, but I view with consternation and deep regret that the Honourable Minister told us on the introduction of the resolution that the citizens of Manitoba are going to be deprived of a proper system of Medicare until at least the commencement of July 1st, 1968. I presume that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . the reason that the Honourable Minister mentions that particular date is that is the date that the federal authority have sloughed off the probable start of a Medicare scheme for the Dominion of Canada. I do not need to say to you, Mr. Chairman, or to the Minister, that a Medicare scheme had been promised by the Federal Government to start on the first of July, 1967 as one of those features in recognition of the progress that Canada has made in its first hundred years.

You recall, Mr. Chairman, a Medicare scheme had been broached as the great "deal" for Canada and for Canadians, and it was going to be instituted in this our Centennial year. As a matter of fact, even the start of the program, the day in which the proposition was to come into effect was going to be on the day of our nation's birth, July 1st, then apparently the federal authority got into some financial difficulties; they feared that inflation was going to set in to such a degree that they decided to take action insofar as the finances of the country and failed to proceed with looking after adequate health care for the citizens of Canada. And this government apparently, Mr. Chairman, is going to follow the same line - delay, postponement; and who knows, I ask my honourable friend the Minister of Health, in view of the reputation and past actions of the Liberal Party at the federal level in respect of health, whether we will be starting on a Medicare scheme on the first of July in the year 1968? We all know too well as we look at the history of Canada and the Liberal Party that it was promised. A national health program, Medicare scheme was promised at the convention in 1919 which first named the late Right Honourable Mackenzie King as the Leader of the Liberal Party and subsequently, of course, the Prime Minister of Canada. We're still waiting. Postponement and delay. The neglect of the health care of the citizens of Canada. In the last federal election a definite promise, as I indicated a few moments ago, of a health scheme for Canadians on our 100th birthday. Now, a year from now, or a year from July 1st, no real firm indication that it will be.

I want to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Health, can we rely any more on this government introducing a Medicare scheme on the first of July in 1968 than we can on the past promises and the introduction of legislation, which has been made, into the House of Commons at Ottawa. My honourable friend, in answer to the question of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition a few moments ago, suggested that the possible cost, to use his words, would be about \$35 million. I want to ask him, does this - as he calls it - cost, make provision for federal participation or would this be the amount of money required for a scheme here in Manitoba in the absence of any further progress with the legislation at Ottawa? And I want to remind my honourable friend of one other very important feature when he talks in amounts of money, the \$35 million he referred to as cost is not actually cost at all; it is just the transfer of the method by which citizens of Manitoba will be paying for health care, and this I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is very important. Let's not say, let's not use the word "cost" in the manner that my honourable friend used it this afternoon. True, there may be additional charges, but it's a fee or an amount of money we can ill afford not to contribute to the over-all health care of the citizens of Manitoba.

So while I agree, Mr. Chairman, with my honourable friend the Minister of Health that we must await detailed consideration until such time as we have the Bill before us, I want to say - and I'm speaking I'm sure on behalf of my colleagues - I regret, we regret, very very much that the Honourable Provincial Minister of Health here in the Province of Manitoba is apparently following on the coat tails of the administration at Ottawa and deferring for a year at least medical facilities, a medical insurance scheme that is sorely needed in the Province of Manitoba and in this our Dominion. I agree with what my colleague the Member for Winnipeg Centre, Stanley Knowles, said not so many days ago, what a privilege it would have been for we as Canadians to be able to say, within our boundaries and without, that on this our 100th Anniversary we enacted a real progressive piece of legislation that would insure to a great degree the enhancement and the benefits of the medical science resources that we have in this Dominion, and that people came before vested interests be it caused through inflation or any other method.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this resolution where we're discussing the Medicare proposal, I just wonder - is it necessary to bring in this measure at such an early date? We still have a year and a half to go and I'm just wondering whether it's so essential that we have to have it brought in at this session. Then, I would like to know from the Minister: when the Federal Government set up those four principles when the plan first came out, has there been any relenting on their part? Will the plan still be compulsory,

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . as I think this question was already put by the Leader of the Opposition? I think this is important that we know this. Then, too, is the Federal Government's share going to be increased from the \$14.00 as originally quoted - or was it \$14.50? And, too, will the 50 percent apply right through or will this \$14.00 or \$14.50, whatever it was, quoted at that time be stationary? Will it be fixed? And that our contribution as a province would be increased whenever the increases took place. I think these are some of the points that I wanted to raise at this particular time and get the information first before I discuss it any further.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, one day last week I attempted to point up to the Assembly, members of this Assembly, the drastic shortage of doctors and dentists and other medical personnel in the province and in particular in the rural areas, and I think I pretty well established that fact because there are members opposite who nodded their head in the affirmative to suggest to me, when I was speaking, that they were in the same sad predicament as many of the areas in which I represent.

Now, when a Medicare program is introduced, the people, having paid a premium for a service, are going to be a lot more demanding in that they receive the service for which they are paying a premium, and so my question is: what is the government going to do to assure the rural areas - if you want to limit it to the rural areas - to assure the rural areas of this province that they will receive a service after having paid a premium? Or where will you have to go? Will it be necessary for people in many many parts of the province to come to Winnipeg to receive the services that they are entitled to under the program? You may say, "Well, it's a year and a half to go yet," but a year and a half isn't long to acquire the necessary numbers of doctors and dentists and other personnel that will be required to effectively carry out a program that is envisaged by my honourable friend. I am not certain of this fact but I thought that this government, prior to the last election, said that they would introduce a Medicare program regardless of what Ottawa did. They didn't do that, eh? Well, they made 78 promises and I guess that wasn't one of them, but I thought they had inferred that they would do this. However, I would be very interested to learn what steps are the government going to take to ensure that the rural areas will have doctors, dentists, nurses and other personnel in adequate quantities to ensure that the citizens after having paid a premium will receive the service they are entitled to.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I said that when we introduced this we'd probably get some discussion about health matters at the beginning of National Health Week in Manitoba, and I was certainly right in that one point at any rate. In answer to the question from the Leader of the Opposition as to whether or not the plan will be voluntary or compulsory, the plan will be compulsory. We had hoped to bring in a voluntary plan; however . . . as we said in the statement which I made to the House last year that we would bring in a plan which would conform with the Federal Government plan, the stipulations of the Federal Government are such, particularly in the percentage of people they need for initial enrolment, that in our opinion the plan would require a compulsory application.

The Honourable the Member from Rhineland asked whether the Federal Government had relented from any of the four principles that they had laid down at the time. The Federal Government had not, although we had made submissions to them asking for them, in particular with the numbers of people required to start, to place it down to 80 percent. They said they would not and they have adhered to their four principles. He asked whether the Federal Government would share \$14.50, and the latest figure that we have is that their contribution will be \$17.00 per person. The basis of the Federal Government contributions is - it's 50 percent of the average per capita cost across the whole of Canada.

In dealing with the matters of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone-Neepawa, the people will be able to obtain services, as they are at the present time, from their doctors in Churchill, their doctors in Lynn Lake, in Flin Flon, in The Pas, in Swan River, in Roblin, in Russell, in Benito, in Boissevain, in Dauphin, in Brandon, in Virden, in Killarney, in Melita, in Deloraine, in Lac du Bonnet, in Winnipeg, etc. etc. I feel that we have doctors now that are providing service for people of the province. At the present time some 70 percent are covered by either the MMS or by private insurance companies. There are 30 percent who are not covered but who will be covered when this legislation becomes law in a year and a half time, and I feel that with the numbers of doctors that we have and their particular positioning in the province that we will be able to take care of their needs.

With respect to the Honourable the Leader of the NDP asking whether or not we are going to proceed by July 1, 1968. This legislation will be before you and the answer will be, "Yes, we will."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): . . . . this resolution be adopted, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed. The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the Minister, when he refers to the legislation as being compulsory legislation I assume that he means that it will be financed by all of the people in the Province of Manitoba and nobody can take the position that they don't want to contribute to this program, but that it will be a perfectly voluntary program from the point of view of the people deciding whether they wish to use this program when seeing a doctor, choosing a doctor, or otherwise making use of the facilities that are available under the particular program, and in that respect it will be perfectly voluntary as far as the individual's use of the program is concerned, similar to the program that was brought in in the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. WITNEY: The proposal will be financed by premiums for the province's portion of the revenues that will be needed, and the premium will be applied on a compulsory basis; but for the utilization of it, that is up to the individual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution and requests me to report same.

#### IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I wonder if I might direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery. . . .

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, perhaps in order to . . . the continuity the Minister should introduce the Bill before the introductions.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon.

MR. WITNEY introduced Bill No. 68, an Act respecting Insurance of Residents of the Province in respect of the costs of Medical Insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: We have with us today some 70 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Miller Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Klippenstein. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. On behalf of all the Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the defeat of the proposed government plan for single-district school divisions in the referendum of Friday, March 10th, 1967, when 19 out of 33 divisions voting rejected the plan; the decisive want of confidence vote expressed by the people of Manitoba in this rejection of the government; the clear dissatisfaction of the people of Manitoba with the high-handed arrogant attitude of this government; the chaotic education situation which is the result of this rejection of the government; and the urgent need for: (1) a declaration of government policy regarding financial assistance to those areas who voted against the referendum; and (2) the long-range plans of the government to arrive at a greater equality of educational opportunity for all the children of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside . . . .

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if it would be in order at this point to address remarks to you concerning whether or not the motion is in order, or are you making a ruling on that matter, Sir? I have some comments upon it.

MR. MOLGAT: I think, Mr. Speaker, if there are comments they should come now before any ruling is made.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable the Attorney-General . . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my only point that I would raise, and it's a much repeated point in the House when these matters come before us, is that the prime consideration before Your Honour is as to the urgency of debate on the subject matter that is brought to be debated by this special procedure for adjournment of the House.

An urgency of debate relates, of course, to the immediate occurrence of some matter or the absolute necessity of the Legislature using this extremely special device, which is part of

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . our rules, to cause the regular work of the House to be delayed for this special debate today. Now we are all aware of the fact that there are various means of bringing matters before the Legislature for discussion, and I suggest with the greatest of respect that while the matter is important that has been raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, still the urgency, the question of urgency of debate, is one that has to be considered quite carefully. A resolution, the substance of a resolution can be introduced into the House today, which would come up for discussion later on this week; there are various other means of debating this matter such as a grievance on a motion to go into Supply, and so I am suggesting that on the subject of urgency, which is really all that is before Your Honour at the present time, that the matter does not fall within that extremely rare category of items which are so urgent as to require the adjournment of the House and the delay of the regular business of the House for the special discussion of this matter. It has nothing to do with the importance of the matter but rather the urgency of debate, and all of the rules and all of the decisions in Beauséjour, I suggest, back up in a general way what I have tried to give you in capsule form, and I suggest that because there are alternative means of having this matter discussed by the Legislature, that this is not an appropriate method of bringing the matter before the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the point of order before you rule - I can only say that my honourable friend is as far away from reality in his comments, when he says that the matter is not urgent, as obviously the government has been from the realities of public life in Manitoba.

MR. LYON: . . . . . of debate I'm not making a political speech, I'm making a speech on the matter of procedure. My honourable friend will have the chance to make his political speech after. I wish he would deal with the point of procedure.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, then insofar as the urgency of debate purely, the Minister says that we could debate it on another occasion. He points out that a motion could be placed before the House which would come up for discussion some time later in the week. Now this is a very hopeful proposition. The Order Paper now has -- I haven't counted them but I presume something like twenty resolutions on it now, and there are at least two or three that have been on the Order Paper for some weeks and have not come forward for debate as yet, so there is no guarantee whatever that a resolution introduced now would reach the floor of the House. Secondly, he suggests that there are other means: by a grievance on going into Supply, which is certainly one of the methods but it's not a method open to me because I have already spoken in going into Supply as has the First Minister, and I have no means of speaking on that type of a motion. So if we are to have a debate, which I submit is urgent, this is the only method by which it can be accomplished.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could add another thought to this debate because I agree with those who believe that on the question of urgency the resolution does not qualify, and I think my point is very simple, that we are certainly going to debate government policy with respect to education, and we are going to debate government policy with respect to the unitary divisions, and we are going to debate government policy with respect to the grants that may be offered, and we are going to have a full opportunity, before anything is decided, to have a full debate on this matter because, as we have already given notice, we intend to bring into this Legislature a bill or a number of bills which will deal with this matter, and before there is going to be anything decided every member of this Legislature will have a full opportunity to give his views on any part of this question.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . Mr. Speaker, if I may once again. We have no assurance from this side of the House when the government is going to bring the bills forward. They have stated they are going to bring them but we don't know when, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent matter here insofar as the public, because there are some votes coming up. There are votes -- people must decide whether or not they are going to stand as school trustees in the new division areas. There's a vote coming up; there are budgets to be prepared; and it is essential that the government policy be discussed at once. How else can the school district know what is going to happen? How else do they know if my honourable friends are going to scrap the whole plan and start from scratch or proceed with the plan? What method is there for the public knowing.

MR. ROBLIN: If there is any doubt upon the matter I can assure my honourable friend and members of the House that there will be a bill in good time before these necessary decisions have to be made.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on the point of order and only on the point of order, I respectfully suggest, Sir, that you reject entirely the propositions and the arguments of the Provincial Premier and the Attorney-General because I find no foundation at all and no support for their contention. -- (Interjection) -- You don't want it this way? We are well aware, Mr. Speaker, that a referendum did take place on Friday, the result of which was one which I am sure that the majority of the members of this House received the results with consternation. This, then, is the whole point, why I'm rising at this time on the point of order to support the contention that there is an urgency for debating this matter.

There are parents and school children and school trustees throughout the whole of the Province of Manitoba, that as the result of the election in their respective communities do not know where they really stand insofar as education is concerned. They are looking, after the results of the vote, for some leadership from the government of a far more rapid nature than that indicated by the First Minister. We know that they can bring in legislation, Mr. Speaker. We know that on this side, or even on that side a resolution can be brought in to debate this matter at some days hence, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling should be based on the situation as it is existing right at this moment. People are disturbed and people are worried about what the net results in the 19 areas will be, and they want a consideration of that by we who are responsible to the electorate within the whole of the Province of Manitoba and they want it now, and I respectfully suggest you should allow the debate to take place.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order I think this is of great public importance and urgent too, and certainly, as already stated by other speakers, I've used up my opportunity to speak on the motion going into Supply and therefore I feel very strongly on this point, that we should have the debate right now.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen for their opinion and I think you'll agree with me they are somewhat conflicting at this particular juncture. The gravity of the situation does concern us all so I feel that I must put this aside for further consideration at a later date.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I presume this can't be challenged or debated, but do our rules provide for such action?

MR. SPEAKER: I'll . . . .

MR. LYON: I concur, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a matter that has to be decided one way or the other.

MR. SPEAKER: It has to be decided one way or the other. Moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the defeat of the proposed government plan for single-district school divisions in the referendum of Friday, March 10th, 1967, when 19 out of 33 divisions voting rejected the plan; the decisive want of confidence vote expressed by the people of Manitoba in this rejection of the government; the clear dissatisfaction of the people of Manitoba with the high-handed arrogant attitude of this government; the chaotic education situation which is the result of this rejection of the government; and the urgent need for (1) a declaration of government policy regarding financial assistance to those areas who voted against the referendum; (2) the long-range plans of the government to arrive at a greater equality of educational opportunity for the children of Manitoba. Has the honourable member leave to proceed?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your ruling on this matter. I recognize that these are not easy matters for the Speaker and I do not envy your difficult position in having to make these decisions. However, I believe that your decision was correct because the matter that is before us is indeed one of major importance to the people of Manitoba and one of extreme urgency to the people of Manitoba.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has on many occasions stated that education was the number one priority so far as it was concerned. This has been an oft-repeated statement of the First Minister himself and of various members on the far side. The proposal that was put forward by the Minister of Education for a referendum was debated quite substantially in this House. A number of suggestions were made to the Minister, urgent suggestions, in the period prior to the Christmas recess of the House. The government was urged to come out with the information on the whole of the plan then. They were urged to come out with the financial information and not to wait. They were told that if they did not proceed properly on this they were in danger of prejudicing the vote. My honourable friends proceeded at their own pace, Mr. Chairman.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . .

They did not have obstruction from this side of the House. One honourable member stated that he would oppose the plan and proceeded to do so, but one honourable member only. There was no attempt by this side of the House to make any political capital of this situation, and there was ample opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for political capital to be made. Members of my group did not succumb to that opportunity because we felt that the issue before us - the education of our children and the provision of equality across the Province of Manitoba - was of such supreme importance that, while we had reservations, and I expressed those reservations when I was asked the questions but we did not oppose the plan, and so the decision that the people of Manitoba made on Friday, Mr. Speaker, can be construed in one way only, and that is an utter rejection of this government. The people of Manitoba decided that they had enough of this government, and of the statements that were made subsequently to the vote by the honourable gentlemen opposite and the First Minister in particular; there is one with which I totally agree, that when the First Minister said that there were many other reasons for rejecting the plan on the part of the electors.

It is so, Mr. Speaker. There were many other reasons, because this was a protest vote against this government, and unfortunately the education matters were maybe not in the forefront at all times. And to say, as the honourable members opposite, that it isn't a vote of confidence in this government, to say as the Leader of the NDP has said that he doesn't think it's a vote of confidence in this government, in his case indicates his standing support which he regularly gives to my honourable friends opposite and in their case constitutes the normal position of a government that is completely out of touch with the public. Completely out of touch, Mr. Speaker, with what is going on in Manitoba, and they only need to ask their backbenchers to find that out. They only need to ask the honourable members who sit behind them, who were out in their constituencies this week-end and who spoke to the people of Manitoba and who are back here this afternoon. If my honourable friends opposite, the frontbenchers, would spend a little more time listening to their backbenchers, if they'd pay a little more heed to what is going on across the Province of Manitoba, we would be getting better government in this province; we wouldn't be in the fiasco in which we find ourselves now on matters of education.

Mr. Speaker, this is a protest against Cabinet Ministers who proceed to raise their salaries with no reference to the public and no reference to their own backbenchers, who proceed to give themselves salary tax-free increases of \$3,000 a year while loading more taxes on the taxpayers; Ministers who are out of touch with the problems of Manitoba; Ministers who have no consistent policy, who rejected the idea of a referendum a year ago, who in September announced that there would be one, who announced that there would be no schools of less than eight classrooms, who changed their minds subsequently and said that well, maybe it wouldn't be eight classrooms, maybe it would be less; who set up a finance board to determine or veto the size of schools and then who say, "Well no, it's really going to be up to the local people." What sort of confidence can the people have, Mr. Speaker, in that type of policies?

This is a rejection, Mr. Speaker, of the attitudes of this government. The people of this province have become convinced that this government cares not for the people. I have it said to me frequently, "You know, we might as well be in Russia the way this government is proceeding. They don't care about the public." My honourable friend the 'Prince-in-waiting' can chuckle all he wants. He can chuckle all he wants. Let him go and ask his backbenchers and he'll find out what's going on. Then go even ask some of his frontbenchers who have a clearer idea than he has of what's going on, such as the Minister of Agriculture who was up last week at a meeting in the Interlake and who found out what people are thinking and how people feel about this situation. This vote, Mr. Speaker, was a rejection at the way in which the government proceeded with the vote; a rejection at the government taking the position: if we only offer enough money people will vote for it. And, Mr. Speaker, people had little choice, very little choice. But it just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that democracy is in fact a wonderful system; a wonderful system, because in the final analysis the people can speak their minds. And they did on Friday. They spoke what they felt, Mr. Speaker, and they voted against being pushed around by an arrogant government.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that from an education standpoint I fear that this will put back some desirable policies. I still agree, Mr. Speaker, that we must get to the point where we have graded classrooms, that if we are going to provide opportunity to the children across the Province of Manitoba we have to get to the point where we are teaching with one teacher per



(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . class wherever this is possible. I recognize as well, Mr. Speaker, that to attempt to impose across the province that one formula, means that certain areas, frankly, while they would be prepared to accept it from an education standpoint, have no choice because of distance and other problems but to oppose it. But surprisingly enough it is those very areas, Mr. Speaker, who supported the plan. The very areas that supported the plan are not the areas represented, by and large, by my honourable friends opposite. In fact, the biggest defeat, Mr. Speaker, occurred in the seat of a Cabinet Minister, the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, where the division that encompasses the majority of his constituency voted by 1,000 against the proposal. And so it's in the seats represented by my honourable friends opposite, not those represented by the members of my group, Mr. Speaker, that this was turned down. It was turned down largely in the seats where the Cabinet Ministers went to speak. That's the effect they had on the electorate.

Mr. Speaker, it was tough for people to vote against this. I must admit that in my own constituency, as I had pointed out very early in this session -- in fact my reply to the Throne Speech when I gave the figures across the province of assessment in population, and I pointed out to the Minister then, Mr. Speaker, the lack of equality, and I said to the Minister then that equality of education also means the need for equality to raise funds for education and unless you do that you are not providing equality, and I gave him the instances then of a number of school divisions. The government had decided that the Interlake area should not be given a vote; they were going to be put into this willy-nilly. I pointed out to the Minister that there were other areas that were in as serious a financial position if not worse than the Interlake itself, and I refer to Turtle River and Duck Mountain School Divisions where because of problems of a small population, a low assessment, pockets of scattered population and very large area, the school division found itself virtually bankrupt. They couldn't continue and they couldn't afford, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this. But it doesn't necessarily mean that they approved of the government's methods or the government's plans.

And, Mr. Speaker, the government can't say today, "We didn't know. This is something new. We had no means of knowing that this was going to happen." Because we told them so, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions starting back, as I said, on the very beginning of the session. I said to the Minister on the third day of this session, the first speech I made in this House, and I refer to Hansard, December 7th. I said, "The Minister is proceeding with a referendum and I'm not disapproving of the referendum; in fact I've recommended that it be done; but I say to him he's going to have to give a lot more information to the people of this province and a lot more information to the voters in those divisions if he expects to have a proper vote on this. They need to know exactly what the Provincial Government is prepared to do from a financial standpoint, and the danger is that if my honourable friends don't give them the full facts this vote may not carry, so it is essential that his advertising campaign and the full financial information be available very very soon."

I'll not read all of this over again, Mr. Speaker. The same debate carried on for several days. It carried on on the resolution calling for the money to be taken out of Consolidated Revenue to have the vote. It carried on on the Bill. On the closing day of our session, the 15th of December, I appealed to the Minister once again and I said to him then, "Don't wait to give the information. The only possible reason for waiting is a political one. The only possible reason for not giving the people the full facts now is because you want to retain some pleasant statements at the same time as you bring in the unpleasant ones with the Budget." And I pleaded with the Minister at that time, Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of December, to come out with his facts; but they didn't come out. They waited, Mr. Speaker. They waited and tied it in with the Budget. In the minds of many people in this province the combination of sales taxes and Cabinet Ministers' salaries and all these factors couldn't help but influence their attitude, and so, Mr. Speaker, there is no means of interpreting this vote other than a rejection of the government.

I understand that one honourable member is going to ask for the resignation of the Minister. Well, I assume that he won't need to ask for it. Others, Mr. Speaker, have suggested, in fact, that any self-respecting government faced with a defeat of this type would know the course that it should take, and that's a pretty clear one. And it's not the chuckles that the Crown Prince is giving us again. In fact, Mr. Speaker, that subject may well be one, too, that the people of Manitoba are resenting. This anointing of a successor, this set-up where the Premier of a province proceeds to load the taxpayers with taxes of all types and then plans to move away having anointed the next one, is not one that the people of Manitoba regard as a satisfactory

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . arrangement. And I have had it said to me several times, Mr. Speaker, across the province, "We certainly hope that that man Roblin doesn't load us down the way he's done and then moves out." These are part of the resentments, Mr. Speaker, of the people in the province.

Well, what do we do now? I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the children of this province, and the reason that I wanted this debated today is so that the government can tell the people of the province and the children of the province what do we do now. What do we do now with the 19 divisions who voted "no" to this program and who yet are going to have to bear the costs that the new program inevitably is going to bring forward? Because there is no way of getting out of it now, Mr. Speaker. The teachers' salaries which have been announced in the schedules of the White Paper - whether a division is going to get the new grants or not they will have to meet those salaries or they won't get teachers.

What are they going to do, Mr. Speaker, about the other costs of running a school division - transportation and all the rest? And the government can say, "Well, they voted against it," but surely, Mr. Speaker, the government isn't going to say -- when there has been such a decisive vote against this, the government isn't going to say to all these people, "Stay out in the cold." Surely the government is going to have some assistance. Possibly not the full program, but some assistance. Or is the government going to cancel the five percent sales tax. Is the government going to say, "If the people don't want this it's certainly not fair to proceed and load them with the taxes if they are not going to get the benefits." Is that going to be the course of action? We have no means of knowing on this side, Mr. Speaker, but let me tell you this, that every school trustee in the province right now is scratching his head and saying to himself: "What do we do now? What do we do about our budget for next year? How can we proceed to run this school district in this sort of a situation?" Is the government going to abandon the plan and let us all go back to where we were originally and start from scratch, or is the government really going to do what the First Minister is alleged to have said on Saturday, that those who voted "against" are out? "That'll teach 'em a lesson. They'll know better next time." Is that going to be the attitude across the way? My honourable friends the backbenchers across there know what that's going to mean in their areas. Where will that leave the children whom we have to educate? What sort of a position will they be in, Mr. Speaker, unless steps are taken to move towards equality?

I approve, Mr. Speaker, in general principles, of the Foundation Program but the Foundation Program as it stands now, in spite of the statements of my honourable friends opposite, will not cover the majority of those who had the right to vote. "Oh sure," the government says. "Well, we don't really need to worry," they say, "because . . . ." what figures did they give - 85 percent is it? Yes, 85 percent, the Premier says, of the children in the province are going to be covered by -- no, pardon me, 80 percent on that statement. Yes. And then he says on another one, "We have to consider that 80 to 85 percent of the children who will be under the new plan, and they are the children we will have to be concerned with," the Premier said. So the 80 to 85 percent -- well let me make this clear first of all, Mr. Speaker. There wasn't 80 or 85 percent voting. The large number of children here in the metropolitan area were not involved in a vote. They already have single school divisions. My honourable friends decided that the people in the Interlake wouldn't have a vote, and I might say on that subject, Mr. Speaker, that from the phone calls I have received the results of the over-all vote in the province certainly have the people in the Interlake highly concerned, because if the vote had passed in the remainder of Manitoba they would have said, "Well, the rest of the province has decided it's good. We don't like the fact that we didn't have a vote but I suppose we have to go along with it." But now, faced with a defeat in the balance of the province, Interlake people feel all the more that they should be given the right to speak their mind.

But this statement, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier's, that 80 or 85 percent of the children are covered and they're the ones to be concerned with, is the very opposite of what the referendum was about, because we knew at that time that I presume 50 or 60 percent of the children were already covered without the referendum. The referendum was held in those other areas, Mr. Speaker, and those other areas voted in majority against the referendum. And so to say that we don't need to be concerned about them, leads me to wonder if this is simply going to mean two standards of education in Manitoba. And it's not good enough, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier and his colleagues to say that they voted for that; they could have done otherwise. Mr. Speaker, if that's the attitude of the government, then it's the clearest indication of their arrogance, because this is saying to the people, "You know, you don't know what's good for you; we

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . know what's good for you. We'll give you a chance to vote but if you don't like it it's just too bad." That's the present position in which we find ourselves.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say to the government: don't go around blaming the voters. Don't go around blaming other people. Don't go around saying, "Well, everybody in this House except one was in favour of it and so it's not our fault." Mr. Speaker, it's those other issues that made the difference in this referendum, those other issues that the people are fed up about, and our problem now is to sort out of this what is going to be for the welfare of the children of Manitoba. And I call on the government, Mr. Speaker - now - for a statement of what the financial position is going to be for those who rejected the referendum and I call upon the government - now - to tell us what are going to be the plans to proceed towards graded schools, to provide that equality of opportunity which they speak about, and to see what we can do now about giving equality of costs across the province, because we are going to be faced with some school divisions who may well go bankrupt unless action is taken. We're going to be faced with fantastic increases in mill rates in certain areas unless the government comes out with a clear-cut statement, and, Mr. Speaker, quite obviously if there's going to be - and I don't know if this is the government's intention, but if they are going to say, "We'll give equal grants to all," then there's going to be some questions in those who supported the plan to say, "Well now, on what basis do we find ourselves? Is it then the intention of the government to proceed with another referendum?" I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but we mean to know what the government plans to do because there are some urgent decisions to be made. There are decisions to be made insofar as school trustees being elected to the boards if the government is going to proceed, and there are budget decisions to be made across the province, and behind all this, Mr. Speaker, the question of the education of our children.

And so we cannot wait. We must have from the government their decision. They are the only ones who can make that announcement, but that announcement must be made now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the introduction of this very important resolution, and I join in saying that the people of Manitoba, and in particular those areas that rejected the proposition Friday last, are entitled to obtain a declaration of the position in which the government now finds itself. And I want to say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that before he attributes to me confidence in the government on the basis of the vote that was taken or the rejection by the government and the statement I made subsequent to the rejection by the divisions, he has taken entirely out of context my report, and I am sure that my honourable friend is well aware, or should be, of the statement that I made.

The statement that I made at half past twelve Saturday morning to the press in answer to a question as to whether or not I considered the vote a vote of non-confidence in the government on the referendum - and this is what we were discussing, the question of the vote on the referendum itself - I said at that time, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to construe the actual vote in reference to the referendum itself as a motion of non-confidence on the referendum, then the Leader of the Opposition and his group, and the Leader of the New Democratic Party and his group, would have to share the responsibility of the rejection insofar as the actual vote on the referendum, but then I went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people's rejection of the proposition on the referendum was an indication of lack of confidence in the government for other reasons. One of the reasons, I am sure (and I have substantiated this since, because I have been around a little bit since last Friday) was the calling of the five percent sales tax an Education Tax when it was first introduced into this House. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this had a large bearing, the imposition of the five percent sales tax and calling it an Education Tax had a large bearing on influencing the electors who voted on the referendum, and to me they were perfectly justified in calling for the bringing down of the government on that particular basis.

This is what I said and I want my honourable friend to understand that, that I do not support this government insofar as those aspects unrelated to the referendum, but when I was asked the statement insofar as the referendum itself was concerned, I was prepared to accept some responsibility because I pledged my support, not only in this House, I went out into my own constituency and worked on behalf of the support for the referendum, and my area happens to be one of those areas that did support the referendum. Now whether they were supporting me or not is beside the point. They did support the fact that I was there and I gave it, and the major questions that arose at the meetings I attended was not so much the referendum itself but was condemnation and criticism of the government for other areas of activity, and this was the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . situation that developed and this was the tenor of the remarks that I gave to the press following the vote.

I said at that time and I said when the referendum proposition was originally before this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that if we were the government we would have introduced the single school administration area in the same method as they did in the Province of Saskatchewan. We would have passed the legislation and given to the people the rights to opt out of it after it was legislated for. I think our stand on this is clear. I also made this statement to the press following the referendum, that I think that we would have had far more support for the principle of the single school administration area had this been done. Oh yes I know, Mr. Speaker, that particularly my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland would call this not unusual as far as I was concerned, because "you Socialists want to dictate to people." Well we attempted to in some manner during the referendum; not particularly dictate, but to offer carrots or whatever you want to call them, in order to entice support. The only difference was in the approach that I suggested on behalf of our party at that time, that they would have had a full opportunity to see the financial effects insofar as money is concerned in the larger area and then had an opportunity if they so desired to come out of it.

I said, too, in my statement following the defeat of the plan in these 19 areas, that the government would be well advised to undertake an extensive educational program in those areas that rejected the plan, and make provision for the peoples in those areas at the earliest possible moment, to have an opportunity of reconsidering the decision made.

I know that this proposition can be construed as saying, "Well what would you do? Have continual vote after vote after vote until the people accepted, got tired of voting against and voted in favour of the single area school administration?" I don't suggest that at all, Mr. Chairman. I do say, and I say this sincerely, that the people in my opinion and the ones that I have talked to, basically were not voting against the principle of the school referendum per se but because of two or three things: the lack of full information, the lack of full understanding of the referendum; but more important, the lack of confidence in other aspects of government under the jurisdiction of the present administration.

We have protested in this House the methodology of the salary increases to Cabinet Ministers. In some respects our position has been misconstrued slightly, I presume, from the position that we have taken, but we did protest. As a matter of fact, I was one of the first ones to protest that. We are more vigorous I think in our protest of the five percent sales tax in this House. We've faulted the government as often as we can and we'll continue in this endeavour as the House proceeds, if indeed it is going to proceed, because possibly my honourable friends opposite will take this rejection of Friday so much to heart that His Honour may be called in this evening and say, "Well, let's go at it again folks," and I am sure as far as my group here are concerned we are ready and prepared for it. The ball is in the courts, of course, of my honourable friends opposite, but I say again, Mr. Speaker, when I make reference insofar as the vote of confidence in the government is concerned in the referendum, I'm still prepared to accept my personal responsibility on the referendum aspect but I join with those people who voted against the government when they marked their X against the referendum, and if they did this, I feel concerned because of this particular rejection of -- I still think it's a good plan, and I believe my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition re-affirmed the fact that he thought it was still a good plan when he was speaking a few moments ago. I say the rejection of the referendum by the people doesn't of necessity mean that 56 members of this House out of 57 were wrong and I cannot accept this. But I do say, Mr. Speaker, in the terms of the resolution that we have before us, that the people of Manitoba and in particular those areas that rejected the proposition, are entitled to, at the very quickest moment, to receive a declaration of government policy regarding financial assistance to those areas who have voted against the referendum, or some alternative proposition so that they can reconsider their position as quickly as possible, and also that they are entitled to know the long-range plans of the government in the field of equality of educational opportunities for all of the students, the young men and women in Manitoba, and to this I would add the long-range plan for equality and educational opportunity at all levels of education - primary, secondary and university, and technical training as well. These things are required and these statements are required, Mr. Speaker, and should be forthcoming from the government.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say yes, 19 areas at least expressed a vote of non-confidence in the government based on the policies of the government in other fields, and fortunately, unless my opinion is wrong, it was not directly responsible, the rejection to the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . proposition that was contained in the referendum, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker too, that if all of the Province of Manitoba had the opportunity of voting on Friday as to whether or not they had confidence in this government, very very few areas would have supported a referendum based on the proposition as to whether that government has the confidence now of the people of Manitoba, and I'm convinced they would not be in office now.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I imagine that among the other contributors to this discussion we may look forward to the contribution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, but as I feel that I know what he is going to say before he says it, perhaps he will not take it amiss if, after hearing from the Leaders of the two parties in the House, that I should say something in respect to this debate.

You know, in one sense I am entirely satisfied that we are having this discussion today because it enables me to say in this forum something of the confidence and the affection that I have for the gentleman who is now the Minister of Education in this province, and I think I may say, Sir, that in making this remark I do not speak for myself alone but I speak certainly for every member of the government caucus. My honourable friend the Minister of Education is human and I daresay he makes his share of mistakes, as I am certain that I do, but I have never had the privilege of serving with a more devoted colleague, one to whom his portfolio has been more than a job but a mission, and one who has given of himself, of his strength, of his personality and character, in a completely unstinted fashion, and I think and believe that those who have said that he should resign will on reflection think better of that suggestion. I myself hope and pray that he will continue to discharge his present portfolio, and certainly as far as I have anything to do about it he will continue to occupy that post, because I want to express my complete confidence in him; and if one is looking for a scapegoat or somebody to blame in this event, here I stand, and I am willing in this Chamber and in any public gathering to accept the responsibility that the Leader of a government ought to do. And in making this statement I say nothing more, nothing more than what must be expected of me. So if one is looking for someone to blame, you don't need to look far. Here I am.

Now let us look at the basic facts, alleged mind you, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition, because although I didn't agree with everything that the Leader of the New Democratic Party had to say I must say that I am certain that according to his likes he intended to be fair and I accept his criticism in that spirit.

The Leader of the Opposition, however, ah! where the carcass is, there will the jackal gather. If this vote had been the other way, if it had been 19 to 14 or some vote of that kind, would he have been standing in his place congratulating the government on their success and proclaiming that this was a political vindication for them? I leave that question for others to answer. But if it began as a non-political question, as I am rash enough to think it did in this Chamber, he certainly didn't lose any time in converting it into the issues of a political question. It would have I think been a more effective contribution even on that line of argument if he had told you what the vote actually was in terms of the people voting. Because a majority, not a very big one, but a majority of the people who voted for the government plan and if we had received any majority of that kind in the general election, which I'm sorry to say we didn't, a good many of the honourable gentlemen opposite wouldn't be here. He might also have informed the Chamber - if he had the information, and perhaps it would have been as well to ascertain it before he spoke - that a very considerable majority of the pupils involved in the vote are under the single division system, 60,800 as compared to 47,100 who are without it.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's not the issue as far as I'm concerned, because if 90 and 9 are saved, if 80 percent are - and indeed they are - within the unitary division, none of us if we believe what we said on Thursday, with one exception, if we believe what we said before the vote, can rest easy until we have done our best to bring this issue to a successful conclusion in respect of the 20 percent of the children of Manitoba who are now outside the unitary division. And the policy of the government is simple to declare - and that is that we are not changing the rules of the game in the middle of the play; we have the situation where we have told the people who are voting what the rules of the game were and at the present time that is what we believe they ought to be. That is not to say that forever and ever, amen, this shall be the case. But certainly that is the statement that I must make today and on this occasion when we are considering where we stand, and if there should be any change it will be brought down in this Legislature in the form of a Bill which will not be long delayed, which all may read - all who run may read. We have to remember, however, that we have to play fair not only with the minority who voted 'no', we have to play fair with the majority who voted 'yes' and we have to consider

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . how we may discharge those obligations under the present situation.

Utter rejection of the government, utter rejection of the vote; I don't think so. We got a majority of those voting and that certainly is as satisfactory an indication as those that have been given by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Well, honourable gentlemen opposite shake their heads and we'll certainly continue to disagree on this point but that's the fact. Oh, but we didn't give full information about the finances, some people say. We said all we could pending the finalization of the budget by the local division. Remember that. We said all we could. And what could we say? All that we could say was what the unitary mill rate would be on a province-wide basis related to the equalized assessment to cover the Foundation Program and we warned everyone of the fact of special levies and we told them how they were calculated. Two factors. What was under the Foundation Program and what the local division decided to do and as local divisions had not made up their budgets as to what they decided to do, we could not with any assurance tell anyone what the special levies were going to be. So we told them what we knew, honestly and truthfully; and we told them that we didn't think the tax rates would remain at the standard levies which we had spoken of here. We said they would go up; and I still believe that that will be the case.

We gave to the public the facts that I am convinced they needed to have to make up their mind as to what to do. Well now some people say, "It wasn't just the educational factors. It was a couple of other things." And I have said that that may be so. The sales tax is one. Does anyone in their wildest dreams think that the sales tax is a popular measure upon which we could confidently expect public support? Well if there is such a person, he doesn't sit on the government side of the House. We bring taxes in because they're needed to pay the bills for the essential services and we know where they're going: for education and for health. Other people have different methods of financing that they would propose. The one thing that the Leader of the Opposition has never done that I'm aware of is propose a different method of financing from the sales tax. If he's done so, let him indicate and I'll withdraw the statement. He says he's against the sales tax but he's for the spending and he hasn't produced an alternative method of financing that I am aware of. I give my honourable friend, the Member for St. John's, the well justified credit for saying that he had another method. I don't agree with it, but he had another method. But not the gentlemen that sit over there. Just today we had the Honourable Member for Gladstone - and how has he presented his plans to this House for medical, social, medical, dental and other facilities of that kind in rural Manitoba, and what kind of a bill has he run up if we were to follow out some of his suggestions? And the Honourable Member for St. Boniface whom I'm certain will have something to say in this debate before long, he's the gentleman that says, "Give the hospitals the 20 percent they want. They need it." Maybe they do but he won't face the sales tax that's required to pay it. You could go over all the gentlemen opposite, the Leader of the Opposition moves a resolution to build a road to Churchill. It's at least a \$10 million touch: And yet he says to us, "No sales tax. You don't need it and I haven't got any other recommendations to offer about where you're going to get the money to run the province." And you can go over most of the speeches of the honourable gentlemen opposite with respect to the sales tax and money and quote the places where they want you to spend but you can't very well quote the places where they want you to tax because they're in the happy position of being able to be on both sides of the question at the same time. They say, "Spend but don't have the sales tax." The Honourable Member for St. Boniface says it's not true. I would be very sorry if I misrepresented him or any other member of his party, but my opinion is that that is the attitude that they have been taking as a whole.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): It's just a red herring and you know it. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: All right. "Might as well be in Russia. Might as well be in Russia," says the friend of the Leader of the Opposition. Well I think there's one or two other people who say that too who don't belong to his party. It was very interesting that during the campaign it was reported to me that after meetings that were held by the Social Credit Party in Manitoba, I can't vouch for the accuracy of this statement because I didn't see it myself but it comes well supported, they had a nice little movie on Cuba. Very nice.

MR. DESJARDINS: What's that got to do with education . . . . ? A red herring . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Just like it is in Russia - Russia. Who brought in the Russian campaign?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That was no Social Credit Meeting.

MR. ROBLIN: Well it was run by a man called Elias that's been campaigning for the Social Credit Party but if he wasn't representing them well I'll just attribute it to him. All I

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . can say is that I didn't raise the subject of Russia. It was raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. And what did some of his friends tell us to do? "No vote," said they. "If the government had any courage there wouldn't be any vote; they'd just go ahead and do it." And we know who said that; and we know what the politics are and the parties are of those who said that. Just like Russia. Well it certainly would have been just like Russia I suppose if we'd gone ahead on that basis. "Well," he said, "you did it in the Interlake. What's holding you back?" ARDA is holding us back because one of the essential conditions of the ARDA agreement as a dramatic improvement and change in the educational structure of the Interlake. That's the basic point and we have had to agree to make large new investments in the Interlake. That's why we were, in my opinion, under an obligation to go ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not making any complaint about what the voters did. That's why we had the vote, to let them do as they thought best. I will not . . . . the fact that I had hoped for a better result. I told some of the honourable members opposite when we were discussing this in a friendly fashion that I'd be pleased if we got 20 of these areas or more - and we didn't, we got 14 and to that extent I'm disappointed. I am happy however that 60,800 children were voted in as compared to 47,100 who were voted out; and I am happy that more people voted for the plan than voted against it and I do not believe, I do not believe that this constitutes another rejection of the government. If it gives people a chance to let off a little steam about the sales tax or about daylight saving - that was the other issue, and many gentlemen opposite voted for daylight saving - who can blame them? They have a wonderful opportunity. I only regret that it was done at the expense of education, that it was really perhaps something that they, themselves, will have second thoughts about at a future date. So I don't think that this statement in the resolution before us about 19 out of 33 divisions is the only way or indeed the best way of looking at the results of the vote. I don't think that there was a decisive want of confidence vote expressed. After all, most of the people voted for it and I do not think that the contention that the government is high handed and arrogant really sticks, because if it did, we'd have proceeded without the vote at all. I do not believe that there is criticism that can be fairly brought against us that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would try to have us believe.

As far as we are concerned we are hoping, and I say this frankly, that there will be second thoughts and that the people will take advantage of the opportunities there are to change the situation in which they find themselves. I point out that the local trustees still have the same power and authority that they did before and that they have the same opportunities of re-organizing their own school structure within their divisions as they had before and that the people have the same opportunity if they desire to take it.

I believe that the policy of the government has been consistent. We have been moving steadily toward the concept of a unitary division and is there a person concerned in education today that is not associated in one way or another with urging us to do this; have not the educational experts in this House urged us to do this? Have not the school trustees urged us to do this? Have not the school teachers of Manitoba urged us to do this? Have not we agreed ourselves that it should be done? We have done the best that we could, but we respect, we respected and we did respect the right of the people who are voting to make up their own mind on this subject - and that decision of theirs is one which the government must acknowledge.

I come back to the point at which I started. Everything is not perfect in the field of education today, either in respect of our policies or in respect of what teachers or trustees or parents do. There is oh so much room for improvement, but I believe we have been moving steadily toward that improvement as fast as our financial commitments would allow us to do so. We were right in having the vote I think on the secondary divisions and we know what happened there. We were equally right I think to have a vote in this instance and we know what the decision is - we accept it. But I take my seat with the words with which I began - and that is that I am thankful and grateful that I have as a colleague a man like the present Member for Gimli who is able to carry out this important policy which his colleagues, all of them, entrust him to do. We are proud of the job that he has done and we are satisfied that he will continue to serve well and long the cause of education in the Province of Manitoba. The government is not ashamed of its policy. It stands behind its policy. We believe that the vast majority of the people of this province agree in general terms with that policy and we are convinced that with patience and goodwill we will be able to show even those who disagree with us at the moment, that their long run interests involve the line of direction and of action which we have indicated as our policy and the policy of the government.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker I want to commence my discussion here this afternoon with the very words that the First Minister stopped on, and that is government policy. This is the very point that the people in Manitoba disagree with, because when they voted against in such large numbers, they indicated this very clearly. They voted on principle and this is where they took disagreement with government policy and the large number of people that voted for it I am sure the majority it was just a matter of finances, a matter of dollars, so that if you take these two things into consideration, the government has failed very badly in this policy in selling its program and that the people refute this and have shown this in a very clear manner.

We now find them groping for straws like a drowning man. They tell us that so and so, such a percentage of pupils will be covered in the one district division class. Well Mr. Speaker, the majority of these children come from the Greater Winnipeg area which did not have a vote at all, that did not have a voice in accepting or rejecting the present plan. And they say there is a lack of understanding. Well, Mr. Chairman, we were told over the news that since last fall the government has had some 1,000 meetings. If they were not capable to tell the people of Manitoba in 1,000 meetings on a proposal of this kind I think they have failed here very badly and certainly in a private concern, if you had a salesman that couldn't produce better, he would be fired. There would be no question about that. When we hear the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party giving support also to the plan as such and that we should continue on this, well I think he has no alternative because this is Socialism, this is state controlled, this is the plan that they endorse and therefore they cannot veer from that course.

Now we find that the people of Manitoba were asked to subscribe to Socialism and state control through this referendum and they have rejected it even at the cost of the inducement grants that were offered and this all came about through their trying to sell the plan at the expense of the taxpayers and using the taxpayers funds for that purpose; and the government has now received its reply from the voters and they find it very hard to accept this reply. In my various meetings that I conducted throughout the province or the central part of the province I stated my reasons for objecting to this plan on principle - the loss of local control, and in such matters as by-laws, the removal of a complete level of government, the school districts, and that we were given no alternatives and that the vesting of the powers was placed in the provincial finance board who would have control over all capital costs as well as the power to regulate and control budgetary matters. These were the points that I made clear to them as well as the matter of centralization as such, and this is the very principle that the people have rejected through this referendum. I think the people of Manitoba should be congratulated on taking this stand and not forsaking principles for bribery.

I think it was a shame for this government to confront the people with such a proposal and to insult their intelligence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am sure the honourable member didn't wish to use the word "bribery". He could probably use some other parliamentary term rather than that word. I wonder if he would withdraw it.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This question has come up more than once in here. I submit to you that the term "bribery" is not unparliamentary. I don't think that it is something that we use very often, but if a person honestly believes that to be the fact I would like to have it pointed out to me any decision that we have ever had made that says that the word "bribery" is unparliamentary.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue - the people of this province were told through this referendum that you vote this way or else and if you didn't vote in favour, there would be no increases in grants, but instead a penalty would be provided and that they will be asked to subsidize those divisions that vote themselves in and this is the case today. I might just give one example here of a local division back home - the Garden Valley Division. They have a population there of 5,539. The old grant - last year's grant in 1966 was \$359,000 and the new grant under the new formula for this year 1967 would have been \$609,000 - a difference of \$250,000. Now when we take a look at the sales tax, what it will do, and you take the \$45 million, divide it by a million and you got \$45 per capita. If you apply the \$45 per capita on the population in that division it makes exactly \$250,000; so that they would have been no better off under this plan. If the government had left things alone, they wouldn't have been penalized -- now they will be penalized because they will have to pay this \$250,000 to the government and not be able to use it for local school purposes. This is what we have on our hands at the



(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . present time and this is why I feel very strongly that the divisions that did vote themselves out are entitled to the sales tax funds that will come in, and I for one, cannot see how the government can refuse to give this to the school entities, the school divisions and school districts that are in south and southwestern Manitoba. And when we take a look at the large number of divisions that voted themselves out, its the total south and southwestern region - it's a complete block except for the cities of Brandon and Portage. This is the largest area in Manitoba that voted themselves out of it and did not subscribe to the principles as contained in the referendum.

Now I would like to briefly turn to the back benchers on the government side. Are you people going to support a government in furthering this policy and continuing in this, in denying your constituents who have clearly indicated to you that they do not want this centralization to take place in their particular part of the province and their schools; are you going to continue and support the taxes, the new taxes that will be imposed and then deny your people the proper and a just contribution of these monies toward the cost of your schools? This is exactly what you are up to; this is what you are facing. I understand that you certainly were not taken into consultation before the referendum was called and you have already had a number of other matters to swallow such as the large increases in cabinet ministers' salaries, these are also matters that happened in which you did not have any say and at the same time, you were there to explain and to take the blame back home.

Now we have the sales tax coming up and you will be called on to support such a tax, and at the same time, you will also if you keep on supporting government policy, be denying your own people the support that they deserve and the monies that are justly theirs of these tax monies. I am at a loss to understand how a member on the government side can continue to support cabinet in this position when they are leading them down the road to destruction and political suicide. This is exactly what they are supposed to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we hear in the papers that there might be further votes taking place, I think this will just aggravate the situation further. This will antagonize the people more than they were already antagonized in this particular vote, where they were confronted with an impossible situation.

I personally know what such a thing means because of the area vote some 6 - 7 years ago in the case of the divisions when the four divisions were penalized year after year, and had to come on their knees to the government and subscribe to their policies in order to get the grants. I think this is very, very wrong and certainly the government will have to take the consequences and will suffer for it.

When the Minister mentions that the other parties are not advancing any new ideas as to how to get the revenue, I think we have on many occasions done so. We have mentioned the matter of natural resources which should be more fully developed, where we should get a bigger share and also in connection with the federal government grants that are available for certain programs under education where we've not taken advantage to the fullest extent either. I think we've been sadly lacking in that respect as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier, the government and its school program has been weighed in the balances and found wanting and wanting badly. As already explained except for the cities of Brandon and Portage the whole south and the western part of the province in a block rejected the proposal. What a colossal failure after all those meetings and all the radio, TV and other news media advertising, spending thousands and thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' dollars for next to nothing as far as results are concerned. This is nothing to me but non-confidence in the government of the day and I feel they should resign, because division after division refuted the government's plan. And not only that I feel that the Minister should resign from his position in order to bring about a change in policy. I think this is necessary in order to bring in a change, and we need a change, because the divisions that did not vote themselves in certainly are entitled to the grants that will be made available to other areas. Because the people of those districts, of those areas, are paying toward the five percent sales tax like in any other part of the province and certainly these people are entitled to the same advantages.

The matter of the Interlake area has already been mentioned so I won't dwell on that but certainly here again we show, we can see that the government certainly isn't giving the people a fair chance. These people should have been given the right to vote on this matter if they so desired and they have indicated this time and again. We hear through the press that petitions have been brought forward and that they have asked for a vote on this matter. I feel

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....that this is their right, it belongs to them and they should definitely have it. So, Mr. Speaker, in discussing this resolution before us, that we are about to vote on, I feel that I will support the motion and reject the government's explanation or their propaganda outright.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to be very long. As most of you are aware, the whole of my area, I have two divisions, this time the whole of my area accepted the plan on the first vote. The chief reason for that was probably not the merits of the plan alone but they were the last ones to accept the secondary division in the first place. This time I think, and I'm quite convinced, that they felt even if they didn't like some parts of the plan, eventually they'll have to accept it. We tried to show them the merits of the plan but I think this was the feeling all the way through. One thing I'll say, that there wasn't a single minister who had come out to my area to speak on behalf of this plan. Some of my colleagues say maybe we were lucky. I do believe that if we would have had several of the ministers come and try to persuade the people to vote for it, I do believe that this would have turned the people against it. Because I thoroughly believe, I'm convinced, that this was a way of showing no confidence in the government and if the ministers would have come there I'm sure that the results would have been a little bit different.

I well remember in the past when my division was the very last one to accept a high school division, I well remember some of the ministers, and I well remember when the former member, Mr. Schreyer, from Brokenhead, when he suggested that it was lack of leadership on my part; and I well remember some of the ministers who said it was lack of leadership and that is why your division did not accept it - you should have shown some more leadership. And I well remember when the Premier threw that at me when I asked him, when I pleaded for the grants, what did he say - and the then Minister of Education? -- you should have shown better leadership, you didn't so now as far as I'm concerned you can be the way you are indefinitely, I'm not being concerned. So now I'll turn and ask some of the ministers in whose area this plan has been turned down - I can throw it back at you - the present Ministers - the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Highways - where was the leadership? If it was right in the past, it was lack of leadership isn't that right now? Where was the leadership -- did they show leadership in their area? Their area didn't accept it. And that applies to many of the members sitting opposite - the lack of leadership. I didn't like it at the time, accusing me of lack of leadership; I knew it wasn't my fault. I would like to know what your feelings are at the present time? Now I can read back in Hansard here what I said when this Foundation Program was announced, I made a simple statement: "I would say that we on this side endorse the principle of this Foundation Program but we have some reservations." And I am sure that the Minister remembers about ten days ago when I asked him a question, I made this statement or this request: "When will we have the rules and regulations, the people are concerned." We didn't get them. And there are many other things that we on this side requested; we didn't disagree with the principle but the way the vote was brought around.

Now come back to what I have repeatedly said in this House, that the former program came in with a crash, it wasn't studied properly and we still have the after effects right up till now and many of the present divisions turned this down because they are still not satisfied with the boundaries, the way they were instituted - not by the present minister but by the former minister, or the Boundaries Commission in there. It was too much of a crash program, too much haste, and that's exactly what happened now - too much of a crash program, 1, 2, 3, too much, push the people, you're not ready for it, they don't know the plan, no Bill before us. It was a crash program and those crash programs usually do not work. And why? I cannot see. Why when the opposition is continually asking for the Bill to be presented to us? And I'm sure the minister had that request and other speakers had the same. There were some questions that even the Minister couldn't answer, listening to the radio, on Bill Trebilcoe's show. There was some questions that the departmental officials could not answer at these meetings, because the Bill was not before us. Could you blame the people for suspecting; could you blame the people for showing no confidence in this government? I do not. It definitely showed no confidence in the government, definitely showed that they did not want to be pushed. They, the people - not only that they have no confidence in this government - but the people of Manitoba really feel that this government is arrogant.

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

And again - I'll go back here, January 23rd, I pleaded with the Minister - and I'm not going to blame him wholly, he's only one cog in the wheel - I pleaded with him, don't dangle that carrot - and I'll read it, but I still don't like stressing this carrot. I mentioned that quite often along with other incentives, do not stress this financial aspect of it too much, I would say, because this referendum I believe should pass on its own merits. And what happened? There was a gun to the temple - you vote or we cut your throat. And isn't that arrogance? That is arrogance. Dangling this financial carrot. I disagreed with it at that time.

And what about the sales tax. When the sales tax was first announced, what was it earmarked? - education tax. And this isn't the first time the government resorted to political tactics such as these. I remember there was a hospital tax before, although it was just a tax, but it was this way, it ~~was~~ a trap to get the opposition to vote against a certain tax bill so afterwards they can say you're against education, you're against health or you're against this. This time the government fell into it's own trap by announcing this as a sales tax and the people related this sales tax with the Foundation Program. They called it - because it was called education tax, sure; too late the government changed its mind and called it a revenue tax.

Now I will not go any further because I don't think there is too much use of flogging a dead horse. But I have a few suggestions here to the government. My suggestion is in regards to these people who have accepted this plan and I would say do not push those people around too much now because a lot of them reluctantly accepted this new plan, reluctantly; they felt like showing their opposition a protest vote, they did accept it. I would suggest that the government table the Bill immediately, have it here before us, give the people the time to study this Bill before going into the next two phases and that is - I'm referring to March 20th and March 31st. On March 20th, nomination of trustees. I don't think it's the proper thing, continue with this crash program. Why no delay it a month or so, have it fully studied this Bill, we've been requesting it, because there may be another failure. I would say to the government give the people time to study, do not push them too far, do not bully them more; and again do not bribe them. I'm not accusing the government of bribing, but I say do not bribe the people with their own money because I'll say that if you do the people will rebel as they did against the government last Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all say that I want to thank all those who participated in the recent vigorous campaign to bring before our people the educational advantages of unitary divisions, especially the co-operation I personally received from members of the opposition on the hustings - except for the Member from Rhineland, and I'll deal with him in a moment. I want to thank the trustees of this province who got behind this with everything they knew and the educationalists. We made an effort to do what I still think is the best type of education for the boys and girls of this province. It was done so sincerely and while bloodied I'm not bowed, because I've been in bigger fights than this and I never thought as many members of this House that I would see reference to Cuba and Russia - not after some of us like myself who spent five years on the North Atlantic. I never thought the day would come when I would stomp my own province and hear the references from colleagues of the Honourable Member from Rhineland and the antics and tactics they had to stoop to to detract the people from the main issue here, the betterment of education for the boys and girls of this province. Yes, Mr. Chairman, when I go to the race track and see them pulling away I'll sure think of my honourable friend. I can't help but feel that in his area he may have done a disservice to the boys and girls of that area.

No, Mr. Speaker, I, certainly as the Premier said, bow to the people of this province. Certainly we're not all perfect and we make mistakes. But I wonder what's leadership and what's arrogance. What I have lacked in the few years in my portfolio is that educators have for thirty years urged governments to proceed to the unitary division concept and for years the answer has been, "We mustn't move our people too far and too fast. They will resent it. They're fearful of change." And this is understandable. But surely those ARDA studies in the Interlake reveal to us that we can't afford not to be priming the pump all the way through the system from now on. Not when we're spending \$200,000 a week in taxpayers money, Canadian money, helping the people to come back into the system and upgrade them so they can find a new skill with which to have a happier life in the years ahead. It's on balance; on the one hand it's arrogance, on the other hand it's leadership.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....

I'm disappointed in the Member from Emerson, for him to stand up and revitalize that old debate about boundary. I spent, and he knows it, about fourteen meetings down there last year on the divisional plan, talking to the people, trying to get them to vote for it - and they did. I met him at none of those meetings. Of course he was ill I must say when I went to his town. I thought that he and I understood that this was best for those people and for the boys and girls there. I think that on balance we made an effort. We have fourteen more divisional meetings. The inspectors and my departmental people, trustees and others, had an average of 30 to 40 meetings throughout their areas talking of the educational benefits. It's true, we didn't bring the financial picture down till after the New Year but we outlined it in a White Paper. We distributed it to every municipal officer, every school division trustee throughout this province. We put it in kits. We gave it to the 350 organized meetings, to speakers, information material of this type. I think we made a sincere effort to bring before the people a package plan and I honestly believe that the members of the Opposition believe with me sincerely that it isn't a bad plan. It's quite an imaginative plan for the support of a basic, sound system of education throughout this province. Early last November for the charge of a smaller school I pointed out to the trustees of the province that naturally we want to get the graded classroom where possible, centralization to a degree, but I was aware as anyone else with a constituency with two islands in it that there's the impossible too, that there is the odd school where you would have to have less than eight rooms in the outlying parts and where you would have to - but that single district division would have not only the resources of that teacher in that district but the resources of that division and in a monetary sense the resources of the province on that Foundation Program. This is the message I brought across to the trustees and spoke on many occasions.

Well, Mr. Chairman, an awful lot has been said here today. The Member from Rhineland I can understand - on the one hand I can see his sense of joy which I think is a tough thing personally, a tough thing for the boys and girls in the province when he talks that way. That's my own personal opinion because I don't believe my honourable friend, in my personal opinion, believes in the public school system and I think Hansard will bear that out over and over again from what he has said about it in the past. However, I dismiss that. I would ask that the members of this House keep in mind that in my opinion as the people in this province who have now cast the vote as they have, I honestly believe that as they re-examine the issues - and possibly as the honourable members have said many other things came in to detract from the main issue. I'm not blaming any members of the Opposition because those I attended meetings with did an excellent job in my opinion, but I am saying that possibly retractions came in that drew away from the main issue before us. But I feel the educators, the trustees, and certainly the officials in my department did a very excellent job. And I say again with respect to the Interlake and reiterate what the First Minister has said: that program is firmly tied in with the ARDA program which calls for the province to upgrade the elementary system and certainly I can't see how otherwise, and this was examined most carefully, otherwise than put that plan in jeopardy had we not proceeded along the lines we did. And may I say to this House personally that long before the last election when this House rose at a public meeting in Teulon with the Honourable Mr. Sauve present I made the statement that Bill 16 had been passed by this House, that we were going to see through a program in concert under this ARDA program and I told the people that as far as I was concerned they had asked me to do a job, I had taken it on, the Legislature had endorsed a program of action to get at the problem and I intended to see it through. And I would hope that this will be the case and that these people will see the benefits of this in the near future as a pilot project tied in with a total upgrading of the entire area. At the same time I felt the program to go on the -- this new program to the other parts of the province and I'm delighted that the division of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and north of him have decided to go for the unitary division system because their problems are very much like those of the Interlake and I think there will be new confidence in the trustees there who have consulted with me on occasion.

No, Mr. Speaker, we bow to the voters. I do feel that in this Province of Manitoba that the single district division concept will in time lend itself to the ears of our electorate in these areas. I sincerely believe it or I wouldn't have the nerve, Sir, to stand up in my seat today. I believe sincerely we have pursued what is right educationally, and I, as the Minister of Education, must say this if that's what I believe and that is indeed the case. As I say I'm willing to take my lumps but if I'm going to stay on in this capacity I'm going to have to do what

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....I can to get out and press on with the kind of system that I feel is inevitable. I honestly believe that the members of the Opposition believe too that educationally it is the system. I was delighted when during the election, or during the referendum, that reference to the political nature of it was mentioned by the Opposition members, that it was educationally sound, and with that of course, I continue to believe, because I firmly believe we must - if we're going to continue to develop our programs, we must get out and try again to work and inform the people of the nature of the changes we have and assure them that there's nothing being read into this that is so nasty.

I understand that lots of things were heard about. They certainly weren't said by any members of this House, such things as 70 room elementary schools, transportation for hours on buses, etc. These are the things that also came into the campaign and naturally threatened some of our people in outlying areas. I hope it wouldn't be construed, Mr. Speaker, as arrogant, arrogant to say that this plan should be pursued further and continue to work with these people to bring them into the system. Surely we can't change our attitude towards the educational benefits as we presented them to the people. I feel confident that the trustees of this province and the educators will continue to endorse this to us and as I say, I would hope that in my capacity if I can enhance education some little bit during my period in office in this government, I intend to carry on. The day I feel I cannot continue to give the kind of consideration to these problems that they deserve, Mr. Speaker, will be another story.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, politics is supposed to be the art of the possible and there is a very difficult distinction to be made between what should be and what is and I think that when we discuss this matter in the House and as we look at it in theory and with good intentions, all the educators seem to agree and the trustees agreed and the members of this House with one exception agreed that a single district division was a good thing and it was something that we in a sense stood shoulder to shoulder in favour of, but the people of Manitoba in 19 of these divisions have rejected this plan and I think that this calls for some re-examination and this is what I intend to point out. I wish to point out that these views are my views in particular. I'm not speaking here on behalf of all my colleagues but I'm expressing my own feelings on this particular vote.

We have said for example, I believe, if I understand my party's position correctly, that we supported the referendum and I think my Leader said, and I said myself in speaking on the Bill we should have implemented the plan. But the government has maintained, and I just heard the First Minister say this a short time ago, that this was a free vote. I don't believe it was a free vote. I don't believe that a person living in a rural constituency really had much of a choice, but yet the results show that 19 out of the 33 were willing to go against what was an obviously good thing, something supported by all the parties, by the trustees and by the teachers and the financial incentives were considerable so that they must have, in a sense, cut their own throats, because unquestionably they were going to get tremendous financial benefits and they rejected these tremendous financial benefits. I think there were reasons for this - and I want to say again on that point that I do not believe this was a free vote. I think that this may have been part of the reason for its defeat. Everybody seemed to be so much for it, they seemed to be putting money on a certain part of the scale, there was no choice and there may have been a natural backlash, maybe they felt they were getting railroaded, maybe they felt it couldn't be quite that good as it seemed to be.

I think there were a number of reasons why the referendum failed and I think that it's important to analyze these reasons because I keep hearing people giving certain opinions on them and I think that some of them are wrong. I think there is no question and I think most of us will agree that there was a concern for transportation, for daylight saving time, for the location of schools -- and as one newspaper put it a belief in the little red schoolhouse. Well I personally happen to be a city boy and I've lived all my life in the city although I've taught in two of these rural constituencies, Emerson and Stonewall, and I personally think the little red schoolhouse doesn't make that much sense, it doesn't make that much sense to me, but it seems to make sense to the people in rural Manitoba. And then I think there's unquestionably a large element of that vote was simply an anti-government vote. I think people voted against the sales tax, they voted against certain policies of the Roblin government and so on. I don't think there's any question of that. I don't think the First Minister himself would deny that. But I think that the Minister of Education must bear some responsibility for not properly, or not conveying his ideas clearly enough to the public. Somehow or other it didn't filter down. I don't know if it was more meetings or more television or more clarity, but there was confusion

(MR. DOERN cont'd).....in the minds of the public. They were buying something they weren't exactly certain of. And then the government talks about 80 percent covered. Well 60 percent were covered before. If you want to argue statistics, one side says it was a failure, one side says it was a success. I'm not interested in the fact that 51 percent voted in favour. It was on the basis of districts, just like us. If you get 40 percent of the popular vote you don't get 40 percent of the seats. It only counts in the sense of how many districts did you win, and there was unfortunately a very bad result. So I think the important thing now is: what is to be done now?

We know what should be done, or we think we know what should be done or what is right, and we know what has happened, and we can say for the next five years, if this government should last so long, that it was a mistake on the part of the voters and that we should simply work on them until they come around. But that's making certain assumptions, isn't it? That's making the assumption that they will come around. That's making an assumption that we're right and they are wrong. So the question is, what do we do now? And I think there are basically three alternatives. One is, let them suffer. They didn't want to come along; we showed them; we pointed down the road; we dangled the carrot, we applied the stick; we tried to convince them with reason; we held the meetings; we had our little brochures and we had the support of everybody, and we can say those who didn't come along should be penalized now, or to heck with them! They didn't see it our way. It's unfortunate; maybe they will some day but they'll have to just suffer.

Another thing we can say is we'll give them everything that we gave to the others, but that wouldn't be fair either. I wouldn't support that. I think the interesting thing is the question of whether or not they should get some assistance, and I think this is a question that I think is going to take a lot of thinking, and I think we are going to have to wait some time for this because I don't believe - and I must say this is a rather rude awakening on my part - I don't believe that you can convince every one of these constituents. I don't believe it's simply a matter of more information better put, because who else did we need? We had everybody. Sure we didn't have the Honourable Member for Rhineland but we had in effect the three major political forces in this province. We had the trustees and the teachers. I mean who else was there? We were opposed by the Social Credit Party. Well that's a pretty big number of forces against a pretty small number of forces, and the thing is it didn't work. And what is going to happen to these rural constituencies now? The point is, what if a constituency takes ten years before it comes around - I suggest that's a real alternative. Or twenty years? We've shown them a carrot and we've shown them a stick and now we are, according to some people, in effect we're going to turn this stick into a bludgeon and we are going to keep hitting them with this stick until they come around. Now as I say this I want to make it very clear that I am in favour of single district divisions and I wanted every one of these to pass, but maybe some of them simply don't want it. Maybe they're afraid of the transportation. I read a letter to the editor in the Carillon News yesterday. I don't read very many rural papers but I took out a subscription after meeting the gentleman on the train. I just looked at some of the letters and the whole paper was geared "anti" to the school referendum, and one woman pointed out that her son or daughter was spending one and a half hours on a bus. Now when I think of transportation on a bus, I always think to myself.....

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): .....a matter of privilege. Was the statement that the literature in the Carillon News was anti, against this new single division? Did I understand the honourable member right?

MR. DOERN: Well, I will clarify my remarks for the honourable member. I read one issue. It was the latest issue and there were about three letters that I think were against the referendum and an editorial or two. I don't suggest that all the information was against. I say that in this last issue that I read, the overwhelming feeling was against.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, again on a matter of privilege. These are letters in the Carillon News and not any writings by the editor. Is this correct?

MR. DOERN: Well concentrating on the letters to the editor, but I believe one editorial or one article did seem to favour what I just said.

MR. BARKMAN: Again on a matter of privilege. If it is a matter of the editorial, then I would wish that the honourable member would produce the evidence, as he was very much for it and wrote very many articles in favour of it.

MR. DOERN: Well I'll limit my remarks so as not to offend the honourable member to say that most of the letters to the editor that I read in the last issue were against the referendum. One woman said, for example, that her son or daughter was spending an hour and a half on the school bus every day. Now ordinarily in an argument, in a debate, I would say to the person, "So what if they do? You see it's worth spending an hour on a bus either 45 minutes one way or an hour and a half one way, whatever it is, to get a better education any time," but this woman pointed out that the roads were pretty bad and that her son or daughter was getting ill from the bus ride, so you also have to consider, when you think of referendums, what condition is the bus in. How long does it take to get there? How good are the roads? And these just can't be sloughed off as though, well, you're getting a better education, and I'm saying that in criticism of myself as well, in the sense that I don't fully understand all these peculiar problems of some of the rural constituencies. I don't see why we have so many little red school houses as we do.

So my point again is the question that's going to come up, if these people honestly do believe in the present kind of system that they have, even though we don't agree with them, what are we going to do? Are we going to deny them any of the advantages of the Foundation Program? Are we going to give them all the advantages? Or are we going to give them some? For example, are we going to, say, give them bigger grants for teachers' salaries, or should we consider paying their full construction costs or what? I don't think we can ignore this, and the main consideration here is again the view that simply by telling them again and again and pointing more and more and piling up the carrots and whacking them more with the stick, they'll eventually come our way. That's an assumption. The assumption is "they'll finally see it my way." Well, I'm not convinced of that. I think more will see it. I think if we have a referendum every year more will pass until perhaps finally we'll get all 33, but when will that occur? What if it takes 20 years or 10 years or 30 or 40 years? That has to be considered, and the main consideration here must be the children. This was said by the Leader of the Opposition and I had it written down before he said it, but that's my tough luck. The point is the people in the so-called progressive divisions are going to get these better schools and better teachers and better audio vision and all the rest of it, but what about these kids in those 19 divisions? What if it takes years to come about? What are we going to say to them? Are we going to say, "You must suffer for the sins of your fathers?"

We have got to actually think about those children and there is one other point that I would like to add here, something that I think the Minister may have ignored, and this is a question of rural education. If some of these areas continue to reject single district divisions, and I think we should give them a chance in the near future, we should give them a number of opportunities, maybe an infinite number of opportunities to go for it, but if they continually reject it, then the question is, what about rural education? And there are ways, if you can't bring the child to the school, of bringing the school to the child. There could be a greater use of programmed learning in the rural schools, a greater use of mechanical teaching aids and so on, a greater use of television. I think there should at least be a TV set in every rural school, and ideally of course in every classroom, but at least one in each school, and if we can't provide some of the services maybe some of the teachers can go to the schools. If you can't have enough kids for music in one school let's have music teachers making the rounds in certain particular areas, and even in an extreme case we might consider giving scholarships or bursaries to bring some of these students into larger consolidated districts or even into the urban districts. So I say that the referendum, which had a shocking effect upon me, cannot be ignored.

The Minister said he was going to have a 100 percent pass rate. I made a prediction before the referendum came off that it would pass in 29 out of 33, a pretty bad guess, but 19 out of about 29 rural ones defeated it, about two-thirds defeated it, and I say they cannot be ignored. I don't say the government should back-track now. I don't say the government should give up its position. I don't say the New Democratic Party should stop fighting for single district divisions. But I say there was a sharp rejection and let's not just say these people are stupid or they are ill-informed. Let's keep on pushing for what we believe in but let's also re-examine the rural situation and perhaps some assistance should be given to these people out of that Foundation Program.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Honourable the Premier had to say about how pleased he was that he had received a majority of the votes, and I listened with interest to the Minister of

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd).....Education, although I think he came closer than the Premier to the situation when he admitted that his head had been bloodied, and he had a very difficult proposition facing him. It's all very well perhaps to second guess what should have been done, but if I may make a suggestion to the Minister, of some of the things that I heard that affected the vote from people both rural and urban, some people resented very much the fact that civil servants had their marching orders and had to go out and had to answer certain questions, but only certain questions. They weren't to talk about anything to do with financing and when some of these people started to ask penetrating questions, it was very embarrassing for the civil servant to say, "Well I can't give that answer," or "I don't know," and this affected a lot of the thinking of the folks that went to the polls on Friday. In some areas of Manitoba - and I'm thinking now particularly of the rural areas - there is a resentment against a teacher coming from the cities or coming from a larger district, and while it was not intentioned or not meant, but they were almost lectured as to why they should vote a certain way.

Now the folks that were sitting in the audience and listening, and I had the privilege of being at one of the rural meetings unbeknownst to them probably, they were listening to an extremely well-qualified teacher, an excellent teacher in our school division, but the things that he spoke about they were not interested in that, and they resented very much the attack that has been taken I think in many of the meetings in rural Manitoba, and I think this played a part in people making up their minds, that they resented very much a teacher or a teaching official from the city coming out and lecturing them on how they should vote for the good of their children.

One of the other questions that was brought to my attention was the matter of the pamphlet, a beautiful PR job probably for an election campaign, with three pictures of the Minister looking very charming with a small child, but that space could have been used to give some of the other answers that people were continually asking, and the Premier knows what I am talking about, the meetings that he had to field some of these difficult questions. And why wasn't the government straightforward from the very beginning instead of allowing, instead of allowing these questions to go unanswered, instead of allowing the resentment to build on these matters? I had myself very strong reservations about this 33 mills versus 9, because in every community you had a built-in group of oppositionists who felt that business was being taxed unfairly. Maybe this isn't right but this is what they thought. And a lot of these people who are community leaders sat on their hands or were openly or overtly opposing the method of taxation to finance.

Well Mr. Speaker, there are many problems that face the government and also the members of the Legislature. What now is going to happen to the vocational high school program where it takes two, three or four divisions to support a vocational high school? Something -- well I don't know, I haven't got this answer. I look to the government as to what they are going to do about this one. Not only was the fact that it was getting to be a political thing before, but now you have solid blocks of the province that are going to -- now have to be told that they can't have a vocational school because they didn't vote the way the government was trying to bribe them into voting.

I think we had a very startling revelation made this afternoon when the Premier stood up and defended his Minister and said, "If there's anybody here to blame, blame me." Well Mr. Speaker, I feel like blaming the Premier when he went on television, was it Friday night? and said, well we'd only hoped to get 20 out of the 33 divisions. Does he mean to tell me, does the Premier of this province mean to say that this government spent thousands and thousands of dollars on a referendum, hundreds of thousands - I don't know what it is - held 900-odd meetings with the hope of only getting 20 out of the 33? Does he seriously expect us to say that was the aim of this program, to get 20 out of the 33? Well if he expects us to believe that statement, Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier of this province should resign for taking the people, his cabinet and his backbenchers and the people on this side, into a program where the best that in his opinion is a 66 percent of the educational system to come under the unitary plan. I think that if this is truly what he thought that he had no business introducing a plan at this time. He should have taken a year to explain the educational benefits and not put out the financial carrots at the very beginning and say, "Vote for this," and in the back of his mind he's only hoping for a 66 percent acceptance. I think the First Minister should be the one who should resign if that is his thinking on what we were trying to arrive at was a mere 66 percent of the school divisions of this province. If this is his judgment on this case what about the future when the government decides to take a course of action? Perhaps he should be more



(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . frank with his backbenchers and tell them what his hopes are, because I have been told that not that many of the cabinet or the backbenchers spoke in favour of this program. Did every member of the Cabinet -- were they out in that week? Was every member on the back bench speaking for this? I've been told otherwise, and I would like to know.

Now Mr. Speaker, I can't help but make passing reference to what the Honourable Member for Elmwood's views are on what the news media should print and what they shouldn't print. Surely we can have all sides expressed on this thing without stick-handling the news or trying to oversee the news, because this is one of the main points where the peoples' resentment built up against this government. In the district that I represent, because it's an urban area and the travelling distances are not that much, it has general acceptance, and I know the government faces a problem in the scattered areas where the travelling is of great concern to parents of young children, and I think the government here should re-examine this part of the plan and make a firm statement that for Grade ones to Grade six that there will be a limit to the amount of time spent on a bus. This is a question that was not fielded very clearly by the government, and when I was asked this question at meetings I had to say I didn't know but there would be an honest attempt to try and alleviate any hardships as concerning travel, but I couldn't answer questions about the size of schools. I wasn't supplied with this information.

School trustees were -- as I understand the people were told, well this is a matter for the school trustees, but the school trustees surely can't supply these answers. At the meetings I was at they were asking me what size of a school will be built and how far away will it be. Well the people that are going out to speak, such as myself, and are not supplied with this information, what do you say to them? You have to be honest and say, "I don't know."

So Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the large number of people in this province who have been left outside on this referendum have to be considered. The matter of teachers' salaries, which will be facing all divisions soon, is going to be a real crisis for these school boards when they know the salaries that they have to meet, and I think in that one area something has to be done; that this can't be ignored and some modification has to be made to help these school boards who have this problem.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the House would like to call it 5:30. It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.