

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 6, 1969

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: . . . schools in St. James-Assiniboia. I'm not sure if the Minister of Education was in the House at the time or not but I see him in his seat now and maybe I should just repeat a few of the things that I said before - the concern of the people in Assiniboia about staggered classes in school. We have staggered classes in the Crestview School where I presented a petition to this House last session from some 1,000 petitioners, and the Minister at that time explained to me, or tried to convince me that because of the population explosion in Assiniboia, that was the reason for staggered classes. Now last fall in the Bannatyne School we had the same situation develop. We had no population explosion; there was no great development in the way of housing in St. James; and the same thing happened. We have staggered classes in the Bannatyne School and there's a great delay with the present Bruce Junior High. The parents and the school trustees are greatly concerned in St. James and Assiniboia, what's going to happen this fall when the school opens in September. There's great concern that most of the collegiates and high schools will be seriously overloaded, and I share this concern with the parents because I think the school program is very heavy and tiring for many of these children anywhere from Grade 4 to 9.

Now I have to put the blame straight on the Minister or this government because this was not the case when the local authority had the responsibility for providing facilities, until under the Foundation Program this became the responsibility of the government or the Finance Board; these situations have developed since. I would like the Minister to explain what is the reason so that I can tell some of the people in Assiniboia that this will not develop this fall.

The other point that I tried to develop before we adjourned after noon was that St. James-Assiniboia will have a pretty large population, approximately 80,000, by 1970 and I think that we need a vocational school in that area. This would take a great load off the present high schools and relieve the overloading to some extent. I know the present vocational facilities are limited in scope and capacity, and if the facilities were available it is my information that studies and surveys that have been done in St. James-Assiniboia indicate that at least 25 per cent of the students would enroll in vocational courses. I believe the demand warrants the construction of anywhere from probably a 1,500 to 1,800 student facility in this area, and I feel that if a vocational school was built in a central location it would easily serve the whole area of St. James-Assiniboia. Otherwise we may be faced with the same situation we are now with staggered classes in the near future, Mr. Speaker. I hope that approval for this technical-vocational school will be given soon by the Minister so that action can be started on it, but I would like some statement from the Minister so that the people in Assiniboia and St. James will be given some assurance that this will not develop in almost all of the high schools and collegiates in that area.

Mr. Speaker, on another point, I was also disappointed when the Throne Speech did not indicate that the voting age would be lowered to 18 years at this session. I presented a resolution some four years ago to this Legislature for lowering the voting age, but it seems this government does not seem to trust the youth in Manitoba. I feel that we cannot afford to discourage our young people and citizens from evaluating government policy or certain candidates. I feel that by doing this we are promoting conditions to disinterest people by excluding the 18 -- by lowering the voting age to exclude the 18 people from having the right to vote. I believe that the measure to lower the voting age was considered by the Privileges and Elections Committee in the House of Commons quite a few years ago and it was approved at that time.

The Winnipeg City Council has also requested to amend the City Charter to lower the voting age for civic elections. Presently, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are five provinces in Canada that have lowered the voting age; they are Alberta, B. C., Newfoundland, Quebec and Saskatchewan. I hope that the government will consider this to be important enough and table the legislation this session, and I'm sure most of the members, or all the members on this side of the House would support this proposal. I feel that we must remember that the choice of 21 years of age as the legal age for signing contracts is purely arbitrary and it has no bearing on the voting age at all. I feel that our citizens at age 18 accept great responsibilities in professions and industry, teach in schools, in the army. I feel that they should have this right. I believe there's some 32 countries in the world at the present time, many states in

(MR. PATRICK Cont'd.)... the U.S.A., Mexico, Brazil, Israel and many others, that have reduced the voting age to 18, Mr. Speaker.

There is just one more point that I would like to make to the House at this time, and I know that we will be discussing The Municipal Elections Act during this session. I feel that this is a very important area that I hope most of the members in this House will be able to support, because in the four by-elections many handicapped people did not vote because they were unable to get to the polls. In a general election I know that persons in hospitals can vote because there's more elaborate arrangements made, but not so in the municipal elections. St. James-Assiniboia, I feel has a most satisfactory system for crippled or physically handicapped people who cannot leave their homes to vote. St. James has had the system for some five years, and those who cannot get to the polls are able to vote by mail and this system has worked extremely well in St. James. The applications must be made prior to the election for a ballot by mail, and a proper witness must witness the ballot and the ballot is returned in an envelope before the polls close. I feel that this House must adopt legislation by mail for the paraplegics and the handicapped people. The other municipalities in Winnipeg, I understand, make no such provision for disabled people, except St. James. I feel that in every Winnipeg election thousands of people in hospitals or disabled at home lose their vote. There have been cases of handicapped people or paraplegics who have been transported to the polls, have not been able to go up the stairs and were not able to vote. I think the vote is very highly regarded by many of these people and I cannot see why we should shut them out from community participation. I appeal to the Minister and to the Cabinet to enact legislation so that disabled, handicapped paraplegics may have the privilege to vote by mail.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I've taken quite a bit of the time of this House and I will be making more comments later on, on different matters. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, first of all, at the outset I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you in occupying one of the highest positions in this Assembly, and I know from past experience that you will carry out your duties in a very fair, just and impartial manner.

I would also like at the outset to congratulate the Honourable Member for Arthur, the new Minister of Agriculture. I know that upon his shoulders has been thrust a grave and serious responsibility, as we all know that agriculture today is in a very sick situation.

Perhaps it would also be fitting to extend my compliments to the mover and seconder of the reply to the Throne Speech. I must say that they have indeed been able to draw a very glorious picture of something that actually does not exist. I will cover that a little later, as I have documented evidence here before me from a speech made by the Honourable Member for Roblin last year and the words he used to describe the conditions in his constituency are somewhat contrary to the words he used to describe the conditions in his constituency this year. I'll leave that a little later. That is really something to look forward to.

However, since I have not had an opportunity to participate in a Speech from the Throne debate, as perhaps you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the first year we were here I was looking forward with great enthusiasm and pleasure to participate, but somehow or other the members on the other side outmanoeuvred us and we just never had an opportunity to... My constituency, of course, composed of four distinct sections comprising of some 2,000 square miles of populated area, lies between the two mountains with lakes and streams and resorts located in both range of mountains. Predominantly, the area is engaged in mixed farming enterprises with emphasis, of course, placed on grains production. The people, of course, are very industrious, co-operative and aggressive in their nature as is evidenced by the fact that we have one of the finest golf courses in Canada and it was all brought about through volunteer labour of the citizens in the community. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the Village of Gilbert Plains has now earned itself the title of being the sports centre of Manitoba as we have won more baseball championships in the Bantam A and B classifications than any other centre, large or small, in the province.

I would also like to say at this time that we have a potential for a beautiful beach in the Winnipegosis area, and I might say perhaps with some regret at this time, as the Honourable Minister of Welfare, as he was attending a conference there one year ago now had promised the people that he would see to it that they received financial assistance to improve the facilities at this beach, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I believe I should correct the record. There was no such promise made.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I happen to have been present at the time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have a good sound little book record some place at home.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. KAWCHUK: The people are still anxiously awaiting.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I insist that I did not make any such promise and I would like the record to show that.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I equally insist that I have a record which I'll be very happy to bring here next week. However, Mr. Speaker, the people of Winnipegosis are also anxiously awaiting the improvements promised them on Highway No. 20 which runs north of Winnipegosis to the Camperville area and they have on numerous occasions complained bitterly about the road conditions. However, as to date there has been no marked improvement on this road.

Perhaps I should also mention at this time, although the Honourable the First Minister isn't in his seat but perhaps I can direct my remarks to the new Minister of Transportation, I believe, who will be in charge of drainage, or is it the Mines and Natural Resources Minister? Mines and Natural Resources. The people of the Pine River area are sadly in need of some drainage in the newly settled area. It is almost a disgrace to drive through that area and witness this water tearing up the very fertile and productive land. When you compare conditions like that to what has been done for the people just around the Winnipeg area here on the Red River Floodway, it is almost incredible. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, you might not believe it but there are some gentlemen who have told me that one spring there was six people digging a ditch with shovels trying to drain the water, and it's incredible that such a procedure should be followed in this jet age where we have all kind of equipment around to do that type of work.

I would also like to place on the record the disappointment of the people of the Ethelbert area with respect to the medical clinic that was promised to them during the election of 1966. As a result of that promise there was some initial work done whereby they had gone ahead and constructed a residence for a doctor awaiting legislation which would enable them to go ahead and construct the clinic at a later date and, according to the last report, they have now given up hope and abandoned the idea.

Perhaps that will suffice for the remarks on the constituency. I would like to go back now to the Throne Speech and register my protest in no uncertain terms that the Throne Speech itself did not contain anything progressive by way of legislation to help alleviate the rural farm income problem. Although the speech does make reference to the fact that the Ministers are gravely concerned about the severe problems created by the large quantity of damp grain on Manitoba farms, they are also disturbed by the serious effect upon farmers and all the people in Manitoba of the failure to sell grain produced in our province. Well, Mr. Speaker, as you probably can recall now, when I brought this issue up on Monday the Minister of Agriculture advised me at that time that he would be submitting a report to this House very shortly. However, the point I would like to make at this time is that the Minister of Agriculture was aware of this problem long before last Monday. He was aware of this problem last fall. Had this kind of answer been coming from that side of the House last October or November it would have been acceptable, but at this late stage of the game, Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse why the Minister has not taken any constructive steps to alleviate this serious situation, and probably, Mr. Speaker, just to further that point, back last January when the Outlook pamphlet of the 1969 Manitoba Farm Outlook pamphlet was published, there's also reference made to this damp grain situation. So the point I'm trying to make is that this government has had ample time but they have failed to come to grips with this problem while putting the blame on Ottawa, and the Minister himself had taken a trip to Vancouver to see and investigate the grain situation there and failed to attend to the grain situation right at his own door step.

I would like to go back now and make reference to the glorified statement made by my honourable friend the member for Roblin last year. This was really interesting, Mr. Speaker. Oh, he's out of the House, eh? Well, he probably left purposely. We'll read it for the record anyway, Mr. Speaker. It's most interesting; as a matter of fact it's almost ludicrous and hilarious. I refer now to Page 1107 of the 1968 Hansard and on that page he says:

(MR. KAWCHUK Cont'd.) . . . "But nobody can tell me that this government hasn't done a good job. Now we're moving. . . ."

MEMBERS: He's back.

MR. KAWCHUK: Oh, for his benefit, Mr. Speaker -- all right, I'll start again. These were the words that were spoken by the Honourable Member for Roblin last year, and he said: "But nobody can tell me that this government hasn't done a good job. Now we're moving into a new stage. We have a new Premier, who I support. I think you'll be hearing lots from our Premier and I support him all the way." Then he goes on to say: "You have missed, my friend, the greatest part of Manitoba - Roblin constituency. Come out some time at my expense and I will show you Manitoba. Manitoba at its best. Manitoba at its best, where I don't hear all the kind of static that I hear in the Assembly here." And he goes on further: "This is Manitoba; this is the Manitoba that I belong to. This is a good province, not the type of province that I hear from over there. This is the one that I am proud to be a citizen of."

What do you think, Mr. Speaker, he has to say about the conditions in his constituency this year, only one year after that new Premier took office? And it would seem to be contrary to all the nice things that are said about him, how well he represented the west at the provincial-federal constitutional conference in Ottawa. All of a sudden - nobody else can put the blame on anyone else because just from one year ago the situation has changed immensely, and I would like to quote from this year's Hansard dated Friday, February 28, and on page 19: "His dynamic personality, his understanding of the personal problems of Manitoba I think is an asset to this Assembly." Then he goes on to say, ". . . and Manitoba has played a great part in the drama of the stewardship of humanity and has done its share to answer the universal cry of this world for daily bread." Now is the interesting part: "The overall picture of the constituency as I stand here this morning continues to show economic growth even though there are pockets of problems in the agricultural sector which have come about mainly due to the uncontrollable elements of weather and while these elements have added considerable burden, not only to my area but I think to most of our province, there are other discerning factors I think that must be rectified if we're to improve the plight of our farmer in this province."

Mr. Speaker, last year everything was rosy; there was no problem; and all of a sudden, one year later, under the new premiership we have problems, which would indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, that probably this government is just as responsible for the economic mess that rural Manitoba is in today as anybody else, and the backbenchers who are rurally oriented should take all the blame on their shoulders because they have failed (-- Interjections --) . . .

A MEMBER: In just one year.

MR. KAWCHUK: Just one year. They have failed to be able to stand up to these. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I wonder if we haven't strayed away from the Throne Speech debate?

MR. KAWCHUK: Well slightly perhaps, but I'm remarking on the government. It's the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: You go ahead; you haven't. . . .

MR. KAWCHUK: I've got lots more left yet.

A MEMBER: You go right ahead.

MR. KAWCHUK: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the backbenchers will have to accept all the blame on their shoulders because they have failed to stand up against their city counterparts on that government side to provide progressive legislation which would enable to alleviate the economic mess this province is in today. I made reference a few minutes ago to our Premier's performance at the Ottawa conference and the Honourable Minister of Health, Welfare, and Housing, yes. He made a statement this afternoon about the wonderful fight I think he said, that the minister -- or the forceful way that the minister presented from the west, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that although I didn't see the TV showings of the proceedings, I understand that the First Minister failed to tell the Prime Minister of the problems that exist in this province. He failed to tell him that there was a damp grain situation. He failed to tell him that we need prompt. . . . to move our grain. He failed to tell him that we need assistance to dry our grain like it's been offered to other sectors of society.

A MEMBER: He didn't even know it. (-- Interjections --)

MR. KAWCHUK: Pardon. However, Mr. Speaker, perhaps this situation could still be rectified to a certain extent, as I understand there's going to be a Canadian Agricultural

(MR. KAWCHUK Cont'd.) . . . Conference held in Ottawa the latter part of this month, if my memory serves me correctly between the 24th and the 27th of this month, and I perhaps may-be should ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture whether or not he has protested with respect to the delegates assigned to the actual producing farm organizations that are to be participating at this conference and the associate agri-business. It is my understanding at the present time that there will be 175 delegates representing the farmer producers and 225 from the agri-business. Mr. Speaker, to me it seems that there is somewhat of an unbalance. As my honourable friend probably recalls at that lovely ball that he was at last Friday for some 600 farmers and their wives gathered from all throughout the province, at the diploma grads association, I had the opportunity to talk to many, and many of my colleagues are somewhat disappointed in the fact that there are not more actual producers to be present at this conference to state the farmer's position. If there was ever a time in history it is now where the farmer has to speak up loud and clear on the farm and rural issues, especially in view of the fact that the representation from the rural areas is dwindling, and I hope that my honourable friend will do his utmost to put pressure on the powers-to-be at Ottawa to see if this can't be changed. The representation should be at least reversed the other way: 225 from actual producers, and only 175, to me Mr. Speaker, would seem suffice to have the agri-business represented.

Mr. Speaker, when I first got up I wasn't going to say very many things but I think, while I'm on my feet, I might as well make reference to another matter and that is with respect to the education and the Public School Finance Board, as it is proposed that there will be some changes in its responsibilities and powers in the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech says "extend the powers of the Public School Finance Board to control total spending of all unitary school divisions with a view to effecting economies in school spending consistent with the maintenance of the quality of education necessary in these times." Well, Mr. Speaker, in my own community there seems to be some resentment developing over the fact that the local people are having less and less to say about matters pertaining to the administration of schools, and I can think of no better instance that just a couple of years ago when we were in the process of building a new school there, and at that time I thought, I was under the understanding that the Department of Education had hired some very highly qualified architects to provide designs for new structures. However, it seems to be that the school boards have to hire a private architect to provide the plans and then they are submitted to the department for approval, and to me, Mr. Speaker, that seems to be a waste of public funds, and I'm sure that a uniform design that's acceptable to most school districts would do in this particular case.

I would also like to register a protest with respect to the civil servants in this province, whereby it's my understanding that they do not have the freedom to participate in political arenas, and I don't think that in a democratic society that it is fair or just to deny them of the privilege of actually participating in public life, which of course in turn determines the standard of living in this society of ours.

I was going to say a few things on Medicare but perhaps at this time it is not necessary because most of the information has now been covered.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'll bring my speech to a close, looking forward to making further contributions on other items as they occur in due course.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would I be favoured to ask the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains a question? I want to know if he read Hansard after those clauses that he quoted in the speech? Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KAWCHUK: They were in Hansard. They were in Hansard, Mr. Speaker. It was last year's Hansard, page 1107. I can pass it over to him right now if he so desires - providing he returns it, of course.

MR. McKENZIE: I'm referring to this year's speech, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's with pleasure I take part in this debate under your guidance once again. I would like to congratulate the movers and seconders on the speeches that they contributed to this Assembly, and while the new members have not taken their place, I know three of them are around the buildings, spend a considerable amount of time these days around the buildings and I would like to add my congratulations to them when they take their seat in this Legislature.

(MR. JOHNSTON Cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, I probably should be confining my remarks to constituency matters and matters of provincial interest. I know that there are many problems facing this province: a heavy tax burden on our citizens; a rather depressing situation amongst the farmers with regard to their grain sales and grain that is lying in the fields, damp grain and so on; the fact that the province is in further need of industrialization. I am certainly not minimizing these problems when I deal with another subject at this time. Perhaps later during debates in this House I will address myself to these matters. In fact, I'm sure I will.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to a serious situation that faces not only Manitoba but Canada. During last June, in my opinion the main issue in the election was national unity. There were other issues, no doubt, but the main one that came to the fore as the two major parties debated different points of view on how to tackle this very contentious problem, it became apparent that all parties were seriously concerned with this and all parties made an honest effort to grapple with the subject. Since that election one party has received a substantial majority and they have started to tackle this ever present problem.

Some weeks ago, an Official Languages Bill was presented to the House of Commons and it's received first reading, and I refer to Bill C-120. Mr. Speaker, when the three western premiers decided in their wisdom that they should challenge the constitutionality of this Bill in the courts, I felt somewhat uneasy. I honestly do not know what is the right answer or what is the right solution in this matter, but when we think that for our first hundred years this country has held together and we're starting into our second hundred and the main issue before the country today is the national unity question, I can appreciate the Honourable the First Minister of this province when he was speaking for Manitoba at the recently concluded conference, and when he attended the previous conference where there was some agreement in this matter, I can appreciate the problem and the feelings that he must have had when he decided to make the stand that he did in suggesting that the three western provinces should have this matter tested in the courts.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I think I should correct that because I never did suggest that the three western provinces should have the matter tested in the courts.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well I apologize then, Mr. Speaker, but it was my distinct impression that the three western premiers publicly questioned the constitutionality of the bill and also the possibility of having it tested in the courts. Am I not correct?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not the first time the Honourable Member from Portage has had wrong impressions. The fact of the matter is that the three western provinces agreed that it would be wise to have a matter this delicate tested before the fact by the Government of Canada with the Supreme Court of Canada, rather than after the fact. Some of the other provinces in the western area went much further than that. The Province of Manitoba did not.

MR. JOHNSTON: I accept the Premier's statement in that regard but I feel we're saying pretty well the same thing. I can appreciate the Premier, when he felt that he had a problem in the matter of the Southern Indian Lake question, how he must have had to deliberate on this with his colleagues and within himself, and he sought the solution that this Legislature should decide on that question and mention was made in the Throne Speech that this would be the course of action to be taken, and I compliment him for his approach because it's a very difficult problem and every member in this House should stand and be counted on this difficult problem. I am suggesting to him that he should take the same course of action with respect to the advisability of testing beforehand. Before the bill is proceeded with in Ottawa, I'm suggesting to him that he should bring a resolution into this House so that the members in this House can stand and be counted on whether or not Manitoba should take this position.

Mr. Speaker, we had Mr. Rene Levesque here last week who is a very able spokesman, I might say, for the Separatist movement in Quebec. When we regard our friends in Quebec there are something over seven million people there; a little over two million of them are non-French, of English, Italian and other backgrounds, but the other five million it's very apparent that the huge majority of the Quebecois are true Canadians and they feel their place is in this country, and I'm sincerely afraid that the hardened line taken by some of us westerners has fed Mr. Levesque's cause a great deal in Quebec. And I would appreciate it if the First Minister would address himself to this problem and would give the members in this House a

(MR. JOHNSTON Cont'd.) . . . chance to express their opinion so that he knows he is speaking for all of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate in this debate and concentrate primarily on the Constitutional Conference. I think that there were two major areas that were dealt with at that conference that the Government of Manitoba took a position on. These were, first, the fiscal problems, and secondly, the question of language rights, and I think that there is no doubt that the western stand emphasizing to a fair extent the importance of priority of fiscal over language matters had a great deal of popular support. I also think that the stand against the Liberal Government was well received and that there is a lot of sympathy for the position of the three western premiers.

First, on the fiscal and financial relationship, one of the things that I found disturbing in the position of the Manitoba Government was their apparent willingness to dismantle certain federal-provincial shared cost programs, and it seemed that in some ways there is little difference between the positions of Messrs. Trudeau and Weir, that although they have a different motive, that the result of their approach would be almost identical. I am not entirely certain of the motivation or the reasoning behind the Prime Minister's approach in the sense of getting out of certain shared cost programs, whether it's his belief in provincial rights, whether it's his desire to give Quebec more autonomy, whether he wants to dump expensive social services, but Premier Weir seems rather eager to play ball and he also apparently wants the right to opt out of certain programs with 100 percent of the revenue, perhaps so that this revenue can be put into the Consolidated Fund with no strings attached and then if necessary used for other purposes.

It would seem to be, if that approach is taken, a short run financial benefit but in the long run it would seem that there was a disadvantage, a distinct disadvantage, for I don't think there's any doubt that Manitoba cannot go it alone, that Manitoba is not a rich province, and that Manitoba benefits from shared cost programs. And if this approach is the approach of the government, it would lead, I think, to some pretty important consequences that are not desirable, because if you look at the pattern of expenditure, provincial to federal in the past 25 years and more after the war -- for instance in 1947 the provinces only spent about a third of what the Federal Government spent, but five years ago they were spending some 15 to 20 percent more; and the same thing with their debt structure, that they are rapidly passing the Federal Government.

One of the problems is that the Federal Government, by getting out of certain programs or perhaps by allowing the provinces to develop their programs more, may have surrendered or subverted its own resources to such an extent that it's no longer able to effectively control inflation and unemployment or to pursue national needs; that, for example, in 1963 provincial governments controlled 75 percent of public capital expenditures and 80 percent of the public purchases of non-military goods and services. So the problem is, if fiscal control goes out of federal hands then this will place an almost intolerable burden on monetary control, and when the Federal Government is attempting to control or to limit fluctuations in the business cycle and so on, they're going to have to almost entirely rely on monetary policy. One of the things that is most harshly affected when they do tighten up is housing and so on, and we all know that most of us are opposed to the kind of policies the Federal Government has in controlling construction because we need new homes and new buildings, and if we're not getting them then sooner or later we're going to have to pay in that area.

Now the Manitoba Government in its presentations to Ottawa argues, for example, in their booklet "What Tomorrow Canada" under proposition 9, that there must be maintained a strong Federal Government which shall be representative of all people of Canada and alone shall act on their behalf to define and to achieve national purposes at home and abroad. The problem is that if the Prime Minister and our First Minister agree in the sense that they are willing to dismantle certain national social programs and have each province go it alone, that this may have some very bad consequences.

On the second question, which was really the major question, the so-called original reason, I suppose, of the constitutional question, the question of language rights, I think that Manitoba has some good legislation in this regard and we all, I think, unanimously passed Bill 59 a year or two ago. The policies of the previous administration, I think, on the question of language rights and the extension of language privileges was clear. But, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. DOERN Cont'd.) . . . the attitude of the present administration is not clear, and this may be a matter of simply conveying what their real feelings are rather than switching policies but I suggest that, to a person who is observing the language policy or posture of the present administration, it comes off as very confusing.

For example, before the conference, before the recent federal-provincial conference, the Premier was attacked by certain organizations - I believe the Société Franco Manitoban - for his apparent anti-French stand, and there were other events both prior and during the conference which may have given this impression. I refer in particular to the position of the Government on the Rossignon affair, a position I might hasten to add that I agree with, where we had what might be described as an unwelcome visitor in our province, a man who was obviously a high ranking French representative who acted as if he was merely a tourist, who was called on the carpet, was later attacked by the Prime Minister. In fact I might say in passing that some of the members of the Liberal Party never did make their case entirely clear, as some of them apparently met with this gentleman, others intended to meet with him. I think at some point a clear explanation of why they met with him, why they didn't meet with him, why they planned to meet with him, would be in order.

So the Premier took what apparently was a hard line in the Rossignon affair and I think this gave him a hard line image on the whole language question, and there were individuals and organizations at that time who were concerned about B and B recommendations, who attacked his stand on that affair, his real or imagined stand, his known and unknown stand, over the extension of the French language. Then, at the federal-provincial conference he hammered the fiscal point over and over again as if the Premier bit into the Prime Minister's leg and simply held on. There was, however, no real discussion or contribution from Manitoba on language rights. Not publicly. And there was really nothing to allay the fears and suspicion of our French Canadian brothers, and I also think there was nothing really to discourage or dampen any fires of racism in the eyes of those who oppose any evolution or extension of language rights because I think, Mr. Speaker, the position of the government was not clear, and I might even quote the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in the Free Press a few weeks ago where he said that the Premier put forward a narrow view encouraging separatism rather than unity, and he said he was extremely disappointed on Weir's stand etc., etc.

Well, the Premier came back from the conference larger than life, and I think that the accomplishment was a western stand and I think that he deserves some applause on that account. The accomplishment was unity against a Liberal Government which has ignored the nation beyond the central provinces. On the negative side, however, I again mention that Manitoba's apparent go-it-alone philosophy may have long-run bad effects and long-run serious consequences and Manitoba's failure on the negative side to make its position on the language question clear to Ottawa and the provinces. So I say, what is the government's position? Now I'm sure that the First Minister will say, "Read 'What Tomorrow Canada'" and I have read it and I have studied it thoroughly and carefully. Unfortunately, when the Premier first took office, when he went to the first conference, there was no such document - which I don't think again was his fault. I think it was the fault perhaps of his predecessor or the entire government that they did not really have adequate preparation and there was the complications of the leadership race.

But this time they were better prepared and this time they did have a document. But one searches for a published position in vain, and there is little guidance here. For instance, there are some confused metaphors. Proposition 12 contains a sub-principle, saying that it may be recognized that Quebec is a province *pas cum les autres*. "It is officially bilingual and has its own law and principal culture. This is not to confer special status on Quebec but rather recognizes the difference of one girl from her brothers in a family of ten. She enjoys the same rights and owes the same obligations but is shown special consideration while making a unique contribution to family life." Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that listening to that confused piece of writing, that Separatists, One-Canada men, special status people, pro-B and B people, pro and anti Quebecers, can all take heart in that. They can all read whatever they like into it or out of it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Maybe that was intended.

MR. DOERN: Perhaps it was intended, because that's the type of position that the government has put forward; it's just simply confused or it's confusing.

(MR. DOERN Cont'd.)

Proposition 11, I think is really the one to focus on, and that is the controversy - so-called controversy - the question of whether or not language rights should be extended in the country, and I think also particularly in Manitoba is dealt with here. For example, the basic proposition is very short and it says that the present constitutional provisions and practices with respect to languages should be continued. Now I don't know what that means. I don't know whether that means there shouldn't be any change or any improvement, or whether since we are evolving and since we are going forward we will continue to go forward. I really fail to understand what that means. And then there's a great deal of talk about the fact that the drastic extension of language privileges will fail and divide the nation, and that we need gradualists. And a whole discussion, a half page in what I consider to be the core of this booklet on the language question, deals with the so-called dichotomy of drastic extension versus gradual extension, and the Government of Manitoba's position is therefore gradualism. Now that would be useful if we knew what that meant because a debate between drastic and gradual I suggest can either be fundamental or it can be semantic, and as long as you simply read the booklet it's purely semantic, because one of the failings of this booklet is that there is no documentation, and I think that's a serious failing. If you look at the submissions of the Ontario and the Quebec government - and I saw some of them and have read some of them; I don't know about the more recent ones but I'm thinking now back a year or so ago - they made exhaustive studies; they had large volumes setting out their position and considerable documentation. We had none, or at least there's none in that booklet.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, we can have no real understanding and no meaningful dialogue until the government makes its position clear. So I ask the Premier to inform us in more concrete terms. I know this is difficult and I know that he will give some lengthy explanations of why it is difficult, but I think first of all he should attempt to state the government's position on Bill C-120, an Act concerning or respecting the Status of the Official Languages of Canada.

Now, his Minister of Education was quoted on that Act not too long ago and took an analogous position. He said that this Bill would be divisive because there can be a backlash, and that the government advocated gradualism. Well, the view is that the Bill is divisive. I'd like to know whether that's the position of the government or is that the position of the Minister of Education? I might point out that the distinguished parliamentary House Leader of the New Democratic Party, David Lewis, termed Mr. Craik's stand on language rights as rubbish. He said that the Provincial Government should be more concerned with creating understanding rather than worrying about a backlash, and he said that there's no compulsion in the French Language bill. Well, I would like to hear what the Premier says about that, and similarly, I would like to know what steps the Premier is willing to take to implement the B and B recommendation, and I'd also like to know in particular what his timetable is, not that he would implement these provisions some day, or eventually, or gradually, but when? Mr. Premier, I think the question is: are you in favour of a go-slow approach or a no-go approach, and I would like to hear your answer in some detail.

I hope that you will also give serious consideration to supporting a resolution which I introduced in the House last year and have reintroduced this year, calling for the establishment of a special committee of the Legislature to hear and receive public presentations regarding the Canadian Constitution, because the First Minister is maybe correctly but nevertheless assuming or presuming to speak for the entire province on the question of language rights, and he has that option open to him, but I think that he would be in a stronger position and the province would be better off if we had some public discussion and some public dialogue. Not the type of dialogue that he calls for in this booklet, one where you write in for a booklet and then when you have some suggestions you write back, and then presumably the government writes back to you - a "Letters to the Editor" approach which is really not a case of dialogue and communication with the public.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes about 90 percent of my comments. I just wanted to mention a few other general areas before I sit down.

The 1970 provincial centennial will shortly be upon us. I think this is something that we all look forward to. We're still awaiting some detailed plans on what the province intends to do. I've already raised the point, which I'm happy to note that the Minister in charge responded to, namely that some Indian and Metis representation should be on the Manitoba

(MR. DOERN Cont'd.)... Centennial Commission, that out of some 30 people, I believe the figure is, there is nobody from the Indian-Metis community, and the Minister did inform me that he was planning to make some changes, and I look forward to that announcement soon, because these groups played a very significant role in the founding of our province and continue to play such a role.

I am also interested in whether or not the government of Manitoba is going to formally recognize the contribution of Louis Riel; whether some physical monument, some park, some scholarship funds will be set aside to honour our first great Manitoban - the father of Manitoba. Certainly this is being done in a gradual sense. We have a Louis Riel high school, I believe, in St. Boniface; there's a constituency under our new redistribution which will be named after Riel; and the Saskatchewan government has placed this honour on the Riel name. Ross Thatcher has apparently seen fit to build a statue, I believe on the Saskatchewan legislative grounds, to honour this great leader.

I would also hope, Mr. Speaker, that although I don't see anything about it in the Throne Speech, that there might be a re-examination of our Liquor Act. We made some considerable progressive strides a year or two ago but I think there are some inconsistencies that should be eliminated. There's rumours that the signed forms might be done away with - where you have to go to the Commission and sign your name, Napoleon Bonaparte or anything else you please, with any address, and I notice that in the annual report of the operation and enforcement of liquor laws in Manitoba that there were some 1,300 forms that were examined, and a thousand of these investigated and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, a thousand forms out of I'm sure millions of purchases, one wonders whether it's really worth the effort. Other provinces do away with it. Most American states to my knowledge don't have such a thing. I think it's simply an old carry-over and I think it's a waste of time. It's at least a waste of time to sign your name; maybe it helps, by filling out the form, to speed up your purchase, although we're now going into self-service stores.

And the other point, which I've raised before, is that I think it's about time we looked at a consistency in terms of extending the hours of cabarets and so on throughout the week, and I'm thinking in particular of Saturday nights. The midnight cut-off Saturday night I think is rather juvenile (-- Interjection --). And then stay at home.

A MEMBER: It's the married guys who are running around...

MR. DOERN: My colleague points out it's the married men who will benefit from the late hours, not the single.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's really about time that we broke that psychological barrier; 1:00 or 2:00 a.m. Sunday morning isn't really considered a separate day - it's considered part of Saturday night. I also think that cutting off dancing and so on at midnight in night clubs on a Saturday night is really rather childish, and I think if you put it to a vote or tested the views of the majority of Manitobans, it would be overwhelmingly in favour of breaking that somewhat archaic rule.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have other comments which I intend to make during the session on education and prison reform and so on but I will leave that for now, and I say to the First Minister that I'm anxiously awaiting your comment on some of the comments I have made.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I just rise to tell you that you have now before you the man who had dinner with Rossignon. If there were guns in this House I don't suppose I would say it because I'd probably be shot.

A MEMBER: Who paid for it? Who paid for the dinner?

MR. VIELFAURE: I did. -- Interjections -- Certainly not that I want to apologize at this time for having done so, but it's sad probably that I have more than anybody else to report who I have dinner with. However, if the member wants to know, I'm not ashamed of it. I'm not ashamed of what we discussed. I would have discussed what we discussed at that time on television or anywhere else. Mr. Rossignon came to this province on the invitation of some of my good friends, very honest and reliable people. They told me that he would visit my home town; they asked me if I would have dinner with him and I did. We discussed cultural problems which I imagine are discussed by any group. I was called by reporters for information and so on and I gave the same story. My name was in the paper that I had dinner with him and at that time it was something like having dinner with a beast. I think the reports were wrong. I even said - and I'll repeat - that the Prime Minister was wrong when he said that he was here to agitate the people of Manitoba, unless he talked different to the others than he talked to me. So, on the invitation of my honourable friend who said that some members have had dinner with him - and I haven't heard of any others - I guess I'm the only one and this is what I'm reporting. I haven't got too much more to report except to say that in my opinion it was a tempest in a teapot; it was vastly exaggerated; it makes one feel bad, I'll say this, as a member of the French-speaking community, that you have to explain as to why you had dinner with somebody. However, nobody has blamed me personally. As I said, I'm not ashamed of what I said, what I discussed there, and this is what I'm telling you now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend to speak tonight, in fact I thought that I'd be speaking tomorrow, but something that my friend the Member for Elmwood touched on kind of compelled me to say a few words today. But before I go into that, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, again for holding that high position. Last year, if you remember, I wished you endurance - you survived - and I'm sure you'll survive this session. I hope you do and I wish you the best.

The Deputy Speaker, I wish him well. I always admired the gentleman and I know, or at least I hope, that we'll get along fine. The mover and the seconder in reply, I would like to congratulate them, although they're not new members in this House, but it's quite an honour and privilege to be able to do so.

The new Minister of Agriculture, I wish him well too, and I can say here that as with the former Minister of Agriculture, now with the present Minister of Agriculture, we've had some cordial relations. In fact as this session progresses I hope to be able to say a little more in this regard because during certain occasions he was very kind to me and the group that I represented. I will not go into this at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I'd like to take you back, say forty years, in the history of Manitoba. At that time I was just a small lad and I used to go with my dad - sometimes he was mixed in politics - he was a farmer, and I used to visit this big city of Winnipeg. I couldn't figure it out at the time but even at that young age I noticed that discrimination existed at that time in this province of ours. I know and I noticed that some ethnic groups were called Polacks, some were called Huns, Galicians, some were even called Dogs - Dogs. I well remember a friend of mine who happened to be an Icelander who was along with my father at that time, and he was going by and there was a sign over the door - no dogs allowed. And this Icelander said, you know - to my dad - to whom this reference is made? To me. There was discrimination, actually there was hatred among the different ethnic groups, and it seems to me that now, very lately, they are coming back to this cycle of hatred. I'd like to go to my own constituency - the constituency of Emerson. I could rightly say that this constituency is a United Nations in the Province of Manitoba. We've got Polish, English, Scotch, Irish, Icelanders, Norwegians - name it, we've got them all. These people in this constituency in the past several years accepted each other and they have learned to love each other, and they have learned to live in peace. There was no discrimination - none at all - but what do I hear now? And it's just lately, and in some of these areas - I am not - but one can say even afraid to go.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.)

What's happening? The Englishman is beginning to hate the Frenchman. I'm speaking what I heard and what I know. The Ukrainian is beginning to dislike the Frenchman. The Frenchman is not happy with the Englishman and the other ethnic groups are also in turmoil. Why is that so? It should not be. There was peace and harmony. I'm sorry, but now I have to come right to this House and I'd like to say that the Premier of this province has, by innuendo, created considerable turmoil throughout Manitoba with respect to the federal Official Languages Bill by innuendo. I say it because he didn't say he was for the Bill; he didn't say he was against the Bill. He did not explain it to the people, but he managed to leave the impression that it would create division and he did not properly explain the implication of this Bill, the Languages Bill. Thus, by innuendo, he has created a climate in this province which was not in keeping, not in keeping at all with the goodwill displayed by Manitoba towards bilingualism in recent years, not only in Manitoba but throughout Canada. Therefore, I say that the Premier of this province is directly responsible for causing turmoil among ethnic groups in Manitoba. That's the way I see it. It's not probably what he said but probably what he didn't say.

At this time I'll have to give credit to the former Premier, Mr. Duff Roblin - and I wish him well wherever he is, I admire the man - but he had the good common sense to unite the different ethnic groups of this province. But I'm sorry I cannot say that now, and again I say I'm just one, but I think what I'm saying many of you will find I am right. It happens all the way through and it should not have happened. I don't know what the Tory workers are saying, how they are explaining this, the Language Bill, but I know how some other bills have been interpreted. This is going off to the side a little. When the Estate Bill was presented, the tax bill, and we know we've got to have certain groups - I forget what they call themselves - planning your estate, and at one particular meeting there was a question asked: What is this Bill going to do to a farm of so and so many dollars? Out it goes was the answer; no explanation. Another question asked: What about the Language Bill? Isn't it true it's being forced down our throats? And the answer from a responsible worker - should have been responsible - what should he have answered? Simply said that's the way I look at it. That's the way I look at it.

Now it goes further than that. I was not at this meeting. You've heard by the Honourable Member for Elmwood and it quotes a Minister of this government, what he had said. It says, "Surely nothing can be as divisive than to force this progress by legislation because there can be a backlash. Mr. Craik said that 'the matter of imbalance between constitutional responsibilities and the fiscal means to carry them out is the greatest threat to national unity.' He suggested that this matter be given priority to problems of language rights." And then I'll give credit again to Mr. Lewis the way he answered. He didn't think it was compulsory - maybe it is compulsory in some people's minds. But explain it, and I think it was the duty of some of our leaders, especially the leaders of the government, to explain it properly and not to leave it as it was by innuendo.

We had a gentleman yesterday in our caucus room - that was yesterday - and he was furious, he was simply furious - from the Interlake area - because he misunderstood this language bill and he was told practically the same thing as this thing says. He was just furious and I can assure you that he had no love for certain ethnic groups. There were several of us, I think about half a dozen in the room trying to convince him and trying to prove to him that he was wrong, but we couldn't do it, and you go across the whole of Manitoba and that's what you'll hear. That's what hurts me and that's why I got up tonight on this question because it was touched by the Minister. I don't like discord and I don't like to go ahead and berate the Honourable the First Minister. No, I don't like it, but I feel that something has to be done about it. I feel that this was wrong, I feel that it's up to our Leader to show the way in the Province of Manitoba, otherwise -- at least the Leader should have had the good sense to say I am for the Bill or I am against the Bill, or explain it properly. I had other things to discuss but I presume I may have another chance so I leave it with this. Maybe I should go -- (Interjection) -- Thank you.

Now this is one thing that I am disappointed in in the performance of the present government, but there are many other things that I am disappointed in. For instance in agriculture, and it has been commented on by my honourable friend of the NDP and I'm not going to repeat the same thing. What has this government done for agriculture? And I'm talking of the present government, the present First Minister. Sure you can go back and boast about crop insurance

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . and about farm credit - fine and good. Some people like it, some just hate it; some people can get credit - some farmers - some cannot get credit. The credit helps some farmers and the credit hurts other farmers as an added expense, but we've got it under another premiership.

But what has this government done to create an atmosphere whereby our young farmers would not be leaving the farms? It hasn't done too much. A lot of experts - yes, a lot of experts going out among the farmers and telling the farmers you're not economical; you're not efficient enough. Experts all over. And how to keep books and pointing out how they lose money, but the farmers can figure those things out for themselves. Not the advice probably that they get how to raise better hogs or better chickens, so that they can get that advice too. But there are other things. A farmer being told he is not efficient enough, and still statistics show that of all industries in Canada in the western provinces the farmers are the most efficient, the most efficient in all industries about two to one. They're more efficient than our big industry is concerned. So that's what they tell our farmer.

But what else are they telling our farmer? They're telling him you're not economical enough; you don't deserve to be a free man. What should you do? I haven't got The Business World before me here but there is a picture there of the Honourable the Minister of Industry sitting in a chair - and it even mentions he's sitting cross-legged or something on the chair. I can't quote exactly, but he says the best thing for the farmers of Manitoba is to go into contracts with industry because then he gets a cheque every month. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the Minister of Industry. It's in The Business World. That's the best thing for them. I know of a farmer, he had \$100,000 invested in his farm, so some gentleman came up to him and he said, "Here, I can show you how you can make \$10,000. Take a contract." He took the contract. It lasted one year. He almost went double broke, because what is \$10,000 on a \$100,000 investment? It's 10 percent, but after you take depreciation - maybe there's 10 percent depreciation - there was no allowance for that so the \$10,000 was gone. Sure some contractual arrangements are fine, but I would like to think that our farmer still likes to be independent.

At a seminar not so long ago in the Marlborough Hotel I listened to a few speakers - well versed - and what did one of them say? And by the way he didn't happen to be a Cabinet Minister; I'm not accusing the Cabinet Ministers. But what did he say? The small family farm is not economical; the small family units cost too much, cost the government too much, and it's time to do away with them. We've had small family farms in eastern Manitoba, southeastern Manitoba, for many many years and they were able to make a living and you could go to the Minister of Welfare - or the former Minister of Welfare under his beard - he will tell you that in southeastern Manitoba there was very little welfare. They were small people but they were able to make a living. This government has stepped in and slowly started turning down the advantages. What's the first thing they did? You know there's a lot of wooded area there. This government took away the privilege from them of going in spare time and taking advantage of the natural resources. They pay stumpage and everything so they can cut a few cords on their own and supplement their meagre living. That was taken away from them. It just seems that this government is convinced that there is no room for the small man whatsoever in the Province of Manitoba. You've got to be big; there's no room for the small farmer; you've got to be much bigger. But they lived in the past and they made a living. It seems to be the philosophy right through with this government - no room for the small fellow to live. South Indian Lake proves that. Those people are making a nice living there; they're making a living. Everybody says they're not on welfare but they're small people, snuff them out - snuff them out. And what does one of the Ministers say? I think it's the Minister of Industry again. They must make room for progress. You can't arrest progress -- room in the path of progress. Doesn't the individual count any more, the small fellow? I wonder.

Now when I go back, what did the government do? They say you're not economical, although they made a living there. Why doesn't the government go down to the basics and provide that chance or give them the chance to make a better living there. We've got in southeastern Manitoba thousands of acres of land, some fit for grain, some fit for only grazing, but maybe hundreds of thousands of acres of land are not fit for anything now because the present government, after repeated requests to the government for better drainage, this government turns a deaf ear to those people in southeastern Manitoba, to agriculture, and that's where we should start. Provide the tools by which those farmers can make a living - and they will make a living because they're making a living under adverse conditions now - but make a living so

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) much better, and the government has not listened to those people in southeastern Manitoba.

I will have more to say on agriculture but I would like to say -- (Interjection) -- I think I'm almost through, Mr. Speaker. I'll just say a word or two on education. I'll have lots more to say. But again my honourable colleague from Turtle -- no, I think it's from Assiniboia ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think there's time for even two words.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Just say one quick word fast.

MR. TANCHAK: Oh, you didn't warn me, Mr. Speaker, that I only had two minutes. May I have two minutes? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, it's the voting. I see.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure I must abide by the rules.

MR. TANCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masiuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 11; Nays, 40.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the amendment to the main motion? The Honourable -- (Interjection) --

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Osborne): Well, I don't think there's any need to get together, Mr. Speaker, if my colleague wouldn't mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Utilities. I believe he's the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BAIZLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I certainly wish you continued good health and tell you how much we all appreciate your impartiality - that is most of the time. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: I prefer not to ... that remark.

MR. BAIZLEY: I would like to compliment members of our caucus who took part in this debate in moving and seconding the address to His Honour, and naturally we're quite happy to have as our colleague the new Minister of Agriculture, and we look forward to Monday or Tuesday when the Assembly is going to be blessed with four other voices - three strong and true and a fourth out of the wilderness -- (Interjections) --

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to tell members of the Assembly that the reason that I wished to take part this evening was to put on the record some of the things that have already been said about our centennial celebration. I think that the Honourable Member from Emerson had rather a tough tone for us entering into our centennial year, and I would suggest to you the attitude and atmosphere of the House in the last few minutes is going to be the attitude and atmosphere for all of us in celebrating and remembering our history and taking part in a very meaningful year, where there will be activities for every Manitoban to share with pride in those things that have been done, and we will be able to look to the future with I think a good deal of encouragement. Knowing the progress that we have made in the first 100 years and the rate at which we're progressing under the fine administration of our leader, why we know that the next hundred - he's young enough - that we know that the next hundred will be doubly as fruitful. -- (Interjections) --

And I would be remiss too, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't pay tribute at this time to the members of the Centennial Corporation - Manitoba Centennial Corporation. The Chairman is Mr. Maitland Steinkopf, known to all Manitobans and certainly to all members of this Assembly, and the Vice-Chairman is the Honourable Mr. Justice Monnin. These gentlemen are supported by 30 ladies and gentlemen from different walks of life and from different parts of our province, and they have assumed the responsibility of chairing the various committees that are now at

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd) ... work to make our centennial year the outstanding success that I'm sure it will be.

I would like to put on the record a few of the committees that are functioning: Come Home to Manitoba; Board Meetings and Conventions; Student Exchange; Sports of '70; Performing Arts of '70; Interfaith Activities; Community Improvements; Decorations; Tree Planting; Provincial Projects; Regional Meetings. There's Speakers Committee; there's Special Projects; there's Hospitality; there's History; Special Book Committee; there's Pioneer Recognition. There's Parades; there's New Birth Recognitions; School Athletics; Manitoba Tours; Stamps and Coins. And Mr. Speaker, to that will be several ad hoc committees that will be formed as the need appears.

There had been some concern expressed by honourable members as to what planning was going on, what could we look forward to. Well, Mr. Speaker, we can look forward to one of the finest years that we have known. I just wonder, and I'd like to say rather quietly to my friends in the press that while we want all the help we can to have Manitobans come back to Manitoba, we're going to have to watch our enthusiasm because I don't know what we're going to do with all the people, because I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that every person who has been born in Manitoba, who has lived and worked here and who for some reason had to leave, is going to be anxious to come back and take part in our centennial celebrations. All our home communities are going to want their outstanding citizens, and some of them are probably considered outstanding for some successes and others will be considered outstanding for some of their failures, but at least they have made a contribution and are known in parts of the community and they are going to be welcomed home to take part with the home folk in this celebration. But if we do this, if we do this, each one of us represents a part of Manitoba and, strangely enough, each one of us represents the best part of Manitoba. I never cease to be amazed in this Assembly - and I've only been here for a few short, short years; I guess this is my tenth session - but I never cease to be amazed at how good that part of the community is that I represent but how terrible the rest of it is, and it seems to me at times that this is sort of an attitude that we have. Well, I would ask all honourable gentlemen who are representing the 57 different constituencies of our province that we're going to work together. Sure, we can be partisan and we can have fun, but we can be partisan and we can be enthusiastic and we can have growth. This is what I hope will occur in 1970.

Now, the government is going to do its part and has indicated to the municipalities that we are going to provide a dollar per capita unconditional grant so that they may use this money as they see fit for some lasting memento or community enterprise that is going to be a memorial to Manitoba's 100th birthday. You have heard, of course, about Sports of '70. This means that there will be sporting activities of every conceivable type. Every Manitoban will be able to either take an active part or certainly he will be able to be a spectator, and it's estimated that fellows like Larry and myself, people like Larry and I who have -- I'm sorry, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. He has more than a passing interest in sports; and while we have joined the spectator class, it is estimated that 300,000 citizens like ourselves will enjoy these sporting activities. Then you're going to have the Performing Arts which will give you a wide range of activity for everybody to take part in.

I might say that our Premier has been busy. He has written 600 letters to the different associations that are known, inviting them to hold their conventions in Manitoba. You might be pleased to know that 218 have replied to that invitation of association, and that a large percentage of these have indicated a desire and a willingness to have their annual association meetings in Manitoba. Well, not satisfied with that, he has sent some 500 letters to heads of companies and corporate structures, inviting them to participate in our centennial by having board meetings, if you will, finance meetings, special events and so on, within our province, and it's very gratifying to know that the response to this invitation has been very encouraging. So that rather than being a divisive influence, I feel quite sure that while all of us are going to have a good time in Manitoba, that all of us are going to make a real contribution to having a better and a stronger community, one which we will all be proud of. We'll have events in which we will all take part. We should have the pleasure of welcoming back thousands of Manitobans. They are going to be especially welcome anywhere in Manitoba but they will be especially welcome in their home communities. We are of course, under the heading of special events, and it has been recorded, that we have invited Her Royal Highness Queen Elizabeth, Queen of Canada, to favour us with a visit for the summer of 1970. There have been encouraging

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd) ... indications that Her Royal Highness is going to visit us. This being so, we are making plans that it won't be the formal visit where only the few folk, or the favoured few, will get to see her. It would be our hope that she would consent to travel throughout our province and particularly to some of our remote areas in Northern Affairs that are getting special attention, as was mentioned by my honourable friend, and I'm sure that this would be an occasion that would be long remembered by all our citizens.

But Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, may I appeal to all my colleagues, all our elected people in Manitoba, that while we have our differences that we are not that far apart, that we're all elected for the purpose of making a better Manitoba, of improving our province, of making it stronger. And the appeal is this for 1970. Let us one and all dedicate ourselves to having outstanding memorial celebrations for our hundredth birthday in 1970. Thank you.

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

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Friday morning.