

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 21, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the Gallery where there are some 33 Grade 11 and 12 students from Brookdale High School under the direction of their teachers Mr. Penner and Mr. Manko. Brookdale High School is situated in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and also a portion of it in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Attorney-General? In view of the fact that he claims that there is full co-operation between the RCMP and the municipal police in Winnipeg would he care to comment on the reported charge of Chief Blow that there is lack of co-operation between the RCMP and the Winnipeg police?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I have not seen any document from Chief Blow on this matter. The newspaper report, I take it, is a speculative story. I'm much more interested in results. I say again that the work of the three police forces was excellent as will be shown by the case when it is proceeded with in Court on the 2nd or 3rd of May.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I be given the privilege of reading a letter which I have addressed, Madam Speaker, to you and to the Honourable Minister of Welfare?

Madam Speaker, I addressed a letter, datelined today, to yourself and to the Honourable Minister of Welfare which I would like to make the members of the House aware of. The letter reads as follows: "Dear Madam Speaker: Yesterday evening an exchange took place between the Minister of Welfare and myself regarding the total income of a person I was endeavouring to obtain a Medicare card for. I stated that the man's total income was \$67.50, and the Minister challenged me that with an income this low the man would not be deprived of a Medicare card, and he suggested I was in error and that the man was in receipt of a higher income. I challenged the Honourable Minister for questioning the figure which I had given. I wish to apologize, Madam Speaker, to you and to him because he was, in essence, correct. The total income of the individual concerned is \$75.00, and he was informed, if in effect his income was only \$67.50, he would be entitled to a Medicare card. So I apologize to the Honourable Minister, to you and to the House, Madam Speaker."

MR. DESJARDINS: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities. Could he tell the members of this House when the dikes will be removed or when some of these dikes -- I know that some are still needed. Madam Speaker, if I may, this question is prompted because they have had two accidents on St. Anne's Road and they feel that something should be done soon. I wonder if, for the sake of the people, if the Minister could bring some kind of a statement on this at this time.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (Minister of Public Utilities)(River Heights): Madam Speaker, I suggest that this matter be referred to the Minister in charge of dikes, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I think that he would be able to answer it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does he wish that I repeat the question? Madam Speaker, I was asking the Minister if he could give the people of Manitoba some indication when the dikes will be removed, where they're not needed of course. Some of the people are quite concerned. Apparently a little girl or woman was injured yesterday coming out of the bus, and it was felt that these dikes, especially on St. Anne's Road in St. Vital, could be dangerous.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, the removal of the dikes is getting underway at the present time, and by the first of the week we expect the job will be in full swing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, on a question of privilege, I wonder if I could ask for a correction in Hansard of April 18, 1966, on Page 1940.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)....It quotes me as saying "...your government and your First Minister because he acted like a spoiled boy scout and he says 'We'll do it alone.' You tell me" then it has '(interjection)' and I believe, Madam Speaker, that it should show that instead of '(interjection)' that at this point you called me to order, and I wonder if we could have this change made.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture on the question that was asked by the Member for St. Boniface regarding diking. I have had one request at least from an individual who has an urgent reason for getting out of his home; he's being transferred. What steps can be taken by individuals in that case where there is a dike in front of the property and they have to get vehicles in. Can they apply for special speed-up as to the cleaning up of the dike in front of their area?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, yes, I would say that if someone has a special situation, that certainly it would be looked at on the basis of its own particular merit. I wouldn't want to give an answer that would result in a deluge of phone calls asking that the dike in front of my place be removed. Just if I may, Madam Speaker, add a cautionary note to this question of dikes. The dikes will be removed in sequence so that we remove the widest margin of protection first. That is, there are certain areas where there is still pressure against dikes, and until the water has receded those dikes cannot be removed. And just to add a little emphasis to this warning, last night at the Town of Morris they had a slight break in the dike and it was only because of the constant patrolling that is going on and the availability of men and materials that it was caught and no damage was done, but we will, as I say, start removing these dikes immediately and by Monday this work should be in full swing. The dikes providing the greatest margin of safety will be removed first. An attempt will be made to get the dikes that are on the Metro Transit circuits removed to speed up transportation and mobility as soon as possible, and then those other dikes which are not impeding traffic in any way will be dealt with later.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, could the Minister indicate to whom application should be made for any special permit or special request to have the dike removed?

MR. HUTTON: Well, I think either to my office or to the office of the Chief Engineer, either one.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, while we are on the question of dikes, and in view of the fact that the Premier is now in Ottawa; and also in view of the fact that there was definite proof that dikes would hold against flooding in towns south of Winnipeg - I will not mention them - and also in view of the fact that emergency dikes are costly and are not always practical, as indicated by a breakthrough at St. Jean and Morris again last night; and also, finally, in view of the speculation by the press that the Premier may take this matter up with the Federal Government, I would like assurance that the Premier is going to discuss the construction of permanent dikes in towns south of Winnipeg for the protection of these people. Is the Minister -- the Premier authorized, or does he indicate that he will discuss this? I don't know which Minister, maybe the Minister of Agriculture could answer, or the Acting Premier.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I think we should wait until the Premier is back and the question can be directed to him.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, in other words, the news that we have in the media that it may be, is just speculation?

MADAM SPEAKER:to these questions. This is a question period.

MR. TANCHAK: That's just what I'm doing. I'm asking whether the news media is just speculating. It's not exactly the fact. Is that right?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I too would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture. About two months ago I asked him if a report had been made as a result of the survey taken on the watershed in the vicinity of Riding Mountain and the Birnie Creek area in particular, and if so, had it been tabled or could we expect to receive the report. My honourable friend said at that time that a survey had been taken but he didn't think a report was yet printed. Could he inform the House now whether or not there is a report available to the members?

MR. HUTTON: I don't know whether it's been compiled in the form of a study as yet, but I will check on that matter for my honourable friend.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General following up on the questions of the Member for St. Boniface. The Attorney-General replied that what he had seen so far was a speculative newspaper story, as I understand it. In view of the story, however, is the Attorney-General checking into the question as to whether or not there was co-operation between the police departments at all?

MR. McLEAN: No, Madam Speaker, because I know that there was co-operation and that the case was properly conducted.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. Could he advise the House as to when the first session or first meeting of the Automobile Insurance Committee might be held?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well as soon as it's established, Madam Speaker, we'll hold a meeting. I'd like to hold one just as fast as we can if I end up by being the chairman of it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, may I ask you to call the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 80 at the bottom of Page 2.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 80. The Honourable the Member

MR. MARK SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, before we proceed, I'd simply like to draw attention to Hansard No. 83 on Page 1957 in the fourth paragraph, and under my remarks it says that the statements that were "contracted," and it should read the statements that were "contradicted," and I would like to have that correction please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 80. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister and members of the House for allowing me to have this Bill stood over until today. I am interested in this Bill that is before us, an Act respecting the Manitoba Development Fund. We have a Development Fund which has been in operation for some years now, and the Fund has been doing well in my opinion. I have given full support to the Fund as such to see it in operation, and also to provide it will necessary capital and that it can function and be improved.

Now that we have this Bill before us, I take it that it's supposed to improve on what we presently have in the Manitoba Development Fund. In checking over the various sections of the Bill, I find that we will now allow the Fund, or we are prepared that the Fund accept more risk in my opinion; that we will support industry with the necessary capital so that it can be strengthened; and that we might take less collateral or secondary collateral in order that these industries can get more funds, and probably take a first claim on its assets so that it can progress.

Now I am not opposed to providing risk capital for industries in Manitoba, but I also find that the Fund will be able to vary interest rates among the different loans, and I am not so sure whether this is sound. What is the reason why we are varying the interest rates? Is it because of the risk factor? Will those loans that have a greater risk be required to pay a high rate of interest? Is this what is implied in Section 8 where we have the various matters brought to our attention and stated? I certainly would be interested in this particular section, and also, why we are going to vary the interest rate. If the Minister later on answers some of the queries of other members, I would hope that he would give us some information on that particular question.

I also notice that we are going to support the development organizations that have been set up in this province, and I certainly have no objection to that because some of these development associations are doing very good work in providing facilities for industries to come in and to use their buildings or assets, whatever they put at the disposal of those industries. We have some of those industries in my particular constituency and also that of the Honourable Member for Dufferin, which is located in the Town of Winkler, and these businesses are growing and are providing employment which is very good as far as I can see it. So that we are now going to provide these development association with a source of funds.

However, when I go to the second part of the Bill, and I am skipping a lot of the other matters that I should probably be speaking on but I do not want to dwell at too much of a length

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....at this particular time. I will be speaking and having further comments on it when we get to Committee of the Whole. But I would like to speak briefly on the second part of this Bill in connection with extraordinary operations.

Here we find now that we are going to have a complete departure from what has been practised in the past and allow the Fund to go into business and setting up subsidiary organizations and establishing businesses and operating them. I certainly have to take exception to this, and very strong exception. While I am very interested in having good business in government, I am not in favour of having government in business, especially of this type. In my opinion, this is very far-reaching and who can tell where it's going to end.

What we are doing is that we are going to place the funds, such as probably the Canada Pension Plan funds which could be taken into this organization, funds that have been deducted from the various employees across this province, and they will be put to use probably in industries or businesses that might oppose the very industry that they are working in, and this, in my opinion, is basically very wrong. These deductions are compulsory as everyone knows. They have to pay into the Canada Pension Plan. This means that they have less spending money, less purchasing power, and here we are going to provide these funds for state-run business, and I oppose this.

Just the other day we had a Bill introduced where we are planning to subsidize the oil industries by outright grants, and who is to say that we might not have an oil industry run by the Development Fund in this province, and that could collect under this grant. Who is going to say that in some future time we might have collective or state farms such as they have in Russia? This is all a possibility under this act. We know that we have under our various government and state programs, that empire-building is one of their objects and they always like to see other people working under them, and in this way the type of business is mushrooming and this is what we could get under a Bill of this type.

I'm afraid of what is going to happen in years to come under this provision that we have under Part 2 of this Bill, and while I support the Development Fund and do not oppose the first part, I definitely take exception to the second part and cannot support the bill for that very reason. We are going too far in socialism under this second part and I certainly cannot subscribe to it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, if no other members wish to contribute . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce is closing the debate.

MR. EVANS: I have the choice at the moment of making a very long speech or a very short one. I have two bags full with me but I think the circumstances call for me to make a short speech. Fortunately, I am able to do so because this is a debate on the principle of the bill, and with the exception of my honourable friend from Rhineland, in part, I think there is agreement to the principle of the bill.

Consequently, I thank my honourable friends for the discussion that has taken place and for some of the points that it is right to have brought up and some of the things that I undertake to take notice of and study carefully. I think my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition when he said that we should invite the Comptroller-General to take a closer, more detailed, more intimate interest in the affairs of the Fund, that's a matter we must consider. As we develop new techniques, new loaning operations and new developments under the Development Fund --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, I'm so sorry. I saw Leader here and I didn't notice it was NDP. Oh yes, I give credit to my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP. That's a good point and we promise to take it into consideration as our new administrative machinery develops.

My honourable friend from Seven Oaks asked about what I meant by an "operation at arms length." I have forgotten the interpretation that he gave of it, but it wasn't the one that I do. What I mean by "arms length" is that the granting of a loan or the consideration of a loan shall be entirely the responsibility of the directors of the Fund without interference from me or my officials. I have said on at least two occasions previously in this House that I never discuss the terms of a loan - I never discuss a loan with an intending borrower until he has been to the Fund and received their decision, then I will discuss it with him and I have never, and I do not, ask the Fund to vary their decisions. That's the sense in which I say I keep it at arms length. I do not interfere with their normal loaning operations. My honourable friend will recognize now that under Part 2 we may very well, as the government, request the fund to

(MR. EVANS cont'd), enter into certain operations or make certain loans. That's under Part 2. That will not be at arms length. That is the definition of the term as I used it.

So, confining my remarks in order to economize on time, I would say that there is fairly general agreement with the principle of the bill and I look forward, as other members have expressed their opinion as well, to a new leap forward in our economic development, using this as one of the tools to do it.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House - the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 80, an Act respecting The Manitoba Development Fund.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Paulley, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Mr. Froese.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 44; Nays, 1.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if I could ask you now to call the adjourned debate on the second reading of Public Bills on Page 4. Bill No. 64.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 64. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I will be very brief on this Bill. The time is getting late, and like the Honourable the Acting Premier, I'll say I'll take only a few minutes. We have had a resolution here introduced by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface which requested that French be another language of instruction in Manitoba schools. Now the Honourable Member from Swan River amended this resolution and amended it in such a manner that it is almost completely nullified, or in other words, the decision is being procrastinated at this time - slowing it down.

And it's a fact in this House that it has become common practice for the members of the government or the government itself to amend almost every opposition resolution in like manner, and I can even refer to some of these resolutions that were amended in the same manner. The tax-free gasoline for farmers introduced by the Liberal Party was amended last year, amended this year again to just about simply nullify it. And another one, the weather forecasting resolution got the same treatment as this resolution, amended by the government. We have had the machinery resolution - that one was also amended by the government because I think

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe that the honourable member should be speaking to the principle of the bill. This is second reading and I would ask him to stay to that principle.

MR. TANCHAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'll try to stay to the principle of the Bill. That's all I had to say on those resolutions. It seems to me that -- it's so hard to follow the principle, Madam Speaker, but I'll try. It seems to me that this resolution completely negates the principle of this Bill. Surely the government has some kind of a conviction on this. The government either is willing to grant this request or not willing to grant this request, because that's what the resolution asks for, the granting of that request.

In this case, the government seems to be against the use of French in schools. Now I would say that if they were against, the government should have the courage of its convictions and simply say yes or no. I personally do not see why this resolution could not have been amended in a different way if the government was not too happy with it. It could be amended so as to make it permissive legislation, and I am sure that what the resolution asks for may be possible in many schools in the Province of Manitoba. It does not have to apply to every school if it's just permissible.

There are many schools where the use of French language as an instructional language may be possible - not in every school. I am sure that with our larger divisions now, with school divisions and so many trustees from different corners of a division, that the danger of being parochial, and say, selfish, is quite remote with so many. I am sure that this wouldn't

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)....have been abused, and I can give one instance where it would even be desirable to use French even now, to use French and others in teaching of the French, where teaching French grammar and teaching of the French would be most desirable, to use the French language as an instructional language in this one case.

I studied French in high school but the teachers did not use French to instruct me in French, and now, although I understand French and I can read French and understand what I read and everything else, but my spoken French is so poor that I'm ashamed of it. But I am sure that if I would have had a teacher who used French to instruct me in the French, I probably would have mastered the use of French much better than I did by having the teachers using English to teach me the French.

So I am sorry that if this resolution was not acceptable to the government that the government did not amend it in a manner - in a different manner - change some of the regulations rather than just simply delaying it for a future date. I would have liked to see a definite stand from the government.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I'd like to add my comments on Bill No. 64. Quite frankly, the French language is getting to be to the point of where it is most necessary in reference to our economy in Canada. The principle of this bill is an excellent one. I see no harm being done by the fact that the children on the public school level have the opportunity to learn another language. Madam Speaker, when you travel outside Canada to places like Spain, Italy, or some of the possessions of Africa and Latin America, it is a revelation to know that you can find people that will understand either the English language, and if they don't understand the English language, the next one they come back at you with is the French language, and I think that seeing that the various countries are getting so much closer to each other these days because of the air age and the jet age, this is all the more reason why commerce in Canada, the business world in Canada, requires our citizens to have a second language. It is an excellent place for the public schools to have the opportunity to pick up another language.

Madam Speaker, the method of instruction in most of the European schools is such that most of these countries have to learn three languages on the public school level, and I think that it is equally as important for the children in public schools to learn French, or another language, as it is to learn Biology or History. Would this government, in terms of the amendment that was made, suggest for one moment that it is detrimental for children in public school to study the history of Africa or the history of Latin America? No, Madam Speaker, I think that it is most important that the children in our public schools are given the opportunity and given the privilege to learn more than one language. French is a beautiful language, and the principle involved in this is an excellent one, and I think that it's high time that this government take the full responsibility of either going on with the program or coming flatly out and saying it's not a good program.

I, Madam Speaker, see the wisdom and the benefits that will derive to Canada in the future generation that's coming up through our public school system, because whether we're bilingual or trilingual or multi-lingual, it's an advantage; it's a plus sign in reference to our Canadian background; and I think that this, Madam Speaker, is going to be brought to the forefront and recognized as a very important part of our Canadian background, in that when you travel to other countries you will find that if you know the English language and if you know the French language, this gives you an opportunity to converse with a very large percentage of the free world, or for that matter the international world as we know it today. You go for instance to Japan, and if you're not able to converse in English, the alternative is that most of these people in the business world are anxious and ready to converse in French, and with Canada being such a predominantly agricultural exporting country, Madam Speaker, it is most important that we give the children in our public schools an opportunity to learn the French language.

I think that this is one of the most beneficial effects that we can give our children in the public school level, and I urge that the government take some definite steps in this direction because we are not serving the interests of Canada by not giving the children in the public schools an opportunity to learn another language.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, in speaking to this amendment, I would like to say I got up the other day and spoke on the main motion, and maybe some people are kind of mixed up. Now I believe that you can be taught any language in your schools. I say that is the right and privilege of everyone. But this is one thing I said when I spoke the

(MR. HARRIS cont'd). other day, and I still emphasize that, that the language of instruction in the schools should be English. This is an English-speaking province and English is spoken all over in this province, but I say, and I emphasize that again, that if any of the ethnic groups in here want to learn their own language and can do so and can have instruction in school by a teacher or whatever goes, then that is their right and privilege, but I say that the rights in this province should be that instruction by English, and no matter if they teach in French or anything else, they can teach French but the instruction in school is English, and I would go for that all the way. But we have the rights and privilege to learn any language, whether it be Eskimo or Chinese, and if we can do so in this province, okay.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 64 as amended.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words in closing the debate. Unfortunately, I couldn't be present yesterday when this amendment was brought in the House and all I have before me is a clipping that I have seen from the Free Press of today, and also a few notes that one of my colleagues handed me just a few minutes ago.

Madam Speaker, what can one say after such an amendment? I'm certainly not going to argue or question your ruling on this. As far as I'm concerned, I might say that I don't consider this in order. It's certainly not morally in order. I think that we should have the courage to say what we have to say without changing completely a Bill, especially a bill -- on second reading we're supposed to vote on a question of principle, either yes or no. For the second straight year the government chose not to do this, and as far as I'm concerned, by their number they steamroll something through again.

My honourable friend, according to the notes handed to me, tells me that -- so that I said yesterday that I was quite wrong when I stated that this was political suicide. Well he's quite right. I did not say it was political suicide. I said that the government felt -- why I don't know -- that this government felt that it was political suicide, and for the second year in a row his amendment proves this, Madam Speaker. For the second year in a row we are forced to have the

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I didn't use the word "suicide."

MR. DESJARDINS: Well that I can't argue with, my honourable friend. It says here -- well, call it political dynamite then -- dynamite or suicide -- I think that he knows what I mean. In other words, if I must explain to my honourable friend, if I must explain, he felt that politically -- some say dynamite, some say suicide. I'm very sorry if I insulted him, Madam Speaker.

But anyway, my honourable friend feels that this is something of my imagination. I won't argue with this -- I won't lose the time of this House arguing with him -- I think that the action of the honourable gentlemen in front of me proves this, that for the second year in a row on something as important as this, the First Minister, who will go all across the country talking about these things, did not say one word in this debate.

The Minister of Education, who certainly should have something to say on this, did not grace the debate by a single word; and one member, one backbencher from the government side brought in this famous amendment for the second year in a row on practically the last day of the Session. I won't argue with this, I can only laugh at that, Madam Speaker.

Now I think that I have not a good speech prepared, Madam Speaker, because as I say I only have these clippings in front of me and a few notes. I also understand that the main thing in this amendment is wait, let us see what the B & B Commission reports, and then we will act. That also lacks so much courage. The First Minister of this province has been going around saying what he thinks of the B & B Commission, that it was a waste of time, and during the last Federal election this was one thing they were going to do away with, but now we must wait on the report of the B & B Commission before we can act. I think that speaks for itself also. This is practically insulting -- insulting to the members of this House to bring in such an amendment.

Then we are told, well this must be studied on a national scheme. Madam Speaker, again this makes me smile at least. I wonder if on the question of private schools that was debated here so often, on the question of private schools which is a matter of education, if we watched, if we looked at this on a national scheme thinking of all the provinces. It was a great thing, and I think he took me to task also for saying that there was too much lip-service being paid this question and not enough action. I think this is lip-service. Oh yes, I did say that, and I

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... say it again - lip-service and nothing else, Madam Speaker. This is just lip-service, especially at election time.

I don't quarrel with the people that feel that they don't believe in this. My honourable friend, the honourable friend that just spoke, the member for Logan, certainly I don't agree with him but he has the courage of his convictions. He stood up and he said what he thought in this House. I was practically -- apparently yesterday the honourable member mentioned again that I had changed. I was pretty well complimented - you know, like you tap a little boy on the head and say, "Nice going, son," - I had been more moderate now.

Well, Madam Speaker, moderate or not, reasonable or not, you don't get anywhere, not with people like this. I can say that I don't even pity these people for their lack of courage. I'm not mad at them because I have confidence in the people of Manitoba; in the politicians on the government side, not a bit of confidence, Madam Speaker, not a bit. If they don't agree, they can stand up and be counted, not bring in these wishy-washy amendments, and before an election come in and place the responsibility again on the B & B Commission. This is getting to be a joke. This government is the laughingstock of the people of Manitoba because they haven't any courage at all, not a bit of courage.

I tried - did I ask anything that was unreasonable? I ask you, Madam Speaker, I ask the members of this House to let a Bill go to second reading to approve a principle, to try to look at the people of Manitoba here first as Canadians. We're talking about don't look in this way, look the lines this way. The First Minister told us that - look across Canada, let's be Canadians first. I ask the members of this House to allow second reading, a principle at least, and I myself even in introducing, not after an amendment was brought in, but even introducing this bill, I said even if it takes ten years, but let the people of Manitoba know that we're going to strive, we're going to try to have a little bit of unity; we're going to work for Confederation this coming year, especially the centennial.

I felt that this would be the greatest monument of all, not building buildings that didn't mean a thing; show a little bit of co-operation and try to stick together and let the people of Manitoba know that these things would be difficult but that we were together. I was gullible enough - not gullible - I guess too ignorant enough to believe this could be done in this House, to believe that maybe my approach had been wrong - maybe my approach has been wrong - but, Madam Speaker, I don't intend to crawl; I don't intend to crawl or kiss anybody's feet. It doesn't matter whether my honourable friend will comment about me on my change of attitude, and to say that there is harmony - harmony, yes, if we get on our knees and lick your boots, but I don't intend to do that, Madam Speaker. I don't think this is needed. I asked for what I thought was reasonable; I asked that we approve a principle. I thought that some day maybe we would start, we would bring in some qualified French teachers, not only for the French people - I've never asked that we be isolated by ourselves - but I don't like to come in by the back door either.

If you remember earlier in this House in this Session, Madam Speaker, and in fact in 1962 and 1963, I objected when they were trying to bring in French for those whose Mother tongue - for French only. I felt that we should all have a chance to learn together, and I thought that it would have been possible, especially in view of -- they had this français un course. I thought that it would be well if we could some day maybe teach history and social studies to those who would qualify to take français un. Is this asking too much, Madam Speaker? Should I toe the line all the time, be very moderate; beg, not for privileges but what I consider my rights; be complimented but get nothing, Madam Speaker? It is disgusting to look at grown men who are elected to take responsibility to act for the second year - to act like members of this government have done.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn. I understand our regular meeting time is 8:00 o'clock tonight.

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