

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 p.m. Thursday, April 20, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): I beg to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their fourth report.

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 33 students of Grade 8 standing from the Holy Family School of Grand Forks, North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Sister Mary Grace and Mrs. Fauglid. We also have 22 students of Grade 11 standing from the Windsor Park Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Stemshorn. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. This question relates to the circumstances which has arisen by virtue of some alderman in the City of Winnipeg acting as unenlightened employer in trying to interfere with the due process of collective bargaining by suggesting that they will pass a motion -- or put a motion at the City of Winnipeg Council requesting, in the midst of negotiations by the way, that the right of its employees be curtailed by the Provincial Government. I would like the Minister to assure the House that the rights of these employees will not be curtailed during the midst of their negotiations.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had no such request.

MR. GREEN: Is the Minister not aware that Alderman Mark Danzker has indicated that he will make a notice of motion at Monday night's council meeting requesting that the Provincial Government curtail the rights of the City of Winnipeg employees. All I am asking the Minister to do is to say that such a motion would have no effect on this government, especially because it is made now during the course of negotiations. I'm asking the Minister to take an action before the motion is passed.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is a hypothetical question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister say that it is hypothetical to say now that he will taken no action?

MR. LYON: We are in question period, not in argument period.

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, I didn't get the Minister. --(Interjection)-- Yes - well then I will ask another question, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the Minister whether he has any intention whatsoever of bringing in government policy to the effect that the rights of the City of Winnipeg employees are going to be curtailed?

MR. SPEAKER: I hope this is not getting down to an argument between two honourable members. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Inkster would agree with me that when the situation he has outlined has become a fact, probably the Minister could . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I might say that the situation is urgent, that yesterday's daily newspaper carried a headline which indicates that there is a breakdown in negotiations -- or will be a breakdown if this motion is put, and if the Minister won't make a statement then I'll have no alternative but to bring in a motion tomorrow that this debate take place as a matter

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . of urgency.

MR. LYON: I think the Minister of Labour has already said, and I believe it is the case, the whole matter is hypothetical. He has received no such request.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, surely that can't be the answer to the question that was put; namely, would the Minister inform this House before such a motion is passed by Council - at which time it will be too late to prevent a breakdown in negotiations - would the Minister inform the House that he will not permit that breakdown to occur?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I understood the Minister to give an opinion which I am sure the honourable member heard, that he considers it to be a hypothetical question at this time.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): A supplemental question. Will the Honourable the Minister of Labour answer this question: Is he prepared to ensure that the due process of collective bargaining will not be violated as the result of actions of any municipal council in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. BAIZLEY: I'll make sure that any municipal council, Mr. Speaker, will carry on legal and proper negotiations.

MR. PAULLEY: My question was not what the municipal council would do, Mr. Speaker, but what is the attitude of the Minister of Labour of the Province of Manitoba. In the absence of advice, the Honourable the Minister of Labour may take my question as notice.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege on an article in the Winnipeg Free Press under the heading "Under the Dome" of April 18, 1967. I'm afraid I'll have to take the time to read this in order to get the context, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to read all of it, but I'm trying to read enough to get the proper interpretation. This is the quote: "But Mr. Campbell, it will be remembered, is the man who refused to accept the money when the Roblin government in 1960 raised the salary of the Leader of the Opposition by \$1,000. Mr. Campbell, with much fanfare and publicity, gave his raise to Brandon College. In his defence, however, it should be noted that he did not give the whole \$1,000 away. What Brandon College actually got was the residue of the raise after taxes. Mr. Campbell believes in devoted and low-paid public service but he is also a practical man."

Mr. Speaker, I want to put the record straight by quoting the fact, and that is that Brandon College got \$1,000 - not \$1.00 more or \$1.00 less - \$1,000. Where the author of this article I suppose was led astray was that she has probably heard that due to concessions that were made by the Federal Government to that expansion campaign that Brandon College had on at that time that the donors were tax-free so far as the donations were made. I am sure it will surprise nobody to hear that I took advantage of the tax-free part, but as far as Brandon College was concerned, they not only got \$1,000, but because of the generosity of the government which had agreed during that expansion campaign to match anything that was raised voluntarily to the tune of 2 to 1, they got \$2,000 as well from the government of the Province of Manitoba.

I just wanted to put the matter straight. I have no objection to the statement that I'm a practical man, but I certainly do object to the statement that Brandon College did not get \$1,000. They got \$3,000, all of it from the taxpayers.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the House Leader. Is there any further legislation to come before the House?

MR. LYON: I think, Mr. Speaker, there are, at last count, only three Bills that the House has not seen. Now this is subject to correction. I'll have to double check again but that is my recollection.

One is the Bill that was moved Monday by the Minister of Agriculture; I believe there is a Municipal Affairs Bill; -- four Bills -- I believe there is a Magistrate's Bill which has been in the House but not yet distributed; and there is also the wind-up Bill that we always get, the Statute Law Amendment Bill which has a whole series of house cleaning amendments - typographical errors and so on. It's on its way back from the printers. --(Interjection)-- University Grants Commission has had first reading but has not yet been distributed.

MR. MOLGAT: No, it's on another subject, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Provincial Secretary. Could the Minister inform the House as to the course of negotiations with the Civil Servants regarding a pay increase and when he might be able to announce the decision on the subject.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the negotiations have proceeded. There are some decisions that are now required. These I expect

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . . will be made shortly. I'm not certain that I will be making any announcement as the result of the conclusion of the matter, but I would anticipate that the matter will be concluded fairly soon.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question. Are negotiations continuing daily or is there a sort of period of rest at the present time?

MR. McLEAN: The matter is in progress, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon? -- Daily?

MR. McLEAN: I said the matter is in progress.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to direct to the Honourable Minister of Education with respect to a news announcement made this morning stating that pursuant to a change in the regulations governing the payment of a cost of living allowance to students attending upgrading classes, there are several thousand students in Ontario that will no longer qualify to receive this benefit. Now could the Minister, Mr. Speaker, advise this House whether there are any changes in the regulations that could result in a similar adverse effect on the students enrolled in a similar capacity in Manitoba.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take that question under advisement and find out just what the regulation is at the moment.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. On Tuesday, the 7th day of February, there was an amendment to a resolution of mine which established the fact that this House would set up a committee on farm machinery and matters related thereto. I am wondering whether or not the Minister is going to make some announcement as to who the members of that committee will be and when they will be appointed.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the Member from Brokenhead checks the Votes and Proceedings, he will see that this has been done.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is it true that the government has refused to approve the two-year course for nurses, that is the diploma course?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Another question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the government to formulate a policy before the start of the class in September?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is at the present time meeting with the various groups on the recommendations that came down from the Minister's Committee on Nursing. The first group met with me today - the Nurses Association.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I was rather surprised at the answer that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead got because -- I'd better put the question then. Is it no longer the practice then that the committees that are being appointed are brought in by the way of resolution?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary. Yesterday I received this Order for Return No. 22, and I wonder why the answers were not given in the way that they were asked, because I don't think that any objection was raised when I presented the Order. You will find it on the front page of the Votes and Proceedings and I'm referring to question No. 3. The question asked the largest amount paid to any single applicant and the number of parcels of land represented by it. And the answer given: \$50.00; one parcel of land. A change in the operation was effected this year whereby each applicant was issued a cheque in order to speed up processing. Well that doesn't stop you from giving me the answer. As I recall it -- (Interjection)-- Well the question is why have I not received the answer?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): The records are kept that way and the answer is correct according to the way the records are kept.

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's a good question then. Well if it is a fact that a cheque was issued to every one, is it not possible to tell me who owned the greatest number of parcels of land?

MR. EVANS: No. --(Interjection)-- Well, it even says in the Return that the system was changed.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Member of Labour. Has he investigated the fatal accident at the Pan Am Pool in

(MR. PATRICK, cont'd) . . . . River Heights and can he give us a report?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, that problem is under investigation and I have not received a report as yet.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Honourable Minister of Education. The other day in the TV media we seen the Vice-Principal of Daniel MacIntyre discussing the new courses in Maths and in Sciences and he said that these courses have not been properly tested that are presently used in schools. Is this a correct statement?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not responsible for statements of the Vice-Principal. I don't think he would have the unanimous agreement amongst his colleagues but he's entitled to his views.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence in 1966 and 1967 between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada in respect to changes in the Technical Vocational Training School construction program.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: The question is acceptable subject to the usual reservations as to consent from the Government of Canada and all the other reservations -- and matters that are currently under negotiation.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debates on second readings of Bills. Bill No. . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be good enough to call Bills 59, 89 and 93 first - 59, 89 and 93. I wonder if I might just ask the permission of the House now to make a statement concerning the House business. It would be our hope that after today's proceedings when we move on to government business tomorrow - on second readings - it would be our hope that the debate on these matters, except those that were introduced just yesterday, could be proceeded with without adjournment. I realize that most of these matters now have been before us for several days, have been debated and adjourned for a few days, and if we could have the co-operation of honourable members we would like to move these Bills along without adjournments if at all possible. Now we wouldn't want to hold 100 percent fast to the rule if good and sufficient cause can be shown - if the member is going to be absent or something of that nature - fine, but otherwise we would like to move them along without at the same time infringing on the rights of regular debate in the House.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite willing to oblige as much as possible. I will be speaking on the Bill that I have taken adjournment on, but I wish to adjourn Bill No. 93 later on.

MR. SPEAKER: The House proceed to Bill 59. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us has been spoken to quite eloquently by various members of the House. I think that the position of the New Democratic Party in particular was well put by the Member for Elmwood and by the Honourable Member for St. John's. Therefore, I concede in rising to speak to this particular Bill that I don't think that I'm going to have a great deal more wisdom to offer the House than has already been contributed by other members.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is a subject which has concerned me for a great number of years. It's a subject in which I had a great deal of interest and in which I engaged in a great deal of conversation with various of my friends and in various discussions, either of a public or a private kind, and I always pledged to myself that if I ever had the opportunity to speak on the subject where my words would be of some consequence, where my assent or dissent would be a significant factor in that it would in some way contribute to the law-making processes of our province, that I would do so. So I say in advance, and I ask for the indulgence of the members of the House, that I make this speech to fulfill a pledge to myself rather than to add a great deal of information to what has already been contributed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the purpose of this particular Bill is to provide an avenue for people who are using the French language to have an option of using that language as a language of instruction in their schools. If I thought, Mr. Speaker, that that was either the objective or the result of this particular piece of legislation, I would not be so nearly excited about it as I actually am. It's my impression, Mr. Speaker, that this particular Bill provides an

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . avenue for the recognition by the Province of Manitoba of the true national characteristics of Canada.

The Member for St. John's said yesterday that Manitoba has a certain characteristic, that Manitoba as part of Canada has a Canadian characteristic, and I think that one of those Canadian characteristics, that is the heterogeneous rather than homogeneous nature of our cultural traditions, has been to some extent lacking in this province and has been in danger, Mr. Speaker, of losing some ground in the country as a whole. Ever since the cultural and economic and social revolution in the Province of Quebec, however, the nature of our national cultural characteristics has changed and I think that Manitoba is quite correct in moving along with this change.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that on a personal basis I think it's also important that I mention when speaking on this particular subject that I speak as a member of what is quite commonly referred to as either a racial, an ethnic or a minority group. I'm a person whose tradition comes neither from the Anglo-Saxon nor French origins of our country. I am of course a Jew, and as such I am from one of the many ethnic groups that make up our population and I represent a constituency, Mr. Speaker, which is largely characterized by a population which is made up of various ethnic or minority or racial groups, as these are commonly referred. In the constituency of Inkster we have a great number of people of Ukrainian descent, a great number of people of Polish, Russian, Italian, German, and others who I can't begin to complete to mention here, and it's from this particular viewpoint that I think that I would like to address myself to the content of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, it's often been argued on behalf of those people who strive for national unity that the best way to achieve national unity is to eliminate national differences, and by this they mean to eliminate the differences in the cultural backgrounds of our people, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a sort of attractive argument. If we had nothing to divide us, we would all be united. As a matter of fact, I must confess that in my earlier years I had the vain hope that if everybody spoke the same language and if everybody attended the same types of schools and if everybody - to carry it further - believed in the same things, there would be nothing to fight about and therefore humanity would live happily ever after. I realize now, Mr. Speaker, that that is not only true but it's probably the worst possible thing that could happen to us, and furthermore that it just doesn't achieve the results that is claimed for by this type of homogeneity. I remember once arguing with a friend of mine about the causes of war, and I ventured to say that if people spoke the same language and therefore being able to communicate with one another, it's unlikely that they would fight with one another. And quick as a flash she threw back at me the American Civil War which resulted in one of the greatest loss of death figures on either side of any other war, and of course in that particular instance both groups spoke the same language.

If we carry it further, Mr. Speaker, the development that took place in Germany following 1933 was an attempt to have a completely homogeneous nation - a completely Arian nation - and it didn't matter, Mr. Speaker, that some people had become completely homogeneously German - spoke German, attended German schools, lived a full German life, had had three or four generations in which they had nothing whatever to do with their particular ethnic background - but when they were being wheeled into the concentration camps, when they were being cremated in the crematorium, this didn't make any difference, because the attempt at arriving at an Arian peoples was of course one which necessitated that kind of intolerance.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that mutual respect and mutual tolerance doesn't result from the elimination of differences, because if there are no differences then there is no conscious effort or nothing needed from which respect flows, and I think that people have to make a conscious effort to be respectful of one another. I think without that conscious effort that probably true respect doesn't arise. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I thank providence for the accident of Canadian history - and it is an accident. I thank providence not because it gives something to the French and Anglo-Saxon people, although I certainly have every respect for these people, but I thank providence because it gives something to the ethnic minorities of this country, and those people who argue, and I think argue wrongly, that we should treat all minorities other than the Anglo Saxons alike, make a serious mistake because that would in effect, Mr. Speaker, be admitting that Canada is a homogeneous country in which the homogeneous culture tends towards the Anglo-Saxon or the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

Mr. Speaker, the people who are interested in maintaining some tie with their background, some tie with their language and some tie with their traditions, are wrong to argue that French

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . is a minority grouping like every other minority grouping and should have the same privileges and rights as these minority groupings. I think it's to the benefit of the ethnic minorities that we recognize that Canada is not a homogeneous country, it's a heterogeneous country, that it is a country which makes possible the living together of two founding nations, two founding peoples, in this case the French and English founders of our country. But by broadening ourselves that far, Mr. Speaker, by broadening ourselves to the extent that Canada is not a country which strives towards a homogeneous personality or a homogeneous culture, we go one step further and say this makes it possible to think in terms of heterogeneity; this makes it possible for the rest of us to think in terms of people having a tie, a background and a tradition which they feel should be sustained and which they feel can contribute to the cultural plurality of our country.

So in making these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that I think that it's for the benefit of the Ukrainian population, that I think that it's for the benefit of the Jewish population, the German population, and all of our ethnic populations, that we in Canada recognize that our country is one which flourishes in heterogeneity. And the reason that we can do that, Mr. Speaker, the reason that we can do that, as distinct from what occurs in the United States is the accident of history. It's not something that we plotted; it's not something that we planned; but something that we are lucky enough to have and I say that we in this province should strive to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, there are some people who say that you cannot legislate culture and you cannot legislate a language. I tend to agree with that but I don't think that that is the answer to the enhancement of Canadian national unity through the use of French as a language of instruction in our schools and through the recognition of the heterogeneous nature of our society. And I give you this example. Mr. Speaker, as a child I grew up in the north-end and I can safely say that on the street on which I lived there were a large majority of Jewish families, and of those Jewish families very few of the children could speak any other language but Jewish. They spoke Jewish in the home; they spoke Jewish in the streets; and they did not hear English until they got to school. When they got to school the teacher said "Hello", and they got together with other children and they were legislated into the English language. If the teacher had said "Bonjour" instead of "Hello", they would have been speaking French. They owed no affinity to the Anglo-Saxon culture. It came as a result of our schooling, and I, Mr. Speaker, say that there's nothing whatsoever to prevent us having the same kind of respect for the other language of Canada as we do for the language of Canada, which is so largely characteristic of this province as the Member for St. John's pointed out to you yesterday.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation; I don't support it in its apparently limited objective. I think that it would be of great benefit to all of us in this province if we were able to speak Canadian. I remember in my early years people would come back from the Province of Quebec and say to me that the people there don't even know how to speak English, and this would be an abhorrent thing to me, that people in Canada couldn't speak English. I made my first trip to Quebec in approximately 1960 and when I got to Quebec I ran into the very experience which had been related to me, but it never occurred to me, or at least the impact on myself as an individual was not that they couldn't speak English, the impact on me was that I can't speak the Canadian language. These people are living in Canada, speaking what they think is Canadian - and what they have a right to think is Canadian - and I can't communicate with them. I think that one of the fundamental problems of our times is that two people speaking Canadian can't communicate with one another, and I, Mr. Speaker, have to lay the blame on that government which brought me up in Canada and didn't teach me to speak Canadian. They taught me to speak half-Canadian but they didn't teach me to speak Canadian.

I hope, Mr. Speaker - and I'm making an effort to correct what I consider to be a defect - I hope to be able to speak full Canadian in the hopefully near future, and I admit that it's a problem especially for a person who is older, but I hope that this will happen and I -- well, the Minister of Education indicates that he will help and I'm willing to take the help even if it's monetary in kind. I notice the -- and I digress for just a minute, but on the same subject there was a statement made by a Greater Winnipeg election candidate back member of the school board, James E. Forhan, who was against eliminating the \$100.00 adult education fee. The City of Winnipeg charges \$100.00 for adult education. He was against eliminating it - and I'm sure the Minister will be interested in hearing his reasons for being against it - he also said, "Some people on welfare or some of the unemployed who have nothing better to do anyway might converge upon the school in large numbers if the fee were eliminated."

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

Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard a more articulate reason for eliminating that fee, and if they teach French in those schools that's fine too, and if you want to eliminate the fee and teach French and give me that financial assistance, I'm not too proud to become a French-speaking person through the combined support of the people of the Province of Manitoba, and I ask nobody else to be too proud either.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill because I think that it has tremendous potential. I think its objectives are limited. I support it as a member of an ethnic minority group because I think that it gives to the ethnic minority groups a long-time insurance that they will live in a country where mutual tolerance, respect, and an opportunity for them to contribute what they are able to contribute by virtue of their backgrounds, because they are living in a country which recognizes that homogeneity is not the desired end, that there are different languages and different people, and the very basic characteristic of our country and our province proves that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, if no one further wishes to speak on this I just would like to close the debate on second reading of this Bill. I wish to thank all members for their contributions. Many have spoken more eloquently than I can on the matter and I am pleased that everyone has endorsed this in principle. I feel that it presents a challenge to the department in implementing this program.

Some questions were asked. I would just like to touch on some of them briefly. I believe the Member from St. John's -- I wasn't quite sure in his address yesterday whether he thought possibly the fact that language can be taught before and after school hours was a new provision. No, it has been in the Act for some time and is a matter of practice. It is going on in parts of Manitoba in the German language before school hours, so this is an older pattern. In the other languages, we're making admirable headway in the last few years in both Ukrainian and the German languages -- that is Germans in Grades 7 to 12 now or Ukrainians in Grade 9 to 12 -- and in our university, as we know this year, equal status on all these languages for university admission.

With respect to some of the questions that were asked during the debate: Are the social study text books readily available and will those chosen be similar to the books for social studies in English? Many of the titles in English are available and are in use as a matter of fact in Ontario, New Brunswick and Quebec, and if a particular title is not available in French then another book of comparably similar content will have to be substituted. We don't visualize too much difficulty there at all.

With respect to another question: Would it be necessary for a pupil to enroll in Français or French in order to qualify for social studies in French? No, social studies is really a requirement in the school curriculum whereas Français and French are options. However, it is more than likely that a student taking the social studies in French would also be taking Français or French, the two by affinity go together.

Another question asked was: Will social studies be available to any school wishing to introduce it? Regulations will certainly stipulate the conditions a particular school will have to satisfy in order to qualify for social studies in French, and this is going to present administrative problems to the department which we hope to be able to approach with an advisory committee under this Act, and preserving pedagogical or educational excellence which is spelled out in the Act also. It would depend in some cases maybe on the size of the school and the suitability of qualified teachers. We feel that most of the teachers who are now teaching Français in the list of numbers of collegiates and schools I mentioned earlier on second reading are well versed in history, and negotiations and discussions are taking place with St. Boniface College who I believe will be putting on a course this summer; and also we've been in touch with the university Faculty of Education, the in-service training.

In general terms, I think we'll have to approach the implementation of this Act in a very flexible manner and in a gradual manner, and within the resources and ability of our staff to develop the courses in concert with the other French educators and advisors who will be available to us.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: For the benefit of the honourable members who were not in the Chamber

(MR. SPEAKER, cont'd) . . . when this matter was being discussed, the vote is being taken on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education, namely, Bill No. 59. Those in favour of the motion please rise.

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. LYON: . . . those who are opposed to the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: I must inform the honourable members that I was so interested in seeing a unanimous vote -- those opposed to the motion please rise.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 52; Nays, Nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Bill No. 89. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my comments on Bill 89 will not be very lengthy. I did peruse the Bill and checked up on certain sections with The Public Schools Act, although there are so many of these sections referred to in this particular Bill and to which no notes are attached to the sections, so that you really don't know what they deal with unless you do check them. There are also many sections that are being repealed because of the new legislation being brought in.

I noticed for one thing that the trustees' indemnities are to be shown under a Schedule B and I find no schedule attached. No doubt this probably refers to some other Act. It doesn't mention the Act that it refers to, I don't think, and maybe the Minister can enlarge on this when he replies to the Bill, what the indemnities are going to be or the amounts that are going to be allowed.

I don't want to repeat what some of the other members who have already spoken have said. I notice for instance the bargaining and certification is taken care of and also certain matters are being referred to the Board of Reference. In this regard I find that presently, or in this past year, there are certain awards have been made by the Board of Reference that the people concerned in the districts are not really aware of what went on. We had a case locally where they had a meeting where certain school districts apparently that had been closed for two years - I think the action was taken under this part of the Schools Act - and now later on they find that an award has been made and that the school district is being dissolved, and here they are up in the air, they didn't know that this was taking place, and when the meeting that was held where the discussions took place apparently these people had not been informed to that effect and they are anxious to get it back now.

I don't know whether there is any provision in the School Act for such cases, but I feel that certain notices should be made mandatory and also that the people in these particular districts or areas and cases that come under consideration under this part, that they be informed as to what is going on and what is happening, and that these things don't arise and later on find that an award has been made of which they were not aware of.

Then I find for instance under Section 16 that the section reads: "Subsection (5) of Section 444 (C) of the Act as enacted by Chapter 50 of the Statutes of Manitoba, 1966, and as amended by another Act passed at this Session of the Legislature, is further amended." I fail to find or to know which other Act is referred to in this particular case. Probably the Minister could inform us on this as well.

I, too, find that on checking on the powers and duties of boards of unitary divisions that it reads, "The board of unitary division has the entire authority in respect of, and responsibility for, the provision of instruction in elementary and secondary school grades in the division." Then the following sections -- or when I then checked up on the Act you find that you have to go back through so many statutes in order to find just what you want and the information that you are seeking. It certainly would be advisable to have the whole Public Schools Act revised and consolidated so that we wouldn't continually have to check back and check back all the time when going through such legislation as is being proposed here today.

Then, too, the main point of this whole Bill seems to me the matter of grants, and here I find that this is all brought under regulations. It seems to me that this House will have no say in the matter of the grants that will be given and decided upon. This is a matter left to regulations and to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and the Public Finance Board. I feel that this



(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . . should be handled differently and that the grants that will be made should be set out and attached to the legislation, so that when changes are being made this House will have a say in the matter.

For instance, it was announced the other day that additional grants would be made to the divisions that did not vote themselves into the unitary system, yet there is nothing in the Bill itself to that effect and the changes are being made under regulations. I don't feel that this is right and proper. I feel that as members of the Legislature we should have a say in the matter. I will be commenting more on this particular matter when we get to Bill 93, because in my opinion this House has already voted the money for all these divisions to get the larger grants. This is what we were told when we considered the estimates. All that was needed and was left was the matter of tax rebates. The grants for the divisions, the moneys for that purpose were supplied in the estimates and have been voted on, so that I feel that these divisions definitely are entitled to the higher grants. In my opinion, the amount offered is far too low and is not even a compromise. In my opinion, it is an insult. I notice also that under this Section 504 which sets out the various items for which grants will be made, that we find Vocational and Evening Courses - this under (i) - and I am very happy to see that because I don't think this was listed in the White Paper. I might be wrong, I stand to be corrected on that, but I think this is the case. I am very happy that grants will be made for this purpose to divisions because I feel that particularly the City of Winnipeg has done a very good job in the way of offering evening classes, and then also that divisions will, as a result I hope, be able to offer vocational courses.

The way I understand the Bill, the capital indebtedness that will be incurred from time to time will rest on the divisions as entities, and even though the provincial Finance Board is the one that has control over this matter, the indebtedness will still be on the division itself. Whether the people have a vote on it or not, or whether the division board -- well, I take it they would have to ratify, or in the first analysis, agree to sponsoring such by-law. I also notice that it requires the authorization of the Municipal Board as well. Then in certain cases - and I think the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has already discussed this point and I don't know whether I should raise it at this particular time - it's in connection with the vote than can be held in certain cases if the Minister so decides. I hope that the Minister in replying to the Bill will give us some further information on this one point.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think these are the main points that I wish to raise under the regulations section. Then we have another section under regulations which is 507, and when I read under (e), prescribing terms and conditions subject to which grants payable, under this part and the regulations, shall be paid. To me it seems that -- and then also Section (h) prescribing procedures by which unitary divisions may submit matters to the Finance Board for approval. I take it this includes the budgets and that the budgets are subject to the provincial Finance Board. Just to what extent they will regulate these budgets, I don't know at the present time, and I'm sure that after a year or so we will know more about this. The Minister probably has some of the regulations already drawn up, so that if he could give us additional information on these points I would appreciate it.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I viewed the Bills concerning the new Foundation Program with considerable interest, and in particular the announcement by the Minister that he's going to, apparently through regulation, make adjustments to the old financing program and the old divisional set-up to take into consideration the results of the recent referendum, and I'm thinking here in particular the announcement that teachers at the elementary level would be given an additional \$300.00, or boards would be given an additional \$300.00 per teacher for elementary and \$400.00 for secondary teachers.

Now the teacher and one who -- former teacher at any rate who thinks about this sort of thing and who knows the feelings of people in the profession, I think this will be considered to be a good move by the people in the division and that at least in the short run this will be taken as a good feature because it will certainly not penalize the students or the children of the area who would otherwise suffer. So as perhaps a short term or a stop-gap measure this may be desirable, but when you look beyond the immediate situation and project the consequences of this action, then there may be some cause for concern, and I have some serious reservations on the wisdom of the Minister's move.

For example, teachers may be at least temporarily inclined to move to other divisions with superior educational systems, because the salaries will I suppose for all intents and purposes be similar, but they may also be less inclined, in the case of certain individuals, to promote the move towards single-district division. I'm certain that if you break down the various

(MR. DOERN, cont'd) . . . . peoples who are concerned in those 19 divisions which voted against the referendum of a month or so ago, that the ratepayers themselves certainly have the best of both worlds, because they have rejected the new Foundation Program and the new financing and realignments which go with it, and now are in effect going to get very significant educational benefits and financial benefits.

The member for Seven Oaks, who is well versed in municipal matters, calculates that in some of these divisions up to 75 percent of the costs are for salaries, and if so, if such a high percentage is for salaries and this is now going to in effect be capitulated, then what incentive is there for these divisions to come in, because if the government has made this concession, perhaps they'll make other concessions without imposing the conditions under which those financial grants were given in the first place. The boards are now relieved of certain financial burdens and incentives.

The problem is this, we are now going to pay first-class salaries in what may be described as second-rate systems. This is comparable I suppose to hiring a professional pitcher for an amateur ball team and saying to him: Take your ball team, go into the major leagues and win the division. They simply won't be able to compete in terms of ultimate quality because the teachers will have skills that they will not be able to use; they'll have skills which will atrophy because of the conditions they are in; they will be teaching courses that they were not properly trained or prepared for because of the heavy subject matter and the additional work loads in some of these divisions, and so on. And the students themselves will be confronted with little choice in courses; they will be taught by teachers who will not have adequate time to prepare their lessons; and they will have teachers who will be under great pressure to attempt to keep up with changes in curriculum.

The government may in some senses be accused of bad faith with those divisions which did support the referendum and which therefore were told, "if you support it you'll be given financial benefits." Now it's obvious that whether you support it or not, you would be given some greater incentives. The government said on repeated occasions that they would not change the rules in the middle of the game. They were questioned on this a number of times. The Minister himself made bold statements; the Premier claimed that he would not change the rules; and they did change the rules.

I think if we examine the various positions of the political parties on this we come to some fairly interesting conclusions. The New Democratic Party consistently supported the single-district divisions and holds to the value of that approach, and has fought for that approach and will continue to support the idea that this is the only and best way of promoting education in the province.

The Conservative Party has now altered its position, and in a sense compromised the future of education in an important segment of our province. I think that they might have given more serious thought to having waited until new referendums were held. They said they were going to wait for new referendums; they're going to promote new referendums; there was a move, a grass roots drive and so on to bring in more divisions, and before that move had a chance to gather any significant impetus, they have now gone and undercut or at least reduced some of the incentives.

But to me it is the Liberal Party which has in my opinion completely switched horses. They first supported the single-district division and now that appears to have been lip-service support. When we listen to the members of their Party who are most vocal, they demand greater and greater remuneration and greater and greater funds for the divisions which decided not to come in under the plan. They act as if their original position never existed and they act as if they were always against it. In fact, if we listened to the position of the Honourable Member for Rhineland who gives the Social Credit point of view in this Legislature, I can not discriminate or distinguish any difference between the position put forward by the Liberal Party at present and the position put forward by the Social Credit Party.

So I think that although as a short-run measure the increase to those teachers in those divisions is a good thing. I think that it has serious long-run implications, and certainly given the policy of the government, they have just cut the ground from under their own feet.

There's one other point that I would like to mention and I don't know whether it comes in under this Bill or one of the others, and this is the question of transportation and the boundary outlines of the various school divisions. I think transportation was a major consideration on the part of the people living in rural Manitoba, as it should be - nobody likes the idea of having children spending long hours on the bus going and coming from school - and I think

(MR. DOERN, cont'd) . . . . that the Department of Education, if it's not within their powers to redraw these boundaries, should advise the Boundaries Commission of some of the educational facts in the province and that when they are considering the design of these boundaries that that design in itself is important, because if you have long, thin, narrow boundaries and you have to in effect build a school in the central part of that division, if you're going to bring the people in tremendous distances this is naturally going to make them more inclined to vote against any consolidation or centralization of education. So I think some very serious thought should be given to the geographic limits and design of divisions when we're implementing this new plan.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I will be very very short, but the former speaker - possibly I would understand his words if he got up and said that I am now speaking as a teacher - but I can not understand him saying what he does as a member of the Legislature representing his own constituency and the rest of Manitoba for that matter. I am very much afraid -- I doubt when he says that the \$300.00 that will now be granted to the elementary grades or teachers and the \$400.00 to the secondary, I am very much afraid that this is not correct, that the first-class salaries are now in the second-class divisions because of the amounts granted in the form of 300 and \$400.00. This is fine and appreciated, but this is a long ways off from the original \$3,600 to the now foundation grant of \$5,200. And while much appreciation should be extended in what little help is given, I am under the opinion that more could have been, because these people have spoken out - and I for one was very much for the new system, I think I've done my duty to try and fight for it as much as we could - but in the meantime there are a lot of aspects and a lot of things to consider and I don't think we need to go into this.

But I don't think for one minute that the teachers in the rural areas or in the divisions that voted against on March 10th, the communities where these teachers will now teach, I think will get the same first-class teaching. I think as a teacher he would know that these teachers will not take advantage of the situation because they are not necessarily receiving government money. It's the municipalities that will be paying more, and I'm sure we can retain our good teachers.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, if there's no one further to speak on Bill 89, I would like to close the debate and trust I'll get the same unanimous response as we did with the French Bill - or Bill 59.

Several questions have been raised and really many of these - I think in Law Amendments - there's so many alterations to Bill 89, or so many sections, we could clarify these at that committee stage, but I could start today by dealing with those who have spoken.

The Member for Rhineland wondered about certain sections re trustees' indemnities. These are spelled out in the regulations of The Public School Act. As you remember, we brought in a uniform salary schedule about two years ago - or indemnity schedule. This Section 5 just refers to the provisions in the Bill 89, amendments to The Public School Act that affect these indemnities and clarification. These indemnities as recommended would be the same for single-district divisions as they are at the present time.

With respect to the Board of Reference and a district being dissolved without anybody knowing about it. As you know, districts are dissolved by many methods - the Municipal Council by by-law. The other provisions of the Act take hold with respect to people must petition on both sides, an arbitrator is appointed and so on. There's been no change in that and the Board of Reference provisions here respecting the Board of Reference just clarify and broaden the kinds of problems that we can send to the Board of Reference. We may have a further small amendment to that in Law Amendments because another situation has arisen. There's many combinations of situations that can arise, but in no case, to my knowledge, can anything go ahead like that without a public hearing, without a petition, as provided under the Act. So any specific case he has, I'd be glad to hear about it.

In Section 16 he mentioned that another -- I mentioned that this provision had been made earlier. Bill 4 was passed before the last Session in connection with the vote, and that's where that provision is maintained. With respect to the question of -- so difficult to follow The Public School Act around now as we've amended it from year to year. That's quite true and I think I mentioned earlier that we're intending to revise the entire Act. I believe our target date will be to have the whole thing started this year with the idea of pulling the whole Act together and make it more orderly so the members can follow it more readily.

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

Grants. We continue to hear the same question by many speakers, "Why can't you spell more out in the Act?" I think traditionally the nature of the regulations as indicated in speaking on the second reading of the school Finance Board Bill, it's so hard to put right into the Act the various combinations of situations that can arise. Certainly the regulations are available and have to be Gazetted, and we'll do our best to have the regulations before the members as soon as possible afterwards. In that connection, last year we did vote a sum of money to cover the grants to all divisions, and hopefully there would have been more unitary divisions, but at the time of voting the departmental estimates the honourable members had the opportunity to find out just what we have in mind.

Certainly the regulations will spell out in some detail the grant structure along the lines as outlined in the White Paper. I don't think there's any tendency here to avoid giving information to the members, but in administering - for example transportation - as I said yesterday, the administration advise me of the need for pretty detailed regulations, all of which would be quite difficult, if not impossible and imprudent, to put right in the statutes.

There'll be an amendment to Bill 89 that I'll be proposing at Law Amendments which spells out, just to make it clear, that the content of the Foundation Program is the matter which will be under the ambit of the School Finance Board.

The Honourable Member from Elmwood questions the wisdom of the government in extending some assistance by way of teacher grants because of our concern for the education of the boys and girls in the non-unitary divisions. Other speakers thought we were playing politics, etc. As far as I'm concerned, this is a matter of judgment. I'm still predicated to the objective of seeing single-district unitary divisions across this province. I sincerely believe it is in the best public interest and I'm going to continue to do - as long as I'm in this office - what I can to bring this about by persuasion, and I think that we want these people to feel that we are not waving a club over their heads but that we have to support with our money the kind of system we think is best. I really believe that most members of this Legislature concur in that sentiment, and while I would like to achieve the best of both worlds as well as they would, nonetheless, when one has the responsibility as a member of the government, and especially in my position, I hope that this will be of some assistance while at the same time bring to the attention of the people our concern that they continue to examine this.

Certainly under Bill 16 votes can be held this fall by three routes. By the volition of the Minister, which on 20 percent of the petition of the electors or by 50 percent of the school boards in any division petitioning to come in, there shall be a vote. I would hope that this fall that many would reconsider and examine it, and certainly I would like to give every assistance to them in understanding the program further. We've had a great deal of feed-back, if you want to call it that, in the last few several weeks and I am most optimistic, but this will take some time and we'll have to feel our way.

With respect to transportation as raised by the Member from Elmwood. With respect to transportation, geographical limits and so on throughout the province, we have -- I know this is of great concern to the people on the local level. In rural Manitoba this was the burning issue: How far are you going to transport our boys and girls? This is a matter which it wasn't always easy to give all the answers because this would be under the jurisdiction of the particular divisional board who, hopefully with the assistance of the government, the transportation officer in the department and district engineers and so on, that satisfactory routes would not keep the child on a bus possibly more than an hour to an hour and a quarter coming and going to school. And by using smaller buses, as somebody raised earlier, we've certainly been talking about this in the department for some time. There's all sorts of things here that one can't pontificate on; one can't enshrine in statute; one has to leave to regulations and to the good sense of the local people who know the local situation.

With respect to some of the other matters raised, the Member from Emerson who started the debate off in this area was fearful of local autonomy. Of course I feel unitary boards in charge of education from kindergarten to Grade 12 with their superintendents and supervisory staff would be more autonomous than other boards, and develop their own experimental programs within their own areas with our assistance, or co-operation with us, or alone, and I still think that this is the case. He talked about why do they have to borrow money. Well, it's quite true that under the provisions of the Finance Board and these two Acts, it is envisaged that we would have realistic ceilings on capital, that the Minister would be given some discretion in approving certain projects, that in others it was certainly in the public interest possibly to have the

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) . . . . provision that should we disagree when a board persists on a certain project, there would be nothing wrong with letting them put it to the electors.

He also spoke of nepotism, the possibility of some trustees having relatives on the boards and so on. I would just point out to the House that this has been a matter of concern to me for some time as Minister, that over the years I think The Public Schools Act has always carried the provision to protect against the possibility of a family compact type of operation at a local level in a smaller school possibly, and as our divisional system has grown we now have a necessary provision in the Act that any trustee coming on to the board, if he has a relative teaching, must get the permission of the Minister to have that lady continue or man continue teaching. To me this would seem to be wrong in principle in a way, in the sense that if I'm teaching on a board and my brother runs for public office, which is his business, and the board has to get permission of the Minister for me to continue teaching, it would seem to interfere with my tenure rights and everything else. So my policy in the past years has been to approve these things as long as I had a unanimous resolution of the Board that this should continue, but in the coming year we should look at this with the possibility of some further amendments at a later date.

With respect to the superintendency and collective bargaining, this is something I would like to discuss further with the department. It's a very interesting point and I shall bring it up. This was mentioned by the Honourable Member from Burrows.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there were many other statements made with respect to Bill 89. The Member from Seven Oaks spoke of it possibly being a buffer, a mechanism to do the dirty work for the government and that sort of thing, which I don't quite accept. They may be so imbued with dollars and cents that they forget good education, etc.

I would remind the members of the House that the Foundation Program remains with the Minister; the regulations with respect to the operations of the Finance Board remain with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; the Finance Board is the agent which is necessary to approve the moneys under the uniform differentiated standard levy, and hopefully we can streamline and improve the method of payment to boards. There's been most interesting observations with respect to, for example, the fiscal year of school boards which has traditionally been from the beginning of the year, January to December. This might well be looked at and certainly we should be happy to look at these suggestions.

I would hope just to close second reading with those comments, Mr. Speaker, and be prepared with my officials to deal with any specific knotty sections at the Law Amendment stage.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 93. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD L. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat heartened by the words of the Minister of Education in regard to his compassion for the students at schools. I was somewhat concerned about the remarks of other members who seemed to take the fact that because the parents made a mistake that the children should suffer. I think this is a wrong attitude to take and I think we should be prepared to accept the facts and have in mind primarily that our children are our greatest assets and they are the ones that we should provide our educational system towards. It's true that 19 divisions did turn down the vote, but certain amendments and changes have been made by the Minister in which I concur in and agree with and he is looking in this respect to the betterment of the students within those divisions and other divisions that they apply to.

But one point I wish to bring out, Mr. Speaker, and I will take my own constituency as an example, that this unified board is not a new factor in regard to their application to education over the many years. I think the Minister will agree with me that in this particular area there were more one-roomed schools in that particular area than pretty well any other part of the province, and since about 1964 or '65 the elementary boards, by persuasion and by education, have reduced this now to a minimum and they are still consolidating the schools with the elementary.

Now the position that it puts these particular areas, and I'll name the three towns - Deloraine, Killarney and Boissevain - puts them in this position. If we have any consideration at all for the pupils, for the ones that we are interested in and the moneys that we are providing for to upgrade our children, I would like you to take one look at this factor. Here we have, from what we had elementary schools to take care of a town population, that we have now expanded and moved the pupils from the rural municipalities in vast numbers and we do not have

(MR. DOW, cont'd) . . . . accommodation for them. The outcome has been that we in these areas, because of the fact that our capital grant structure is a difference of 25 percent, the people will hesitate to put a by-law vote up to the people in that community knowing full well that within the next year or two they will be coming into the unified system, and this will be a costly matter as far as they are concerned. But my greatest concern, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the sooner and the faster that these boards can be informed that they will have considerations of capital grants to take care of a unified system that will be turned over to a unified board, the better it is for the pupils within our particular areas, and I am thinking that this will apply in a lot of areas throughout Manitoba.

We in our areas at the present time are trying to convert old halls, old basements or anything else to try and provide the educational system to these children. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is not playing fair with the children that we are trying to provide our money for. It is true the parents made a mistake, as far as I am concerned, but I don't want to be a party to take it out on the children. Here we are sitting in the year of Canada's birthday, and for legislators to go back and have to say, I'm sorry kids we have got to wait until your parents vote you in before we will take some consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to give consideration - if nothing else - if he can't see his way clear to increase the grants equal to the unified boards, give consideration to the fact that they do go ahead and provide proper accommodation for these children. This province over the last eight or ten years has been bragging about the wonderful schools we have had in the province, and I agree - I agree - and now I don't want to be in a position where we are going to take a large number of elementary schools and put them in slap-happy little places to give them an education. They would have been far better, Mr. Speaker, not to have even moved into consolidation if they have to end up with this kind of a position. So I make a plea to the Minister to give some consideration through his department that this is being corrected, that we will have proper buildings as fast as we can to look after the wants of these elementary children.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would you now please call Bill No. 97.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 97. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUS E, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the First Minister when he says that this Bill will be a cause of embarrassment to the Members of this House inasmuch as they are dealing with a matter in respect of which they have a personal pecuniary interest. I feel, too, that the First Minister was much more statesmanlike in his moving of the second reading of this Bill than the Honourable Leader of the NDP, who in one place in his remarks yesterday stated that he was not speaking as Leader of the NDP but as the Member for Radisson, although in the first part of his remarks no such mention was made, and I think a reading of his speech would convince most members that when he was speaking as Member for Radisson he was only speaking in reference to referring this Bill to Law Amendments Committee.

Now the Leader of the NDP, and I think it would be worthwhile to read what he has to say and I'm quoting from Page 2722 of yesterday's Hansard, and he says near the bottom of the second paragraph, "I want to say to this Assembly that the members of my caucus have given this matter deep and earnest consideration and there has been a wide divergence of views, at least to some degree. Some felt that there might have been some validity in referring the matter to a Commission, as indeed the Member for Lakeside suggested the other day. Personally, I join with the conclusions that the Member for Lakeside arrived at, namely, that eventually and basically the responsibility is ours in this House.

"There are members of my group I confess, Mr. Speaker, that wondered whether or not there should not be further deductions from the taxable portion if an increase were granted. There were some who felt that maybe the amount arrived at was not the proper amount. These are the matters that were under consideration I say within my own particular group." Then he goes on to say, "Mr. Speaker, but I think by and large it is agreed that this is a matter generally that should be approached on a purely non-political basis and I trust and hope that this is the manner in which it will be considered by all members of this House."

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).....

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a government Bill. It was introduced by the First Minister as such and this is a Bill which cannot be considered on a non-political basis, because if this Bill is defeated the government goes down to defeat with it, and I say that the suggestion that this matter be considered on a non-political basis is absurd and pure tommyrot.

Now further on on Page 2723, the Honourable Leader of the NDP party - and in this case he seems to be speaking as the Member for Radisson but not as the Leader of his Party - says, "I personally, not speaking as Leader of the New Democratic Party but rather in this particular instance as a Member for Radisson, suggest that Bill 97 should pass second reading without too much debate, particularly debate of any nature of antagonism or on a basic political approach and let us consider the matter where we have full freedom in the Committee of the Whole House."

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me that is a very very strange statement to come from the Leader of a party which professes to be the champion of the working man, the champion of the oppressed and the depressed and the poor, and the saviour of mankind. We would at least expect a statement from the Leader of the NDP, whether he is speaking as a private member or whether he is speaking as Leader of his group - and I submit, Mr. Speaker, he can't speak in a dual capacity, he is either speaking as one or the other - we would at least expect a statement of policy coming from this party and not a suggestion that this matter should be considered on a non-political basis, unless of course what he means to say is that there should be a free vote in his own party.

I would refer you back to the discussion. Now this man is talking towards the end, not as a leader of a group but simply as a private member, yet he purports to tell to this House what transpired in his own caucus, and according to the statement that he made to this House, there were only two things considered by his caucus: first, as to whether or no the amount of exemption was too high; and second, whether or no the matter should be referred to Law Amendments Committee of a special committee.

Now with reference to the matter of exemption of \$2,400, it seems strange that there should be that discussion in his party now when a little while ago we were considering the \$3,000 exemption which was given the Cabinet Ministers and they thought it was all right.

MR. PAULLEY: We did not.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You did.

MR. PAULLEY: We did not.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You did.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll be hearing about that again too.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well I'm waiting.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I want you to ...

MR. HILLHOUSE: You want to what?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Now reverting to what the Leader of the NDP says, whether it's as leader of the party or as the Member for Radisson, he says this is a matter that should be treated on a non-political basis. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is a matter that should be treated on a basis of your conscience, not on a basis of your political thoughts, and that is the context in which I intend to deal with it.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are not only embarrassed, but having regard to all the circumstances and attendant facts surrounding the introduction of this Bill, if we pass this Bill the public can rightfully charge us with blatant hypocrisy and of sacrificing our principles for our own self-aggrandizement.

The First Minister in introducing this Bill, in part, sought to justify it on the basis that other provinces were paying higher indemnities than we were receiving in the Province of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, to me, that comparison alone is irrelevant. I think the only basis upon which we can justify in this House an increase in indemnity is whether or no we can afford that increase and whether or no we can afford it under present legislation without considering Bill 65 or 56. Now the sales tax Bill was introduced into this Legislature on the grounds that the Province of Manitoba required the money to meet its current and contingent liabilities. That was the reason we had to have it. The First Minister - or the Provincial Treasurer advised us that such legislation was absolutely necessary, and it is out of that sales tax, in part, which is going to be paid into Consolidated Revenue that we are going to get the money to pay this added indemnity.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd)...

I say to the First Minister if he wanted to commit political suicide, he fired the first shot when he brought in his sales tax Bill and he's giving himself the coup de grace with this Bill increasing the indemnities of members, because this Bill increasing the indemnities of members would not be possible without a sales tax. To say that we should increase our indemnities simply because other provinces pay higher indemnities than we do, is in my opinion like my saying that I'm going to borrow some money to buy a coloured TV because my neighbour has one. It's just as simple as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that there was nothing altruistic in the Honourable First Minister introducing this legislation into the House. I think he was forced to do so from the pressure brought by his own members, and if I were to hazard a guess, I would say that this is part of the price that he is paying for the loyalty of his own members. His own members were opposed to the increase or the method used for increasing Ministers' salaries. They were quite outspoken in their opposition to that method, outside of the House. His own members were also opposed, outside of the House, to the sales tax Bill, and I suggest that I wouldn't be unreasonable in hazarding the guess that that is the price that is being paid.

MR. LYON: ...have to remind the honourable member of a rule of which he is well aware, that he should not ascribe bad motives to other people when he may well be aware himself that the motives that he ascribed are not true.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't ascribe anything. I said if I were to hazard a guess. I didn't say that I'd made the guess. —(Interjection)—Now it's very important to note too, Mr. Speaker, that the Throne Speech was absolutely solid on this proposed legislation, and it is further important and very significant to note, as all members know, that shortly after I made my first resolution regarding the reduction of ministers' salaries, and that was made on January 24, 1967, we became aware that it was the intention of the government to bring in a bill increasing indemnity salaries, and when we were made aware of that we were also made aware of the fact that it was the intention of the government to withdraw that bill unless they got the support of the majority of the members of the House. Now, as a group, we made no deal with the government in that respect, I don't know whether any deal was made between the government and the party to my left — that's up to them to disclose. But it's perfectly evident to me from what was said in the halls by members of the government and other members in this House, that it was the intention of the government not to proceed with this legislation unless they were assured of a majority, a majority support. And I believe that that support must have been forthcoming before this bill was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, this is a government which has placed great emphasis on priorities. As late as two days ago we heard the Minister of Urban Renewal and Municipal Affairs read a long telegram which she had sent to Ottawa on the question of priorities; but what is the government's performance in respect of priorities? It's interesting to note the following: In the first place they increased the Cabinet Ministers' salaries when this House was not in session. In the second place they defeated a motion to increase the minimum wage in this province to \$1.25 an hour. In the third place they introduced this sales tax legislation which contains provisions of double taxation, taxation of children's clothing, taxation of working men's apparel — even when that particular apparel is required for the particular job that's being done, and I refer specifically to the men employed at the Manitoba Rollings Mills at Selkirk on the open hearth, who have to have special types of clothing in order to be able to stand the extreme heat under which they are working. Now these men go through, I believe about a pair of shoes a month. These shoes are fairly expensive, yet the government here, considering priorities as of prime importance in legislation being brought down in Manitoba, refused to grant any exemption in respect of working men's apparel.

In the fourth place, this government too, on the basis of its idea of priority, brings in a Medicare Bill without first ensuring that the necessary regional medical arrangements had been made to retain medical men here, and in failing to take the necessary steps to see that there will be sufficient doctors available to ensure the proper and effective working of such a plan.

And finally, as an act of anti-climax, they bring in Bill 97. That is the government's record of priorities. Mr. Speaker, I am not approaching this matter on a political basis, but I do approach it ...

SOME MEMBERS: Oh-h-h.

MR. PAULLEY: Only you are pure.



MR. HILLHOUSE: My self-righteous friend to the left there, he can't stand that anybody in this House can have honest motives... I believe that this is a matter of conscience. We should determine whether or no the people of Manitoba can afford this increase, and in the light of the legislation that we have recently passed, namely imposing the most inequitable type of taxation upon them without any regard for ability to pay. I submit that this bill should be withdrawn, and if this bill is proceeded with I submit that it should not be referred to the Law Amendments Committee but it should be referred to the Committee on Unconscionable Transactions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question. My question to my honourable friend is, was he speaking officially on behalf of the Liberal Party of Manitoba.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I was speaking as a member. I am not the Leader of my party. The Leader of my party is quite capable of speaking on behalf of his own party and he does not have to hide behind the fact that he is the member for some other constituency.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Are you ready for the question?

... continued on next page

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I must compliment the Member for Selkirk on his courage, but I would suggest that if he's going to go around the hallways quoting rumours, he'd better turn up his hearing aid. I speak as a backbencher and I join the crowd, I speak for myself; but I was not bought by the suggestion of this Bill. If the Member for Selkirk wishes to suggest that I, as the Member for Churchill, could be bought by this type of a bill, then he has a lot of learning to catch up with. It's up to the rest of my party to defend themselves on this type of a statement and I don't care at this time to speak for them or for other members of the House, but I am sure that there was no member of the House that was bought by this type of a bill. And I think that members, both on this side and the other side, certainly are above being bought by the suggestion of this type of a bill.

I don't think, as far as I understand, that there was any suggestion that any party or parties would support this type of a bill, as the Member of Selkirk said. I feel that this is something that reaches into the personal being of each of us and we have to consider it on this basis. Perhaps we on the government side will take a little more licking than the rest of them as this is being considered, but I think this is a fair suggestion. The government is growing and so is the responsibility of members. Some of us will be here for years and some of us won't, but certainly the longer that you stay in this Assembly and the more you are called on to the duties of this Assembly, would demand that the pay be in respect to the time it is required to do the duties.

Each side of this House has a lot of work to do; each in his own way has a lot of people to be responsible for; and certainly if the people of our own individual constituencies, Mr. Speaker, feel that we have not done the job properly, they're the ones that are paying the shot and they're the ones that can decide whether they should have somebody else representing them. But in suggesting this Bill we are not selfishly asking for remuneration for ourselves alone. Certainly not. It is for those that follow also, and there is no guarantee that any of us will be here four or five years from now, so I don't see where this can be taken as a selfish motive. If there are those that feel they don't require the money, then there's no law. It's permissive, they can turn it back. They can turn it back. If they feel that they have a guilty conscience and they are taking money from the taxpayer that they don't deserve, or if they feel that they have not done enough for the taxpayer to deserve a raise, then let them give it back. There are lots of ways to give it back. Maybe you can make a little political mileage by giving it back rather than standing here saying that "I don't want it and I don't think anybody else should have it." So the door isn't closed. You can have your raise; you can have your cake and eat it too. You can give it back and you'll get the headline - it'd be a good headline. But if you feel that you are doing a job for your constituency, if you feel that you have earned your money, then I suggest that we consider this Bill and pass it. There's always the opening for those that don't feel that they can conscientiously put out their hand and take their pay cheque; they can turn it back. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we go on with this and pass it and then let our conscience be our guide when we decide whether we have earned the money in view of what we have done or have tried to for the constituency and the people which we represent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to what was said by the Honourable Member for Selkirk who delivered of himself an impassioned oration to the largest extent -- well to a large extent criticizing my leader and the government, and when he touched on what was -- his comments on what my leader said when he spoke on this matter, I paid fairly particular note to what he said. This Member for Selkirk, a member of the LPP Party, has criticized my leader on three counts. He criticized him as being the leader of our group and daring, daring to speak in his own capacity.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I did not.

MR. CHERNIACK: He says he did not but as far as I am concerned he did. And he went on to say, "And here . . ." and he quoted the Honourable Leader and said: "Here I think he's speaking for himself," and then he quoted - the actual words were that my leader said: "I personally am not speaking as Leader of the New Democratic Party but rather in this particular instance as the Member for Radisson." He quoted it but he didn't yet quite accept the fact that he was speaking in that capacity, and he did, and if he rereads what he said he'll see that he suggested criticism on the Leader of the New Democratic Party for daring to express his own point of view rather than that of spokesman of his party. Of course, the Honourable Member for Selkirk doesn't have that problem because he is not the leader of his party and therefore doesn't even ever have to declare himself in that way. So this was a criticism on his part.

He also criticized - and I now say he dared to criticize - my leader for mentioning some

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . of the points of view of members of our party as they were expressed in caucus, and I wonder at the presumption of a person outside of the caucus of the New Democratic Party to decide for the party and for the caucus what it shall report, or what shall be reported about what goes on in the caucus; and he dared further to say that what was reported appeared to be all that was discussed in caucus, and I think he was just talking out of the excitement of the moment and his enthusiasm in his own righteousness, and I suppose one should forgive him for that and I hope to reach the stage where I am prepared to.

He criticized my leader for suggesting that this should be approached on a non-political basis, and then he proceeded to say that he was not approaching this on a political basis. He dared to suggest to my leader that this should be a matter of his own conscience not on a political basis, which again is a contradiction of what he said just a moment before, and then said he was looking at it as a matter of his own conscience. Does he not give the right to other people to deal on their own conscience on a non-political basis? And yet he seemed to suggest that that was the case. And dealing with his own conscience he then delivered of himself - which he had a perfect right to do - his attitude in what he had said. But he also spoke of our party as having agreed to the exemptions in the Ministers' salaries, and I think if he knew the truth - and I think that he probably does know the truth - and if he has been listening to what has been said, he should know full well that we opposed exemptions in Cabinet Ministers -- a portion of the Cabinet Ministers' salaries. He knows, if he was here or if he read Hansard or if he read the newspapers, that we opposed it and we stated our position so clearly that I thought that even the Honourable Member for Selkirk, had he not been here, would know what our position was.

But for his benefit and on the assumption that he wants to be fair and on the assumption that he wants the truth to be spoken and wants to repeat it, I'll repeat it for him; that on the question of the first vote on the Minister's salary - I believe it was on Education - we spoke against; we voted against the increase in the Minister's salary, and we spoke against and we voted against the exemption provided in the increased Minister's salary. And on the second occasion when the LPP Party brought up this matter for the second Minister's salary to be reviewed, we stated, and we stated it openly and we didn't state it in any corridors or lobbies, that we felt that there were two points at issue. Firstly, we had an 80-hour limit and we did not feel that it would be of any advantage to this House to be repeating debates again and again, and twelve times as would be the case on Ministers' salaries, to restate our view at all times; that we felt that having stated it, it was sufficient to be accepted as being our point of view, and that it should not be necessary to review it twelve times, and we stated we should not take up the time of the House nor encroach on the 80 hours - I think I said minutes earlier but I meant 80 hours of debate for the estimates. And we said further that we did not believe in merit rating of Ministers, and that we did not believe that there should be a variation in Ministers' salaries, and we did that on the practical basis that the first Minister's salary had been established by debate and by vote, and we did not accept the technical approach that the second or the fourth or the twelfth Minister's salary should be any different from that of the first - and when I say the "first" Minister, I mean the Minister first discussed rather than the Minister of Education. And since people such as the Honourable Member for Selkirk seem to feel it necessary to bring this matter up again, we had occasion more than once after that to restate our point of view, and we voted against the amendment to reduce the salary and against the amendment to take out the exemption for the stated reasons.

Now that the Honourable Member for Selkirk has cooled down somewhat I would expect of him the courtesy to review what he said and to assess how close to the truth he came. And I would expect of him - and I think I've a right to because I've known him long enough to respect his opinion and his integrity - to say so, and that that is that our position was made clear enough that had he paid attention to it he would have recognized it. So that he could withdraw what he said which added, I think, nothing to the level or content of this debate, and was completely unnecessary in saying what he had a right to say, and what I do respect his opinion on, and that is his attitude on this bill. It seems to me it was unnecessary. I hate to suggest it, but I do, that when he made that portion of the speech he was speaking politically and not according to his conscience. I believe when he swung over to the question of indemnities as in the Bill that he then spoke on the matter of his conscience although it was very hard to accept his statement in the light of what preceded it. Yet he said so and I accept it. But certainly his attack on -- I don't know whether it was intended as a personal attack or an attack on the Leader of the New Democratic Party or an attack on the Member for Radisson. That of course remains a matter for the conscience of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I too resent the approach taken yesterday by the Leader of the socialist party; not because he spoke as a private member - this is his business - but because of some of the things that he said. One thing that I remember was that "I believe that I can say without any equivocation that the matter will not be approached insofar as those of us in the NDP on a political basis." A little later on he said, "I suggest that Bill No. 97 should pass second reading without too much debate, particularly debate of any nature of antagonism or on a basic political approach." It is quite odd, Mr. Speaker, that all of a sudden when we have something touchy, something that could be embarrassing, please, boys, no more politics. No politics at all. This would seem to indicate - these two sentences that I read - that the Leader of the socialist party wants one thing. He wants to make the ground rules. He wants to say here: "If you are in favour of this going to second reading, fine. You're playing the game. You're not playing politics. But if you dare oppose this Bill you're playing politics." And by the way, the members across the House laughed a while ago. This is exactly what they want us to believe, what they want the people of Manitoba to believe. Well if these same people can get up and say, "This is our responsibility," how can they try to deny me the right to speak, or if I speak against this, say that I am political? Say that I'm political.

A MEMBER: Nobody said that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Nobody said that, and they're not insinuating this at all. Well, this is fine, Nobody said this so don't say it now because I'm going to oppose this Bill. Right?

MR. SPEAKER: I sense a feeling that the discussion is going to develop into something rather explosive.

MR. DESJARDINS: You might be right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think it's necessary. I think that everything that has to be said can be said in a rational way and I would ask those who have the floor in the following moments to kindly keep that in mind. I really have no intention of allowing this discussion to get out of hand.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, are you suggesting that I did anything out of hand so far?

MR. SPEAKER: I ...

MR. DESJARDINS: You're anticipating.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think it's fair for me to say that his avenue of debate might have a tendency to provoke an argument, so I ask him to ...

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they're not all going to agree with me. But I want to get this thing straightened out right now, that if they are not suggesting, if they are not trying to set up the rule that if you just very kindly let it go through -- some people wanted to see it all go through yesterday, the first day; well then that everything is fine, you're following your conscience, you feel that you're well paid and therefore everything is fine, but if that you dare oppose this then you are playing politics. But my honourable friend says this is not the case. I'm very pleased. So now it's established that they didn't play politics, that I'm not going to play politics, so we can proceed.

As I say, I certainly oppose this. I do not think that it was right to say, "Let's look at this in an unpolitical way." Because politics is nothing more, nothing less, than the governing of the affairs of the people of Manitoba. A political business. The political affairs, social affairs, the affairs of the people. We are politicians; we are dealing with politics; and we cannot get away from this. And if we want to get away from politics we cannot say, "Let's not be political," on the one hand and then on the other hand say, "I go along with the Honourable Member for Lakeside that I think this is our responsibility." If it is our responsibility, it's politics. Partisan politics, that's something else. Maybe this is what they meant. But I remember getting up just last week and asking the people, telling them that I felt that this Medicare thing was one of the most important problems facing the people of Manitoba. I remember this, and I remember telling them how difficult the work of the Minister of Health was, had been, and would be. And I remember telling them that we had to settle this business of hospitalization soon, that we were now going down on the standard; we were in danger of going down in the standard of care that we would give the people of Manitoba. I remember this. And I also said not to be non-political but to approach this in a non-partisan way. It was credited. I probably disagree more with the Member from Inkster than any member in this House, but at least I know where I am when I'm battling or debating with him. He doesn't bring any red

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . herrings; he doesn't do anything like this. He states; he give me credit for having some ideas. If he doesn't believe in them he tells the people and he tells me and I do the same thing, but I know where he stands. But unfortunately, the Member from St. John's wasn't quite as straightforward as far as I'm concerned when he spoke on the debate, and he brought a lot of things in. Maybe what he said was right, some of the things. But I mean, is it only misquoting if you change a word or if you try to change the meaning? And I think that this is very important. The Member from St. John's is very good at pouring oil on troubled waters, like he did today, when his party is kind of shaky. This is fine. Kind of, "Well go back in your hole, Member from Selkirk, and when you're all set, when you're calmed down, you'll look at the thing the same as I do." Well this is not necessarily so. This is not necessarily so.

Now, there are a lot of things to face in this Bill. There are a lot of things. When we brought this question of Minister's salary, I brought in the amount because I didn't agree with the First Minister, the amount. I said that this wasn't the main thing; it wasn't the important thing; that we did not agree in our Party on this, although I did not like the idea of him comparing somebody that just came out of law school to the Chief Justice of this province. Oh, they played on words. I had the misfortune of saying "housewife". I was against motherhood because I mentioned the word "housewife." And you remember that, Mr. Speaker. All right. But then I said it was the way this was done. Again I made the suggestion, my suggestion that maybe if we were dealing with such a budget it might be an idea to have such an amount of percentage to govern this, to spend this money, and I said maybe we should have different levels of Cabinet Ministers. And we have it. We have a Minister without Portfolio -- we haven't got him yet but I suspect that maybe after the oration or the prayer, whatever we had from the Minister from Churchill, he might be it after today. I suspect that maybe this is the case. But in the meantime I suggest that this -- this wasn't my reason for voting against this Bill but this is my friend -- and I think it was the Member from St. John's again brought this in that this is what I had in mind and I was discriminating against Cabinet Minister. Well if we're going to follow one rule, let everybody follow the rules at all times in this debate.

Now today I'm going to mention about the amount, and again I say this is not the important thing, but let's look at the amount. The amount now will be for the members if this goes through, \$3,600 tax free for some members, the rural members, at least \$3,600 tax free plus \$4,800 and it could go to \$8,400. The city members, those that don't have to live away from home - and I'm not quarreling with the difference but I want the true picture to be shown - \$7,200.00. Now this is it. This is the amount. I'll come back to this but I think that this is too high. Now if this was the only thing I wouldn't make any accusations about the question of being too high, because we all have different ideas. It might cost a certain person, and I know the people from the country, it is difficult. I know that I can keep an eye on some of my business. I know that some people can't and some can, so I'm not -- the big thing is not necessarily the amount although I think that the amount is too high, but this, remember, is not the debate.

Now I protest in the way this was done. I protest in the way that the Ministers' salaries were brought up, and this is part and parcel of the same thing. The First Minister got up and he said if Bill 97 goes through we will go back and we will reduce the amount that we will pay in as members and we will take this away from the salary of the Minister. Why? If he was worth so much before as a Minister why is he going to go down now, if the members are worth that much? It doesn't make sense. Then he said the same thing about the tax free, and I said, "At the time you wanted to make darn sure that you got this increase come hell or high water," and this is exactly what happened. Then he got up and he said, "If you pass this we will take it up." In other words, he wanted to make sure that he got his and that the Cabinet Ministers got theirs first. This is why, my honourable friends, that it looks -- and we have seen different -- we've had different editorials and so on in the papers, and even mentioning some of the backbenchers. This is why he says that the government was forced to have this, to give them this, to the backbenchers. This is what he was saying.

Now my honourable friend says, "All right; we did not vote against the first motion." Right. The first time they voted with us. They did state that they didn't agree, though, because one member said that they were going to vote against us. They were going to save time, they said. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Speaker, you are going to save time when you get up when they say "Nay", instead of when you get up when you say, "Aye", when they are counting votes? They didn't have to say a darn word. And if you remember, the second time we made

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . . the motion my honourable friend here got up, made the motion, then the Leader of the NDP got up and he spoke for 20 minutes to tell them that he was going to save time; he had spoken for half a minute. Do you remember that? I can find that in Hansard. This, we were saving time.

You can't be on both sides. You've got to go all out on these things. All right, I could use the money as well as anybody else. I'm not a millionaire. I haven't got money to throw away, I can tell you that. Just as much as anybody else and it's a temptation as much to me as to anybody else, but I don't think that it is right to do it like this. I don't think that it is the right way that the Cabinet Ministers on their own, immediately following an election, will decide to take this and then when the pressure is on by the backbenchers and other members across, that they will go along with this and try to include the Leader of the NDP and the Leader of the Official Opposition in this deal. It's a good parcel then and we say, don't antagonize anyone; don't play politics on this. You would think we were building a church with this money. Don't antagonize anybody; don't . . .

MR. DOERN: Just your funeral home.

MR. DESJARDINS: Gosh, I'd like to get you in there I'll tell you that!

MR. DOERN: You never will.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh I know you. You told us how wonderful you are and how you are going to live forever but I can't stop that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are a lot of things to discuss on this and we have to be fair. I think that this government should withdraw this. I mentioned the amount and I also mentioned the way this was done. I call it -- well, I'd better not because you'll tell me I'm out of order, but I would say that if I was outside the House I would say that this is blackmail, but it's the priority and the timing that I don't like. The priorities. We've been getting up; the Minister of Municipal Affairs will send a telegram -- I wonder how much this is going to cost us. I hope there's no five percent tax on this telegram she sent. A purely political telegram to tell us about the need of money, the need of money; what we need here; we should have more for the farmers, more for the mothers, more for the brothers, more for everybody. This famous priority. This is the main thing; we are fighting for this priority. What's the main thing, the first thing? Looking after us. They do it next door. They do this next door. What does that mean? What does that mean? It means that the people probably have reasons to feel the way they do about politicians; that they are looking for themselves first. Oh, it was a very virtuous member that said, "Oh, we are doing this for the people that come." I am sure that the Member from Churchill is worried about the next Member from St. Boniface. I'm positive of that. I'm very positive that he's so worried about the people that are coming. This was his contribution to this debate. Oh yes, he said we could give it back - with a big smile on his face also. That changes all the principle. That changes everything, because we can give it back. That makes it right. You can give it back if you want to.

Now, as I said, there has been the priority and the timing. What will they say, what would the members supporting this say, Mr. Speaker? They will say this is a drop in the bucket, but what about showing leadership and inspiring the people of our nation? Is it right to say, "I am going to get \$8,400 or \$7,200 for two or three months of work. Sure, we work besides that." And what did the Minister of Municipal Affairs say? "Be realistic," -- to the Metro Council. You're not members of this House - be realistic. They work a heck of a lot more than we do, but "be realistic." Why can't they decide? It's our responsibility. Why can't they decide how much they should be paid? Why can't every mayor and alderman and councillor in the province decide? Have we got the monopoly on brains, on conscience? Have we? I don't know if that's right; if this is the dumb side or this is the bright side. I don't -- but the bright side after that bright speech yesterday, so if you don't mind . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Where? Where?

MR. DESJARDINS: Are you speaking as the Leader of the Party or as the Member from Radisson? -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We were going along on the quiet level that I had hoped for. I . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: We were doing quite well. That's right, Mr. Speaker. Now you go . . . my member, trying to. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Member from St. Boniface doesn't intend to create any arguments by anything he might say.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know me much better than that. No, no, Mr. Speaker. I just want to be non-political and I object to this bill here.

Now if my friends are so sure and if the people are so sure that this is the right thing and that the people of Manitoba want this, they want to see first of all that we are well paid. Now they might give us five percent of the bill when they get their kid's shoes fixed, but be well paid fellows, because you need it. And if my friends want to go on any platform and say yes, we are the party of the people, we're the party of the poor people, we have a principle "ability-to-pay." This is what we want but we are not political when we talk about -- we can't be political when we talk about our indemnities. That wouldn't be right, you see. So we tell them go ahead. You pay. These people are telling us now we have priorities, but first thing before anything else, we are told, we don't know how much money is going to come from Ottawa and so on, but the first thing, we will be well paid. And we have the gall to stand up and put a tax on children's clothes. I brought in an amendment, all right, why not just on things over \$100.00. It's not done, like this in other provinces. It can't be done, my people tell me -- after looking upstairs. This is what we got on every darn amendment that we brought in. This is what we got and now, virtuous again. "We need this money."

Now I am against this . . . , I am against this government, the people of this House who are afraid to commit themselves. When we talk about the education of a certain class of people, second class of people, and children, they won't even talk about this. They don't even talk about this because it shouldn't be brought in. It's embarrassing. And if we ignore things long enough it will go away. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that every single one of us should have a good look and I think we should be ready to forget this, the Cabinet Ministers and all of us, to leave our salary the way it has been, our indemnity. I don't quite agree with the Member from Lakeside. I think that it is our responsibility but I don't think that we should finally have the last word in everything. I don't think this is right. I think there should be some outside people. I think that there should be some outside people -- it's the only way that we could do this in the right way. We could have some kind of a committee. I don't know. I'm not going to make any suggestions now but I don't think that it should be left only to this group -- only to us. And if this is the case, we should do the same thing with the people from Metro and the same thing with the people -- because they can be turned out of office, like the Honourable Member from Churchill said, just as easy as us. It's funny, if you are so brave and say you are going to wait, you might be turned out of office, that you do this three days or four days after the election. That's odd. And we're told that we shouldn't oppose this. Well we opposed the pension. It's not too much help for these people who are jumping on and off the fence so many times, who are already gone and . . . this House. They didn't help us too much, but the First Minister, because of public opinion, because of politics, yes. And I say the best thing in politics has been pressured these last few years -- the only thing that forces to do anything, and the pension bill was withdrawn, and you remember, Mr. Speaker, what kind of pension that was for the Cabinet Ministers. Were we playing politics? We were told the same thing, told the same thing then as we are told now, as we will be told by the Attorney-General and others later on in this debate. I say that we have got to inspire the people of Manitoba to have faith in their politicians. They have got to believe in politicians and therefore we've got to start by being responsible and not just say this is a drop in a bucket. We've got to be able to -- when we have to tax, does anyone here -- stand up. Any member from this -- my honourable friend from Elmwood. Can he go in his constituency and say yes, I think I should be paid, even if it means, even this year, when we have a tax on children's clothing?

Now they were supposed to save time. That was another thing when we talked about these indemnities, but it's funny, on the tax bill they voted against every single motion, even the three percent and he had to explain -- they voted against everything. Why? We knew that the bill would go through the same as this bill would, when we were talking about the Minister's salary, but he voted for three percent.

MR. PAULLEY: No, we voted against the three percent, that you wanted . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You voted for five percent.

MR. PAULLEY: No we did not. We voted against your three percent.

MR. DESJARDINS: Did you vote? Did you vote?

MR. PAULLEY: You wouldn't understand.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. PAULLEY: You haven't got enough intellect . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: He's the one, not me. I've got the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Sales tax matters are over and done with for the present and I think the honourable gentleman has spoken about sales tax a considerable number of times during this debate and I don't think he should carry it into an argument between he and another honourable member and carry it forward. I think he might very well forget about that particular part of the legislative work at this particular time.

I'm asking you to kindly forsake the matter of discussing sales tax at this particular time with an honourable member across the floor, creating what can develop into an argument that is going to serve no one any good.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well it would be a lot easier, to start with, if ... member would wait until I sit down, when I have the floor. I didn't get up yesterday. Now secondly -- see I'm wrong, but I thought that we needed the tax to get this increase, and this high priority, and this is why I mentioned sales tax, because we have got to have money. If there is no money in the funds, Sir, we will not be able to get this increase, and this is why I mentioned ...

MR. SPEAKER: My point is that throughout the Honourable Member's debate he is spending a considerable amount of time on the matter of sales tax when we should be discussing the contents of Bill 97. That's what I want him to discuss.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're absolutely right, Sir, and you said this yesterday to another member, but I'm saying that it is very much Bill 97 because I started by saying that I wasn't too worried about the amount but I didn't like the timing, and I didn't think it was the proper time when we were taxing clothes on the people of Manitoba, when it was time to raise our indemnity. Now is this wrong? I'm saying that -- somebody said yes, I don't know, but I didn't hear you say ... If you say that I'm out of order I will forget about this but I think that -- this, to me, is the reason why I'm voting against this; the main reason, because of these things.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has had ample opportunity to make the points that he is asking to continue to make. I believe for some considerable time that he has made these points and made them well in his own opinion, and I don't see any point in him continuing the present trend of discussion, but rather to come back to Bill 97 in order to deal with the contents of it. I believe the honourable member will agree with me that he has had a fairly good inning in that respect.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well thank you very much, Sir, for telling me that my speech has been so clear, and I just hope that the other members have seen the point as clearly as you have. Now if this is so clear I think that there's not too much point in keeping on, but I would like to, in finishing, Sir, say that the main reason why I object to this is because I feel that it shouldn't be Number one in the hit parade or first on the priority list, and I won't mention anything else because apparently I've made this point, but these are the things, these are the reasons why I think it's not the time to bring in, to look after ourselves first. I don't think we should be first on the list. And then, as I say, my only quarrel with the NDP Party is that I do not want anybody in this debate to say all the good guys are the fellows that are going to vote "for", and if you dare speak "against", you're playing politics, because we were told the same thing, as I said, on the Pension Bill, but eventually the First Minister, either he saw the light or there was enough pressure and he withdrew this, and I hope that this is going to happen again today because we have the same situation again.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I was just going through my files here, as you may have noted, on the famous Pension Bill that was introduced into the House just about two years ago now, and the debate I note lasted for about two weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the pension bill of some two years ago has anything at all to do with Bill No. 97 and I would ask the honourable member to refrain from this ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well the same principle is involved and there's three principles, as I see it, in the bill that is before us, one concerning pensions - certainly one concerning pensions - and certainly one concerning members' indemnity, and certainly one concerning the out-of-pocket expenses of the members. In going through that file - I will be allowed to say that, surely, Mr. Speaker - I did come across some material that I would like to use now in support of the argument that I put forward then, pretty well the same argument that I intend to put forward now in respect to the bill that is before us.

Now I think that when we are considering -- well perhaps I should deal with pensions to



(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . start with. I must confess that the provisions in the bill, in this Bill 97, isn't it, that is before us - certainly, certainly it is an entirely different kind of a bill altogether than the one that was presented to us two years ago, because my honourable friend the First Minister has pretty well assured the House that this Bill will be self-supporting, nearly self-supporting, or that the pension aspect of it -- pardon me, that's what I intended to say if I did not say that: the pension aspect of the bill. And if that is so, then the taxpayer should have no quarrel with that end of it. I'm one of the members of the House, I will have them know, that is already on pension, a pension that I set up 20 years ago with the government, known as Canadian Government Annuities. I'm drawing the pension now and the taxpayer didn't contribute to it and I understand the taxpayer is not going to contribute to this portion of the bill that we're dealing with at the moment.

Now the other principle in the bill is that our living allowance while we are away from home, presumably 60 days, and we have been getting \$10.00 a day for 60 days - \$600.00 - with the exception of two members, I believe, rural members I'm talking about not, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland and the Honourable the Member for Churchill, and I believe they get double that amount or something of that kind. But the \$600.00 living allowance that we have been in receipt of for some three or four years is taxable - is taxable; and as such, of course, we can - or I have been keeping pretty close track of my expenses because I can use them then, having paid a tax on the \$600.00 I can use my receipts for my living away from home to support that I have spent the \$600.00 or more than the \$600.00, and I find that it doesn't pay the cost in this day and age. The \$10.00 doesn't pay it. So there's some justification, Mr. Speaker, for this part of it, even though it's taxable.

Now the other principle that is in the bill is whether or not the members of the House should be paid more money, and of course that is what the whole bill is about: shall we pay ourselves some more money? And I guess this is the way that this whole question has been handled since Manitoba joined Canada nearly a hundred years ago but I, like all of the other members that have spoken prior to me today and certainly on other occasions, have raised a storm over the way the Ministers increased their salaries on September 7th last without asking the public and without asking the House, and this, I think, is what caused the storm and resulted in the bill being before us today. I'm confident of that, confident as I'm standing here that that is a fact.

Well, what are we worth? Now I was trying to find out what some of the members said we were worth two years ago, Mr. Speaker, and then trying to find out what we are worth today, or why we should be worth more today than we were two years ago, because several of the members that spoke on both sides of the House two years ago made quite a case for the fact that the members of the House, apart from the Cabinet, were just serving a part-time job in the House, and I think the First Minister made this statement, and it's a true one. In fact, I think I have the Hansard in which he made that statement that members, apart from the Cabinet, are enjoying (I don't know whether that's the right word to use, the right adjective to use) but enjoying a part-time job. I think my honourable friend did but I will try and find it later on. But certainly if he didn't, the Member for Winnipeg Centre and the Deputy Speaker did on several occasions because he was one of the members opposite that was strenuously opposed to the plan, and I would like to read what he did say, and just very briefly, in his opening comments. Mr. Cowan. He said, "Madam Speaker, I'm opposed to this Bill. I think that when we are elected as members of this Legislature we knew that there was no pension to be received here and we were elected, not for the money, but for an opportunity to be of public service," and certainly that holds true.

I know when I was elected to this House I never asked anybody what the indemnity was. That was beside the point. I was told that by virtue of the fact -- this is about the conversation that went on: "You did pretty well. Don't you think that it's time that you did something for the community?" Surely to goodness there's still room for the volunteer in our society, somebody to give a little bit of their time and money if necessary. Should we expect \$20.00 or \$25.00 or \$40.00 a day for the part-time job that we are doing here? Or when you talk about what are we worth, or what do we think we're worth, what do the taxpayers think we are worth, what do our own electors think we are worth, and by gosh, Mr. Speaker, you could be talking this point a long time but I still maintain that nearly every member of the House, in fact I think every member of the House that is not a Cabinet Member, that is every member apart from the Cabinet, has another source of income. I would like to have those put up their hands that haven't. I'm confident they have. Every member of this House with the exception of some of

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . the Cabinet Ministers has another source of income, and that further establishes the fact that this is a part-time job.

Now the First Minister has made this statement, I know, as well as his desk-mate the Provincial Treasurer, that only 6,000 out of the 40,000 farmers are earning \$4,000 a year - that means 34,000 farmers are not. Are we worth in our part-time job more than the 34,000 farmers? I say we're not. We're not. And their's is certainly a full-time job. If there's anybody in the world that's got a full-time job it's a farmer. And here we are in a part-time job asking for twice as much as the average farmer is getting, and I don't think it's right. I don't think it's right. Another argument that is always being put forward when a bill of this kind is before us, and I think this is three times in my short life here that we've had this bill before us - three or four times - probably this is the fourth time that we've had a raise since I came in 1958, and in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I've been back here at about four different special sessions. The last one we got \$200.00 a day for it - for the special session.

So there's all these things to consider, Mr. Speaker, and so I guess that you will likely have observed by this time that I intend to vote against the bill and I will have more to say - quite a bit more to say I think - when we get into the committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: If the Minister is going to close the debate then I would like to say a few words before the vote comes. Mr. Speaker, my own background is that of a businessman. I've always believed, in my business, that I should pay the people who work for me as best I can and certainly everything that they are worth. My experience as well is that a business can only pay wages if the business is making money and if the business is progressing and if it is in fact showing results in that the individuals in it are producing, so it seems to me that when we look at this question here in this House we have to look at two things: one, what time and effort is put in by members and what are they in fact worth; and then the other one, is the House, is the government doing its job and is the business progressing?

Well when you come along to the amounts, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that you could argue this ad infinitum. What is the right amount? I suppose there is no right amount for everyone because the circumstances vary considerably for each individual in the House, and yet we have to strike a balance somewhere along the line. I don't believe and don't want to see this House a House where only people of independent means can come as legislators. On the other hand, I don't believe that becoming a member of the House should be a sinecure and a money-making proposition. I think we are here to serve.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the time expected of members in this House; when you look at past sessions - I must confess that this one is dragging out longer than most sessions - it seems to me that the government legislation has not been coming forward as it should. We were told today that there are still more bills to come. The length of the session therefore has been determined by the government; not, as is frequently said, by the Opposition. When we look at our normal sessions, the time required then, the time required out of session, I frankly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of \$7,200 is too much. I don't think that the members are required to put the time and I don't think that they are putting the time that calls for that amount of money. The indemnity was originally meant to indemnify for the money that you lost otherwise. Well, it's progressed beyond that and I'm not quarreling with that part of it; but nor do I think, Mr. Speaker, that becoming a member of this House should be mainly a financial operation, and so I cannot support that amount of money.

But much more than that, Mr. Speaker, my objections to the Bill, my objections to the Ministers' salaries - and I have said this before in the House - are really based on the fact that I don't think that the Province of Manitoba at this time has been producing and that the government has been producing what needs to be done in the Province of Manitoba, because the facts are that the business isn't improving the way it should. One need only look at the various figures, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to go over them all again. I have done so on a number of occasions before and I've spoken on the Throne Speech debate and on the budget and I've quoted from the government's own statistics as to the failure of Manitoba to keep up with the rest of the country, and I simply don't think that we can on the one hand turn around and tell our people, "You know we have to tax you more, the income of the province isn't increasing because there isn't enough growth in the province and we have to add taxes on to you"; but the right thing to do on the other hand is to turn around and increase our own salaries.

And I frankly, Mr. Speaker - and I know some people who accuse me of cheap politics when I say this - I simply can not stand here and say we can't pass the \$1.25 minimum wage

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . . but we can raise our incomes to \$7,200 a year. Mr. Speaker, let them accuse me if they wish of cheap politics, but I can not frankly feel any different than that, and I have said that insofar as my own proposed salary increase. This is a difficult position for a Party Leader to be in because my words obviously affect much more than just myself. They affect my party members too, and I don't like to be in a position of having to deny them of anything, but I can not in conscience support the bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm being consistent in this, in that it is the position that I took on the question of the Ministers' salaries. I believe that the same position exists here, and it is my intention to oppose the bill. I recognize that there have been a number of arguments, and again there's room for different points of view as to what method one should use to gauge what members are worth. We sit here in judgment as to what the municipal and the Metro people across the province ought to receive and we also sit in judgment as to what we ourselves are to receive. I recognize that the final decision must be ours, but I frankly don't like the method that is employed, and that is that after elections one of the first pieces of action seems to be an increase in members' indemnities.

I would prefer to see the matter removed from, at least in its first stages, from our own immediate responsibility and that recommendations be made to us, possibly by some of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, although I would think there would be one gentleman sitting in this House who would not relish having that responsibility forced upon that Commission. Possibly there would be another method of doing it, recognizing still that the final decision should come here, but that there should be recommendations come from elsewhere. And so, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to support the Bill.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, perhaps it would be better if I were to adjourn the debate because we only have three minutes left.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . could call it 5:30 so the debate may proceed.

MR. ROBLIN: If there's anyone else who wishes to take part in the debate I would like them to do so now, otherwise I'll commence my speech . . .

MR. PAULLEY: At 8:00 o'clock?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll be speaking at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. PAULLEY: I think we could call it 5:30 and then you close the debate . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, I said adjourn. I'm sorry, I misspoke myself. Well, I'd better commence my speech now unless there's anyone else who wishes to take part in this debate. I could say at the beginning that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt my honourable friend, but it appears as though he has commenced closing the debate. I'm wondering whether or not it might accommodate my honourable friend if you were to call it 5:30. I would imagine he'd be more than three minutes.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, yes. I think probably five minutes or longer.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest you call it 5:30. My honourable friend then, having commenced his speech now, will continue at 8:00 when we resume the sittings.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.