

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, February 10th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba, Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HONOURABLE STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders begs me to present the following as their report. Your Committee met on the 17th of June, 1963, and on the 31st day of January, 1964, and examined Manitoba Regulations 10/62 to 105/62 and 1/63 to 15/63. Your Committee makes the following comments on and recommendations with respect to regulations examined by it:

Manitoba Regulation 11/62. This regulation amending Manitoba Regulation 74/55, fixes a maximum bond that can be required to be given by a collector under The Gasoline Tax Act to the Provincial Treasurer. Section 19 of The Gasoline Tax Act provides that the bond is to be in such sum as the Minister requires. There is no authority in the Act allowing the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to limit the discretion of the Minister in this matter.

A new Gasoline Tax Act was enacted at the last session of the Legislature, and this regulation ceased to be effective after the new Act was proclaimed. The Committee understands that under the new Act and the new Regulations under the Act, the same objection does not occur so that further action is not necessary.

Manitoba Regulation 12/62. In considering this regulation, which declares certain substances to be minerals under The Mines Act, the Committee thought it would be more desirable to have the definition of "mineral" wholly within the Act. The Committee, therefore, suggest that The Department of Mines and Natural Resources consider the desirability of including the substances named in the Manitoba Regulations 12/62 in the definition of "mineral" in the Act itself.

The Legislative Council reported that this matter has been referred to and is being considered by The Law Reform Committee.

Manitoba Regulations 14/62, 15/62 and 16/62. Your Committee noted that each of these regulations had retroactive effect. However, each of the regulations have been validated by an Act of the Legislature, so that no further action is necessary on these particular regulations. Your Committee feels, however, that the attention of the department should be brought to the irregularity of making retroactive regulations without specific authority, and recommends that the department give consideration to seeking amendments to the Acts under which the regulations were made authorizing retroactive regulations in these matters.

Manitoba Regulations 22/62 and 23/62. Your Committee noted that each of these regulations contained a provision which proposed to make the regulations apply to certain areas of the province. The Acts under which the regulations were made authorized the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to fix the areas to which the Acts apply. Your Committee recommends that each of these regulations be amended to provide that the Act, rather than the regulation, apply to certain portions of the province. In particular, your Committee recommends:

(1) That Manitoba Regulation 22/62 be amended by striking out the words "These regulations shall apply to and be effective" in the first line of Section 11 thereof, and substituting therefor the words, "The Hairdressers Act applies to and is effective only"; and, (2) that Manitoba Regulation 23/62 be amended by striking out the words "These regulations shall apply to and be effective" in the first line of Section 13 thereof, and substituting therefor, the words, "The Barbers Act applies to and is effective only."

Manitoba Regulation 52/62. As this regulation is no longer effective because of the

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd.) amendments to The Rivers and Streams Act made at the last session of the Legislature, your Committee recommends that this regulation be repealed.

Manitoba Regulation 79/62. This regulation provides certain definitions for terms used in the insurance contracts with The Crop Insurance Corporation. Your Committee suggests that the corporation consider the advisability of including these definitions in the form of contract itself rather than in a separate regulation, which may not always be within the knowledge of the insured person.

Manitoba Regulation 6/63. This regulation adopts the Canadian Electrical Code, Part 1, for the standards governing electric wiring and related facilities under The Manitoba Hydro Act. There is no specific authority in The Manitoba Hydro Act permitting the Manitoba Hydro to adopt a code. Your Committee recommends that the Manitoba Hydro consider the advisability of seeking an amendment to The Manitoba Hydro Act authorizing the Board to adopt codes prepared and printed by others.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare that the report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, may I ask the Chairman of the Committee if it is the intention to move concurrence at a later date?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, present the report regarding the Constitution of Canada Amendment Act of the Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations.

MR. CLERK: The Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations has begged me to present the following as their report, dealing with a draft of an Act known as The Constitution of Canada Amendment Act. Your Committee met on June 17th, 1963, and on January 31st, 1964. Your Committee has invited public representations upon the Draft Constitution of Canada Amendment Act and the following were heard: Mr. R. D. Gibson, Professor of Constitutional Law at the Manitoba Law School, also Messrs. S. Bordman and Leonard Kruger. Your Committee has considered the Act and the submissions made relevant to it and reports as follows: (1) That the proposed draft Act represents a positive step forward in the search for a formula whereby Canada may amend its Constitution without reference to the Parliament of the United Kingdom; (2) that the Government of Manitoba request the Government of Canada to reopen the Federal-Provincial Conferences with a view to carrying forward the progress made at earlier conferences and arriving at an agreed procedure for the amending of the BNA Act in Canada. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the Report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I have the same question of the Honourable the Chairman in this regard.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I have the same answer.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I beg to submit the final report of the Special Committee appointed to investigate all phases of marketing livestock in the Province of Manitoba.

I really expected a standing ovation for this.

I would, at this time, ask the indulgence of the House that the Clerk dispense with the reading because it is a lengthy report. I would also like the indulgence of the House to ask a favour of having a vote of concurrence in this report at a later date, in the near future, after the Members of this House have had a chance to study and read this report.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the House have consent to dispense with the reading of the report? Agreed?

MR. SHEWMAN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the report be tabled.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: the Honourable the Chairman of this Committee may have mentioned and I didn't catch it, but are copies to be provided for every member of the House?

MR. SHEWMAN: Yes.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act, and Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.

HONOURABLE ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act.

HONOURABLE CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Alcoholism Foundation Act.

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Testators Family Maintenance Act.

HONOURABLE MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.

MR. McLEAN: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and in those of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Honourable the Minister of Health as printed in the Orders of the Day.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, the following is a statement on this particular resolution. I believe that we have not yet taken action to appoint the Chairman of Committees, have we, in this House? I think we're in the position where we have no chairman to take over this committee.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for raising the point. It is a fact, and I had proposed to ask the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to continue this task this afternoon, if that would be agreeable to the House?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. MOLGAT: Is this to be that the Member for St. Matthews is to be the permanent chairman of the committees, or is this for this session only?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll have to give notice of a permanent motion, but for the time being, that's for this proceeding this afternoon.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the Honourable Member for St. Matthews took the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Libraries Act by providing, among other matters, for the establishment of municipal public libraries within certain local government districts to which grants may be made from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm out of -- I've made an error here -- I should have informed you that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to this House. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment to The Public Libraries Act will permit certain local government districts in Manitoba to be dealt with on the same basis as organized municipalities for the purpose of The Public Libraries Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask a few questions of the Minister in this regards? What is the present situation for local government districts? Can they take part in a library group with an adjoining municipality or not? Secondly, is it proposed that a single local government district would be allowed to do this or would it be the same as in the case of municipalities where there has to be at least two or more?

MR. McLEAN: No, the present situation is that there is no provision which would allow local government district to become a library, either regional or municipal, under the terms of The Public Libraries Act, and this Bill will allow certain local

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . specified in the Bill to become either a municipal library or a part of a regional library, as the case might be. I think as a practical matter it would be more likely that they would be municipal libraries, the equivalent of municipal libraries, as distinct from regional libraries. This would place them in the same basis as otherwise an organized municipality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Soldiers' Taxation Relief Act by providing, among other matters, for the payment from and out of Consolidated Funds to municipalities of amounts that have been paid out, marked off, or cancelled by the municipalities in respect of applicants for relief under the Act who do not apply until after the usual date for making such applications.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, at the present time the Act provides for applications for relief under this Act to be made on or before the 31st day of December in the year for which the taxes were charged, and there are many people who would otherwise be entitled for relief under this Act who from time to time are late for one reason or another in making their applications. In the past, there late applications have always come before the Legislature for approval. The proposed amendment would allow the Minister of Municipal Affairs to make the approval where it is recommended by the municipality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Adopted. Resolution No. 3. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Health Services Act by providing, among other matters, that charges, costs, expenses or other monies, or expenditures, that the government is authorized or required to pay for, on behalf of, or for the benefit of, a hospital area, a hospital district, a local health unit, a medical care district, a laboratory and X-Ray unit, or a medical nursing unit district, that comprises therein a local government district or a part thereof or for, on behalf of, or for the benefit of, the whole or any part of a local government district that it has been proposed to include in such area, district, or unit, or for, or preliminary to, or for the purpose of, the inclusion of which in such an area, district, or unit, measures have been taken, may be apportioned to, and assessed against, that local government district or that part thereof.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, this rather intriguing sentence, I think, is self-explanatory, but in case it isn't I would like to say that The Health Services Act at the present time provides for local health units, laboratories and X-Ray units, etcetera, and it provides for the municipalities to pay for one-third, but it also provides that the -- by Order-in-Council a portion of a local government district or the whole local government district may be declared a municipality for the purposes of this Act. This resolution and the amendment to the Act will simply say that any portion of a local government district or a local government district will be considered as a municipality for the purposes of the Act.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, all I have to say to the Honourable Minister is, if this is the sample of what we're going to get from him from now on, he's a worthy successor of his predecessor.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert-Plains): Mr. Chairman, does it mean now that the local government districts that'll be included in these units are going to be taxed? Is there a levy going to be made which wasn't made previously?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, the situation is the same. If they come into one of these areas they pay one-third under the terms of the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Passed. Committee rise and report.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may just ask a general question here. I note that the first resolution was introduced by the Attorney-General. Have the responsibilities for the libraries been transferred from Education?

MR. McLEAN: They have not, Mr. Chairman. When I was in my previous portfolio I was, in addition, the Minister responsible for libraries, and through some serious oversight that situation was not changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Soldiers' Taxation Relief Act.

MR. WITNEY introduced Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Health Services Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my left, where there are seated some 27 Grade VIII students from St. Ignatius School under the direction of their teacher, Sister Sheila Margaret. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In the second section on my right are 40 some students from Grades V and VIII from Dugald school under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Findlater. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Springfield. In the first section on my right are 17 Grade XI students from Precious Blood School under the direction of their teacher, Sister Mary Joseph. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

Nous vous souhaitons la bienvenue ici cette après-midi; nous espérons que tout ce que vous avez vu et entendu à l'assemblée législative vous sera utile dans vos études. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre intérêt dans les affaires de la province. Revenez encore nous visiter.

TRANSLATION: We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders for the Day may I lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Department of Industry & Commerce and the Manitoba Development Authority for the period ending March 31, 1963.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table the following reports: -- The Annual Report of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the year ended March 1963 -- the members of the Legislative Assembly have already received their own copies. I would like to table the Report of the Manitoba Water Supply Board for the year ended March 31, and the Annual Report of the Co-operative Promotion Board for the year ending March 31, 1963.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to place a report on the table of the House showing that pursuant to Section 13 of The Trade Practices Enquiry Act 268 of the revised Statutes of Manitoba 1954, I have the honour to report that there have been no enquiries made under this Act during the year ending December 31, 1963.

MADAM SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, in answer to his speech at the opening of the Session. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it is once again my pleasure to congratulate you on your return here as the ruler of our assembly and the one who attempts to keep both sides of the House in order. I am particularly pleased on this occasion to welcome you here as one of the bilingual members of our Assembly and to congratulate you on the speech you just delivered a few moments ago. Je vous en félicite chaleureusement. (I offer my warm congratulations.)

It is my pleasure as well to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Address from the Speech from the Throne. I don't think I would surprise them unduly if I said that I did not agree with all the contents of their speech, but I do commend them for their delivery and for the position they have taken in view of their location here in this House. I am happy, too, to be able to compliment on this occasion, the one new Minister, since we last met. I have had the opportunity of knowing the honourable gentleman for many years. In fact, I sat across from him in this way on many occasions in the past -- not quite in this type of assembly but when we had the pleasure of doing business together. He was at that time on one side of the bargaining table as a manufacturer of footwear, I was on the other side as a buyer for a wholesale firm, and we conducted some very interesting and spirited negotiations on many occasions. I regret to see that the quality of the product that he sold has deteriorated substantially in his new post, and I regret as well that he sure will not be able to continue as vigorous a salesman as he then conducted.

MR. MOLGAT: Madame, nous nous réunissons cette année à un moment où à travers du Canada certains expriment des doutes sur un point fondamental -- l'unité du Canada. Il me semble que le Manitoba et son peuple à cause de leur origine peuvent jouer un rôle de premier ordre dans le règlement de ce problème qui est en jeu, en fait, la survivance du Canada comme nation libre et indépendante. Notre province jouit sans doute de la plus grande diversité de groupes et de cultures et nous avons appris à vivre ici ensemble en amitié et en bonne entente. Le discours du Trône propose que le concours des deux niveaux de gouvernement -- fédéral et provincial -- devrait continuer pour perpétuer la Confédération Canadienne en unité et prospérité. Tout en acceptant ce point de vue je crois qu'il faut aller bien au-delà si nous allons réussir. Tous les Canadiens doivent participer à cette tâche. Nous ne pouvons la laisser que dans les mains des gouvernements. Les Canadiens comme individus doivent s'y attacher, s'y intéresser et travailler.

TRANSLATION: Madame, we are assembled this year at a time when across Canada certain people are expressing doubts on a fundamental point -- Canadian unity. It seems to me that Manitoba and her people because of their origins can play a leading role in the solution of the problem at stake, in fact, the survival of Canada as a free and independent nation. No doubt, Manitoba benefits from the great diversity of groups and cultures and we have learned to live together here in friendship and understanding. The Speech from the Throne proposes that the co-operation between the two levels of government -- federal and provincial -- should continue to perpetuate the Canadian Confederation in unity and prosperity. While accepting this point of view I believe we must go far beyond that if we are to succeed. All Canadians should participate in this task. We cannot leave it in the hands of governments only. Canadians, as individuals, should apply themselves to the task, show interest, and work.

The Speech from the Throne this year proves without doubt that the First Minister of the Province is still a master craftsman in the art of self-promotion. Within the short space of six stages, he has made some fifty promises of proposed action, and has managed to squeeze many pats on the back for his Government. Of course, one would expect this from the First Minister. During his six years in office he has built up a reputation as a man who does promise. He calls for study after study and report on top of report. The fact that he has wrapped up an even larger package of promises this year is easy to understand. Now that he has his eye on Ottawa, the First Minister no doubt feels that such a package will give voters in other parts of the country the impression that he is a man of action.

Now, the heavy agenda outlined by the Government doesn't impress members on this side of the House, because we know from experience what will happen to a great deal of it. Some of the measures no doubt will be withdrawn at a later date for further consideration by the Government. Then, some proposals will be referred to committees and commissions and studies. That's another tactic that this Government has frequently used to get itself off the hook. The third trick will be no doubt to keep some of the legislation under wraps until the very dying days of the session, so that then it can either be rushed through, as we saw last year, with little debate, or put over until the following year's session. It will be very interesting, Madam Speaker, to see at the end of this session how many of the fifty-odd proposals have actually seen the light of day.

Going through the Speech from the Throne, I find that it's also notable for what it didn't say. There was no mention, for example, of a Retail Sales Tax, which I suggest the First Minister has long been considering. The Speech does indicate, however, that the House can expect to be presented with the first report of the Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance, appointed to examine the whole field of municipal-provincial finances. It's been speculated on many occasions that the Commission may recommend a sales tax to help pay for the government's ever-growing spending program. We in our Party are strongly opposed to the imposition of this unfair tax which hits the poor harder than it affects those in the higher wage brackets who can afford more, and I serve notice on the First Minister that it won't be good enough for him to hide behind the Commission and say that he is only acting on its recommendations. His government has appointed countless commissions in the past and it has never hesitated to shelve the reports with which it disagreed. It is therefore fair to say that the Government has implemented only those reports it has fully endorsed. If the Royal Commission on Local Government recommends a sales tax, and the Government

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . decides to impose this additional burden on the people of Manitoba, the Government must take full responsibility for it.

I also wish to remind the First Minister that in view of his past promises to the electorate of Manitoba he does not have a mandate to impose a Sales Tax.

Before continuing my criticism of the government, Madam Speaker, I would like to refer to a sentence in the Throne Speech which deals with one of the oldest issues in the history of Manitoba. It is the question of aid to private schools. The Speech says that the government will, and I quote, "present a statement dealing with the relationship between the public school system and the private schools and the principles which, in their view, underlie sound educational policy."

Now, the House was promised a statement of this kind in the Throne Speech four years ago. None was forthcoming. I urge the First Minister to clarify the statement in this year's Speech and to tell the House at the earliest possible opportunity exactly what he intends to do. Tempting as it is, it is not, however, my intention to go through the Throne Speech section by section. While I recognize the importance of many of the subjects covered, I plan to deal with them in detail during estimates or when the government proposals are presented in concrete form. I cannot, however, overlook in passing, the change of attitude of this government on certain subjects. In view of the generally buoyant conditions in agriculture, one could have expected some recognition of the role of the federal government, and of the farm outlook for the future. Instead, there is almost no reference to agriculture. On the other hand, ever since the Throne Speech in 1959, we haven't had a mention of federal-provincial financial arrangements, but now in this year's Throne Speech we hear that the government's views have not been satisfactorily met. Again, for at least two years this government has been aware of the possible loss of the T.C.A. overhaul base, and yet no mention of it was made in the Throne Speech last year or the year before. We now find critical comments without positive action. One cannot help remembering a phrase which I believe was coined by my honourable friends opposite, "Why didn't you do it when?"

Returning to my criticism of the administration, Madam Speaker, I would like to say something about the recent Cabinet shuffle involving four of the Ministers. The First Minister said at that time that he believed that a redistribution of portfolios from time to time was good, because it gave the Ministers broader experience and fresh challenges, and gave depth to the government. Well, I might concede the matter of depth, but it would seem to me to indicate, Madam Chairman, that a major function of government in the views of this administration is to give experience to cabinet ministers as such. I say that the main function of government is to get the job done, and cabinet ministers need not be changed unless they have either completed the job they have set out to do, or they have proven to be a failure. They should then be replaced by new men. An analysis of the departments concerned shows clearly that the problems are far from solved and the job is far from done in those four departments. The First Minister in his Cabinet reshuffle has publicly indicated that he does not have confidence in these Ministers.

Perhaps the department which will be least affected by the shuffle is that of Mines and Natural Resources, because it's the one where the least has happened since the Conservatives took office in 1958. Strangely enough, except for very recently, it hasn't even tried to look busy by issuing press releases and promises. Look at the facts. Not a single new major mine opened in the Province of Manitoba since my predecessor, former Premier Campbell, negotiated the opening of the multi-million dollar Inco mine at Thompson. Compare this with Saskatchewan, for example, where several potash mines are now in operation or under development. I understand that the same potash deposits extend into Manitoba and yet there's no action here.

Look in the field of land use, Madam Speaker, where for five years this government had no policy whatever. It didn't know if it wanted to rent land, give land or sell land, and you couldn't find out whenever you got in touch with them. Last year at this same session they announced a new policy, spurred on by what had been said during the election campaign, and they still haven't settled that policy. There is still no clear-cut indication insofar as the farmers and ranchers of this province as to what is going to happen to their costs of rented lands.

The problems facing commercial fishermen are still unresolved as the Speech from the Throne acknowledges.

(Mr. Molgat, con't.)

Perhaps the most unfortunate Cabinet switch was the transfer of Dr. Johnson from the Health Department. He was just beginning to initiate some action in many fields and, as a medical man himself, was well aware of the problems that exist. It is to be hoped that many of his ideas which were never implemented will now be carried through by his successor. It's also to be hoped that the switch won't delay such proposed programs as the community mental health centres. They are long overdue. Only lip service has to date been paid to this idea. I see no community health centres being developed, for example, in Swan River or in Neepawa or in the other towns across the province. What is due to happen to the revision of our mental health legislation? It's still a fact that once a person is committed to either Selkirk or Brandon here, his property is put in trusteeship. I understand that England and even Saskatchewan have recognized that immediate trusteeship is an out-dated concept in this day of voluntary admissions into mental hospitals. Dr. Johnson had apparently been working on a revision for two years, but there's nothing in the Throne Speech on this subject.

The most serious failure in the Department of Health however, Madam Speaker, has been the handling of the Hospital Plan and the hospital construction in this province. What has happened to the Willard Report recommendations? Why is it, that although compulsory hospital premiums have been collected since 1958, there is still a shortage of hospital beds. This government fines or puts into jail people who do not pay their hospital premiums, but it doesn't provide sufficient hospital beds for those who need hospital care. Here is just a recent clipping of the actions of our honourable friends opposite. A Winnipeg man was sentenced to a \$25.00 fine plus costs or 15 days in jail for not paying his hospital insurance premiums. He was \$90.30 in arrears. My honourable friends will be prepared to put him to jail, but there are many people in the province who can't get into the hospital today because there is a waiting list. Since taking over this government has added a three percent income tax on all Manitobans, supposedly for the hospital plan, but it hasn't given the leadership required to provide the service in the province.

Madam Speaker, the government and the Minister cannot plead ignorance. They called a commission to study this matter. They received the Willard Report, this monumental volume back in March of 1961, almost three years ago now, and the Willard report is a very clear document. It contains specific clear recommendations. There is no wishy-washy beating around the bush. What does it say for example? Let's take the case of the Children's Hospital. Recommendation on page 97 -- requiring 100 additional beds to bring the capacity up to 350 beds. This will be accomplished by adding a new fifth floor to the hospital and by some bed additions on existing floors. It is recommended that construction be commenced in 1963 -- last year, Madam Speaker -- and no construction has yet commenced. St. Boniface Hospital -- the Survey Board has recommended that a 300 bed extended treatment hospital be constructed on the grounds of St. Boniface Hospital. It is recommended that the construction of this facility be commenced in 1963, at the same time as the extension to the out-patients wing of the St. Boniface Hospital. What about Victoria Hospital? Same situation. This proposal would provide approximately 135 beds in the immediate future. The Survey Board recommends that this project should begin early in 1962, and here we are in 1964 and there's no action by this government.

The situation is so bad, Madam Speaker, that hospitals now have to set up commissions of their own to study the needs that the Willard Report was set up to study for this government. Here is the news report on the 16th of January. "Hospital Orders Study. In another move to break the financial deadlock holding up its reconstruction program, Victoria General Hospital has engaged an economist to report on the hospitals financial contribution to the municipalities" -- and so on. A hospital that was declared by the Willard Report, set up by the government, as being necessary in 1962, here we are in 1964 where it must set up a commission to prove to the government that it needs to have this addition. Madam Speaker, what sort of service is this to the people of Manitoba? People who pay premiums expect to have hospital facilities and they should have them. No one wants the government to take over the hospitals, but leadership must be given to enable municipalities and voluntary organizations to develop bed capacity. Why aren't nursing homes being used more extensively to reduce this pressure on hospital beds? It has been talked about in this House every year, but the government fails to take action.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.)

Now I don't know how Dr. Johnson will fare in his new role as Education Minister, but it's to be hoped that he'll accomplish more than his predecessor did behind the smoke screen of verbiage. The impetus given to education in this province by the MacFarlane Royal Commission has been lost. In 1958 and 1959, oh there was a great burst of activity on the part of the government to implement the interim report. Larger school districts were created in great haste and a vast program of expanding school facilities was undertaken with a corresponding increase in the burden of taxes on land. Some of the tax increases, in fact, are unbelievable, despite a solemn promise by the government that taxes would not rise. Since then, what has happened to ensure that education given in the schools is of the highest calibre and practical for all students? Curriculum reform been handled on a piece-meal part-time basis and little progress has been made. Instead of a genuine overall review, starting from grade one and going through to bring our forces up to today's needs, the Minister has floundered long in a patchwork manner. When I gave him clear indication at the session last year of an unsatisfactory text in a certain geography course, the Minister did nothing to correct the situation. Only after some highly unfavourable publicity this year, right across Canada, did he show any further interest in changing this text to the benefit of the students in the Province of Manitoba.

In the development of technical and vocational facilities the Minister has in his five years made sure that Manitoba is last behind all other Canadian provinces. Three years ago in the Throne Speech on the 14th of February, 1961, we were promised an expanded technical vocational program. Here is a statement then made by the government: "Vocational and technical education and training are being expanded both at Winnipeg and at Brandon to assist in the problem of training and retraining unemployed persons." Three years later, where is the program? Where is the new Brandon School promised by the First Minister during last year's provincial election campaign when he was complaining so loudly about parish pump politics. Much has been promised, Madam Speaker, but little has been done.

Once again the Minister can't plead ignorance. He acknowledged the need three years ago in the Throne Speech. We have reminded him every year since. Every year I have spoken from my place in this House about the forgotten group in education, the boys and girls who don't reach high school and for whom there are at present insufficient courses. The Minister should not plead lack of funds, because 75 percent of the construction is paid for by Ottawa and 50 percent of the maintenance, but Manitoba fell behind while other provinces forged ahead. The Minister failed to take advantage of these generous federal grants and young Manitobans lost opportunity. One need only look -- the situation was known -- there is a news clipping not too long ago: "Manitoba passing up federal aid. Government won't ask for share of technical school grants."

Let's turn to another proof of what exactly has been happening in this department, and I have in this case the report of the Federal Director of Technical and Vocational Training and nothing could be clearer, Madam Speaker, about the lack of action by this government. I refer you to the tables on Page 7 for example, where approved projects for new school facilities right across Canada -- approved projects totalled 253. Saskatchewan has three; Alberta has 18; and Manitoba has one. Even Prince Edward Island, with its small population, has proceeded with two projects. Manitoba is at the bottom of the list. Looking at it from the dollar expenditures we find that apart from P.E.I. and New Brunswick, both of whom have substantially smaller populations than we have, once again Manitoba is far behind. Manitoba's share of the federal contributions, approved at the 31st of March, were estimated to be \$4.9 million. Saskatchewan took almost double that amount, 8.2; and Alberta over seven times that amount for a total of 36.9. This is the sad story, Madam Speaker, of inaction by the Minister in that department.

I could go on into other fields as well, such as that of retarded children, for my honourable friend has been passing the buck from year to year and saying that in due course we'll consider the matter. Well, it is to be hoped that the honourable gentleman will be more effective as Attorney-General than he was in his old role as Education Minister. Here he inherits a department that has also accomplished very little under the former Attorney-General. In 1961

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . for example, my honourable friend, after calling for a Royal Commission and receiving its report, the one on judicial boundaries, did nothing at all for the next three years on judicial boundaries except to hold more hearings. I hear in the Throne Speech of this year that he's now considering eventually doing something. He hasn't even been able to, Madam Speaker, proceed with the reform of the methods of appointing Q.C.'s, a subject which was very dear to his heart in his pre-ministerial days. I don't know if we can expect his successor to proceed with the proposition of beer in grocery stores or not, but these seem to be the extent of the effectiveness of my honourable friend the past minister as Attorney-General. However, we'll have a great deal more to say about him at a later date, Madam Speaker.

While talking about the Attorney-General's department, I want to condemn this government in the strongest possible terms for failing to take any action with respect to the group of truant children in St. Vital. We have a compulsory school attendance law in Manitoba. That law is one of the most fundamental laws; it is the guarantee to every child in Manitoba that he will get an education. Before its passing there were unfortunately children who did not get an education and were thus deprived of equal opportunity. The law in Manitoba is clear. The school attendance legislation requires that children attend school to the age of 15, and it is the duty of the government to see that the law is enforced. Instead this government has sat back and watched the law being flouted. I charge this government with a callous disregard for the rights of these children. Criticism or defence of the parents and their reason for keeping their children away from school is irrelevant to this issue. The important thing is that these children have lost three months of schooling -- about one-third of their school year -- and probably can't catch up on their work now. What's to be done with them? Will they be kept in their present grades for another year? I serve notice that we in the official Opposition want a full statement from the government on why it has permitted the law to be flouted. The law is the law. The government's responsibility is to see to it that laws are observed.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to turn to a problem that is of vital concern to all of us in Manitoba -- the problem involving old age pensioners. The Federal Government's proposed Canada Pension Plan is designed to provide a contributory income-related pension fund that will look after the needs of all citizens in this country after retirement. It requires discussion and scrutiny by all of us, and public debate on the plan has no doubt been beneficial, but surely we have a right to expect more from the First Minister of this province than the doubts he expressed in newspaper columns about the priority that should be given to old age security, and the negative position that he has taken at all times is a development of this plan. He has let down our senior citizens by his statements.

I hope that the paragraph from the Speech from the Throne on portable pensions does not mean that the First Minister is off on another one of his "go it alone" ideas. I point out to him that the Province of Ontario is presently holding back its own legislation to make it fit into the federal plan.

Leaving the Canada Pension Plan, which is still in the planning stage, I want to deal now with the Federal Government's ten dollar increase in the present flat rate old age pension, which brought them to \$75.00 a month. Last July, when the First Minister was going to Ottawa for the federal-provincial talks, he said he would press for an immediate increase in the old age pensions to \$75.00. The Federal Government already had plans to implement a ten dollar increase, based at that time on the Canada Pension Plan. Meanwhile that increase has gone through. But back in July -- and this is a clipping on the 23rd of July, 1963, which says -- large headlines -- "Roblin will seek pension increase." The great defender of the old age people at that time, Madam Speaker. "Premier Duff Roblin will propose an immediate increase in the old age pensions to \$75.00 a month when he goes to Ottawa Friday for federal-provincial talks. The Premier said Tuesday that the old age security pension should be raised without delay" -- there was no time to waste, Madam Speaker. Now what did the First Minister do when the \$75.00 cheques came out? He immediately chopped off \$10.00 from the Social Allowance which is paid monthly to some eight or ten thousand elderly persons who can't get along on their pension alone. In other words, Madam Speaker, we have the situation in Manitoba where a needy person who, before, was receiving \$65.00 in their Old Age Pension cheque and, for example, \$30.00 in a Social Allowance payment, now is getting \$75.00 in the

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) Old Age Pension cheque but only \$20.00 in Social Allowance. He's still getting only \$95.00 a month because the First Minister has robbed him of the extra money that Ottawa felt he needed and which the First Minister last July was pressing Ottawa to give.

What about the better-off elderly person who, before, was getting a \$65.00 pension and had a private pension plan of say \$200.00 a month, or a total of \$265.00. Now he's getting the full \$10.00 increase, or \$275.00. It's pretty clear that the actions of this provincial government has hurt the group that needed the extra money most. This is the second time, Madam Speaker, that the First Minister has robbed the needy of their pension increase by chopping off an equal amount on their Social Allowances. The last time it happened was in 1962 when the pension was increased from \$55.00 to \$65.00. The First Minister explained then that those pensioners on Social Allowances were already getting sufficient money to look after their needs. How can you say that those who are better off should get the \$10.00 increase and those who are on Social Allowance shouldn't? It doesn't make any sense.

Madam Speaker, the Provincial Government's disregard for our needy pensioners warrants this House expressing non-confidence in this government. I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that this House regrets that the Government of Manitoba, after calling on the Government of Canada for an immediate increase of \$10.00 in the Old Age Pension, has denied that increase to many elderly persons in the province by reducing its Social Allowance payments.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

.continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I sat here with some pleasure, not to say entertainment, in listening to the speech which we have just been favoured with on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. In that speech he underlines for all to see what a difficult task he has. It is tough to be the Leader of the Opposition in this province today when we have a government like the present one that is on its toes. It is tough to find these things about which he wishes to direct public attention to the extent that we should be turned out of office because of our neglect or inefficiency, or whatever you will have it. But he's learned one thing. He's learned that if you don't get him on one side, try and get him on the other, because today we have listened to what I choose to call the revised edition of the Leader of the Opposition - very much revised - very much reformed - because when he formerly would speak to us here, he would come down on the side of too fast and too far. Do you remember it? Do you remember those eloquent appeals for us to slow down? Do you remember those expressions of concern lest the province be rushing headlong into financial disaster because we moved too fast and too far? Well I remember them because I heard them for a number of terms. Now we are confronted with a speech that says, "Oh, but they're not going fast enough and far enough." That's their trouble this time. . . . am a beggar I will really say there is no sin but to be rich, and being rich by virtue then shall be to say there is no vice like beggary. That surely is the position of the honourable gentleman opposite. If you don't catch them on one side, try and catch them on the other.

Well I must confess, Madam, that I did not stand today to deal in any detailed way with the various points that he has raised. I don't think many of them are very new or refreshing, and I think they will be adequately dealt with by others who may speak in this debate at some other time. Just one or two general comments and then I have a particular statement that I wish to make to the House.

I wish to say how much I regret the terms in which my honourable friend referred to the problem that exists in St. Vital with respect to the students attending a private school there. I really wonder if he considered fully the import of what he had to say, because it is perfectly true that we are charged here with the responsibility of the administration of justice. But I suggest to you, Madam, that justice must be administered insofar as lays within the limitations imposed upon us. It should be administered with compassion and with understanding, and it is with compassion and understanding that we have attempted, perhaps not very well, but attempted to deal with this problem. There are certain procedures which need to be gone through to set the machinery of the law in motion. That has begun. But we attempted at every turn to give to those parents, who have the right to direct the course their children follow, the opportunity to express their case as their conscience evidently dictated they should do without bringing to bear upon them, without the fullest consideration, the full and mighty powers of state. We are dealing here with half a dozen families and parents, and yet my honourable friend wants this government to stand convicted of negligence because at the very first moment when he thinks that we should have, we did not set the juggernaut of the law rolling, to compel them to conform without any opportunity to give their side of the story. Well if we are wrong to have delayed, we accept the blame for that. The process of the law has begun, which members know, and no doubt it will continue until the issue is clarified.

But I apologize to no one, in this House or outside of it, for having approached this question which is able to set the opinion of this province on edge as nothing else in our public life can do. I apologize to no one that my colleagues and I have taken the course that we have in this particular problem. I am hopeful, although that hope may be vain, but I am hopeful that what I have to say today in the rest of my remarks this afternoon may lead the way to a reconciliation of all the outstanding problems of this character which perplexes this province and its people. So with those few remarks, Madam, on what my honourable friend has said, I assure him and other members of the House that the detailed points he mentions will be dealt with in an adequate and satisfactory way by those who have the particular responsibility for them.

I notice he does not approve of the way in which we organized the Cabinet. I suggest that he need not concern himself unduly; it may be some while before that responsibility becomes his. When he does he may view the matter in a different and, I trust, more constructive light than he did today. I assure him I am proud of my colleagues, all of them, and I am satisfied that they perform their duties to good effect.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)...

Now, Madam, I want to talk about the question which the honourable gentleman urged me to speak on, namely, the reference in the Throne Speech with respect to education. I would like to read this because of its importance, as far as we are concerned, to make sure that I present my thoughts to you in accurate form.

In the procedures of a parliamentary democracy the Speech from the Throne occupies a unique place. This is so because the Speech is the means by which the Executive Branch of the government places before the Assembly, and indeed the public at large, the important items of policy to be considered in the session that follows. Sometimes the references in the Gracious Speech require little elaboration to make their meaning clear. Other references by their nature call for careful and precise explanation so that their intent may be completely and thoroughly understood. In the Speech that we are considering now you have been informed of the government's intention to lay before you a measure concerning the relationship between the public school system and private schools. We deem it advisable and necessary that at the very earliest opportunity, and this is it, you should be informed of the exact nature of this proposal. Not only is a complete and accurate knowledge the essential basis for sound judgment, but when a measure is proposed which is likely to affect sensitive areas of the body politic as concerning fundamentals, it is incumbent upon the sponsor to declare his policies and his reasons. It is for this purpose, therefore, that I speak to you now.

One need only mention the phrase "Manitoba School Question" to indicate the frame of reference into which my remarks are placed and to make abundantly clear the emotional, philosophical and religious considerations with which the subject is surrounded. I shall not now rehearse in detail an account of the sad, bitter and wounding nature of the great debates of the 1890's. Suffice it to say its effect on the political and constitutional history of Manitoba and of Canada is writ large for all to see. Though its echoes reverberated on the federal scene until 1897, the voters of Manitoba in the provincial elections of 1892 and 1896 displayed, in the words of Professor W. L. Morton, and I quote, "the settled belief of the electorate that the school question was no longer an open issue." And so it seemed.

That this assumption was to prove wrong in the minds of many citizens of this province is a fact that history was subsequently to establish, since it is all too apparent that today this issue is still with us and still smoulders explosively beneath the surface of our political and community life.

If the problem has not lost any of its difficulties with the passage of time, at least one may be thankful for the happier atmosphere in which it is possible to discuss it in 1964. Truly the scars of bygone days can still be seen. Opinions may be just as strongly and as religiously held as in former times, but there has been a determined and successful effort on the part of most of us to approach our responsibilities today in an atmosphere of calm and prayerful deliberation. Few of us wish this question to become a matter of issue between political parties. I am not so foolish as to expect universal approval for what we suggest, but we hope for an agreed consensus of both majority and minority opinions.

Looking back from the vantage point of 1964, I believe three main principles stand out as basic to the settlements of 70 years ago. First, it was decided that there should be a separation of church and state as that expression is understood in Manitoba. Second, it was decided that public funds should be dedicated to the support of a single public school system in which all children have the right to enroll and which all taxpayers have the duty to maintain. Third, it was decided that parents were at liberty to enroll their children in private schools of their own choosing, such schools, however, to be supported entirely by private resources.

To comment on these principles, as far as this government is concerned, it can have but one policy with respect to all religions and churches, and that is a respectful neutrality. Manitoba has never had anything in the nature of an established church or state religion. The separation of church and state is a cornerstone of our constitution. How can it be otherwise in a pluralistic society? Be it remembered, however, that the foundations on which that separation rests is neither a-religion or anti-religion, but religious liberty. Its inspiration is tolerance and its object religious equality. That is the basis of the present religious instruction provisions in the Public Schools Act. Manitoba is also a democracy subscribing to the rule of law. One law that cannot be altered by any power vested in the people of Manitoba is Section 22 of The Manitoba Act. This has been conclusively interpreted by the highest judicial

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... authority as meaning that while the establishment of our common system of free public non-sectarian schools supported by taxation levied on all is lawful, Manitobans cannot be deprived of the constitutional right to have their children educated in a private school, outside the public school system. This right of minority and of conscience is enshrined and inviolable.

Since the 1890's no political party has sought, and no government has received, a mandate to set these principles aside. At present they remain the basic principles on which public education policy is founded. And I repeat that statement -- they remain the basic principles on which public education policy is founded. It is against this background that we must now proceed to consider what measures are called for in the interests of the education of children and sound public policy. While preserving the integrity of the principles on which public education policy rests, our inspiration must be to bring as well the best educational opportunities to the children whose constitutional right to attend private schools we respect.

Having thus made clear and plain the attitude of the government on the basic principles on which Manitoba's educational system rests, let me now offer an examination of the operation or working regulations of our school system within the ambit of those principles, and to suggest how that operation and working mechanism may be modified in the interests of our school children, especially those in private schools. The modification submitted for your consideration is basically simple. It is based on the proposition that if a child has a right to the whole he has an equal right to a part. It can be briefly described as: "a program of shared services or the open door policy."

At present, in the operation of our public school system we provide that every child has the right to enroll in the public schools. He also has the right to decline the public school service and enroll in a private school. In spite of this, the public school stands ready at any time to accept him as a public school pupil.

However, if the child is enrolled in the private school, he then forfeits any part whatsoever of the public school services. He thus has lost all his rights in the public school system and the rule obtains even though his parents are obliged to continue to pay their public school tax. The practice therefore is all -- or nothing. The child must take 100% of the public school services or he will get none of them.

When this situation is analyzed, doubts as to its necessity -- or indeed of its justice -- must surely arise. Can it be maintained that the whole does not include all the parts? Is it logical -- indeed is it fair -- to offer freely to a private school child, 100% of the public school service if he will only take it, but at one and the same time, refuse him a portion of the public school service if -- as he has the undoubted constitutional right to do -- he does not accept it all? The public school system stands ready to give 100% of its service to a private school child if called upon to do so. Should it not stand equally ready to give a part of that service if part only should be desired? Indeed will not the whole relationship between the public and private school be altered for the better if we open the public school door for a program of shared services that may conceivably lead to a harmonious and growing association of the private schools with the public school system itself, while at the same time respecting constitutional rights.

We suggest then, that the "all or nothing" practice can be changed for an open door policy of shared services in complete harmony with the three great principles of the settlements of the 1890's to the real benefit of the children of our province and to the reinforcing of unity and understanding among our people. Separation of church and state, the maintenance of the public school system, and liberty of conscience are all fully consistent with an open door at the public schools for the program of shared services.

Let us then examine how such a program might work in practice. First, where would the services be offered? It would be offered by the public school system and in the public school. Second, what services would be offered? In general terms anything available at the public school could be offered. The private pupil would be entitled to any one or more of the services he would get if he were enrolled at the public school. Nothing more -- but nothing less. Third, how would the service be offered? Private schools wishing for shared services would affiliate with a public school division or district and receive the service under public school regulations at the public school.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)...

The Services thus rendered by the public school system at the public school would naturally operate on public funds to which the parent of the private pupil has already made his full tax contribution. No payments would be made to private schools. I repeat that -- no payments would be made to private schools. Private pupils would remain at liberty to continue private school classes where this was desired as a constitutional right.

All this may sound very straightforward, but in fact there are real problems of administration and organization for the public school system to solve. The authority of the public school administration needs to be recognized. Precise ways and means of requesting a shared service and of providing it need to be elaborated. Questions of timing, notice and schedule will have to be settled. But when the public school system has already accepted the responsibility of providing a full service on demand, as it has, the problem of offering a shared service will yield to effort and to goodwill.

But even if these problems are solved, does the shared service idea run the risk of reducing the effectiveness of the public school system itself? I do not think so. To the extent that the presently existing private schools decide to affiliate to the public school for shared services, it strengthens and enlarges the public school. It may also reduce any element of divisiveness that may be thought to exist between public and private schools without offence to the constitutional rights of conscience or of minorities.

Might there be, however, a proliferation of new private schools as the result of shared services that would work a harm to public education? I think that possibility can be guarded against. Without in any way affecting the existing right to establish new private schools we may regulate the conditions under which such new private schools might be accepted for affiliation with a public school for shared services. These conditions might call for a new private school to operate a minimum number of classrooms with a minimum total pupil count before it is eligible for affiliation; and such new private school affiliations might be limited to school divisions where the population is sufficiently numerous and concentrated to permit the public school system to operate freely. Such rules may appear repugnant in theory but they may be a necessary assurance. Other matters of planning and organization and co-ordination would require careful study.

I consider, however, that the concept of shared services and an open door at the public school has great merit. It respects the basic principles of our public school system. It honors the rights of conscience and minorities. It introduces the possibility of a harmonization and a reconciliation of the public school system with the private schools. It will operate substantially to the benefit of our children and yet it is by no means a compromise. It is not the thin edge of anyone's wedge. No payments are to be made to private schools. It works against divisiveness and for understanding. It is in fact a new concept, fully compatible with majority education policy and minority education rights. The interests of the public school system and of the children within the public school are fully preserved and at the same time it opens to private pupils a door that is now closed. Shared services and the principles of the open door offer the promise of a new measure of harmony and mutual benefit to the school children and people of our province.

If these hopes are to be fulfilled, we must provide a full opportunity for debate and examination, both by the Legislature itself and by the public at large. To facilitate this process we are now preparing a motion providing for the appointment of a Special Committee of the House to consider the advisability of a program of shared services for private school children within the public school system, in a manner consistent with the principles of the separation of church and state, preservation of the integrity of the public school system, and in conformity with the constitutional rights of minorities.

The Select Committee may not only consider the matter itself but provide an opportunity for representations by the public who may wish to express their views. And here let me add that I hope that the Select Committee will be representative of the three main parties in this Legislative because we have always hoped, and so far successfully, to approach this matter on the broadest possible basis. We feel as well that this concept of shared services is a new one for the people of our province, one which perhaps may not explain itself on first hearing to those who are interested in this matter, but we should provide the fullest opportunity for members of the general public and members of the Legislature to hear the views of those who

(Mr. Roblin, contd)... are interested and to examine all aspects of this matter in the hope that the line of action proposed here may, after full examination and consideration, prove worthy of acceptance.

Let us pledge ourselves therefore to deal with this matter on the highest level of public responsibility. If Manitobans can be brought to an understanding and an acceptance of this measure, I believe we may look for a new increase in the mutual respect and appreciation that exists between the communities of our province and a growth of spirit and unity among our people.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the N. D. P.) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: It has been moved by the leader of the New Democratic Party...

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I don't object to the Honourable Leader of the N. D. P. having the adjournment. I am ready to speak and I wonder if I could speak at this time.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is the House agreed? -- The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, as you no doubt know by now, I am rising to answer to a point of the proposal made by the leader of this House. I feel that there must be some merits in what he has said. I don't think that at first glance anyway one could decide if it should be accepted or if it should be refused. I might say that this is too important to make even my own personal decision at this time. I would have to read the statement of the First Minister many times over again before I could justify taking action immediately. I might say that no doubt there is some merit in what has been said by the Premier today, but I feel that unfortunately what should be done first is to decide if there is an injustice being done and, if so, I think that the members of this House should have had a chance to stand up and be counted to admit that an injustice is being done or, if they thought that everything was fine, to refuse to vote for this motion. No doubt after this statement I will have to withdraw my motion as it would serve no purpose, but before anything is done I would like to give these thoughts to the Premier and to the members of this House.

MR. ROBLIN: raised a point of order I could clarify it for him if he wished me to. I am sure when the resolution that I have suggested is before the Legislature my honourable friend will have an opportunity to amend it in the terms of which he has already given notice, so if he wishes a debate it can certainly take place.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I know that I will have the chance at this time. I am talking about my original motion that should come up tomorrow and I doubt if I will be allowed to proceed with this motion.

Now I would like to give my thoughts also, Madam Speaker, and I also find that this is very important and I will follow my notes fairly close. A motion has always played an important part in discussion on this subject as the First Minister has said. This is understandable, when with so many people this is a question of principle. Unfortunately, too few are familiar with the existing conditions in this field and also with the recommendation of the Royal Commission, and at this time I would like to discuss these three different aspects, namely, the present situation as it really exists and why I believe an injustice is being done; and also what could be done to remedy this situation without injury to the public school system. I might also discuss the political aspect of the question as was mentioned by the First Minister and present some of my personal observations.

To begin with, let us study the existing situation, and I will discuss mostly the situation as it affects the Catholics of Manitoba simply because I am more familiar with this. But let me say now that I consider that members of other groups certainly should enjoy the same rights as the Catholics do.

There are approximately 40 to 50 thousand Catholic students in Manitoba. Now I would like to try to show you where these children are attending school. It is difficult to have the exact number so I will use the figure 40 thousand. Of those 40 thousand, approximately 10 thousand are attending private schools and the remaining 30 thousand are attending public schools. We can have a breakdown of the numbers of Catholic children attending these public schools. There are approximately 10 thousand or so attending public schools in a section where there is predominantly either French or ethnic groups, predominantly a Catholic district

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) . . . in other words, and in these schools the majority of students are Catholic and are entitled to their own teachers and they feel that this is at least satisfactory education -- the Catholic parents' view of this is satisfactory education for their children. Then we have the Catholic children attending public schools in predominantly non-Catholic areas, and there are roughly 20 thousand of these. Here again we can have another breakdown. Those -- and this I would say would be mostly in rural areas, who live in predominantly non-Catholic centres where there are no private schools and where the number of Catholic children does not warrant the building of private schools. This group -- and I think I must admit that I'm guessing a bit here, it is difficult to arrive at the correct number -- would be approximately another 10 thousand. Then there are the children who are attending public schools where there are presently private schools in the area. These children are not attending private schools, either because their parents cannot afford it or because these private schools cannot accommodate them because of lack of funds. Well also in this group we can include those attending public schools in districts not presently served by private schools but where the number of such children would warrant the building of private schools. I would say that there are approximately 10 thousand of these again; and in these last two groups, these come mostly from urban areas.

Now that we know that the Roman Catholic children of Manitoba -- where the Roman Catholic children of Manitoba attend school, we must discuss what the Catholics of Manitoba want. Let us start by talking about those in the last two groups mentioned. That is those who are at present attending a public school in a predominantly non-Catholic centre, but who could, and we believe should attend a private school. I would like to read from Chapter 11 of the report of the Royal Commission on Education before going any further, Madam Speaker, and on Page 78, No. 6, "The Commission having weighed the evidence submitted, and much evidence of its own, is of the view that private and parochial schools are not everywhere harmful. But equally the Commission is agreed that in some small and/or sparsely settled school districts, a second school would on balance be more harmful than beneficial, both to the children attending it and to those remaining in the public school. Notwithstanding whatever harm may resolve, alternative schools are today permitted in even such districts just so long as they are privately financed. As the Commission recommends public support of such private and parochial schools as are not clearly injurious to education, it recommends not just non-support, but prohibition of such private and parochial schools as are, or if established, would be clearly harmful to the education of either children attending them or those already in the public school in the district."

And on page 179, Madam Speaker, No. 9, "The Commission therefore recommends that wherever a minority religious, or other, can be provided with the kind of education they wish for their children, this should be done. However, the Commission believes it must guard against its recommendation for tax support of alternative schools leading to their establishment in districts in which as best we can judge they would be harmful in themselves and to the public schools. The problem as the Commission sees it, is to provide some measure of public support for private and parochial schools without injuring the public school system."

Madam Speaker, this is the first thing that we would like to see, that is, that whenever possible and where it would not harm the present public school system, we would like to see our children receive the kind of education we feel is better for them. Our children would be attending either private schools or public schools in predominantly Catholic centres whenever possible. Now in order to enable us to operate these private schools we need a certain measure of public aid and this is what we're asking for.

I would like to talk about the financial setup before bringing in the question of rights, but at this time I wish to state that in justice we are entitled to exactly the same share of public money for the education of each child as is given to each student in the public school system, but we are not demanding this. In fact, I feel that the education of our children will mean more to us, and to our children, if we are ready to make a few sacrifices and to finance a larger part of our children's education, but the situation is getting extremely serious. More of our children must drop out of parochial schools because their parents cannot afford to keep them; and more of our private schools will have to close their doors because it will be financially impossible to stay open. Eventually, because of lack of funds, the standard of education in

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... our private schools will not be good enough and we might be forced to abandon our private schools. And this is a very important point, Madam Speaker. I say "forced to", because these schools will be closed only when it is absolutely necessary.

Once in a while there are rumours that the Catholics will close their schools in order to force the government to pay for the education of their children, but I doubt that our schools will every be closed willingly. Too many Catholics believe as I do, that we can't play with the welfare of our children and we must provide them with the education that we feel they should receive as long as we are able to do so. This is a question of principle with us and we will not try to bluff the government or the people of Manitoba. Therefore, when you hear that certain schools, such as the Immaculate Conception School in Winnipeg, are closed, you will know that this was not a bluff but rather that it was impossible for these schools to remain open. We are demanding only enough help to keep our schools open and to keep them on a comparable standard to the public schools. This is the reason why my proposed motion asks only for the approval of the principle of state aid. I feel that if this was done it would be comparatively easy for the government, or the members of this House, to sit down and draw up a fair program of public aid to private schools, but I think that we have to study the principle before arriving at any solution.

To assure those of you who might feel that I have something up my sleeve and that I'm only trying to get my foot in the door, I will personally go on record as saying that I will be satisfied if the teachers in the private schools could receive the ordinary teacher's grant from public funds; and if the teachers and children could receive fringe benefits such as pensions for the teachers and textbooks for the children. I feel sure that this would be acceptable to the Catholics of Manitoba.

Now I would like to explain the financial condition regarding private schools, as it is clear that too many people do not understand the present conditions. Many believe that the Catholics are asking for something extra. At the present, as far as the province is concerned, these 10 thousand students in parochial schools do not even exist. They receive not one bit of help. The Catholic parents build their own schools without receiving any grant; they pay the teachers; maintain their own buildings; they must buy books for their children, provide transportation to and from school; pay for the milk; and instal their own fire detection system in these schools if they wish to have them. All this without any help at all. Besides this they are carrying their full -- and I repeat -- their full share of federal, provincial and municipal taxes that provide education for the other children of Manitoba. This is what for 70 years has been accepted as fair in this province; this is how we protect religious freedom in this province; and this, Madam Speaker, has been done under full Conservative and Liberal administration.

I am told that it costs approximately \$300 each year to educate a child here in Manitoba. The people of Manitoba therefore have been saving \$3 million on these 10 thousand children that they have refused to educate up to now. This injustice, Madam Speaker, could be rectified. For example, by accepting my plan of paying grants to teachers and by allowing fringe benefits which would cost less than 40 per cent of the total cost, but we will use the figure 50 percent just to make sure to be conservative, well then this would cost approximately \$1.5 million to give the Catholics of Manitoba what they want in these private schools. The people of Manitoba could rectify a wrong and would still save \$1.5 million. But this isn't all. By providing some measure of help for private schools we would make it possible for some Catholic children now attending public schools to attend private schools and provide another saving to the public of approximately 60 percent of total cost. But here again we will use the more conservative figure of 50 percent of the total cost of educating each child, and this would save another \$150 for each child that would leave the public school to attend the private school.

Now let us say that public aid is given to parochial schools. It would cost the province approximately \$1.5 million for the children attending these private schools, but on the other hand if let us say that 10 thousand students, and I'm only using this as an example, now attending public school would transfer from public schools to private schools, this would mean a saving of public funds of approximately \$150 per child, or \$1.5 million. This should show that the cost from public funds would be very little, if any, as we would have a more even distribution of public funds now being spent on the education of Catholic children.

Before I leave the financial picture, I would like to remind the members of this House

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... that our financial burden is heavier now since the first part of the Royal Commission's report has been implemented. It was bad enough before but since then the cost of education has at least doubled. This means that Catholic parents, like everyone else in the province, are paying at least twice as much towards the education taxes, and besides this they are supporting their own schools. They might have to pay \$20-\$25 for their books and also \$25 a month for each child. The cost of operating these private schools on a par with the public schools is also much higher due to the fact that these schools have to compete for teachers who are receiving much higher salaries.

Now that we have a better understanding of the financial problem confronting the Catholics of this province, let us look at some of the objections that have been raised. We have talked about divisiveness, about religion does not belong in schools -- everyone should be satisfied with a secular education. I do not intend to deal with these separately, Madam Speaker -- I have answered these questions on previous occasions -- but at least notice that the granting or refusing of aid will not alter the situation too much, as the majority of Catholic children would not change schools. Then we are told that schools would be mushrooming all over; the Commission was very clear in recommending that this should not be allowed and the two paragraphs that I have read should answer this objection. In fact if the government wants to make sure they could bring in stricter regulations than those brought in by the Commission.

We are then told that Catholics are already enjoying too many privileges. I would like someone to name one privilege that Catholics get in this field of education. When Catholics do not receive one cent how are they privileged? Apparently the fact that these schools are allowed to remain open is a privilege in itself. Well, Madam Speaker, this is not a privilege but a right, and I will come back to this. First I would like to point out that those who bring in these objections, if they are really sincere, would insist that these schools should be closed and that the children attending them be educated in public schools. In other words, they would insist that the government spend at least another three million dollars per year. They have never suggested this and this is why in the past I have stated that they were either not familiar with the situation, or they lacked sincerity, and I think that today you have the proof.

Then there are those people who do not want to endanger the present public school system. These people are sincere; they represent the larger portion of those opposing state aid. I, and all other Catholics in the province, have always agreed with this principle. Today, publicly, I would go on record as saying that whenever there is any danger of causing injury to the public school system, we do not want any change at all. This is not a compromise. This is something that we would insist on. This is something that we always believe in.

Then we hear an awful lot about separation of Church and State, and the Premier today spoke about this many times. I welcome the occasion to discuss this. Let us look back in 1802 when Thomas Jefferson urged very strongly that there should be separation between the Church and the State. You must remember that the United States formed a new country with people from all the parts of the old country. Many of them had come from countries that had an official religion, such as the Anglicans in England and Great Britain, and the Catholics in Spain. Of course, this would never do in the United States, because freedom of religion had to be protected. This of course is very true of Canada also, although there is no mention of separation of Church and State in the B. N. A. Act. But this phrase was not coined by Thomas Jefferson, but more than 100 years previously Pope Innocent XIV had used it in its proper sense, exactly as it was later meant by Thomas Jefferson, in other words, separation, not as an end in itself, but as a means to preserve the basic liberty, freedom of religion. Jefferson himself in his famous Danbury letter clarified the wall of separation as a means to guarantee the ultimate liberty, individual freedom of religion. Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, in his book, *The Living Bill of Rights*, states, and I quote: "The State may not compel any form of religious observance. This does not, however, prevent all co-operation between Church and State." In other words, the constitutional principle is that individual freedom of religion must be guaranteed and when the principle is not preserved and the State infringes on the individual's freedom of religion, then the wall of separation is not a useful means. Justice Douglas separation was not put into our constitution because of any hostility to religion.

We often hear about the Bill of Rights, but I've never heard about the Bill of Privileges and I still insist that freedom of religion is a right and not a privilege. This House is not in a

(Mr. Desjardins, Cont'd). . . position to grant privileges to the Catholics and this is not what I'm asking for, but this House does have the duty of defending the rights, even the rights of minorities, and this is what I insist on. Right now in this province, those who, in the exercise of their freedom of religion, choose one way of educating their children, rather than another, are deprived of property and denied the equal protection of the law, precisely because of their religious convictions. They are faced with an unfair deprivation of their liberty. They are given an unfair choice, perhaps unwittingly. They can exercise freedom of religion and pay heavily for the exercise of this freedom, or they can prevent the unfair burden of the loss of their property by surrendering their freedom of religion and using a public school contrary to their religious convictions. The government should not penalize those who exercise their rights.

Madam Speaker, if we continue as we are now doing, freedom will be taxed right out of existence. The private schools will be rendered hopelessly inferior and ultimately extinguished by considerable public aid to public schools only.

Madam, what would happen if the government were to decide that public funds may be spent only in public hospitals? I asked the Minister of Education this question. Why don't we hear cries that the Grey Nuns Hospital in St. Boniface or the Salvation Army's Grace Hospital should not be allowed to receive any money, any grants, from the provincial government? What about this principle of separation of Church and State? What is the difference, Madam Speaker? Isn't it a fact that Greater Winnipeg would be in a sad state without hospitals owned and operated by the Catholics, Salvation Army and the Mennonites? And, by the way, didn't the members of this House unanimously approve a grant to the affiliated college last year? Why can't this be done now? What is the difference in the principle, Madam Speaker?

We can look at the provinces to either side of us, Saskatchewan and Ontario, and we will see that they seem to be able to respect the freedom of all the citizens without too much trouble, and the political parties have not tried to use this issue for partisan politics. Why can't this be done right here in this province?

And talking about the political situation, there is no doubt that, politically speaking, this question is considered embarrassing. In the past the government, the different political parties, their leaders, and in fact most of the members of this House, have shied away from expressing -- excuse me -- an opinion publicly. We hear that this question could be the downfall of the Conservative Party, and I am told that my motion could ruin the Liberal Party. Madam Speaker, are the parties that weak that they cannot survive if the members of their caucus accept the responsibility? Do these parties want to dictate to the consciences of their members? If this is the case, these parties are not worth saving. Friends of mine express their satisfaction here in Manitoba we are so tolerant. After all, isn't it a fact that a major party has as its leader a French Catholic, a member of the minority? Madam Speaker, what is so wonderful about this if the people who chose him do not want him to vote according to his conscience? "Roblin will lose all his votes in certain parts of the province." This is something else that is heard. I repeat, Madam Speaker, these fears are exaggerated. The people of Manitoba, they expect us to follow the dictates of our conscience. They admire true leadership, and I sincerely believe this. But even if they didn't, have we the right to sell our souls, our honour, for a few measly votes?

Madam Speaker, my proposed motion was very carefully worded. It does not place the onus on any group. It does not set out any amount to be given and it clearly states that the principle of public aid should be approved but with one condition, and only with this condition, that it could be done without injury to our public school system. Those whose main aim is to safeguard our public school system would be safe in voting for this motion. Those who feel that at least something should be done -- and apparently this is what the government is doing -- some little measure of help should be given, would also be protected, and I feel that this is the only way to get this decided once and for all, is to vote on the principle, to see if we are right in refusing aid to a certain group because of their religion. The only ones who should vote against this motion are those who sincerely believe that no injustice is done at the present, that the children attending these private schools, their parents, their teachers, are second-class citizens and should continue to be second-class citizens. Madam Speaker, I hesitate to believe that even one member of this House can honestly say that this is what he believes.

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... There is no reason why, with co-operation -- and believe me we need an awful lot of co-operation in this instance -- and with a little courage, this all-important first step could not be taken. If this was done, especially if we were unanimous or near-unanimous, then we would succeed in doing what we have been trying to do for the past five years, that is, to take this question out of partisan politics. Then either the government or a committee, this committee like we're talking about naming now, could decide what should be done, how far we should go, and what should be fair, always keeping in mind that the public school system should be protected at all costs. But I repeat again, this should be done only after the principle has been accepted or rejected, to get this out of politics once and for all.

Since the last Session, my life has been greatly affected by the tragic loss of a beloved daughter and a beloved mother. Every time I tried to prepare material for this speech my thoughts would drift back to my daughter. I wanted so much to let you know how I felt, but I always hesitated. Would I be understood or would I be accused of being too emotional? I have finally decided that even at the risk of being considered too melodramatic I would try to tell you something about the feelings, about what is important, feelings of a father who finds himself helpless and unable to do anything for a dying child. After all, we seldom hesitate to speak about other things that are interesting to us, important to us, such as our cars, our homes. Why would it be poor taste, why would it be wrong to talk about our children, for whom we live, toil and sweat? Four days before the end of the last Session, my younger daughter Michelle was suddenly taken ill and was sent to the hospital to undergo extensive tests. It was soon apparent that she was suffering from a rare case of heart disease and we were given little hope that she would ever recover. For several months we died a little with her each day. After awhile she herself realized how serious her condition was. You can just imagine how we felt. During her last stay at home, at about three o'clock one day, 3:00 a. m., after she had been suffering very much, she asked if I would talk to her. It was then that she confided that she was no longer afraid to die. She understood that soon she might be asked to make a sacrifice. It was then that she asked me to make her a promise. Would I, after her death, make arrangements to give her eyes to some little blind girl? Two days later she entered the hospital for the last time. Again on two different occasions she mentioned about her eyes, and finally one day, when we had been called in by the doctors, who felt that the end was near, and while she was in an oxygen tent, she asked me again about her eyes. After I assured her that all arrangements had been made, she smiled and said, "Oh, I am so happy. They won't be wasted. Some poor little blind girl will see again." And then, bringing her little hands to her eyes, she closed them and said, "I'd better save them."

The same day, she asked her mother if the doctor would like to have her heart, and when she realized the question had puzzled her mother, she explained that the doctor was interested in research, and knowing that her disease was not too common, he might be interested in studying her heart after her death, and he might be able to help someone else. She actually was suggesting an autopsy after her death.

Madam Speaker, at this point it was impossible to hold back the tears but she still had a sense of humor. She told me if I did not stop crying I would make the grass grow. I tried to explain that my tears were not tears of bitterness but rather tears of pride, as I felt that she was such a good little girl. This embarrassed her and she assured me that she was but an ordinary little girl, and when I added that she seemed to understand so well, to be so brave for a young girl of twelve, she answered, "Well daddy, I go to school, you know." In other words, she took it for granted that this was something that one should learn in school. Now do you see why we want this kind of education?

Madam Speaker, I mention this story only to help you realize why our schools are so important to us, why we believe in them, why we will always insist and fight for our rights to educate our children as we see fit. There is nothing that I wouldn't have done for my child. I would have gladly traded my business, my political future, my life, for that of my daughter, but my hands were tied. There was nothing I could do to give her back her health. At this stage the good marks she had in school were not important. She was not asked to earn a living but rather to face her death. It was then that I realized how very important a Christian education is. "I pray little Jesus to come and get me, if it is His will", she would say, and at times, when she was suffering she would hesitate to ask for morphine as she was ready to

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... accept suffering, and offer it for others, for her parents, and yes, Madam Speaker, for the settlement of this school question. Not once did she say, "Give my eyes to a French girl or to a Catholic girl!" but it was always to "a poor little girl." Could she have received this kind of education that some people would have us fear? Forgive me, Madam Speaker, if I have been emotional, but during the past year I have had the chance to reassess my values. I thank God for having loaned me this little girl for twelve years and I would like to try to continue her labor of love.

Madam Speaker, please allow me to ask Duff, Gil, Russ and all the members to forget the worldly demands this afternoon, to forget the rat race, and think of Andrew and Paul, Anne and Jennifer and all their children. Prejudices will not disappear because we ignore them, and if we are not ready to vote on this question this is what we are doing. We must face them. We must make a decision. Let us make this province a better place to grow in. Let us strive to forget political expediency. Let us have a cease fire, just for this once, and work together to eradicate prejudices and to correct an injustice.

On January 28th on the CBC program, Eye to Eye, the Premier of this province was asked this question; "What would you like best to be remembered for in the pages of history?" and his answer was, "I would like to be remembered for having made the most of the opportunities that Providence gave me." A very commendable answer indeed. Well, Providence is giving all of us this great opportunity to do something worthwhile, and history will record our actions. Sure, this is a difficult task, but what credit could anyone ask if it was a cinch? Couldn't we just this once stop being pulse-takers? Couldn't we be real leaders for a change? Wouldn't this be better for the welfare of the people of this province? Couldn't we show a little faith in our people, and I am sure that we would find out that they would understand, and although as I say, there certainly is some merit in what has been suggested here today, I still would thank the government to have a vote on this, to get this out of partisan politics once and for all, and I would hope that the party leaders would not have tried to seek this amendment, and tomorrow I will still try to have this amendment put before you because I don't think anything in the Throne Speech was said that would clarify that this principle of state aid is being voted on. This is what I am asking for, for all the Members of this House to let this matter go to a vote, and to give a unanimous vote of justice and fair play, so that here in Manitoba at last we can truly say that we have an equal opportunity for all in the field of education.

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

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: I think the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities would like the indulgence of the House to have the next item stand. It is a lengthy proposition which we will no doubt be debating for some time. If that is agreeable, I will then move the adjournment, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.