

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 27th, 1965.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): On reading this resolution I am not clear on what was meant by the resolution and I listened carefully and reread the Honourable Leader's speech in that he so often makes the mistake of not differentiating between Hydro as a Department of Government and as a Royal Commission. Now this may appear to be a small point but nevertheless it is a point. But as I read his resolution he requests the government to equalize the rates in northern Manitoba. Now the Act of Manitoba Hydro reads in Section 40, concerning the sale of power, "the prices payable for power supplied by the corporation shall be such as to return to it in full the costs to the corporation of supplying power including, the necessary operating expenses of the corporation including the cost of generating, purchasing, distributing", and then of course goes on in Section B, to say there's a matter of interest and debt charges and so on.

Now in the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's speech after covering the differences of rates from urban Winnipeg, southern rural and to the northern areas which are supplied by diesel generation, he says, in conclusion, "the problem is not a great one." Now like so many problems that appear to be not great, nevertheless there is a very definite problem and rather vexing, because in these remote areas where transmission lines would be of such terrific cost as not to be economical and not feasible - sensible - then the generation of electrical service to these people must be made by mechanical means such as the diesel generator, and naturally members will realize that the cost in these instances is considerably greater. I think that Manitoba Hydro deserves a great deal of credit in the service it is giving to the north. Just this last recent while eight more communities were served by diesel electric generation. I understand that there are some 120, I believe it's 129, but let's say 120-odd Indian Metis sites in the province for example, and 90 of these are being served by Manitoba Hydro.

I would like to acquaint of the recent additions to this service generation. The Honourable Minister of Utilities touched upon this the other night, but some period - I suppose about a year ago, the Manitoba Hydro acquired the 16 doppler sites of the Distant Early Warning Line and it became feasible for Manitoba Hydro to use these diesel generating plants in the northern settlements, and the following points are receiving this service now. I will touch on Easterville first because it is rather in a different position. During August the distribution system was built and a diesel unit installed to provide service to approximately 55 customers. Road growth required the installation of a second diesel unit during November. Construction of the 33 mile line from Easterville to Grand Rapids is now nearly completed and distribution will become part of the southern system. Diesel units will be removed to use elsewhere. Operating experience has been quite good with the District Supervisor from Grand Rapids responsible for the operation. Now this is an instance where a remote point can be tied in with the transmission of the province.

At Manigotagan there are 31 customers being serviced; at Matheson Island 23 customers being served; at Wanless 20 customers, and this is on the original hookup and installation. At Cormorant it is anticipated that 38 domestic services and 11 commercial services will be connected at this location. At Thicket Portage, no sign up at Thicket Portage has been commenced. It is expected that the sign up and construction will commence in this location in the near future. At Ilford two diesel units and the distribution was put into service on March 19 to provide service for 36 customers. The wiring of all prospective customers was not completed but was underway when the plant was put in service. Wabowden, residents of Wabowden have only recently petitioned Manitoba Hydro to take over the local plant. The distribution system owned by Rock Island Power Company. At Gillam, approximately 50 customers at Gillam are receiving service from the CNR. There are eight more potential customers and estimates have been prepared but until CPR and the local residents submit requests no action will be taken.

Now all over the north there's this awareness that the service is necessary and will encourage the development of the north, but when you start to analyze the situation the real danger and risk of reducing rates which are already reduced beyond the actual cost of production and distribution, then the more you reduce the rates the more the usage of electricity in that community will grow and proportionately the bigger your losses will obtain. It is estimated that with all the communities now being supplied from diesel electric generators as well as those

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . . additional communities to which service is being extended by the extension of local diesel electric plants, were reduced to the rates now applying in southern Manitoba the annual estimated loss would be \$365,000.00. Now the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition says that this was a small problem. Well this is quite an item to impose upon a Hydro Electric System. I think that the management and the board deserve a very great deal of approval for the method that they have used in handling this very vexing problem, because the annual loss now will be in the order of with the present lowered rates that went in effective April first 1965, of \$190,000.00. This means that these users in the northern communities are being subsidized to the extent of the \$190,000.00. But this problem of the fact that when you reduce rates usage goes up and your losses proportionately become greater, is a tremendous problem.

Now I recently had the opportunity to have a study of the last chapter of a publication put out in the United States, the National Power survey, Federal Power Commission 1964, and they are forecasting that electrical rates in general and averaging across the continent will be reduced by 27 percent by 1980, I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the need of greater usage because while they point out in this survey that the costs relative to producing electricity will certainly increase during this time, the usage, the demand for electricity will grow at a much higher rate. Members can realize and understand that any given distribution system if you can pile more customers, more users onto that system and the load is being spread over a much broader field then this is certainly one of the areas in which reductions can be effected. And then when you think in turn by comparison of these tremendously remote areas in the north where the problem of getting the service to these people will never probably within our lifetime except if a large industry locates in a particular area, but generally speaking these remote areas over the north will probably not within years have such a load demand as to make feasible the tying in with the southern system. So this becomes a problem. Now, also you will find in the study of electrical production all over the continent, in fact anywhere in the world, it's natural that in remote areas and areas where they are not blessed with Hydro electric - costs are always somewhat dearer, so this matter of a differential is not unusual. The remote areas do represent a very great problem when it comes to equalizing rates with southern areas. It's interesting to note, if we think of the production of electricity to realize that this is one of the items that has not been plagued with this continually increasing costs over the past few years, so that in effect relatively and as this article forecasts, by 1980 costs will be lower over the continent, the fact remains that relatively Hydro costs are gradually and every day becoming lower, when you think of it in a relative aspect with other items. Now certainly if a private company were operating they would have a great deal of trouble I think explaining to the board of directors, at least to their fellow stockholders, as to why communities were being served at a loss, and certainly these remote areas -- and we certainly must feel sympathetic towards them -- but they are enjoying a very great advantage from the Manitoba Hydro System in this province.

So the issue boils down to simply one of a nice assessment between this progressively increasing loss with the greater usage, and a balance of what can be opposed upon the remainder of the system to compensate or to absorb this cost. And from my own personal experience I think the management and board have done an excellent job in very sympathetically assessing the proper burden which the southern users should assume and also a recognition of the distances and the problems involved and the very greatly increased costs of supplying power to this northern area.

Because of this situation, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition be amended by deleting all the words after the first "of" in the third line of the first paragraph, and substituting therefor the following words: "Electrical energy in the greater part of Manitoba outside the City of Winnipeg; and whereas certain communities in the province are supplied with electric service by Manitoba Hydro in isolated systems supplied from diesel electric generators or by local diesel electric plants due to the separation of such communities from the utility's main transmission network; and whereas rates charged for service supplied from diesel electric generating plants are, due to the economic factors involved, higher than those charged for comparable service to comparable communities where lower cost power is available from the utility's main transmission network; therefore be it resolved that this House requests the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board to continue its present policy of reducing such differentials as exist between the rates charged for electric service supplied from diesel electric

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . . generating stations and the rates applicable to essentially similar service in essentially similar communities supplied from the main transmission network; and in so doing give proper consideration to the importance of maintaining favourable rates for all classes of electric service in all parts of the province as well as to the element of subsidy involved when any services are supplied below cost".

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable Member for Brandon before you read the amendment? I didn't want to interrupt him before.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the . . . . from Brandon is agreeable.

MR. GRAY: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. LISSAMAN: Yes.

MR. GRAY: You mentioned a number of people who are utilizing the diesel electrical supply and others. Can you tell the House or tell me how many are not using it and whether it's because they don't want it or they cannot supply the electricity?

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I gave the honourable member that impression. I didn't give him the numbers that were using it. These were the recent additions of new users who were getting new diesel installations. I don't have the other figures. I could get them for the honourable gentleman. And as to the ones who are not using it, I think this would be rather impossible to obtain.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, is this amendment in order? It seems to be opposite to what the original resolution asked for and this is not -- in other words it's not in order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, it is in order. It is dealing with the same subject of lowering electrical rates. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us in point of fact, states that the matters concerning labour relations should be referred to the Labour Board. I believe there's no legislation more important and certainly in the future than labour legislation. From time to time we will receive information, as we did a few days ago regarding the chemical complex coming into Manitoba, we will receive information that there's going to be another industry into our province and we welcome this news. It creates employment which we welcome. It creates an expansion in our industry. But with that welcome news, also comes a problem and that is labour problems and as we become more industrial, we do on the one hand gain the benefit from industry, on the other hand, we do or could inherit some of the problems of labour relations.

Therefore I believe that there is no more important legislation in the future in this province than that legislation which will concern labour relations. So many of us have come from a rural background and perhaps do not completely appreciate the importance of this subject. Some of us on the other hand have come from the world of labour and we do appreciate this. We, I think, are very fortunate in this province in that we can at this time and in the near future have legislation which will create the right climate to encourage, to improve labour and management, that we can prosper, and both can prosper. We can learn from the old world, the older provinces. And I sincerely hope that we don't make the mistake of copying, rather that we learn the mistakes of others and improve on those mistakes, because I believe right now we are in the position where we can learn a great deal and we can lead probably North America and perhaps the world on this problem and asset of labour relations. When I say this, of course one must realize that the problems of labour and the problems of management are completely opposite. Their interests, their intentions, their motives are quite separate and right that they should be.

Therefore I believe that the problems of labour management relations are all matters of grey - they're not black and white - you can't have a problem decided. It's a continuing thing, it's a thing that's continually changing. Therefore I believe that we cannot make decisions in these matters which will be binding. I think they are matters we decide at this moment and have to perhaps change and amend in later years. They are matters not of black and white, but matters which are grey.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, I have discussed with a number of people who are better

(MR. STANES cont'd) . . . . qualified than myself and I have met people who do agree with this resolution. I have met people who do not agree with this resolution. In view of the Honourable the Minister's amendment, just a little earlier, late this afternoon, on a previous companion resolution, I'm inclined to agree that we should go slowly, but we'll go surely. I'm not one that say that we should put off the decisions, I'm also one that we should hastily go into decisions. Therefore I cannot find myself at this moment in a position where I can support this resolution, but rather that I'd like to consider it and in view of the amendment on a companion bill, I would like to go and rely upon the committee which is studying these things -- better qualified than myself -- headed by Dean Woods who has been appointed by both groups, un-animously I understand. They have been meeting for really quite a short time -- less than a year -- and I'm hopeful they'll come up with a decision, a decision which I'm sure will help our labour relations in this province in the future. Therefore I cannot support this resolution at this time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson and the proposed motion in amendment thereto of the Honourable the Member for Springfield. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I see that my honourable leader is absent. I wonder, with leave of the House, whether I'd be permitted to say a few words. We've sent for him so when he gets back he can continue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that about everything that could be said about the particular resolution has been said, that is on the main motion and I think there is a consensus of opinion from, if you took what everybody has said when speaking to this resolution, that it is of fairly great importance that we as Canadians learn to speak and write as many languages as possible. The situation in the world today demands that. And I believe that we as Canadians are gaining in influence in world affairs and the more languages we will know the more influence we'll be able to exert upon the international affairs.

And I feel Mr. Speaker, that the motion is a good one, not because it covers the Ukrainian language, immaterial of what language it would cover I would have the same thing to say and give it the same support. Of course we've got to think of the demand for the language as well as our ability to supply the tuition, and in this case I think we have both. We have the demand which has been proven by the attendance in the high schools, the number of children that have been taking this particular course; there was only one thing lacking and that is that the course as it stands at present comes to a dead end. There is no incentive to take it because you receive no credit after you have completed your Grade 11 course and I think it is only natural and necessary that we extend it throughout the secondary school as well as take it and give it in the university.

Now as far as the motion is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think it covered the ground well. I don't think there was any need for any amendment to it. In fact I am unable to apprehend or understand why the amendment was made. I am quite sure that the intention and the motive of the Honourable Member from Springfield was good but what I see lacking in it Mr. Speaker is that it's based on the false premise. One of the preambles reads as follows: "Whereas the Department of Education and the University of Manitoba have agreed to establish a committee to consider." Well, I haven't heard of any committee being established either by the government nor by the University of Manitoba and if you are going to bring in an amendment and base it on something that is not a fact then of course your resolution is no good; and the amendment is based on that false premise because the resolution reads, "Therefore be it resolved that this Legislature concur in the action being taken to secure university acceptance of Ukrainian" and so forth. But as far as we know, there is no action taken. We haven't had any commitment from the Honourable the Minister of Education or from any other reliable government source that this course is being taken. It may be considered but we have no assurance that it is being taken. As far as the Senate of the university, which I understand is the body that decides as to what courses are going to be offered at the university, we've heard nothing and I don't think that we have any jurisdiction over the Senate in its decision.

So I say that I'm sorry that this amendment was brought in, because it could very easily jeopardize the implementation of the resolution, the original motion and I'm sure that no

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd) . . . . member of this House would like to see that happen. I do believe that in all fairness to the amendment as it stands I don't see how we could support it and yet we have no choice to do anything else but support it, unless something is done to place it in the light in which the members of this Assembly can, on the basis of fact, and not on the basis of assumptions, give it support. I hope that in spite of the amendment that the suggestion contained in the motion will be accepted by the authorities and will be acted on.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for Ethelbert Plains for having spoken during my absence and I wish now to speak on the resolution itself. I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, to see the amendment that was proposed by the Honourable the Member for Springfield to this particular resolution. Here is another instance where a specific resolution embodying a principle was introduced by a member from this side of the House and the government immediately feels a necessity to amend it, to pat itself on the back in part and to, as I see it, delay the action recommended by the principle stated in the first resolution. But more than that Mr. Speaker we have the situation here where for the second time in a row in this particular department, in the Department of Education, we have a backbencher from the government side announcing supposedly government policy.

We had exactly the same thing earlier on the matter of vocational training in The Pas Vocational School, where absolutely no statement of policy had been made by the Minister, no indication of the courses that were to be taught, nothing at all except the statement that the school would be built; and we have the Honourable Member for Churchill getting up and giving us precise details as to courses to be taught and how the whole matter was to be handled and every aspect of the operation of that school and all the meetings that have been held beforehand and so on and so forth.

Now what do we have? The Member for Springfield. He's announcing government policy and he makes statements which are contrary to the statements made by the Minister of Education himself, because the Minister of Education when speaking on his estimates, and I'm quoting from page 1020 of Hansard on the 26th of March, said as follows: "In Ukrainian, the pilot program introduced in '63/64 at the Grade 9 level in some 19 schools has carried on through Grade 10 last year and into Grade 11 in the coming year" -- into Grade 11 in the coming year. Well the coming year presumably is 1965-66. What does the Member for Springfield tell us? He tells us that Ukrainian is now a recognized subject and will be introduced into Grade 12 of the General Course in 1965. The Minister on his estimates tells us that it will be going into Grade 11 in the coming year, the Member for Springfield says it will be in Grade 12. Now which is which? Who is correct? Is it going to be in Grade 11 next year as the Minister of Education says, or is it going to be in Grade 12 as the third Minister of Education, because the second one is in Churchill, the third from Springfield, says it's going to be? Who speaks for the Department of Education in this House? -- (Interjection) --

Well I'll admit that we've had a discussion that "upon" means anytime in the next year, so maybe "in the coming year" means different things; but there are the two statements Mr. Speaker. In one the Minister of Education speaking on his estimates says it's going to be in Grade 11 in the coming year, the amendment proposed by the third Minister of education -- it's going to be in Grade 12 in the coming year. Now I think it's high time that the Minister indicates exactly what it is that we're doing.

The Minister indicated as well that the proposal, the complete program from 9 to 12 is being submitted to the university for consideration by the Matriculation Committee of the Senate with regard to its possible acceptance as a complete senior Matric subject up to and including Grade 12. So he indicates that this is being submitted to the university. I might point out Mr. Speaker that when the Minister was speaking on that particular day he had the text of my colleague the Member for Emerson's resolution in his possession. He knew what it was that my colleague was proposing and I presume that this was partly to cover the proposed resolution. So he says it's going to be submitted to the Senate.

The third Minister of Education from Springfield, he tells us that the Department of Education and the University of Manitoba have agreed to establish a committee to consider the proposed syllabus and that isn't what the Minister of Education, that is the First Minister of Education, the one from Gimli stated. He said it was being submitted to the university. Now we are told that the Department of Education and the university are sitting down together.

Mr. Chairman in my opinion the amendment that we have before us either is incorrect, either it's not factual or the Minister of Education, when speaking in this House on his estimates, did not give the correct information to the House, and backbenchers on the far side have been

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . . once again provided with information which is not given to the House proper as was obviously the case insofar as the Member for Churchill. He certainly had an inside track so far as the technical school at The Pas. It appears that the Member for Springfield has another inside track and I say Mr. Speaker that this is not a proper way of proceeding.

If the facts in this amendment are correct, the Minister of Education should have said so on his estimates and told the House, not told private members on his side what the facts were, because certainly there is an absolute variance here when the Minister says it's going to be Grade 11 in the coming year and this amendment says Grade 12.

Well so much for the amendment before us Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that the original resolution proposed by the Member for Emerson set out a proper principle. I have never accepted the American system or plan of the melting pot. I believe that the Canadian experience is superior. We have operated in this country, rather than on the melting pot principle, the basis that the various cultural groups that came to Canada could maintain their own culture and could contribute more by maintaining that culture and becoming just as good Canadians but by maintaining their origins, and one of the vital aspects here is obviously that of language.

I think Canada has shown the way in many ways, in many fields, in this regard. I think the University of Manitoba has been one of the leaders in this particular field. We have established many years ago, a Chair of Icelandic study and I think this has been a very worthwhile enterprise at the university. Since that time other cultural language Chairs have been established there and I think that all of these are contributing more to the Canadian structure. I agree that we can build a nation on the principle of unity in diversity, not necessarily unity by submerging the various groups who come here. And I think that this request, as introduced by my colleague the Member for Emerson, is a sound step forward insofar as the Ukrainian language is concerned, because it is quite obvious that if we simply say we will allow the teaching of Ukrainian but you cannot use this as a matriculation subject, that we will be penalizing many students who would like to take up and continue the Ukrainian language but because of the fact that it is not going to give them a university credit, and that they wish to enter university, they may feel that they have to drop it, and take another language which will supply them with the university credits. So I think that this is the proper next step to what we have now done. To say that we are going to teach it in Grades 9 and 10 and 11 is fine but unless we go this next step we are, by that very fact, discouraging some students from starting in Grade 9 and taking the subject through because they know that either they will have to take up another language during the course or they will be unable to enter university as such. So the original resolution is a perfectly sound one, in keeping with what has already been done by the government in establishing the first grades.

So Mr. Chairman, I cannot see why it is that our friends across wish to once again amend this resolution and weaken the original principle established and delete it so as to apparently delay the action which I think is the proper next step. I suggest to them that they should accept or that they should have accepted the original resolution as it was, as a statement of principle to be acted upon at the earliest possible opportunity and, quite true, the university has to agree to this. This is what my colleague was suggesting. He wasn't saying that the government could impose this upon the university but he was suggesting that they should be urged to do so and that this statement of principle, I think, was sound. I regret that the government felt it was necessary to amend it but I think the matter can be corrected, Mr. Speaker, and I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word "following" as it appears in the first paragraph thereof, and substituting therefor the following: "Ukrainian is the mother tongue of the second largest ethnic group in Manitoba and whereas there is grave danger of the Ukrainian language disappearing as a cultural language, therefore be it resolved that this Legislature urge the Department of Education and the University of Manitoba to include Ukrainian as a senior matriculation subject and as a matriculation language at the university level."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've attempted to follow the amendment to the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and I've attempted at the same time to read the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield, and I fail to see in the amendment -- oh, excuse me, I do now find the word "following", it's in there. Fine, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say something to correct a little bit of nonsense that I think has gone on with the Leader of the Opposition who just spoke. The point is that in the first place let me make it abundantly clear that, like all previous speakers, I feel

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . that the people of Ukrainian descent in this province are by their very numbers and their culture and with the leadership they are getting, entitled to the very fullest consideration of all of us in this House. I have come to know the people very well as a large part of my constituents are people of Ukrainian origin. Since becoming Minister I've tried sincerely to become acquainted with and meeting with the Ukrainian people to understand the problems facing them in the introduction of their language into the status which they would like to see it, both at the secondary level and at our university.

I think in all of the charges that have been made against me there's probably one word, one word in all the statement I made on curriculum where I understand "there ne'er 'twas a twist between lip and text" except that on -- what was just quoted by me, I noticed the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said I said during my estimates, "In Ukrainian a pilot program introduced in '63/64 at the Grade 9 level in 19 schools was carried on through Grade 10 last year and into Grade 11 in the coming year." That really, to be precise, should read "present year" because in the annual report, if he had looked, and from my statement I believe last year, he would see from the annual report, and as the speakers referred to, the Ukrainian language was introduced into the Grade 11 course in this current year. It's there now. And furthermore that the particular resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member from Emerson could be said not to be strictly accurate when it said in his fourth whereas, "Ukrainian is not recognized as a matriculation language offering university entrance credit." In this sense, and to explain to the members of the House that it is recognized as a university entrance credit in the matriculation course but only as an option at the present time in Grade 9 and 10, not as the primary language next to English. And I think this is where all the misunderstanding is coming in.

Now to say that I might have told this to the -- when I made up my statements on curriculum during the Session, the Honourable Member the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, knew perfectly well from that I'd said in the House, this whole matter with respect to the Grade 12 Ukrainian content which will come in the coming year, automatically come in in the General Course and we can automatically put it into the University Entrance Course but, recognizing the problems, the fact that the children would want university credit for this, we, as I said on Page 1020 of Hansard, placed it before the Senate of the University. Now the Senate of the University as I understand it, and this has been going on for some years, have a matriculation committee in the modern language section in this connection and the matriculation committee meet with the University Entrance Course Committee Seminar people and approve these courses. At the time I made this statement in the House this matter, insofar as I was advised by my department, was before the Senate so I was not able to, and I was not aware at the time this resolution -- I saw it on the Order Paper and made inquiries from the department and they advised me that this matter was being studied still by the matriculation committee of the modern language section and the University Entrance Committee because of certain matters that the university wanted cleared up before sending the request, apparently, officially to the Senate.

So there was no -- I think all members speaking on this resolution were getting into a play on words and so on. The facts are that the Ukrainian language is in Grade 9, 10 and 11. The hope was, and the intent is, to introduce it into Grade 12 next year. Certainly as I indicated, I might not have spelled it out in so many words, but we indicated that the committee recommendations for the Grade 12 program have been submitted for consideration and of course we would have to in the General Course as a matter of sequence carry this forward from Grade 11 to 12 although I might not have spelled it out as fully as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition feels I should have. But certainly the intent was there.

And certainly I agree wholeheartedly with the Member from Emerson in the intent of his resolution. I'm not quarrelling with it. The Member from Springfield who has brought in this amendment, I really think is, as I read it, being more precise in that he's saying furthermore, as the Member for Springfield says, "The Legislature urge the university to recognize the Ukrainian language as a matriculation language offering university entrance credit." It was really the same thing as has been said earlier. It is recognized in 10 and 11. This is in the annual report. Our plans are to introduce it in Grade 12 in the General Course, that's true, and we're also prepared to forward in the University Entrance Course subject to the Senate Matriculation Committee and the University Entrance Seminar Committee approving this. So I think we're really all on all fours and it's a matter of how you express this.

I just want to say, as the Member from Brokenhead said during the debate at one stage, that we also have to be careful that I think we can urge -- this resolution is quite in order as the Legislature's recognizing the importance of the Ukrainian language in our opinion, quite proper

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . for us to urge the university to do so, to give this language the recognition that our boys and girls may get it as university entrance credit, a matric subject, but we must also recognize the academic economy, as he said, of the university authorities who after all are the experts in our languages and it is my hope that this will proceed.

I think that the Member from Springfield has called -- where he calls the Department of Education and University of Manitoba have agreed to establish a committee -- actually this committee is the committee I have referred to and at this particular time I believe the matriculation committee -- in fact they have sent this back for just further discussion with the University Entrance Seminar Committee -- I believe, from what I gather, some minor points re text or something to that effect and I would hope to hear from the Senate in due course. However this will have to be resolved very shortly as we can well appreciate. So if any announcement comes forth when the House is sitting from the Senate I'll certainly let the honourable members know. But to say that this was the second instance that the department or I as Minister had pre-empted the House or members of the Legislature, certainly I don't accept this criticism because after all insofar as The Pas Vocational Centre went -- course content and so on -- I can honestly tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that when the money was voted last year to proceed with this facility at The Pas and in getting on with the job, it concerned me very greatly that I get up to The Pas.

We have a provincial advisory committee of various industries and some very large committees who approved in principle the course. This has always been the case. It's a big job. These people are divided into sub-committees who work with the people in the planning and certainly we had to go straight to the heart of the matter and consult all these people and it was my decision that, in addition to the Manitoba provincial committee, it would be very wise to let the people at the local level -- the mayors of the communities who were going to be affected, who were in that area -- to let them learn something of the syllabus and the program as contemplated and approved by the provincial technical advisory committee. And this is precisely what was done and invitations were sent to the Chambers of Commerce throughout the north, and to members of councils and they were asked to come into The Pas to hear the plan so that they might be able to contribute. And I think this was very worthwhile because senior personnel officers of INCO and the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting were there and gave us some very practical suggestions to the gathering and agreed to serve on sub-committees -- for example, mining technology -- where we could call upon our full-time people and our provincial advisory board could call on their particular local knowledge of the situation to help us develop the courses to an even better degree.

I would hope that, in planning the Brandon facility, frankly, Mr. Speaker, that I have the opportunity to do the same thing, to acquaint, to form a local advisory committee. I don't know how in the world I could advise the House unless I'm going to send -- maybe we should send every member in the Legislature a copy of the syllabus when it's ready and concurrently with that meeting. As a matter of fact, if all the members want to come, I'll send them all invitations also but that might be quite an onerous task because we try to cover the material in a day, and copies of The Pas submission are available to all members and I believe I distributed some. I could have some more made. But in that we discussed the philosophy of our trade-school program, we discussed why we picked particular courses for that area, we show a rough diagram, the preliminary plans of the building, and we invite further comment. This is after it has passed the provincial advisory committees and so on. And first of all, of course, over a year and a half ago, labour, welfare, education, everybody went through the north, met with these people and took their ideas at that time. This was more or less to confirm that we were going ahead, if they had any last minute suggestions to make. I would hope that the department is not caught up in red tape to the point where we can't go ahead and do the job when we have to do it and it's sitting in front of us; it's the only way we can get on with it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that we all have our heart in the right place with respect to the matter before us. I would hope that before the debate is ended we can agree to a resolution. But the facts of the matter are, it's in Grade 11, it was anticipated and taken for granted it would go forward in Grade 12 next year; I indicated to the House that the syllabus is ready to go. There's no problem in implementing it. The problem is in making certain that certain students who wish, may take it as a university entrance credit course in Grade 12. This matter is before the Senate. The Senate is made up of a matriculation committee in the modern languages section who deal with these matters and pass the recommendation to the senate and somewhere in there at the moment our problem is being given a great deal of attention I understand by the people concerned. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.



MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to disregard the remarks of the Minister of Education for north-eastern Manitoba and the remarks of the Minister of Education for northern Manitoba, and confine myself strictly to the remarks of my neighbour, the Honourable Member for Gimli, the actual Minister of Education.

The thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, and I think concerns most members in this House is firstly, I think the Ukrainian people are interested in two things: (1) in Ukrainian being recognized as a matriculation modern language; and (2) in Ukrainian being recognized in the University of Manitoba as having equal credits to French, German or any other modern language. Now I think these are the two points that the Ukrainian people are very interested in having recognized and I think that simplifies the question, getting rid of all the chaff.

And what I'd like to know from the Minister of Education is this. Firstly, Ukrainian I believe is recognized now as a modern language up to Grade 11 by the university. Does Ukrainian, in the university, have the same credit status as say French or German for any student who wants to take Ukrainian in the university, wants to continue Ukrainian as a modern language in place of either German or French? I think that is the question the Honourable Member for Emerson is very interested in having settled and I think that is the question too that most Ukrainian people in Manitoba want to see settled. They feel that Ukrainian should be given the same credit status in a General Course or in Arts Course in the University of Manitoba as any other modern language has.

MR. JOHNSON: Firstly, if I may answer the question now, precisely what this request from the department before the Senate at the moment -- this is precisely what they have to settle at this time.

MR. HILLHOUSE: The point is, I don't think that the Honourable Member for Springfield's resolution or amendment covers that particular point.

MR. JOHNSON: It says they're meeting. I said it in the House.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a few remarks to this.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader . . . .

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I'm sorry. No, go ahead - after you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a word or two in connection with this very interesting debate, because the original motion proposed for our consideration in this Assembly, that the Legislature urge the University of Manitoba to recognize the Ukrainian language as a matriculation language offering university entrance credit. Then along comes the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield, which in essence in my opinion, did not change too much the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Emerson. And now we have before us the proposition of the Leader of the Liberal Party, which basically speaking in my opinion, does exactly the same thing, namely that it be resolved that this Legislature urge the Department of Education and the University of Manitoba to include Ukrainian as a senior matriculation subject and as a matriculation language at the university level.

It seems to me in listening to the debates on all sides thus far, Mr. Speaker, that we're all and one attempting to do the same thing. The only difference is that when the original motion was proposed my colleague from Brokenhead suggested that, rather than the Department of Education dealing with this matter alone, that there should be consultation with the Senate of the University of Manitoba and this was his suggestion. And it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we're now back to the suggestion in essence that was proposed by my colleague in Brokenhead. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there's no basic difference of opinion. We're all interested in the Ukrainian language here in the Province of Manitoba. We're interested in those people, citizens of our province who are born of Ukrainian parentage and others, that they should be able to receive due credit because of their knowledge of Ukrainian.

I breach no confidence to this House when I say, Mr. Speaker, that one of my sister-in-laws is a girl of Ukrainian extraction and the -- (Interjection) -- yes, I have a sister-in-law who is of Icelandic extraction as well. Indeed in the Paulley family, Mr. Speaker, we have truly a United Nations because my mother and father who came to this country from England had - no not Lower Slavodia, but the bastion of democracy -- had seven sons and each of us went our way to bring about a truly unification of all of the national heritages, within reason, of this universe. So I can say with pride that I have a Ukrainian sister-in-law as indeed I have an Icelandic sister-in-law and I'm proud of them both. The only thing that I do regret -- if I may, Mr. Speaker -- is to say that their offspring have not followed the languages of their national heritage insofar as their mother's side is concerned, but their Uncle Russell has attempted it. And while my vocabulary in the Icelandic language is really limited, I have taken the opportunity of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . learning a few words in Ukrainian. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, for the edification -- boy oh boy, they really need edification in this House -- that for the edification of the members of this House that I think that I was, and still am the only member of this House in its long history who has even spoken Ukrainian in this Legislative Assembly. Yes, I can prove it. My honourable friend from St. George, I am sure, will recall that when we had the first Ukrainian Speaker of this Assembly, after I had paid my compliments to him in English, I turned around to him and I said, "Mnohay Lita," which in Ukrainian means, "May you have long life." -- (Interjection) -- Dobra, yes; dobra and many other words that I do know, but the point is, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with these resolutions, it seems to me that we are not so far apart with the original motion, the amendment and the sub-amendment, and basically what we are saying to those of Ukrainian ancestry here in the Province of Manitoba, we recognize the language of your ancestors here and we urge that the Department of Education and the University get together in order that due recognition will be given in respect of this language of yours. And in saying this, Mr. Speaker, the only regret that I do have, as I said a few moments ago, is that it seems to me that coming generations do not pay as much attention to continuing national heritage as some of us may desire insofar as we are concerned.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't really matter does it, whether we support the amendment to the amendment, the amendment, or the main motion, the objectives are the same. Mr. Speaker, what difference does it make who gets the credit -- the Leader of the Opposition by his amendment to the amendment; the Honourable Member for Springfield by his amendment; the Member for Emerson by his main motion - as long as the job is done, which reminds me of one of the basic principles of the founder of the CCF party, J.S. Woodsworth, who said: "It doesn't matter who gets the credit as long as the job is done," so I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there's no need for further debate really. There's no need for worrying about who gets the credit. If the Ukrainian people are satisfied here in the Province of Manitoba that their national tongue is a tongue that is acceptable in our educational system in Junior Matriculation, Senior Matriculation and at University levels, let's do the job and go ahead.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Pane Presidniku, ya takoj hochoo wziaty uchast y sih debatah po ukrainsky. (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I too want to make my contribution to this debate in Ukrainian.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister of Education for his remarks because I'm quite sure that the Honourable Member for Springfield did not completely realize, nor I do believe, he had the intention possibly of what his amendment was likely to create. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to add something to what the Honourable Minister of Education was attempting to put across, and I want to congratulate him in his remarks because these are the facts, and that is that today at the university level, we have, if you are taking an Arts Degree, you are permitted to take subjects like History, Mathematics, English, Science and one language. Now that language is a selection of either French, German, Latin, Greek or Russian. Now if a student wants to take a course in Ukrainian, in Hebrew, or Icelandic, he has to take one of the prescribed languages and then take the additional Ukrainian or Icelandic or Hebrew as an additional course for which he will get credit, but he must take one of the prescribed languages. The thing is that, as the Honourable Minister has expressed, his feeling on the matter is that it would be highly desirable as a matter of fact it is in keeping with what some of the other universities do - is to give the selection to the student in first year that if he takes Ukrainian or Icelandic or Hebrew or Greek or Latin or German or French or Russian, that he can take a selection of any one of those eight languages and have it a fully accredited first year subject.

Now if this is done, then I think that certainly we will have achieved the principle that is being proposed in the resolution, and I am quite sure our Ukrainian community and our Ukrainian friends would be highly pleased and delighted, because I might also mention this, Mr. Speaker, that if you have had the opportunity to converse in Russian with some of our Russian visitors from Russia, if you understand the Ukrainian language and if you can read and write Ukrainian, this is approximately 90 percent of being able to under the Russian language and the Russian literature and whatever they may have; and I think that as mentioned by previous speakers, this augurs well into being able to build a better sort of a United Nations, because we always are in contact with Russia and this certainly would help us a great deal. So again I want to thank the Honourable Minister and the other members that have spoken along this line and I do know that it will just be a matter of time that these three languages that I mention should be

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd) . . . . . placed on an equal selective basis because each one of them has got something to contribute to the community and the so-called truly Canadian aspect of Manitoba community life.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Pan Presidniku, Ya hochoo pid-perty Resolutsiyouzastoopnika wid Springfield. Dyakooyoo Wam. (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I want to support the amendment of the Member for Springfield. I thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I don't think I could let this go by without thanking the Leader of the Opposition for the appointment. I might state that maybe it's a little out of order because I think it's anticipating government policy. -- (Interjection) -- But I am disappointed that the Minister of Education didn't confirm this while he had the opportunity. Also, I think the Leader of the Opposition was right in placing the Member for Churchill well ahead of the Member for Springfield. But getting back to -- the point of issue that I rise on is I really don't feel that I did say anything that was either out of order or that had not been released publicly, because when the meeting was called for the Vocational School in The Pas, members for industry were invited, members from the unions in the industrial townsite, and members of the press and radio, and I might state at this time that I remember seeing a Tribune reporter there and I was quite sure that the Free Press were represented too. I know that the radio stations were represented from the northern areas and I saw representatives from at least two of the papers in the north. I got my information from a booklet that was distributed at that meeting. I'm sorry I haven't got it here tonight, but it fully outlines everything including what courses could be held, and also pictures of the architecture of the building, so I do feel that this was public information that I spoke on at that time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got the amendment before me, therefore I will move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan, and the proposed motion in amendment thereto of the Honourable Member for Brandon. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, could we have this matter stand please.

. . . . . continued on next page.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . next Order, may I just ask the indulgence of the House to make an observation on a point of order, and that is that I would hope that from now on we would exercise a degree of self-discipline in having matters stand or adjourned, particularly on private members, because many of these items have been on the Order Paper for a long time and I think that we should come to the stage where we dispose of them, or else we will be standing and adjourning things all night, or all week, or all month. My comments do not apply to the Honourable Member for Rhineland because he obviously hasn't got the resolution in front of him, but I would request the co-operation of the House in exercising a degree of self-discipline on this matter of standing and adjourning.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the First Minister, I think that we have reached the stage where a number of these things can proceed, but I really think that during the course of the debate today, we did, in fact, proceed to pass and move on quite a number of the motions and I think that this will be the case. The Member for Selkirk is out unfortunately right now. I regret that is the case, and I think that by and large the motions will proceed.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . give the House warning that it is unlikely that the government would be willing to agree to any further delays.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, Whereas the Roads to Resources Agreement entered into between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada expires on March 31, 1966; And whereas this Agreement has been instrumental in enabling the construction of roads to northern areas rich in natural resources; And whereas it must be generally agreed that much of the economic growth of Canada's future will come from the further development of Canada's Northland; And whereas the development of our Natural Resources would be of benefit to all Canadians; Now Therefore be it resolved that this House request the Government of Canada to expand or renew the Roads to Resources Agreement to provide financial assistance for the extension of roads to further develop Manitoba's north.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this resolution, I would point out firstly that in the "Whereas" we indicate that this is a program that has been carried on for many years and it expires in March 31, '66, at which time we will have to have some program introduced by then to carry on a road development, and inasmuch as the Federal Government had not indicated to date that they're willing to carry on the program, I would hope that we could urge them to look into the Roads to Resources Program as it will apply to the province for the future. I believe that the most important facts are that, as far as I understand, most of this money either has been or will have been picked up by the provinces well before the 31st deadline of 1966. This means that it has been a good program and it has been used extensively by all the provinces. I would point out that it is very important for the progress and growth of any community to have good means of communication. I believe that this is a policy that must be carried out throughout all the northern portions of Canada and in Manitoba particularly, where we have so much undeveloped areas still waiting for an orderly development.

New mines are being announced every year in Northern Manitoba. I believe when we look in the last few years we will find that the introduction of each one of these has sparked our imagination and certainly introduced many millions of dollars of industry into our province and I'm sure that we would hope that in the future many more of these industrial sites will be announced and developed.

For many years politicians have always looked with vision to the north, to the developments of the north. They have talked about it just as our forefathers talked about developing the west, and in sending our young people to the north then we must be sure that there will be a development that will be similar to that which went on in the west in the years past. I would point out that we must, if we're going to continue to balance our trade in the export market, find new raw materials. It is very necessary to introduce raw materials along with fully integrated industry if we are to expect to get the most out of our resources whether they be renewable or non-renewable, and I think that if we point again to my own town of Thompson, where they have a fully-integrated plant developing raw, non-renewable resource from its original

(MR. BEARD cont'd). . . . .state through to a completed material, we will find we are getting the most out of our resource, through the mining industry, smelting, refinery and the final shipping and exporting from Manitoba to not only all parts of the province but through Port of Churchill to all over the world and down through CNR railway system to all parts of the United States.

For many years the CNR and the Hudson Bay Railway was the lifeline of Northern Manitoba. Everybody depended on the railway, and it has served its purpose and it has served its purpose well, and it will continue to do so; but this is a changing world, Mr. Speaker, and we now turn to roads. In many cases we depend upon roads and we must continue to expand our road system if we are going to look forward to expanded industry. Since the period of 1958 to date, we have spent some \$33 million on roads in Northern Manitoba. Thirty-three millions of dollars in less than a ten year period. This money . . . . . spent on expanding and preparing for the great development of Northern Manitoba. We must look forward to greater use of the roads that we already have and the roads that will be built in the future through an expanded population, and further use of these roads develops more tax dollars for the Province of Manitoba and for Canadians as a whole. Roads could be a key to holding down new government costs throughout the Province of Manitoba. Roads are something that it is necessary to have if we are going to develop our resources, and resources are the quickest way to tax dollars.

In the program in the north, or in looking forward to an orderly development of programs in the north, I would point out that there are several areas that are still waiting for a road system. First and foremost, I think, would be the town of Lynn Lake. We all know it; we've heard of it. Lynn Lake has waited for a long time for a road, and if Lynn Lake is to receive a road in the foreseeable future I'm sure that it must be under a program in which we could expect federal aid - direct federal aid. And in Lynn Lake itself they have secondary industry - the fish industry - which is a very large one and one that any community would be proud to have. The fish industry probably is one of the largest secondary industries that any community has in the north. In Lynn Lake they take anywhere up to 10 millions of pounds of fish through their town each year. Ten millions of pounds of fish is a lot of fish. Roads to resources and to communities in the north have proven that they will lower the cost of living, and in some ways, such as at Flin Flon, they take the town out of the one-industry town and place them competitive with other communities with the services, and also take away that threat that they will become ghost towns if the mining industry closes. We certainly don't want to see another Sherridon and we have had our scare at San Antonio Mines, and I would hope that a road to northern resources and industrial townsites would help us in that way.

At Lynn Lake they have recently shared with us the necessity for roads and for people getting out. The Sherritt-Gordon Mines Limited recently announced a new policy for their employees in which they will participate with them on offering up to \$100.00 per year for the family as a bonus, the purpose would be to encourage the employee, along with his family, to take a holiday outside the Lynn Lake district each year. The Mine company recognizes that people should get out to more southern communities, get away from their isolation at least once a year, and I'm sure the Sherritt-Gordon people would share with me the hope that they will be able to use a road in the not too far future so that their transportation problems will be cut to a minimum. To date, by the time a man flies out his family, freights his car out and back from the community of Lynn Lake, it has cost him somewhere around \$200.00. This is before his vacation starts. This is a cost that he can't get out from under, and if he is going to use his car then it is going to be a cost that he must accept if he is going to have a vacation away from his home town.

Lynn Lake have proven again that they are on the march. Through the Dunphy Lakes - Fox Lake area they are announcing their intentions to develop another shaft. If this goes ahead then it will be one of the more responsible programs for keeping Lynn Lake alive. It has always been a worry to the people at Lynn Lake as to just how long the ore body will last. I think that the Sherritt-Gordon announcement of the Fox Lake area has given the people in Lynn Lake a shot in the arm. It proves also, this new shaft being somewhere close to 40 miles closer to Flin Flon, that there are ore bodies throughout the whole of the north, and that a road connecting Lynn Lake to the Flin Flon area would assure us that in all possibility there would be other developments in the north, and with a road system from Lynn Lake to Flin Flon I'm sure that we'd find development would follow, not only in the non-renewable resource but in the renewable resources of fishing, lumbering, etcetera.

(MR. BEARD cont'd). . . . .

We find that in our Snow Lake area we must continue to develop and improve the road to Snow Lake to bring it up to a road comparable to those that we enjoy in the southern part of the province. While it is acknowledged there is a road to Snow Lake, there are parts that certainly must be acknowledged that an improvement should be looked into in the foreseeable future. I think we must encourage tourist industries into these industrial townsites so that they again are taken away out of the mining era and into something that would be similar to more of the towns in the southern part of the province.

People must be encouraged to visit our industrial townsites, for it is known fact that we cannot expect them to get enthusiastic about moving to the north unless they are introduced to northern living well ahead of time. In many cases, a man trying to locate in the north has his wife to cope with. She probably isn't as interested in moving as he is, and he has to encourage her to move up, and the easiest way would be if they could jump in their car and go up and take a look. I would point out also an area that is not an industrial town-site in Cormorant. Cormorant has been there long before the Hudson Bay Line. It has grown throughout the years but to date is stifled now. The growth will be stifled until there is a road in there that could introduce a tourist promotion program, because Cormorant has one of the larger lakes in the north and certainly provides many trophy fish. But again, they require a road before they can really get down to promoting it.

Cormorant is one of our unfortunate areas which is high in the demand on our welfare dollar. Welfare dollars are non-productive. If we can produce an industry that can take these people away from the welfare dollar and make taxpayers out of them, then we all profit. Cormorant has many acres of good rich pasture land surrounding the town. It is ideal for opening up the beef cattle industry in northern Manitoba. Many years before even the railway was there, it is a known fact that they farmed and they transported the grain by canoe. To date, in many of the areas, they would still have to do the same, so we are living in an era where we're transporting by canoe and shooting for the moon.

One of the roads I think that we should deal with in the foreseeable future again, is the one that's well-talked of in Thompson, the Wabowden-Grand Rapids Road. I know that the Minister will probably shudder when he thinks of the cost of the development of a road like this, but certainly we couldn't complete or consider northern development complete until we had a direct line between the largest supplier and one of the larger users in the province. With a direct road between Winnipeg and Thompson, or the Wabowden area, we would cut down our mileage almost to half. To date, the mileage by road is approximately 750 miles from Winnipeg to Thompson. It's a long road, an interesting road, but I think we would all agree that business today demands that we save time as much as possible. We would provide more competitive freight rates with a road such as this. We would open up larger commercial fishing areas in which, with transporting the fish direct to Winnipeg, they would save enough on the freight costs alone, to pass along prices to the fishermen which would be almost double what they're receiving today. Once again, this road would open up new industry and certainly new and interesting tourist areas, and promote that wonderful tourist dollar that we see rising every year.

The importance of roads to communities, I think, can best be taken if you refer to northern residents to find evidence in all the areas that roads today are not a luxury but a necessity. It would appear that it is now easier to get federal funds for the development of space travel than it is to clean up the roads in the last half of Canada - that portion of Canada that promises to be the most productive. No request for new funds is asked for. This is just a continuing program of what we have had in the past. I think we need roads, once again, to produce new raw materials so we can get deeper into the export market and offer our products on a competitive price. Lastly, we require our roads certainly to develop the most important resource of all, our human resource of northern Manitoba.

In winding up, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record a recent release by the Churchill Chamber of Commerce for future reference. This urges a Churchill-Thompson winter road. "The Port Churchill Chamber of Commerce at its general meeting this week decided to go all out in pressing for a winter road linking the 250-mile distance between Churchill and Thompson, and thus completing the network of Manitoban provincial highways right up to Hudson Bay. Advantages accruing from such an access road, the Chamber felt, would include increase in winter tourist travel; boom in northern prospecting ventures; access to stands of northern pulpwood for shipping via Churchill seaport; employment for vast reservoir

(MR. BEARD cont'd). . . . . of unemployed unskilled Indian labourers in the north; lower wholesale cost for local merchants which would be passed on to northern residents in lower retail prices; increased northern immigration; more people willing to settle in Churchill once the feeling of being cut off from the outside world was gone; increase in auto sales, bus travel and general industrial and commercial development. Northern engineers have estimated cost of construction of such a northern link with Thompson, based on similar construction in the Western Arctic, should not exceed \$1,000 a mile and might conceivably be much less perhaps - even half that sum - as much of the distance has connecting water bodies requiring little or no preparation whatever." Remember, this is a winter road. "The completion of such a road, target date for which has been set for the Canadian centennial year, would also result in greater exchange and visits between the two communities of Thompson and Churchill, and would see the rise of small new communities in between."

In closing, I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that this release is coming from the Town of Churchill, which has a program in that area of research which sends rockets into the stratosphere and yet does not have a road connecting them to the other parts of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Would the Honourable Member permit a question, please? In the fisheries report, 95 northern lakes produced something like a total of 11 million pounds. Is the honourable speaker referring really to 10 million pounds of fish out of Lynn Lake, or is this an error to a million?

MR. BEARD: No, this includes the fish that are brought over from Reindeer Lake and shipped through Lynn Lake on the Red Lake road. This production is pretty well of all of Reindeer Lake.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: This would be Saskatchewan fish then. Is that it?

MR. BEARD: Yes -- on the co-op fishery.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly to say that I intend to support the resolution of the Honourable the Member for Churchill. I think that the Roads to Resources Program - and here I'll give credit where credit is due. It was brought in by the previous Federal Government. I didn't agree with too many of their policies. I think this was one that was a desirable program. I think it helped to develop many of the northern areas of Canada. I think insofar as Manitoba, we still have quite a number of specific areas that require opening up, and that this type of assistance is sound national investment. It is important to us provincially, and I think that Canada as a whole stands to benefit by it and that this is a proper program to continue. It would be my hope that the Federal Government will see fit to proceed with the program when it reaches its expiry date. Possibly the Minister of Public Works has already been in touch with his Ottawa counterparts in this regard and is negotiating. If not, I would urge him to do so at the earliest opportunity.

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

MR. LISSAMAN presented Bill No. 121, an Act respecting the Temporality of The Anglican Church of Canada, for second reading.

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

MR. W. H. HAMILTON (Dufferin) presented Bill No. 44, an Act to incorporate the Dufferin Racing Association, for second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Speaker, this would give the Dufferin Agricultural Society a Charter to conduct harness racing only at their fair which lasts for three days each year. It's harness racing only and it's good for only three days in any calendar year. Previously, Dufferin Agricultural Society has had to borrow unused portions of charters from clubs who are not using them - that is 14 day charters - and that's a pretty unsure way of conducting their annual fair racing activities, so this bill will merely give them a charter for the three days of the Carman fair.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, in one section in the Bill, and I'm not dealing with sections individually, it's only three days races a year; then the second section says, "The permission of using pari-mutuel". Now would the establishment of a system of pari-mutuel pay them to run races only for three days? Secondly, by giving them the authority to use pari-mutuel, does it not give them the right at a later date to have horse racing, probably for 42 days? There's a big territory around Dufferin. Thirdly, who is going to get the benefit of the pari-mutuel, the province or the town of Dufferin?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I hope we will hear from the Honourable Minister of Trade and Commerce who I think is the person charged with the responsibility of supervising this type of operation --(Interjection)-- Industry and Commerce? Trade and Commerce? Well he can have his choice, I think it's Industry and Commerce.

I have difficulty in relating it to gambling in relation to the person of the Minister, but he will recognize himself if he feels he is the person I am speaking about. I'd like to get clarification, Mr. Speaker, just what is meant by borrowing a charter for the purpose of operating pari-mutuel betting as apparently has been done in the past. Just how is a charter borrowed and who owns the charter? Is it quite the thing to do? Is it done elsewhere in this province? Will there be other applications from organizations such as this who have been borrowing other organizations' charters in order to conduct some sort of an operation which apparently now they want to conduct under their own name?

I hope we will get some sort of clarification just what this means, and I wonder if at the same time we could be informed whether it's the same horse racing commission which will now look after this operation or will there be another type of horse racing commission that will be organized in order to look after the affairs of this Dufferin Racing Association which has made a practice of borrowing other charters in the past.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just a few words. I think the harness racing at the Carman Fair - I think this is what he refers to - is definitely an added attraction to the Fair being held every year, and I for one certainly wouldn't want to discourage it. I think members should give support to this.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see that the Member for Rhineland is in favor of some limited form of gambling. I think that there is a place for some amount of horse racing in rural fairs. Harness racing is I think a form of sport, an entertainment which I think many people in rural Manitoba find favor with, and if this would help to make the fair at Carman, or in the south central part of Manitoba more successful, I see nothing wrong with it except that I too am curious as is the Honourable Member for St. John's about the statement that the honourable member made that charters were borrowed in the past. It's very interesting.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (ST. BONIFACE) presented Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (4), for second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, as you no doubt know, I consider this resolution quite important. On a previous occasion while discussing a related subject, I wasn't too successful in conveying my thoughts to the members, so therefore I would beg your indulgence if I may be allowed to follow my notes a little closer.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago while speaking on the subject of citizenship, I tried to demonstrate, to establish the fact, that Confederation meant the rejection not only of the political and economic annexation by the USA but also the American melting-pot concept of national unity. Confederation was an understanding between the founding races of Canada made on the basis of an acceptable and equal partnership. As Mr. Pearson points out, this settlement provided that national political unity would be achieved and maintained without the imposition of racial, cultural or linguistic uniformity.

We realize now that the belief that the French Canadians introduced the element of separatism into certain of our schools is erroneous and that the opposite conception is the true one, that this distinction ultimately belongs to the Protestants of Quebec who are in the minority. We remember that Alexander Gault, one of the Fathers of Confederation, insisted that certain guarantees be given the English Protestant minorities of Quebec. The educational clauses of the Confederation Act protecting the rights of the minority in respect to education was a concession to the English Protestant minority of Quebec. The French Canadians only suggested that, if in answer to the demands of the English Canadians of Lower Canada these safeguards were given, it would only be fair that the French Canadians of the rest of Canada should have the same protection accorded them.

Mr. Speaker, it is that simple. The French Canadians of Manitoba demand the same rights and privileges - no more but no less - than those rights and privileges that have been enjoyed for almost a century by the English Protestant minority of Quebec. There is nothing that the French element of Manitoba would like better than to take their proper places in the sun, except maybe doing it with the understanding and blessing of all their fellow Manitobans.



(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....

With your kind permission, I would like to quote some excerpts from Professor M. S. Donnelly's book entitled "The Government of Manitoba", and I quote. "Manitoba began its existence with an almost equal and extremely delicate balance between French and English. The basis of the government formed in 1878 with John Norquay as premier was a dual majority principle similar to that which existed in the Province of Canada after the Act of Union of 1840. The seats in the Legislature were almost equally divided between English and French, as were the cabinet portfolios, and to be passed a measure needed the support of a majority of both groups.

"The English politicians recognized a partnership with the French at first as absolutely necessary and by 1875 as convenient, but, as their numerical superiority increased, they began to see it as an encumbrance. The French were fighting a losing battle from the beginning.

"In 1878 the House passed a redistribution measure based in part on the principle of representation by population. Twelve years later a majority of members approved a bill establishing English as the official language: 'Any statute or law to the contrary notwithstanding, the English language only shall be used in the records and journals of the House of Assembly for the Province of Manitoba, and in any pleading or process or issuing from any court in the Province of Manitoba. The acts of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba need only be printed and published in the English language'.

"The School system was the last bastion of French rights. Prior to 1890 it was controlled by a Board of Education of which half were Protestant and half were Roman Catholic. Its orders were enforced by two superintendents, one from each faith. Legislative grants were, before 1875, divided equally between the two sections and after that allocated in proportion to the number of children of school age in each group. The School Act of 1890 swept away the Church-dominated system and put in its place a system that was public, non-sectarian, and supported by taxes on real property. A provincial Department of Education was created under the direct responsibility of the Minister. What has come to be known as the Manitoba School Question developed from this legislation.

"The issue was brought into focus in Manitoba by D'Alton McCarthy, the leader of the Ontario Equal Rights Association, and taken up by Joseph Martin who was Attorney-General in the Greenway Cabinet. Martin appeared on a platform with McCarthy in Portage la Prairie in August 1899 and in a belligerent speech stated his conviction that separate schools and official use of the French language must go or he would cease to be the Attorney-General, thus committing the Cabinet to a decision which he had taken largely on emotional grounds. Religious bigotry and social intolerance also played a part and electors were often given lurid previews of Manitoba under Vatican control.

"The question became one of constitutional safeguards against a majority decision alleged to be oppressive and the relationship of such safeguards to provincial rights. The question of provincial rights was not brought squarely into the open until after nearly five years of petitions, counter-petitions and litigation. The Roman Catholic minority first tested the constitutionality of the law setting up secular, free, and non-denominational schools, but, while the action was in progress, also petitioned the Federal Cabinet for redress, in the most efficacious and just way. The petition was supported by prominent churchmen and the official hierarchy right across Canada but the cabinet refused to take action because the issue was already before the courts. The case known as Barrett against the City of Winnipeg travelled upwards through the judicial system producing different results at each level.

"The Roman Catholic minority now turned back to the possibility of a remedy from the federal cabinet directly on the basis of section 22 of The Manitoba Act and/or section 93 of The British North America Act. The substance of section 93 is that education is exclusively under the jurisdiction of the provinces except that denominational schools existing at the time of union are given a constitutional right to continue to exist and should this be denied the religious group concerned may petition the federal cabinet for remedial action. The essence of section 93, omitting specific reference to Upper Canada, and using a slight change of wording, is repeated in section 22 of The Manitoba Act.

"A petition asking for remedial action was heard before a committee of the cabinet in January, 1893. The committee, uncertain of what action was possible, sought the advice of the Supreme Court of Canada. Six reference questions were submitted, which, when stripped of legal verbiage, asked: Did Section 22 of The Manitoba Act or section 93 of The British North America Act, or both, apply? Was remedial action under either possible in view of the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . . decision in the Barrett case? Did any acts of the Province of Manitoba prior to 1890 confer rights or privileges on the Roman Catholic minority and, if so, were these rights prejudicially affected? The Supreme Court of Canada was split on these questions. Justices King and Fournier held that both the Manitoba Act and The British North America Act applied, that rights had been granted after the union and had been prejudicially affected, and that remedial action was legally possible. Justices Ritchie, Gwynne, and Taschereau said that only the Manitoba Act applied, that rights that might have been granted since the union had nothing whatever to do with the case, and no remedial action was possible.

"The reference questions then went to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council where the ruling of the Supreme Court was reversed. The committee decided that section 22 of The Manitoba Act governed. The phrase 'at the union' appears in subsection 1 but in subsection 2 is replaced by 'any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.' The first phrase was taken as applying to rights existing as of July 15, 1870, and the second to rights granted thereafter. It was then established that the rights granted after Confederation had indeed been prejudicially affected and therefore remedial action proceeding from the federal cabinet would be legal.

"The cabinet in Ottawa decided to take action and the cabinet in Winnipeg decided to resist by every possible means. On March 21, 1895, the federal cabinet passed a remedial order-in-council which commanded the Greenway government to amend or supplement its educational legislation to give the Roman Catholic minority the right to maintain their own schools, to share proportionally in any grant made out of public funds for the purposes of education, and to exempt 'such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic Schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.' The provincial government refused to carry out this order, noting in its reply: 'as to the legislative grant we hold that it is entirely within the control of the legislature of the province . . . . . it would therefore appear that any action of the Parliament of Canada looking to the restoration of Roman Catholic privileges must be supplemented by the voluntary action of the provincial legislature.'

"Nevertheless, the federal government persisted and followed up its order-in-council with an ultimatum: 'A session of the present Parliament will be called together, to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time the Manitoba Government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared . . . . . to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21 st March, 1895'. The result was a protracted debate without action of any kind except the dispatch of three emissaries of peace to Winnipeg to talk things over with the insurgents. This solved nothing and the session proceeded to talk itself to death. The five-year life of Parliament expired and Tupper was forced to go to the country.

"Laurier, the victor in the ensuing election, had stated in 1895: 'The government are very windy. They have blown and raged and threatened and the more they have raged and threatened the more that man Greenway has stuck to his coat. If it were in my power, I would try the sunny way. I would approach this man Greenway with the sunny way of patriotism, asking him to be just and fair, asking him to be generous to the minority. . . . .' The sunny approach was tried and resulted in the Laurier-Sifton compromise of 1897. The basis of the compromise was that religious exercises were to take place in any school if authorized by a majority of the members of the school board or if petitioned for by a stated number of parents. A school board was bound to engage a Roman Catholic teacher if one was requested in a town or city where there was an average attendance of forty or more Roman Catholic pupils or in a rural area where the figure was twenty-five or more. Finally the compromise contained the clause which was to prove so troublesome: 'Where ten of the pupils in any school speak the French language (or any language other than English) as their native language, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French (or such other language), and English upon the bilingual system.'

Mr. Speaker, by quoting Professor Donnelly it is not my intention to raise the controversial school question at this time, but rather to retrace the fate of the French language, particularly here in Manitoba. As mentioned, the Laurier compromise largely restored the position of French in Manitoba Schools, but this position was swept away again in 1916 and since that year Section 240 of The Manitoba Public Schools Act has been, in effect, "English shall be used as the language of instruction in all public schools."

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . .

In order to bring us up to date, I would like to read from a series of articles by Tim Creery entitled "French for the French in English Speaking Canada," and I quote. "The French settlement in Ontario was increasing, as were demands of the Anglo-Protestant majority spurred by the Orange Order to nip 'Frenchification' in the bud by attacking it at the school level.

"Hitherto Ontario's Premiers had resisted such pressures on the grounds that they would dishonour the deal of 1867. But now the government bent, and in 1912 issued the notorious Regulation 17, intended to all but snuff out French instruction in the schools. This was not an attack on separate schools, but an attack on French within the Roman Catholic schools. As in the earlier 'French-Irish wars' in New Brunswick, it brought a majority of English-speaking Catholics to the support of the Anglo-Protestant majority.

"The London Free Press had written, under the heading 'A Quebec Plot' --- 'The Liberal Leader in Ontario must cease this practice of speaking to French audiences in Ontario in the French tongue.' In this same year the Manitoba legislature put the final nails in the coffin of the Laurier-Greenway compromise and established English as the sole language of instruction in the publicly-supported schools.

"As Ontario Conservative MP, H. B. Morphy declared, 'Never shall we let the French Canadians implant in Ontario the disgusting speech they use'. Imposition of English instruction is seen as a major first step on the way to forcing French Canadians into 'le melting pot'."

Mr. Speaker, this bill that I am proposing to the House would correct the injustice imposed on the French minority of this province. It would restore the rights of the French speaking Manitobans intended by Confederation, by the B. N. A. Act and The Manitoba Act. Let me assure you, sir, that it is my intention to be practical - it is not intended that French be used as a teaching language in all schools of Manitoba, but only in centres such as St. Boniface, La Broquerie, St. Jean Baptiste and others where French speaking Manitobans form a very large majority.

If it is possible to teach an optional course in French for students whose mother tongue is French, then allowing French as a teaching language for those whose mother tongue is French and others who wish to use French as a language of instruction, should be possible. Please notice, sir, that teaching in French would be optional. Can Manitoba in all sincerity deny these rights to the French Canadians of the province and then give lip-service to "Le Fait Francais?" Can we profess that we are fair, that we wish to remember Confederation? To associate ourselves with McDonald and Cartier? Can we make preparation to celebrate the Centenary of Confederation? Can we build an Arts Centre and then continue choking French Culture in our province?

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the answer is obvious. We must strive to unite our great country but we must also remember that this must be done without uniformity. Manitoba is situated in the heart of Canada. The history of our province has been somewhat tarnished by what is commonly known as the Manitoba School Question.

We are in the enviable position of being able to show the rest of Canada how the problems of French-English relations can be solved. We have a unique opportunity to show leadership in restoring the true spirit of Confederation. Should we let this opportunity go by or should we help save Confederation?

Mr. Speaker, it would be unfair to forget those whose racial origin is neither English nor French. After all, they form approximately one-third of the total population. If it is true that the two founding races of our country are the English and French races, it is also true that these partners of Confederation have encouraged people from countries in which the native language is neither French nor English to immigrate to Canada. These people cannot, must not be considered second class citizens. No one who had come to Canada since 1763 had the right to challenge the original arrangements made on the Plains of Abraham.

English and French alone are the official languages not only of Canada but of Manitoba. This meant that only they could be used as languages of instruction, but this does not mean that recognition should not be given to other languages. The principle of integration rather than assimilation should be applied. The melting-pot theory, whether as one process or two processes, should be discarded as not being realistic. There is no reason why people of ethnic groups should be assimilated either by the French or the English Canadians. They accept the fact that English and French should be the two official languages of our country and that these two languages only can be languages of instruction in Canada, but they wish to retain their language and culture.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....

I fully endorse the brief submitted to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism by the Canada Ethnic Press Federation, and I think it is safe to say that this brief truly represents the views of all ethnic groups.

I would like to quote some of these recommendations found in this brief. "An essential of that pact was that the French people of Canada are entitled to the use of the French language anywhere in Canada as an official language of Canada, and to exercise their faith through the instrumentality of the French language. English and French are the two official languages of Canada. The practical use of those languages, as distinct from the official right to the use of them, must, to a large extent, be based upon the population content of each province. All other languages, including the languages of the Indians and Eskimos, spoken to an appreciable extent in Canada, may be regarded as unofficial languages of Canada. A distinction must be made between languages as instruments of instruction and languages which are, to an appreciable extent, spoken in different areas in Canada. The only languages of instruction in Canada should be English and French.

"Canada is bilingual, English and French, but that does not exclude factual bilingualism where one of the languages is neither English nor French. The official Canadian language selected by a non-French, non-English speaking immigrant is his Canadian language but aside from practical considerations there is no duty upon him to learn the other official Canadian language. Encouragement should be given to the study of both of Canada's official languages. Encouragement should also be given, on both cultural and practical grounds, to the study of more than one language. No province should have the power to enact that either French or English shall be prohibited as a language of instruction in that province."

As previously mentioned, The Laurier-Greenway Compromise of 1897 contained a clause which was to prove troublesome: "When ten of the pupils in any school speak the French language ( or any language other than English) as their native language, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French (or such other language), and English upon the bilingual system."

It is obvious that the adoption of this clause was ill-advised. It was the base for a real Tower of Babel with the arrival of people of so many different ethnic groups. This clause was to be deleted in 1916. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this had certainly not been the intention of the BNA Act, the Manitoba Act and especially of the Laurier compromise. All I am doing today is asking you to restore this intention and to legalize, once again, French as a teaching language.

No fair-minded Manitoban, I am sure, will object to this. An article entitled: "This Bogey Of The Tower Of Babel" appeared in The Ukrainian Voice of March 1964. It points out emphatically that no Ukrainian submission asked that the Ukrainian language be made an official language in the land.

Together we have glanced back at history. I have tried to make the members of this House aware of the demands of the French Canadians. I gave you my views, sir, on the third element of our Canadian people, those who might be called new Canadians, although many of them have been in this country for two or three generations.

Now, if I may, I will direct a few of my remarks to "Le Fait Francais". I must repeat that this bill involves French for the French - there is no intention of forcing the French language on anyone. The French Canadians of Manitoba are worried. They are afraid that under the present system they stand to lose both their language and their specific culture. While it is true that the French language has gained official recognition as a school subject from Grade 1 to Grade 12 on an optional basis, the French Canadians are convinced that the only result that can be achieved by this measure is the preservation of the French language from total extinction.

But this is not satisfactory to them. They would like something more positive. All those who deal with educational matters in French Canadian circles: L'Association d'Education, Les Commissaires Canadiens Francais, the teachers, parents and clergymen are aware today of a distinct impoverishment of spoken and written French at home and at school. The vocabulary of the students is extremely poor by being first of all limited to the daily period of French and then by being gathered from one reader and one grammar while they are at the same time picking their working and practical vocabulary from all their other textbooks.

Furthermore, the word processing into a linguistic structure or pattern is readily observed as being derived more, if not exclusively, from an English conception or mentality than from the French. For all practical purpose, our French speaking students, though

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . . subjected to this hour long period of French daily, experience a very great difficulty in addressing themselves point blank in the French language. They cannot but translate from English into French when placed in a situation where they have to express themselves in French. This practice is unwholesome. They become weary of speaking French, many of them are on the verge of dropping French altogether.

An education in French is the key to the survival of the French Canadian culture. If this culture is to be preserved in Manitoba, the young French Canadian student will have to learn his maternal tongue in a proper atmosphere, in a French atmosphere. It is only then that better French will be spoken by the French Canadians of Manitoba.

Of course when French becomes a language of instruction, there will be a demand for more and better qualified French teachers, and there will be greater interest in the teaching profession. This will eventually be of benefit to those Manitobans who, although not of French origin, are also interested in learning French or at least in having their children learn French, and believe me, sir, even now there are many such Manitobans but unfortunately they suffer because of lack of teachers - because of lack of good qualified teachers.

The next step of course would be the establishing of a French Branch of the Manitoba Teachers' College. This is the only way that we will be able to develop our own teachers. This, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced can be accomplished quite easily in view of the fact that the St. Boniface College, presently affiliated with the University of Manitoba, would be in a position to assist the Department of Education in taking on this responsibility. The recent relocation of the Teachers' College to the Fort Garry campus would also facilitate the establishing of a French branch of the college.

I suggest to you, sir, that it is not healthy, nor is it satisfactory for us to rely on the Province of Quebec or even on France to supply us with qualified French teachers. When the French Canadians of this province are able to use French as a teaching language, when Manitoba can develop enough qualified French teachers to meet the demand of French and other Manitobans who are interested, then the French language will be properly spoken; the French culture will flourish and the French Canadian will be better understood and therefore more understanding - then we will be on the way to obtaining real unity without uniformity.

Mr. Speaker, Canada will only be a nation when all her people can be proud of the same things - or, if you will, have a common heritage - while still retaining their own identity.

I am sure that most members of this House agree with me that this bill should be passed. Now, mind you, it will not be easy for all the members. Some will be pressured by certain people, certain groups I imagine, to oppose this bill. As Mr. Farquharson wrote in an editorial in 1963, "There are people in Canada who do not wish to see the preservation of minority culture; their vision for the future of our country is the melting pot. But there are other people who see a different kind of 'One Canada', a nation made distinct and strong because it has two main streams, as well as many brooks, to feed it and make it grow. History until now has been on the side of those Canadians who have tried to preserve, not sacrifice, cultural minorities."

Mr. Speaker, it might be advisable to apply to Canadians the words of the late President Kennedy: "Each Canadian should ask himself not what can your country do for you, but what can you do for your country."

Many Canadians now realize that it is the responsibility and duty of each and every one of us to do his utmost to save Confederation. Archbishop H.H. Clark, Anglican Primate of all Canada, speaking to church members in Regina a few weeks ago said: "Canada faces the real danger of becoming divided as a result of the French dispute." He urged English speaking Canadians to try to understand the French Canadian in his bid to retain his identity. English speaking Canada, he said, "has to accept French Canada's drive to retain a specific French-English culture and language. Whatever solutions we find for Canada's problems, let us never go to partition. If it came to this - this terrible wall of suspicion - it would be a tragedy." He told his audience: "It is our responsibility as Anglicans, strongly Anglo-Saxon, to love our French Canadian brothers and show that love in our words and deeds."

I would like to quote from the Free Press of March 2nd of this year. The article is headed "French Schools Get United Church Okay." "The United Church of Canada went on record Monday in favor of a distinct and public system of primary and secondary schools for French-speaking minorities outside Quebec. The country's largest Protestant church proposed many changes in education and the public service to promote official bilingualism and 'the cross-fertilization of the English-Canadian and French-Canadian cultures', in a brief to

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism.

"The United Church called on the royal commission to hold discussions with the nine provinces with an English-speaking majority to suggest 'that there should be better provision for French education. We see every reason to encourage children to complete their primary and secondary school courses in either English or French, with the further opportunity of learning the second language.' Languages other than English and French should also be taught in high schools and universities, on an optional basis, to assist the preservation of the other cultures in Canada, the brief said.

"French-language public schools adapted to local needs were desirable wherever there was a sufficiently-large concentration of French-Canadians outside Quebec. French schools need not be Roman Catholic separate schools. 'Such practices as these would, we believe, strengthen rather than weaken national unity.' "The brief said too many Canadians confuse official, public bilingualism in Canadian institutions with bilingualism in the individual. 'There can be no question of forcing anyone to speak either English or French, let alone both.'

"The issue was the development of policies to ensure the survival and growth of all 'sub-cultures' found in Canada. 'Your report should make clear that the description of the British and French as the two 'founding' peoples does not imply that Canadians of other origins are inferior'."

From the Free Press of November 15, 1963, I quote: "There can be no 'split personality' or birthday cake for Canada's centenary celebration in 1967 - the question of French Canada's culture and language must be settled first, Hon. Maitland Steinkopf, Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities, said Thursday.

"He added that he was certain the Fathers of Confederation intended to guarantee the right to instruction in the French language to all French Canadians in all provinces, not just Quebec. 'The French language is the key to the survival of the French Canadian culture. The right to it was secured a quarter century before Confederation,' Mr. Steinkopf contended, 'and the clear intent of the Fathers of Confederation was mislaid when education was established under provincial jurisdiction.' Because education is a provincial matter under the BNA Act, Manitoba is tackling the problem in addition to the work of the Royal Commission, he explained."

And here I have a submission, an excerpt from the Canadian Chamber submission to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism held in Toronto on March 30, 1965, and this clause is entitled "Bilingual Education, Section 32." "That, in all areas where there is a sufficient concentration of one of the two language groups to warrant such action, there be made available public schools at which instruction is carried out in the language of that group."

Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing I urge all the members of this House to go along with the good words of the First Minister, the Leader of this House, as spoken and referred to earlier and in a previous debate in Quebec and in Montreal, and I would like them to join the Provincial Secretary and vote in favor of this bill. I hope that a free vote will be allowed by all parties. As far as I am concerned there is no English problem, there is no French problem, there is no Ethnic Group problem, but only a Canadian problem; and in Manitoba as well as in the rest of Canada, this problem must be solved by all Canadians in a non-partisan way. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan) presented Bill No. 120, an Act to amend The Shops Regulation Act, for second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, the Shops Regulation Act at the present time calls for a petition of 75 percent of the occupier of shops throughout Manitoba, and when they procure the 75 percent they must within 30 days present it to the local council who, if requested, will comply with their wishes as far as closing by-laws are concerned. This amendment will only reduce the figure from 75 percent to 66 and two-thirds.

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

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953, for second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that if the Honourable Member from St. George had taken the trouble to read the explanation, if he'd look at his bills, I think that it's very clear. I couldn't add any more than that, but for his information it is -- there'll be somebody answering his questions in second reading. Now some of it, the first clause provides for -- this is the only one that's not properly explained. It says that it's self-explanatory and he can't read. This provides for the assessment of railway lands for business tax purposes in St. Boniface on the same basis as provided for under the Municipal Act for the City of Winnipeg.

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

MR. SCHREYER in the absence of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, presented Bill No. 124, an Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953, and The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, for second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Honourable Member for Elmwood has had some lamentable problems and illness in his family in his own case, and he has been unable to be here. However, I will try to explain to honourable members the gist of the legislation or bill before them. Bill No. 124 has to do with re-arranging the boundaries of the two municipalities mentioned, Winnipeg and St. Boniface. In fact, I'm sure that honourable members, if they were to appraise themselves of what is involved here, would very likely come down heavily in favor of the proposed legislation.

Some honourable members may know that Elmwood was, prior to 1906, part of Kildonan and part of St. Boniface, at which time it was found necessary, because of local demand and local problems, to take that area out of Kildonan and St. Boniface and incorporate it into the City of Winnipeg. This I suppose has been satisfactory over the years to the residents, but when this was done back in 1906, a small strip of land comprising close to 100 acres was left with the municipality of St. Boniface even though it was on the wrong side, or the far side, of the CNR railway track carline as it's called, which carline makes it difficult for the municipality of St. Boniface to service this area. As a consequence, this area is unserved even to this day. In fact, studies made by engineers and by engineers of the City of Winnipeg indicate that the area could be serviced soon and at a much more reasonable cost, much more economic cost, by Winnipeg than by the City of St. Boniface.

Now then, the matter was brought to the attention of the Council of the City of Winnipeg. It is my understanding that the City of Winnipeg is not opposed; in fact, there is a letter here to the effect, signed by the City Clerk, that the City of Winnipeg is not opposed to the re-arrangement of the boundary so as to bring this land into the City of Winnipeg so that Winnipeg might service it and thereby make the land useful for industrial purposes. As the situation stands at the present time, this land is lying in waste and largely unused. It is valuable industrial property. It is a good industrial site but it is not serviced, and I repeat Mr. Speaker, it is not serviced and cannot be serviced by the City of St. Boniface except at a cost much in excess of what can be provided by the City of Winnipeg. Now I would hope that honourable members will support the legislation at least to the point where it can come to Law Amendments Committee, where I understand that the interested parties will appear, including representatives of the City of Winnipeg.

I believe that honourable members here believe in bringing things to the light of day. They would not want to see things being held in abeyance time and time again. As long as this matter is not dealt with, an industrial site in this area is lying waste, and I'm sure that the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is anxious to provide for industrial development and industrial development sites, would not really like to see this situation continue in that area, so for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood had wanted to propose this legislation. I do so on his behalf at this time.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C., (Birtle-Russell) (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to oppose this bill at this time, but to express certain reservations concerning the bill. I think it's probably correct that it should go to Committee so that we can hear the representations on both sides, but I do think that all of the facts have not been put before this House and that there are some additional facts which should be put before the House when we are considering this bill. One of the things that the sponsor of the bill doesn't tell us is that a fair amount of the land that's involved in this transfer is owned by the City of St. Boniface. The member who has just spoken on the introduction of this bill on second reading has said that the land is

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd). . . . . difficult to service by the City of St. Boniface. The City of St. Boniface tells me that they have at the present time in contemplation, two underpasses under the railway line which would serve this property. They have had no application from any owner of property in the area affected for municipal services.

We are told that the City of Winnipeg doesn't oppose the passage of this bill. The City of St. Boniface didn't oppose it either - they didn't know anything about it until the bill was introduced into this House, and I asked the City of St. Boniface how they felt about it and they hadn't heard about it at all. These are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I think the sponsor of the bill should be prepared to answer when the matter comes before committee. The City of St. Boniface advises that it is quite feasible to service this property, and that as soon as there is some demand for municipal services such as sewer and water in this area that they will be quite prepared to provide those services. They also advise us that there is at present being contemplated a throughway which would go through the centre of the property involved. Metro is at present discussing this with the owners of some of the property. It is not yet known by the party how much property will be required for this throughway, and therefore I think that the matter is one that, before any services are contemplated from either side - either the Winnipeg side or the City of St. Boniface - these other questions are going to have to be determined so that the services can be put in the proper place to serve the properties in the most efficient manner.

And so, Mr. Speaker, although I will not oppose this bill going to committee so that we can hear the representations, I do have strong reservations concerning the advisability of the passage of this bill by this House.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . . . realize that it is not in order for me to speak again to the bill at this time because if I do I'll be closing the debate. However, I would like to say that the Honourable Minister sort of implies that I was withholding information. I wasn't withholding any information. Let the information come out at Committee. He's prepared to do that; so am I. There'll be no problem.

MR. SMELLIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I didn't make any suggestion that the proposer of this bill was withholding information. I recognize that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead was not the original sponsor of this bill. I don't hold him responsible for any of these matters. I don't suppose he even knew that the City of St. Boniface, for example, was not informed that the bill was being introduced, and I would not like there to be any suggestion that I suggest that he was doing something improper here. I'm merely suggesting that there are a lot of questions that I would like to see answered before this bill is passed by this House.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough to call the resolution on Ways and Means?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, and the proposed motion in amendment thereto of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, . . . . . but if anyone else wishes to speak we have no objection.

A MEMBER: He's on his way.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . . . to fill the gap, because I want to speak only briefly. I'd like to draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that on March 23rd, when I was speaking on the Education Estimates and dealt with the \$10 million set aside for what is called school tax rebate, I asked whether it would be possible for the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer to give us a recapitulation of what he now knows or expects in relation to the income from the special taxes imposed last August and the expenditures which he estimated at that time and on which he now has more information. That was something over a month ago, March 23rd.

On Friday, April 9th, I spoke and gave information which I was able to deduce out of the Estimates from my meagre ability in that respect, and I suggested then that according to my calculations there was a very substantial difference between the moneys expected to be raised out of the special taxes and the moneys expected to be spent or disbursed to relieve the real property ratepayers by moneys paid in addition to, over and above, what had been paid in the past. I indicated then that I was quite prepared to acknowledge that I was not too versed in dealing with these figures and that I may have been in error, but according to the calculations which I made, I came to a conclusion that there was some \$5 million expected to be raised in the special tax in excess of the moneys which I calculated would be paid or rebated, or paid in reduction of



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . . costs otherwise chargeable to the real property ratepayer in addition to, or over and above moneys which had been paid in previous years by this government.

Now this \$5 million is a substantial amount and I hope that there will be a discussion of this before the last speech that is made on this motion, so that we will have an opportunity not only to hear the comments, but to debate them if it appears that there is further matter to debate in that connection.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I just adjourned the debate yesterday and I am really not prepared to speak tonight. I have no objection at all to anyone else speaking but I do beg the indulgence of the House to allow me to stand over until tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Agreed? The motion stands.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough to call the constitutional debate now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. WRIGHT: Could we have the matter stand, please?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't wish to be tiresome about this, Mr. Speaker, but the honourable gentleman has had two or three standings already. He was in the House about two seconds ago and I think it's poor taste, to say the least, that he isn't here to speak at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . on the point that the Honourable the First Minister has raised, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to him that he is in bad taste completely. This is one of the most important resolutions that is to be faced in this House, and if the Honourable Member for Brokenhead happens to go out of the House, I resent very much the implication of the First Minister. But the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is now in his seat - he can answer for himself. But before, Mr. Speaker, calling on the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, may I severely chastise the Honourable the First Minister for his remarks. They are uncalled for and not necessary.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't have to take that kind of rebuke from my honourable friend. My honourable friend the Member for Brokenhead has had this matter stand on a number of occasions. He was in the House; he knows that the item was coming up; and I'm glad to see him back and I hope he's able to proceed. But I don't think that I'm entitled to accept the rebuke that my honourable friend would like to lay upon me.

MR. PAULLEY: May I say, Mr. Chairman, ---

A Member: Order.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh you order, yes. May I say, in all due respect, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that the Honourable First Minister --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . had his resolution before this House for many weeks himself and didn't proceed with it.

A MEMBER: Oh, quiet.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wish that the members would observe more decorum in the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, and I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would do likewise on other occasions.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that I could begin debate on this resolution under more auspicious circumstances. I wish to thank my Honourable Leader for the defence he made of my not being here. I think that if anyone has cause to be cranky or cantankerous about this particular resolution, it is the First Minister. I think that I can see why the government has stood this resolution itself on several occasions. It is because the Conservative Party in Canada is split down the middle - divided hopelessly on this issue of patriation.

I have no apologies to make whatsoever for having stood this resolution. I was not here a few minutes ago because I thought that the Honourable Member for St. John's was speaking on Ways and Means and I thought that the Honourable Member for Gladstone was going to speak on Ways and Means. I fully intended to speak this evening, and I shall do so.

As for the reason why I stood it last time, it was because I wasn't feeling well and I don't think I have to apologize for not feeling well. I realize that the First Minister commands a majority in this House, but he doesn't command when we on this side shall get up or sit down.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . . He can reserve his command over getting up and sitting down to his own members and refrain from telling us when we shall stand or rise or sit.

Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the remarks made by the Honourable the Attorney-General when he introduced this resolution, and I also read with interest the remarks made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I can understand now a little more clearly the position of the Liberal Party of Manitoba with regard to this matter of patriation, but I still am not quite clear as to the position of the government of this province, because the Attorney-General when he spoke said that the government approved of the revised draft, the Fulton-Favreau formula, but seeded throughout his speech are all sorts of reservations, either stated or implied reservations, about this formula.

The Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party, made it fairly clear in his speech that the Liberal Party was now in favour of a policy of further waiting and further studying of the matter. Well, I think that this is a good idea. It's not the best idea. I think that the policy that we should have is one of opposition to the formula, to the revised draft, because what it proposes in effect is that we shall patriate the Constitution at a very high price. The major flaw in the formula is that it provides for a veto power, veto power is given to any province with respect to the amendment of the Constitution, regarding all of the powers of the provinces under Section 92, and I suggest that there is no other jurisdiction, no other state in the world that has a Constitution that is quite as rigid as that. I know of no other state that has in its Constitution or in its organic law such degree of intrenchment that it amounts to veto. I know of none. In the United States, as all members well know, amendment to the Constitution - formal amendment, that is - is possible on a two-thirds, three-quarters vote; in most of the other federal states it is possible on a vote that shows obvious consensus but not unanimity. Obviously we must agree that formal amendment should take place only after obvious consensus is reached, but that amendments should be forestalled or prevented until complete unanimity is achieved is really asking the impossible.

I think it's really unfortunate that the Fulton-Favreau draft should contain in Section 2 thereof this veto feature, this unanimity feature. It's true that when you look at Section 5 of the draft that you find provision there for amendment to the Constitution to be based on a two-thirds vote of the provinces containing 50 percent at least of the population, but what is that Section 5 - this is a rather desirable section - what does it apply to? It applies to very little, if anything, of major importance in our BNA Act. Everything that is important in the way of constitutional law in the BNA Act is really covered by Section 2, which is the veto section. It is nice, it is desirable that we should be able to patriate our Constitution by our centenary. It would be nice to be able to patriate it at any time, Mr. Speaker, but to have to resort to extreme measures - and I consider this veto inclusion an extreme measure - to have to do this in order to patriate the Constitution is paying too high a price.

I was interested to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition say that this draft act should be referred to committees all over the country, it should be committed to various groups of learned people that they may study it and make recommendations and give their opinions thereon. Mr. Speaker, this has already been done to a large extent. The Canadian Association of University Teachers has considered the draft act quite carefully, I should think, and they are opposed to it. Dean Borolaskin, who is one of the most eminent authorities on Canadian constitutional law, refers to this draft act as it implemented "an unmitigated constitutional disaster." Dean Frank Scott, former dean of the McGill Law School, certainly one of the top five constitutional law men in our country is also quite opposed to the features of the draft act. Therefore, it seems possible to say even at this time that already the considered opinion of men learned in these matters is one of opposition to the draft act as presently before us. What more can one say then, except that if nothing else is possible we certainly go along with the idea of delaying, of delaying at all costs, the acceptance of this draft act, because it would be in our opinion unfortunate if it is accepted in the present state.

Now it is argued by some men - some rather qualified men too, I must say - that why spend all this time arguing about the features of the Fulton-Favreau formula, why spend all this time decrying the unanimity feature embedded in Clause or Section 2, when formal amendment is not in any case the most important method in modifying a constitution of a country. They say, "Look at the United States. In 176 years of existence the Constitution has been formally amended only 24 times, but that the Constitution is being changed and modified every year by non-formal means." In other words by judicial interpretation, by custom convention and so on. This is certainly true, but I suggest to you that the more rigid your amendment

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . . procedure is -- see, the Constitution has to modify itself in any case. The Constitution is not a static thing - it must grow; and if you don't make adequate provision for proper amendment procedures, it means simply that the Constitution is going to be changed anyway but by unauthorized persons. It will be modified then not by the proper amendment procedure, which will be too cumbersome, but it will be modified year after year by judicial interpretation and by inter-governmental pressures, and by, if I may use the term it will be modified sort of by default, and I suggest that this is wrong. The proper way is, if the Constitution or the organic law is to be changed, it should be changed by the proper body and that is by the parliamentary and legislative bodies of the country - those who represent the popular will or the popular sovereignty.

Well, I can foresee the future in this connection. Our Constitution will be so difficult to amend by the proper procedures that it will be modified more and more by people and institutions and bodies not properly authorized to do so, and I think that if that happens, it will have been our fault - our fault; the present incumbents of Parliament and the Legislatures in Canada today; because we will have been the ones that approved of this formula.

I think honourable gentlemen in this Chamber are fully aware that since this matter was before us last there have been some changes. Since that time, the right Honourable John Diefenbaker has changed his position on this matter completely, and the Official Opposition in Quebec - and not just the Official Opposition but a substantial body of opinion in Quebec which previously or hitherto have been quite earnestly in favor of the draft - are now coming around to have second thoughts about it, and the publishers of the Free Press, the Free Press chain I suppose, are coming to have serious second thoughts about it, and the Liberal Party of Manitoba according to the Honourable the Leader, as expressed the other day, are coming to have some serious second thoughts about it. At least they are not prepared to go ahead now. They would rather see an extended study.

I think that we can be more positive than that and express our views more pungently at this time. We oppose the draft but at the same time we find allies in anyone who sees fit to hold off expressing approval until such time as overwhelming opinion comes to bear, presumably and preferably in opposition to this draft. It may well be said as a final resort that this was the closest we have come thus far, and that if this fails that any possibility of arriving at an agreement as to an amendment formula will seem hopeless from here on in. That is rather pessimistic thinking, Mr. Speaker. Who knows what alternatives may be brought to light which might be more acceptable? It seems to me that intrenchment as such is not being opposed, is not being opposed merely because it's intrenchment. I mean, for example, that Dean Scott or Professor Laskin or other spokesmen of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa say clearly and openly that intrenchment of minority rights, intrenchment of cultural rights of the minorities, are perfectly acceptable. They should be intrenched in the Constitution and amendable only by unanimous agreement. So there's no disagreement there. Where the disagreement comes in is that all sixteen of the sub-heads of Section 92 are being intrenched, and those 16 sub-heads deal with things far beyond cultural and minority rights. They deal with matters social and economic.

Now why should matters social and economic be intrenched and amendable only by unanimous agreement? Once you do this, it means in effect that economic legislation from now until the end of time practically, cannot be amended in terms of division of powers between Federal and Provincial governments unless you have complete and unanimous agreement. It means that a province of 100,000 people or a province of 500,000 people or a province of a million people can effectively prevent the change or modification of the Constitution to meet changing society and social needs, and I think that you . . . . . defend this under any circumstances, Mr. Speaker.

It seems to me that if honourable members are at all interested in what sort of specific proposals we would urge, I would put it as follows: that we could support a formula which would provide for the intrenchment of basic minority rights but which would enable amendment in respect to other matters on the basis of a general consensus, and a general consensus would be something in the order of two-thirds.

Simultaneously with the patriation of the Constitution, there should be intrenched into the Constitution a Bill of Rights, which provides another interesting topic for discussion, Mr. Speaker, that Canada does not have a Bill of Rights that is really worthy of the name. Now it's true that we enjoy civil rights because of centuries of tradition and protection of the common law, but we don't have constitutionally safeguarded civil rights, and I think that when we're talking

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . about repatriating the constitution, we should also give time -- surely this is the time to consider the possibility of intrenching civil rights into the Constitution.

And finally, we wish to make it clear that a unanimity feature that applies to anything more than minority and cultural rights is really unique in the civilized western world, the civilized world anywhere for that matter, and really uncalled for. We can certainly see the position of those who argue for intrenchment because of minority or cultural matters, and when they extend that argument to argue for intrenchment of provincial powers unrelated to minority or civil rights, we say, "what's really your point except provincial rights." Provincial rights don't deserve intrenchment, and anyone here who supports the concept of intrenched provincial rights as opposed to minority and civil rights is acting in the tradition or the spirit of the U. S. South of the 1860s. We on this side here are not Calhouns but I think that honourable members who are prepared to vote for this draft act including Section 2 as it does, with the veto power for the provinces, would find John Calhoun a useful ally at this time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would be prepared to move adjournment but I'm not ready to speak tomorrow, so -- It's either one of two things. I can adjourn but I'm not prepared to speak tomorrow.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable the First Minister has given me the authority to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned. And I thank him most cordially.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock, Wednesday afternoon.