

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their Second Report: Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 8 - An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act.

No. 9 - An Act to amend The Highways Protection Act.

No. 10 - An Act to amend The Optometry Act.

No. 11 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of the Winnipeg School Division Number one.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bill No. 15 - An Act to amend The Companies Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motions; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 88, an Act to amend The Registry Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: The next one will be introduced by the Minister of Health and Social Development. I understand there's some confusion about the introduction.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services) introduced Bill No. 89, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (2).

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona) introduced Bill No. 91, an Act to amend The Department of Labour Act; and

Bill No. 92, an Act to amend The Labour Relations Act; and

Bill No. 93, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. MACKLING introduced Bill No. 90, an Act to amend The Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act; and

Bill No. 96, an Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

MR. TOUPIN introduced Bill No. 98, The Health Services Insurance Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 14 Grade 9 students of McCreary Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. North. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

And 25 Grade 11 students of the Miles MacDonnell School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Weibe and this school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

And 41 Grade 11 students of the Neepawa Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bailey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . . this afternoon.

And may we also welcome His Worship the Mayor of St. James, who is sitting in my gallery. On behalf of the members, I welcome you this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Could the Minister now inform me of how many departments of government have placed their requirements for student placement from the university students.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the question. The various departments are placing people but I don't know what numbers or to what extent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister comment on weekend reports that the Student Employment Service in terms of University employment was not going well.

MR. MILLER: I don't know the report referred to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has a decision been reached as to whether or not the government will be paying compensation on grain that has been destroyed by flood -- grain, yes.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the Order-in-Council relative to compensation was passed and is on view for any of the members who wish to see it. The Order itself contains the suggestion that other things can be considered, but my recollection is that there is nothing specifically said with respect to grain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. From that comment of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, would this also include the area south of the floodway gates?

MR. GREEN: I believe the honourable member is referring to that location known as Turnbull Drive that is immediately to the south of the gates?

MR. HARDY: . . . clarification, Turnbull east side of the Red River and the R. M. of Richotte.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Order-in-Council refers to, I believe, all locations. Now, the terms of compensation are still within those provided by the Order-in-Council, which my honourable friend should be able to review to get a more specific answer to his question.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of members of the House the fact that there are two complete - or almost complete - sets of the Revised Statutes on the table of the House. They're in the attractive Manitoba tartan cover. Sets are being delivered to the caucus rooms for all of the members and to the offices of the Ministers and the party leaders. Deliveries are also being made to the law libraries in the courts today. A start will be made at once on the filling of orders from the public received by the office of the Queen's Printer. In addition, special sets of selected statutes will soon be provided for magistrates, justices of the peace and law enforcement officers. All of these hopefully will go forward by June 1st. However, the present sets that are on the table and those that are being delivered are not fully complete. There will be three binders of index which will be delivered later. It is also planned to provide for each binder at a later date indices for the binder, a table of contents and table of pages, which will be in distinguishable colours. Information on other planned innovations to make the loose leaf system more serviceable will be forthcoming. The traditional bound copies of the Revised Statutes will not be available until after June 1st. It may be of interest to members to note that over three and a half million pages are involved in providing the Revised Statutes in loose leaf form in approximately 25,000 binders for use by government and

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . the public. I'm very happy, Mr. Speaker, to make this announcement at this time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Will he be tabling a copy of the Order-in-Council with regard to the flooding?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have made some attempts to see to it that they are circulated. Of course, my honourable friend knows that it can be seen by any person, but I believe that we are attempting to see to it that honourable members will get copies of what the scheme entails.

MR. MOLGAT: A supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker. There are areas in the province where flooding has occurred, possibly not on the same scale as, say, Gladstone or Carman, but nevertheless flooding, for example along the Riding Mountain in the Waldersee area and Amaranth. Will the government undertake to investigate these areas or must there be a request from the municipality concerned?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm of the opinion that we have a fairly extensive knowledge as to where flooding has occurred, but if we don't know of some place then we're certainly happy to get the information. The Order-in-Council states which areas are affected thereby.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Another supplementary question. Would the people involved in the flooding and who are making requests for compensation, address their requests to the Minister or to someone else specified?

MR. GREEN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Order-in-Council states the procedure, and my recollection is that you first approach your municipal council. That's just a recollection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It appears that the municipalities are not aware of the program that the Minister is talking about. I have evidence this morning of a municipality that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Yes, I'm wondering - would he circulate the municipalities of the province on the Order-in-Council?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my impression, of course, is that there is no lack of dissemination of information, but I take the honourable member's question seriously and will see what they can do to further acquaint people as to what is taking place. My information is that the Department of Government Services is also circularizing people through Information Services with respect to these matters.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, just on the point that my colleague has drawn to the attention of the House that the Department of Government Services, through its Information Branch, will be making available legitimate information respecting this matter to municipalities and others, and also that I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, as honourable members are aware, that it is not normal for Orders-in-Council to be made public. It's up to the individual members to ascertain that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. I wonder if he can tell the House, or tell us how many students have been hired by the government to take part in placement and referral operations in student employment?

MR. MILLER: How many students have been hired to do which?

MR. PATRICK: To take part in placement and referral operations in student employment.

MR. MILLER: I believe there are a total of three people in the entire operation.

MR. PATRICK: Will the government departments be hiring any students this summer?

MR. MILLER: All government departments are in the process of hiring students for this summer, yes.

MR. PATRICK: Can the Minister give us an indication how many or what number. Will it be a large number or just a very small number?

MR. MILLER: It will not be any less than in previous years, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Has the government as yet taken any steps towards enabling the people to plant trees on the Red River Floodway this year?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question insofar as tree planting is concerned, there hasn't really been a policy developed as such but we're looking at the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that several CNR employees in the Transcona Shops are being trained after hours in government procedure for insurance purposes?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): I don't know what the honourable member is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you on a point of privilege at this time with regards to an article which appeared in the Free Press on Saturday re the younger legal age voting in the House. The article, under the name of Mr. Paul Pihichyn, says that I voted against the resolution and if the press would be kind enough to examine Votes and Proceedings they would find that I voted for the resolution. The article has caused me considerable embarrassment, Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, and I hope that the matter will be retracted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder could he inform the House whether or not the people that have been accustomed to taking their campers out to the provincial parks and leaving their trailers there, or their campers there, were given any notice that this was no longer possible. I'm referring specifically to the situation at Grand Beach. I understand in the West Hawk Lake area the owners of trailers were informed that they would have to take the trailers back with them, that they could not leave them there for a week or the customary two-week or three-week permits that up to now have existed.

MR. BURTNIAK: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if I heard the question correctly or not. In reference made to a two or three week period that the trailers were left, I am wondering if you are referring to at the end of the season or at the present time when the season is opening.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. No, I'm referring right now, it's been brought to my attention that a number of persons that have been accustomed to being able to use the facilities of Grand Beach, to leave their trailers or their campers at a site that they were fortunate to acquire, were told that this was no longer permitted under the new rules and regulations. I can't recall any such statement being made. I can only recall that there was an increase in fees. But I would ask the Honourable Minister to take that question as notice, if nothing else.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I think I know the question the honourable member is asking. I believe that the reason for this - and I think it's a valid one - and I would like to say at this time that there have been a number of people who have tried to use these facilities and at the same time move from one place to another from time to time, and the reason that we have made this statement to the effect that we don't want to have these people move from one place to another, if they come into a certain area, where they pay their fees for a certain period of time, we want them to stay there rather than to move from place to place. At the same time, I might add that without knowing how long they are definitely going to stay, we are not in a position to be able to tell someone else to come into that spot if that spot is available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question on the same subject. Has the government cancelled the three-week permits at provincial parks, and the seasonal permits, or are they still available?

MR. BURTNIAK: No, they are still available.

MR. MOLGAT: Can the Minister explain then why people were turned down at Grand Beach this past weekend?

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I wasn't aware that there were any people turned down this last weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Could he tell the House how sales of the Centennial license plates are proceeding this year; and secondly, how it might compare to the '67 project?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is either to the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if you can confirm whether the government is now in the process of examining and studying with consultants the commercial trucking field in Manitoba, particularly with a view to government entry into the commercial trucking field.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs, and ask him which of two versions with respect to the Royal itinerary is correct. There was an earlier report this year that the Royal itinerary would include a stop at the Delta Waterfowl Research Station. The reports published on the weekend, Sir, did not make any such mention of a visit. Could the Minister advise us as to which of those is correct?

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the second report that was referred to. I'll have to take this question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, I'll direct the question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is the Minister aware that PFRA pastures are being sprayed with 245T at this time?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker; I don't know what the ingredient is.

MR. MCKENZIE: Would the Minister take it into consideration and check out my constituency where there are pastures?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Government Services. Is the Minister in a position to comment on the question that was posed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs re CNR employees in Transcona?

MR. PAULLEY: I must confess, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the question.

MR. HARDY: Is the Minister in a position to confirm that several members of the CNR Shops in Transcona are being trained, after hours, in the procedures that could be adopted for the introduction of automobile insurance?

MR. PAULLEY: I want to assure my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that the employees of the CNR, both past and present, are vitally concerned with automobile insurance in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, by permission, I would have leave to table a document that currently is part of the curriculum for the high schools of the city. It's entitled -- it's put out by the citizens of public automobile insurance, entitled, "General Questions and Answers about Public Automobile Insurance." I understand this is now part of the Economics class that is being taught in the high schools of Manitoba, in Winnipeg.

A MEMBER: Read it.

MR. ENNS: No, I won't read it. It is, of course, the propaganda sheet that's put out by the New Democratic Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a correction. A few days ago, the Honourable Minister in charge of Cultural Affairs was talking about early churches and I claimed that the church at Churchill was the first in Manitoba. I am very sorry to have to admit that I was in error. We had the first minister but he was so busy that he didn't have time to build the church.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . On Friday, I believe, he appeared and represented the government before the Minister of Fisheries in connection with the Fish Marketing Processing Plant and its location. I wonder whether he can indicate whether a formal presentation was made in writing to the Minister at that time. A formal brief.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there was no formal brief made with the Minister but we had an extensive discussion with both the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Regional Economic Development, which lasted approximately 1-1/2 hours.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTION FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned Debate. Order for Return, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, may we have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

#### PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether, with the concurrence of the House, that we could proceed to the Bills presented by Private Members on Page 10 of the Order Paper, starting with Bill No. 36.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, when this bill was last before members of this House, which was just three or four days ago, it was not my intention to delay action on it but we were very close to the end of the day's sitting and I didn't feel that the clock provided me with the two or three minutes that I wished to have to comment on the bill and on the initiative that it undertakes, and that's why I adjourned debate on that occasion, Sir.

I want to say that the proposed legislation has the full endorsement of myself and, insofar as I know, the full endorsement of all members of the Progressive Conservative caucus. We would like to commend the Honourable Member for Logan in introducing the bill into this Legislature and we would like at this point to pay our tribute to the Manitoba Sports Federation and its officers, under its president Mr. Guy Simonis, for the imaginative and innovative work it's already done in the field of promoting sports and athletic participation, particularly in the field of mass participation in amateur athletics since the Federation itself came into being.

There is no question today, Mr. Speaker that competitive sport, athletic competition, provides an opportunity for the development of character and the development of discipline, and in particular self-discipline, which are sorely needed ingredients in our society. There are many factors and many influences that tug and pull at young people's interests today, and all too few of them have the constructive and beneficial effects that competitive athletics do. In fact, there are many pressures and influences at work in our society today with great appeal for young people, that are unequivocally and unquestionably harmful, and I think that all of us would agree that where young people can be interested in something constructive, where they can be interested in pursuits that make for development of their own character, and particularly development of self-discipline, then those exercises deserve the commendation of all members of our society, and this is the role that amateur sport plays, and in fact professional sport, in my opinion, to a very large extent plays in our society. At least these are the beneficial results of sport, both amateur and professional, and those people, men and women, who have contributed time and energy and effort - and in some cases their own funds - to the development of the Manitoba Sports Federation and to the development of all those bodies that make up the Manitoba Sports Federation, deserve our salute, Sir.

I think that one of the most laudatory and beneficial programs being undertaken by the Sports Federation is that in the field of sports clinics and the sending of sports clinics and sports advisors and sports facilities into those areas of our province that have not heretofore had the advantages of full-scale athletic involvement and development that some of the more heavily populated regions have enjoyed, and this is a program for which the Sports Federation deserves great credit and deserves all our support.



(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.)

There are many, many examples of the values and of the benefits that athletes and athletic organizations have produced for our society, not only in Manitoba but in Canada and North America in general and throughout the western world, and the degree to which sports development and sports involvement helps societies attain their full potential cannot, in my view, be over-emphasized. As a consequence, the work that's undertaken by those people who belong to such sports bodies as those now united in the Manitoba Sports Federation, is work of extreme importance and hopefully work that will be recognized by all members of this Chamber and, in particular, members of this government in the immediate future and in the years to come.

Centennial year in our province has helped focus attention on the Sports Federation and on the work that people involved in sports development are doing, and we would hope that the interest and the enthusiasm now manifesting itself in this field will be maintained in the future. We would hope that it won't be just a Centennial year phenomenon but that it will reflect and represent an increasing and continuing awareness through the future on the part of our society of the importance of sport and sports training grounds. One of the great things, of course, about sport is that it teaches you to lose as well as to win, and surely this is one of the most important and invaluable lessons of life. There is a tremendous amount to be said for winning but there is also, as I think I have noted before and as all persons connected with sport would agree, there is also a great deal to be said in this life and in this world for losing, provided one loses in the proper spirit and in the proper manner and with the proper values uppermost.

So, we wish to add our endorsement to this legislation. We wish to add our commendation to all those officers in amateur sports bodies in this province who have worked together to develop and produce the Manitoba Sports Federation and, in fact, add our support to those working in the fields of professional sport as well as amateur, in this our Centennial year. The Sports Federation promises to produce great benefits for our young people in the years ahead if it can get off to a successful start at the present time. One of its difficulties, of course, has been the achievement of a degree of cohesion and unity and mutual interest on the part of those sports bodies who have come together under its aegis, but that difficulty has been surmounted and there now is great unity and cohesion, and the people who used to work specifically for individual sport now are working for sports in general and for the whole Sports Federation as an umbrella embracing this whole field of culture and activity.

Now the one difficulty, the one hurdle remaining in the Sports Federation's way, Sir, provided this legislation receives the blessing of this House, the one difficulty remaining is the one that seems to dog us in all our pursuits in this world and that is financial, so it's to be hoped that once the Federation takes form as a legal entity, that there will be avenues of financial support made available to it, reasonable avenues of financial support made available to it by this government and succeeding governments in this province.

Before sitting down, I would like to add my party's words and eulogy to that uttered the other day in this Chamber by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, with respect to the late Dr. Frank Kennedy and all that he did for amateur and collegiate sport, for sport at the university and high school level here in Winnipeg, and for the kind of thing that's now articulating itself through the Manitoba Sports Federation as a united body. He was a great friend of sport and a great friend of Manitobans. His loss is certainly a severe one to this province. It is to be hoped that the goal he staked out for himself will now be pursued, and diligently so, and will now be achieved by those who are left to take up the torch that he first carried.

Mr. Speaker, with those words we in the Progressive Conservative Party commend the member of the House who brought the bill before this Chamber and offer our wholehearted support.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Within the past few moments, we have had 21 Grade 10 students from Deloraine High School enter our gallery. These students are under the direction of Mr. Keeler, and this school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. On behalf

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . . of the members of the Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

PRIVATE BILLS (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. George, Bill No. 64. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in adjourning the bill the other day it was not my intention to speak at any length on the bill before us. This is a bill whereby it makes it possible for the Manitoba Farmers Union and the National Farmers Union to amalgamate. Looking at the statute of the Manitoba Farmers Union, which was passed in 1953, I find there are a good number of familiar names listed in the Bill of Incorporation. Among them are such people as J.N. Galonsky, and Warner Herbert Jorgenson of Ste. Elizabeth - I think that is the present Member for Morris, if I'm right. I also find the name of James Patterson of Neepawa, Mr. Jacob Schulz of Melita, and Rudolph Edward Usick of Erickson. These people no doubt were active at the time in the Manitoba Farmers Union movement when the Act was passed, and no doubt the organization has served a purpose here in Manitoba. If you take a look at the objects they are quite substantial, and then, too, there is the matter of co-operative buying and selling and carrying on of and exercising trade in the province, promoting it; and when you come to the purposes there's listed here that they can act and be agents for the sale of farm produce and supplies. I'm not sure whether all of these things that were asked for and were inserted in the bill have ever been used to any great extent. There is the matter of whole-sale buying. I think this was exercised at some time.

But, Mr. Speaker, the main point today before us is the matter of amalgamation between the two organizations, and some of us might have attended the founding convention of the National Farmers Union held here last fall in the City of Winnipeg. I was there one afternoon and had a chance to look at the new by-laws, and it seemed to me that the new organization is going to be much more militant than the former provincial organization. I don't know at this point whether it was a unanimous decision to have the Manitoba Farmers Union amalgamate with the National Farmers Union. This morning we had an amendment placed on our desks in Law Amendments Committee in connection with Bill 15 amending The Companies Act, which calls for certain unanimity in proposing amalgamations. This particular section won't apply to this bill since that is not law as yet, but it would be interesting to hear from the person sponsoring the bill just how unanimous a decision was it and whether the members are very much in favour of going national. Certainly there must be some benefits to gain by having a federal charter and operating in a federal way than that from the provinces. I'm sure that the purpose will be more united because you will then not have three prairie provinces going into different directions and probably taking different stands. I understand also that the federal charter will allow for regions and that you can have regional organization. But I understand the purpose of this bill is mainly to bring about the machinery whereby the provincial organization can amalgamate with the National Farmers Union and provide the necessary means to wind up the provincial organization. I personally do not oppose the bill if this is the wishes of the members. I think that will be satisfactory to me, but at this point I still question whether the right thing is being done in winding up the provincial organization and going federal.

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

MR. BILL URUSKI (St. George): If there's anyone else wishes to speak -- I'll be closing debate. Nobody left? In answer to the question - first of all, I'll deal with the question posed by the Member for Rhineland - I'd like to say that the decision to amalgamate was not with the Farmers Union; the decision was made by the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, B.C. and Ontario, between the provinces to form the Farmers Union. They did not merge into the National Farmers Union. The National Farmers Union wasn't an entity created all to itself. The Farmers Union members and executive from the different provinces merged together to form the National Farmers Union. It wasn't a sort of a going into another separate field altogether. And I might say that the request for this was unanimous from the four provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Ontario.

At this time, I would like to congratulate the officers presently from Manitoba in the National Farmers Union, particularly those, as I stated, from Manitoba; and they are Phil Schwartz, who is a farmer of the Town of St. Norbert, K. Dyck from Headingley,



(MR. URUSKI cont'd.) . . . . John F. Palamarchuk from Silver, Manitoba, whom I know very well - he is in my constituency and I know him quite well - Kenneth J. Singleton. These are the four people who are the Manitoba representatives on the National Farmers Union whose head office is here in the City of Winnipeg.

I would like to congratulate them for their foresight in proceeding with the setting up of this organization, because such an organization is required as a spokesman for the farmers on a national basis. There are, of course, other farmers' organizations but the National Farmers Union, in my view, is a grass roots organization with the following objectives that they are striving for, and these objectives are set out in Bill S-22 of the Senate of Ottawa, and they are as follows:

To promote the betterment of farmers in the attainment of their economic and social goals.

To conduct projects for the benefit of farmers in the development of markets and for the marketing of farm products.

To achieve the reduction of costs and other measures designed to increase economic benefits of farming.

To conduct educational and research projects for the benefit of farmers.

To promote and secure legislation and other forms of government action for the benefit of farmers.

And lastly, to promote a higher standard of community life in agriculture, and also to provide services for its members consistent with its objectives and work jointly with any other persons or organizations for the attainment of its objectives.

I might add there are other organizations on a commercial basis representing various interests or sections of the agricultural producers in Canada. Some of these are business corporations and I think that while they may represent their members, nevertheless they have a vested interest in representing the corporation itself, and they advocate policies that are beneficial to that corporation only, even though at times such policies may not be in the best interests of the ordinary agricultural producer of this country.

The National Farmers Union gets its membership by individual voluntary subscription and by asking, year after year, individual farmers to make such subscription, because it is a grass roots farm organization and it has real strength in speaking for the ordinary agricultural producer in this country. I might add that I have been informed by the attorney acting on behalf of the National Farmers Union, who is in Toronto, he will be attending or he will attempt to attend the committee meetings and explain any questions that anyone might have on this bill when this bill goes to committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur, Bill No. 48. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

#### PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I commend the Member for Assiniboia for bringing this in but it's only a minuscule attempt at amendment and the government, through the Attorney-General, will be bringing in a number of amendments to The Election Act. Consequently we'll be able to debate all the ramifications and changes that are desirable at that time. Therefore we can't support this at the present time.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, ayes and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The matter before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, Bill No. 52.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling,

(STANDING VOTE cont'd. - Nays) . . . . . Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 25; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, Bill No. 70. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Could we have this stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Public Bills. Bill No. 75. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANKSY (Radisson) presented Bill No. 75, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (3), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, if it is the wish of the members, I'd like to deal with this Act in two ways; first of all, to give some general comments, followed by specific reference to the proposed amendments to the Liquor Control Act involving principle section by section with explanation.

Now, before I go into the explanation, I'd like to take this opportunity to correct an impression made a week ago Monday by the St. Boniface City Council. A charge was made that government members were using the schools to promote government policy. A motion was passed by the council asking the St. Boniface School Board to investigate this matter. I wish to compliment the board for not reacting to this rather petty charge by a defeated PCP party candidate in the last provincial election. Mr. Speaker, the government member referred to was me, the Member for Radisson. At first, Mr. Speaker, I was amused and was quite prepared to let this matter drop. However, I found on enquiring that there was concern and considerable doubt, and I feel bound to set the record straight.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that I was invited by the students of Pierre Radisson Collegiate, through their teacher, Mr. Senchuk. I was invited by the students to speak on the functions and responsibilities of cabinet. This I did, on the morning of Thursday, April 30th. In the course of the question period, questions were asked on various topics, including questions regarding the proposed amendments to the Liquor Act. Now, as we all should be aware, Mr. Speaker, the last ten years have witnessed important and at times tremendous changes in society. Perhaps nowhere has the immensity of change been so explosive as in North America, notably in the United States of America. Up until the present, at least, there has been a time gap between Canada and the U.S., and in this respect, that there are rebounds of change in the U.S. being felt here an appreciable time after the impact to this country to the south of us. Our proximity to the United States serves as a sort of a time machine mirror into which we can look and see the picture of things to come in Canada. This is an invaluable insight, but only if we are aware of what we see and are willing to prepare for it. It is fundamentally important that we do not over-react, but it is also important that we do not sit idly by and . . . yes, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: It is the intent of the honourable member to relate those comments to the principle of the bill?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker. This is my introductory remarks. And . . . allow change to overcome and disrupt the order of life here in Canada and here in our Province of Manitoba. It is obvious that great changes, particularly in the Sixties, have cast doubt on the utility and truth of many long held theories and opinions, but it is also true that in many ways the knowledge and technological explosion has enriched and altered our way of life. These powerful factors have also tended to have a divisive effect on our society necessitating considerable amount of soul-searching and adjustment, and I am sure you will agree that sensible, reasonable adjustment is the most mature and beneficial manner in which to meet the challenges of our changing times.

It is far better to adjust than stand the risk of disruption. The area of the distribution, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages, like the other areas of activities in our society, is also an area affected by change. This bill and its proposed amendment takes note of these changes. This bill and the amendment it contains are in keeping with the Manitoba characteristics of reasonable adjustment, pragmatic adjustment to keep the provisions of our Liquor Act compatible with the times in which we live. These amendments, as you will note in reading the bill, constitute a responsible and a reasonable approach and ignore the two small

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.) . . . . minority camps, one of which recommends complete repeal and the other untrammelled free reign. Rather, this bill sets out to adjust our Liquor Act to correct those aspects which are proving onerous and inequitable, and also updates the Act to meet the trends to operational and attitude changes.

In considering these amendments to the Liquor Act, we should keep in mind not only the changes in our way of life that make these amendments justifiable and necessary, but also how these amendments contribute toward a lessening of abuse of alcohol by an increasingly mature society. I know you all agree that society today does not view the consumption of alcoholic beverages as suspect and evil, and does not welcome, indeed will not accept undue restrictions and repressive regulations. All but three or four percent of our adult population adopt a responsible attitude to the consumption of alcoholic beverages. It is my belief . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I hope the honourable member isn't violating the rule prohibiting the reading of speeches.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I had asked if it was the wish -- I was going to give some general comments and then go section by section explanations on the bill. -- (Interjection) -- General comments.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is allowed to proceed with the debate as permitted by the rules, as long as he doesn't violate any of the rules.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Okay, Mr. Speaker. Because this is a free vote, we may all contribute in a positive manner towards a reasonable adjustment to our Liquor Act intended by these amendments. The explanations of a few of these amendments will suffice, I am sure, to impress upon you the necessity of amending the Act to meet the needs of our time. One of the changes to which I refer and to which several amendments are directed, is indeed not only already upon us but in a few short months from now will be a fond memory in history. I refer, of course, to our Manitoba Centennial and the many events which are planned in communities all across the province, and by organizations and citizens all across the province. Perhaps this is the appropriate time to give you a few examples of the particular changes being asked for in the proposed amendments in this bill. The amendment contained in Section 2, Sub-section (1), Clause 23, for example, will allow all licensed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. I'm sure the honourable member will be able to find a more appropriate time to deal with the amendment section by section. He no doubt is aware of the fact that at this stage all that is permitted is to debate the principle of the bill rather than making any specific reference to sections.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe the member could in a general way refer to what he might consider to be the improvement, for the edification of members, without mentioning sections by number.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Thank you. The amendment will allow all licensed premises to sell alcoholic beverages on Thanksgiving Day. I think this amendment will also allow the sale of alcoholic beverages on Thanksgiving Day in cocktail rooms, cabarets, beer parlors and beverage rooms. This is a reasonable amendment in that in the present Act alcoholic beverages may be served in a certain licensed area of the premises on Thanksgiving Day, while prohibiting the same in another area of the same building.

Another amendment will allow the broadcasting media to carry advertising of alcoholic beverages at any time during the day. This amendment will bring this section into line with Ontario and British Columbia. -- (Interjection) -- Harry says "nonsense". As you know, this section now allows broadcasting media to advertise alcoholic beverages only between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (That's not me; that's the Member for Lakeside.)

Also, another amendment will allow the Commission to extend the sale or issue of permits for consecutive days to any organization holding a convention or meeting lasting more than one day. Now this amendment will allow such an organization, or rather an event as the Manitoba Festival du Voyageur which was centred in St. Boniface, allow such an affair to be not violating, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had stated at that time that a certain section violated a section of the Liquor Act.

Another amendment is a change that will be widely welcomed across the province by many members of this House. This amendment will authorize the Commission to withdraw the present order form which has received so much criticism from the general public. Now, it would mean that the Commission could schedule -- this particular amendment will apply primarily to the Self-Serve liquor outlets but will not apply to the ones where you still have to

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.) . . . . . select it from the board and then pass it on to the order desk. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? There's no provision for home delivery at this stage.

Another amendment is a change that will be of special benefit to rural hotels who are now forced to operate through food facilities if they wish to serve draft beer, wine and spirits. At the present time, the holder of a dining room license who wishes a beverage room license would have to provide an additional restaurant. This amendment would delete the additional restaurant requirement. As mentioned, this amendment would be of particular benefit to certain rural hotels where the restaurant patronage is of insufficient volume to make two food operations viable. The provisions now contained in this section impose an undue hardship and an obvious inequity on the many hotel licensees, and as mentioned, particularly many in rural areas in Manitoba.

Another amendment contains provisions which are proving inequitable, and again particularly to certain licensees in rural areas. There are certain rural hotels which, under the present provisions of this Act, are compelled to keep their restaurant open during hours that the beverage room is open, even though there is little or no patronage of the restaurant. This presently means additional cost to the rural licensee, a cost which in some cases the licensee is not able to bear. This amendment would authorize the Liquor Commission to allow beverage room licensees to close an adjoining restaurant during a period of the day when the beverage room is open and when there is no or little demand for food in the restaurant. It should be mentioned that this amendment does not give wide open permission to the licensee but rather provides that the licensee must receive authorization to close an adjoining restaurant from the Liquor Commission, which presumably would authorize such closures during a period after an investigation of the situation and the need of fulfilling such a request from the licensee. This is another amendment which I am sure most people would agree is reasonable and worthy of endorsement.

Another amendment is an example of updating necessary in the Act. This would allow it to do two things. It would allow the Commission to issue a special license to a proprietor or operator of a building, the primary purpose of which building is a presentation of large performances of the theatrical or musical arts. A second part would be the amendment would allow for the issue of a special license for the sale of beer to the proprietor or operator of a sports park, stadium or arena designated by the Commission. This would mean that beer could be sold at certain sports events which the Liquor Commission, in its discretion, would feel qualified to receive such a special license. The term "sale of beer by the glass" would mean perhaps a plastic container rather than a glass container, which would of course offer certain dangers. We would expect that, with the passing of this amendment, the size and the significance of the sports event and the provision of adequate facilities would be major factors for consideration of applications for such special licenses. In other words, the issuance of such special licenses would be at the discretion of the Commission. Here again, this amendment has special significance not for only major sports events planned during our Centennial year, but for the development of successful sports operations generally in our province.

Another amendment is a matter which some people may feel of topical interest as it deals with specialty restaurants. What this amendment does is recognize that specialty restaurants are now part of the scene, and this amendment sets the stage for the Liquor Commission and the Liquor Licensing Board to give attention to requirements for a specialty restaurant license compatible to a specialty operation. It should be pointed out that the passing of this amendment doesn't open the doors to any specialty food operation to have a license, but gives recognition to the fact that specialty restaurants are now part of the scene and that attention should be given by the Licensing Board and Commission toward a study and review as to the requirements that would be compatible to such a license and that would reasonably meet the need of the operator of a specialty restaurant as well as allow the Commission to fulfill its obligation to the public in maintaining a high standard of service on such operation.

Another amendment involves upgrading to meet changing trends. The operators of food operations in hotels, particularly the newer hotels, are not necessarily proprietors of the hotels in which they operate. The Act now prohibits such concessionaires from serving hotel guests in their hotel rooms. This amendment will allow a food concessionaire licensee in a hotel, who is not the proprietor of the hotel, to serve liquor to guests in their rooms. Of course, passing of this amendment would still allow the hotel owner, who also operates the food and licensed facilities, to continue to have the privilege of serving guests in their rooms.

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.)

Another amendment is of crucial importance to the successful operation of the river and lake cruise boats. River and lake cruise boats are a comparatively new operation and are not provided for within the provisions of the present Act. This amendment will allow all licensees to qualify for a special permit for dancing privileges, and as you may know, the permit requires an annual fee of \$10.00. This amendment, as noted, would allow dancing in any licensed premises, including river and lake cruise ships. In regard to allowing customers to dance in a beverage room, the beverage room licensee would have to be willing to sacrifice seating capacity if extra space is not already available. I mention this because, as you know, beverage rooms have a fixed seating capacity set by the Licensing Board.

Another amendment would enable cocktail rooms to stay open until 1:00 a. m. six days a week, Monday through Saturday, and licensed cabarets to remain open until 2:00 a. m. six days a week, Monday through Saturday. At the present time, cocktail rooms may remain open until 1:00 a. m. on weekdays and until midnight on Saturdays. -- (Interjection) -- Somebody asked, will this cover canoes? At the present time, cocktail rooms may remain open until 1:00 a. m. on weekdays and only until midnight on Saturday, and cabarets until 2:00 a. m. on weekdays and midnight on Saturday. This amendment makes Saturday similar to other evenings of the week - that is, similar to Monday through Friday.

Another amendment deals with river and lake cruise ships, and I don't think it'll cover canoes as somebody suggests. For example, minors are not allowed in cocktail lounges. This provision of the present Act inflicts undue hardship on licensed boats because of the special nature of their operation and because of the restrictions in area. Minors should be allowed to move about the ship; also dancing should be allowed on every part of the ship, and ship patrons should not be forced to have food with their alcoholic beverages. For example as you know, the river boats pass -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

A MEMBER: How do you spell that?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Minors? M-i-n-o-r-s. Now you know that. For example, as you know, the river boats based in Winnipeg have several scheduled trips a day, and one or more of which may be scheduled for just after the luncheon and/or dinner hour. It is unreasonable to force patrons who have just had their dinner at home to again have food while cruising on the ship if they wish to have an alcoholic beverage. We should mention that even though this amendment were passed, ship operators would still have to comply with the food requirements of the Act in that food sales would still have to exceed the sale of liquor.

Another very important amendment, and it will be especially important to the newly incorporated towns such as Thompson, Manitoba. Under present provisions of the Act when a town is newly incorporated, such as Thompson, no types of licences may be issued by the Licensing Board unless and until each type of licence is passed by a local by-law vote. This means that prior to incorporation licences have to receive the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. At the present time, in the Town of Thompson licences in existence are beverage room licences, beer vendor licences, licensed restaurants, beer and wine licence, dining room licence and cocktail room licence. These licences were approved prior to incorporation by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Technically speaking, if this amendment is not passed it would mean that the Town of Thompson would have to hold a local by-law vote on the licence it would wish to have issued in the town. However, passing of this amendment will make legal the various types of licences now existing in Thompson and would therefore not make a local referendum necessary on these types of licences. In other words, the passing of the amendment would make the existing types of licences approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as valid as if a licenced sale by-law vote had been approved by the citizens. If this amendment is passed, the only type of licence that will need referendum vote support is the cabaret licence. There is not now, and has not been, a cabaret licence in existence in Thompson.

What I have just explained to you are more than half the amendments you will be asked to endorse and approve. After hearing the explanations, I am sure that you will agree with me that the proposed amendments are reasonable, sensible changes to the present Act and deserve the endorsement of all of the members of the House. Thank you.

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

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, in my view there are two things

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . . being considered in this particular bill. They can be broken roughly where and how long liquor will be sold, but there's a second more important one, I feel, is with reference to advertising, the principle of advertising. For the first consideration, where and how long alcohol will be sold, I have no basic argument with, because I for one don't think you can legislate morality, because if we could, my friend over here in the corner his first ten would probably have been enough. But with reference to advertising, I find myself diametrically opposed to the expansion of the principle.

Now, we hear much today about pollution, and pollution in my view means contamination of environment. We usually hear of it in a physical sense, but polluting of the environment through the abuse of the environment, dumping things out there that will eventually come back to haunt us as far as, say, our physical health is concerned, I think there are other forms of pollution. Now I said when I started out that I don't think you can legislate morality. I, for one, wouldn't oppose building beer troughs down Portage Avenue but I would diametrically be opposed to convincing people that they should drink it.

In my view, there's my own personal morality; in this I may, for example, say that I don't believe it is right for me to indulge but I don't think I should have the right to prohibit somebody else from drinking. But here in advertising, the very *raison d'être* of the advertising industry is to persuade people that they should take advantage of this particular product, that they should indulge in this. And if you'll notice the type of advertising, the tenor of advertising that is used in magazines, is used on television, it is directly keyed to the younger people of our population. And it is a matter of identity. Now we finally have come to realize that smoking, for example, is detrimental to health, and we are now pulling back from the type of advertising which we have for a good number of years allowed to take place in reference to cigarette ads, and now we at least demand equal time for the concept that it may be detrimental to health.

So, I just want to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, just to put my views on the record, that while I will support the bill in second reading, I will not support the expansion of the advertising principle included in the bill, either in committee or in third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words. This is most unusual. In my memory in twelve years the Attorney-General has always brought in amendments to The Liquor Act and I was just wondering why the Honourable Member for Radisson is bringing in amendments here. Is it because the party are not united on these amendments? Are we going to have a free vote?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: That's right. I stated that in my comments.

MR. McKELLAR: Yes. Well even though we are having a free vote, and this was always the case in my memory. -- (Interjection) -- What do you mean? Is that closing debate? Well I've been away for a lot of the session so I'm not concerned whether I'm confused or not. But there's so many different amendments to the Act here and it's so broad; it's so very broad that I can't support this under any consideration. It might be all right in some parts of the province but you're covering -- it's a blanket policy for all over the province, and while you might think that this is right and proper and you're going to reduce the drinking age down to 18, I think you'd be well advised to leave many of those amendments out at this time. Now I know we're going to hear many arguments for and against in committee, but even though -- they're not going to sway my thinking on this bill. I'm going to be prepared to vote against it and put myself on record now.

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

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to briefly comment on the bill. I agree in part with what has been mentioned by the Member from Winnipeg Centre. I think that the bill unnecessarily brings in material that is a little bit irrelevant. By this I mean a relaxation of the laws in a general sense, and then coupled with this, the matter that I think is irrelevant is that part dealing with advertising. I would like to point out, however, that the portion which deals with advertising is not giving full authority to the people to advertise. I understand that this is subject to the Governor-in-Council's approval in regulation.

There is one thing I wish to mention at this time, however, and this is the methods by which these amendments will be put into force. I think it's unfortunate that we can't legislate laws that are clear enough to apply in all circumstances, and I suppose that it's necessary that



(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . . laws be subject to approval by Government-in-Council. However, once the Orders-in-Council are passed, there is another stumbling block and that is the authorization by the Liquor Commission, and this is the point I wish to emphasize. At the present time, I'm under the impression that in executing these laws the Liquor Commission is, if not abusing, certainly is controlling very rigidly some part of the legislation. I think that too much use is being made of selling liquor in premises as a whipping -- a bit of a carrot in order to get people to renovate, make large expenditures, bring premises to standards that maybe are above what those localities can afford. I'm referring specifically to some parts of rural Manitoba where populations are not necessarily increasing and where, at the same time, in order to take advantage of the legislation, premises are required to either go into lavish expenditures and renovations or else cannot take advantage of the Act. I would like special consideration being placed for the locality rather than closing the premises, make special considerations so those places can remain open, yet I understand that they must treat the public with some concern.

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

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on this particular bill. I think I'm in agreement with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre when he talks about the matter of advertising, and I think that I would be quite willing to second him if he wished to have this particular section removed from the bill. If he wanted to sneak in a little bit in there about soap advertising, I think I'd be willing to support him as well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm in general approval of this bill. I think the basic principle is to liberalize the liquor laws and to bring them up-to-date with the feelings of the majority of people in Manitoba. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the attitudes of the public in this field are changing all the time because of the great deal of information available through the various media. It's to a stage now where the Prime Minister can say and be accepted for saying that the government has no business in the bedroom of the nation. Things are changing, Mr. Speaker, and I think that this bill just brings the law of the province up-to-date with the thinking of the majority of people in Manitoba. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, people are becoming more tolerant of other people's habits, and I'd like to commend the Member for Winnipeg Centre, who has very strong feelings on alcohol and drinking but he's still tolerant of other people's wishes in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is one section of the bill with which I have to disagree, and this is the section on advertising. Right now we're considering the possibility or the feasibility of banning advertising in regard to cigarette smoking, and I think it would be unwise to lessen the regulations to permit more advertising in regards to liquor sales. Mr. Speaker, I'm therefore in favour of liberalizing the law but I'm not in favour of allowing the type of brainwashing that we have in regards to advertising in regards to liquor sales. Thank you.

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

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 73. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 73, an Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this bill is self-explanatory. Flin Flon desires to change its status from that of a town to a city. All it gains is prestige. It has the necessary population. I would ask that the members of this House support this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates. On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. PAULLEY: May we have it stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I had adjourned this on behalf of the Member for Ste. Rose and I notice he's not in his seat. Can I have this matter stand? -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . somebody else to adjourn it on his behalf and then we'll be within the rules.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. George in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, may we have this matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Riel in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise not as the financial critic or the tax critic of our group, on this particular resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and amended thereto by the Honourable the Member for Riel, my colleague, but I'd like to take the opportunity to say a few words at this particular time in anticipation of the amendment that the Honourable Member for St. John's is supposed to bring to this resolution. I believe, Mr. Speaker, he did indicate to us the last time this resolution appeared on the Order Paper, that the Honourable the Minister of Finance did indicate that he would hope that we could dispose of the amendment that is attached to this resolution on the part of the Member for Riel, and that he would then be in a position to move an amendment that would be more suitable, I assume, to himself and to the government of the day, and as he suggests now, to the House.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I only rise to suggest that perhaps I can attempt some exercise in clairvoyance and suggest to the House the type of an amendment we are about to receive from the Honourable the Minister of Finance, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it will be the kind of resolution or amendment that will enable the government to avoid doing anything in this particular regard because, as I had suggested earlier in the budget speech, that the interests of the New Democratic Party on the question of tax reform, and particularly the proposals as contained in the White Paper that are before the House of Commons at this time, is a particular field or subject that the New Democratic Party at this particular time is not really too interested in debating at all. They find themselves in that wonderful of all wonderful positions, of having somebody else do pretty well what they have wanted to have done for some years and unfortunately have not found themselves in a position of power to do it, but they have won, at least for the moment, an instant ally in the person of the current First Minister of this Country, and that, generally speaking, the tax reforms as being put forward by the Federal Government are certainly in keeping with the philosophy and the approach of the New Democratic Party, not only in this province but nationally as well. And you don't have to believe me, Mr. Speaker, but certainly the kind of tacit support given to the proposals in the White Paper by national spokesmen of the New Democratic Party make that position abundantly clear.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think that there should be an opportunity to express or to elaborate or to more clearly define a tactic used very successfully by our current First Minister in this country, and that may be worrying the members opposite a little bit. The First Minister has on numerous occasions now found it expedient to have a position put forward on any given subject that is at first reading somewhat extreme, and one gets the decided feeling that it's far above and beyond what the official government position actually is but he finds it a very suitable political tactic to stake out a field way out over there, and indeed puts one of his Ministers to defend that field way out over there, and then when the ensuing debate and the public enthusiasm is aroused about the subject, we find a certain back-stepping taking place and we come back to a position which I suspect that the Federal Government is far closer to the original position of the Federal Government in the first instance; however, having gone through that exercise, makes it that much more acceptable to the people who feel themselves under some relief. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: It seems to be working.

MR. ENNS: Well, we didn't really accept the measures, the drastic measures that were

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . . proposed in the original document, or in the original position of any particular piece of legislation, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker that the White Paper is again this kind of an exercise and one that is being fairly astutely and fairly cleverly carried out. In this case, the Minister that is taking the brunt of the attack is of course the Honourable Mr. Benson, who finds himself faced with foes not only from outside his group but certainly from inside his own caucus, and if the final recommendations that will in fact be brought into law are somewhat less than those actually anticipated in the White Paper, then the people of Canada will give off a sigh of relief and accept them and the Federal Government will have attained precisely what it has desired.

Now my honourable friends opposite only concern here really is that this procedure will in fact work. They, of course take the position that the White Paper does not go anywhere near far enough, as per their spokesman Mr. Saltzman of the New Democratic Party nationally, and that they honestly feel that their best tactic and their best position is the whole debate surrounding the White Paper, Taxation on White Paper, is to say as little as possible and not to muddy up the waters; let the Liberal Party take full responsibility for the implementation of this report, because they feel that any intervention on their part may, in fact, hinder or delay the passage of certain aspects of the White Paper that they are particularly in favour of.

This is really something to wonder at, because normally that group of individuals that represents the New Democratic Party in the House of Commons, despite its size, makes up a very voluble and indeed sometimes credible opposition to any major piece of legislation that's presented to the House of Commons to the people of Canada, and it's notable, it's notable - their absence. Now I can't, aside from the one remark that I've alluded to, the one remark about Mr. Saltzman indicating on a national TV program "it's not far enough", I can't really refer to any other significant contribution on the part of the members of the New Democratic Party with respect to the White Paper in Taxation. Now I'm well aware that obviously there were more, but their silence, their absence of taking part in this very important, very crucial debate in front of the House of Commons is notable when one considers their very active role in just about any other field that presents itself for discussion before the House of Commons.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what I'm suggesting is not too far from the truth. I suspect that the Honourable the Minister of Finance will introduce an amendment that in effect puts this resolution in mothballs because the government, this particular government, has no particular interest in creating any undue attention or any unnecessary debate on the question of some of the proposals that are contained within the White Paper. They would rather let this one go by silently and quietly and lay in the bushes while other parties, who have the major responsibility in this instance, namely the federal Liberal Party, and indeed the federal Conservative Party, who are opposing certain measures of it but certainly not all measures of it; that the strategy, if I can use that word, Mr. Speaker, of the New Democratic Party nationally and the New Democratic Party provincially will be one to say as little as possible and to say it as quietly as possible on this particular issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I leave this remark, unless any of the remarks that I have said be construed that I am unalterably opposed to the recommendations contained in the White Paper, nothing could be further from the truth. It is high time that certain tax reforms take place in the country. The position of the national party that I belong to has been clearly enunciated, clearly established. We certainly go along with the concept that some of the current loopholes within the taxation system have to be closed. We certainly accept the fact that income is income and, as such, accept the concept of the capital gains tax although at a level that is non-confiscatory as I suggest that the level being contemplated in the White Paper Act comes close to it, particularly with reference to the small businessman, so that I would not want any of the comments that I have made at this time, Mr. Speaker, to be used by members opposite as portraying a position that we reject all forms of tax reform, that we reject all proposals within the White Paper. We do not. We have stated this publicly and our respective leaders have stated it better than I can state it, but I do suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that far from having anywhere near the kind of discussion that the original mover of the resolution asks for in this resolution, that is that we, quite aside from the national impact of these tax measures, that we in Manitoba should seriously sit down and concern ourselves with the impact that these tax reforms or these suggested tax reforms are going to have in Manitoba, and that this be given the added stature of not simply a partisan approach but an all-party approach to it, as was suggested by my colleague the Member for Riel; that we are going to find a very

(MR. ENNS cont'd.). . . . wishy-washy type of amendment in due order, one that would fall within the ambit of my friend the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the House Leader, when he a long time ago suggested that they are certainly amenable to considering the advisability of all things in all things in this House; that we will have that kind of amendment attached to this otherwise meaningful resolution, and it will be quietly, silently swept under the Tory-blue carpet that lays in this Chamber and we will hear very little of it in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, earlier I had intended just to speak on the amendment but I should probably dwell on the motion itself in conjunction with the amendment. I note the amendment is requesting that a committee of the House consisting of all members of the Legislature be constituted as a committee to consider this matter and bring in a report by July 1, 1970; in other words to speed up the matter and to bring a report that could be submitted to the Federal Government, I take it, in time for consideration by the federal Parliament before it acts on the White Paper. I feel I could go along quite well with the amendment because I don't think we can afford to drag the matter out too much. We might be too late before the Federal Government takes action. According to the Victoria Daily Colonist of March 21, 1970, under the heading of "Are Canadian Taxpayers Puppets" referring to the White Paper proposals, Mr. Hellyer, the former contender for the office of the Prime Ministership of Canada, had this to say: "The basic question raised by this White Paper and other policy proposals is whether or not the public, including elected representatives, have any real say in their own affairs or are merely puppets in the hands of the gigantic bureaucracy they have created."

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the other members speaking on the resolution before us, and having heard other speakers speak on the question at different functions, I have heard some very strong comments made in condemning the White Paper as such. I would like to join with them because I have as yet, I can see no use in bringing forward those proposals, because when we take a look at them, just what are the benefits of the Benson's White Paper proposals. I think they just tend to serve the rich for one. The top tax rate now is 80 percent of all taxable income. The White Paper proposes to make the top rate 51 percent from \$24,000 on. Secondly, dividends to individuals from Canadian corporations now fully taxed, with new proposals that company shareholders get 100 percent tax credit on dividends. And thirdly, tax treatment of trust and estates - tax on retained earnings to be reduced from 50 to 40 percent. And oh yes, gambling games and sweepstake winnings to be exempt. This is for the rich. These are the benefits that will come out of these proposals for those of means in this country of ours.

But what does the White Paper provide for the average or middle-class citizen. And here I would like to list some of the items that have been drawn from the White Paper.

For one, lowest tax rate and applicable income level now 11 percent of taxable income up to \$1,000; under the White Paper the lowest rate will be approximately 22 percent. This means that it's double the present rate and I'm sure that many people will find it very difficult to pay that much more in taxes.

Secondly, the capital gains tax, now exempt, proposed to be taxed at full rate. Inflated sale price of a home of over \$1,000 per year to be taxed as capital gain. If a young family buys a \$20,000 two bedroom home and five years later sells it for \$30,000, they will have to pay capital gains tax on \$5,000 plus having to pay \$40,000 for a three or four bedroom home that was worth \$30,000 five years back. So we can see some of the situations that can arise and can come about.

The matter of corporation tax is now 21 percent on the first 35,000 with the balance at 50 percent. The new proposal will make it a straight 50 percent. This earlier gain will now be abolished, will no longer be there.

Fourthly, tax concessions to small businesses now have a low rate of 21 percent up to \$35,000.00. This concession is also to be removed.

Then the hidden 12 percent sales tax is to remain. There is no relief in sight on this matter.

The 11 percent sales tax on building materials is to remain; no abolishment either.

Employee fringe benefits now exempt will be taxed.

The professional practitioners now taxed only on income as and when received in cash will also be taxed on accounts receivable. That means that they will have to pay taxes on money that's in their books and whether they will ever get it we don't know; but the taxes will be charged.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

(9) The capital gain on sale of farms now not taxable will be taxed, and this too can have a very devastating effect because we know of the fluctuations that we have in farm land, that prices are subject to rise and then fall very drastically and that an owner who probably thought a year or two ago that he had a large investment, that in case he sold it he had large savings to fall back on, finds that these are reduced probably by 50 percent within a year or two; and these would be subject to taxation.

(10) Cooperatives now given three-year tax holiday, for new co-ops the tax holiday is to be abolished. While there might not be too many new cooperatives set up these days I think in years gone by you had many more brought into being and established, still this incentive or this concession is being removed as well. Patronage dividends at present not taxed now to be taxed on the same basis as regular corporations. This is in regard to cooperatives. So that they no longer will have this tax advantage or this concession.

I might comment once more in Mr. Hellyer's words: "The taxpayers will become puppets to be manipulated by the bureaucracy. The White Paper and other proposals by the Trudeau Government will make us economic serfs in a welfare state. Mr. Benson has a new twist on Robinhood. He will exempt the rich, tax the wage earner, keep enough for administration and give a little to the low income group." This is referring to a statement that was made in British Columbia and as recorded in the Victoria Daily Colonist. Mr. Speaker, I would not be able to support the original motion unless we had some kind of discussion that would come to a conclusion that would be acceptable, but I will support the amendment in order to see just what the Honourable the Minister of Finance has to propose in the way of a further amendment. -- (Interjection) -- No, I take it the government is going to defeat it regardless of what way I'm going to vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable Member for Rhineland? -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's my fault. I didn't quite hear. The report which you read which was from British Columbia, I didn't hear the authority for it. Is that a government statement?

MR. FROESE: No this is a press statement from the Victoria Daily Colonist of March 21st, 1970.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask then whom it was quoting or was it just an opinion of the newspaper?

MR. FROESE: The two quotations that I made were the Honourable Mr. Hellyer, former contender for the Prime Ministership in Canada.

MR. CHERNIACK: One more question please, Mr. Speaker. A Social Crediter who is now a member of the government?

MR. FROESE: No he's a former Liberal member, Paul Hellyer.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh Paul Hellyer, I'm sorry.

MR. FROESE: Yes.

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The matter before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Riel in amendment to a motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that appears on Page 5 of the Order Paper.

A STANDING VOTE WAS TAKEN, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, G. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to be in a position to present the amendment which I indicated the other day I would like to bring before the House for consideration of honourable members. Before doing so I'd like to comment on the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I don't recall that he was here when I spoke on the other two occasions on this resolution but I'm not too sure that he heard or read what I had to say. But I did listen to what he had to say this afternoon and I want to give his speech all the attention which it deserves, so I intend to say nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment I wish to propose is one which will be favourably received by honourable members of the House. I do believe that we should support the proposal to review the federal tax reform proposals known as the Benson White Paper; I think we ought to debate it further so that we can participate further in these discussions; I am not prepared as previously indicated to brush aside the entire subject as I believe the Conservatives would like to have done, but that we should review it. I have grave doubts about the possibility of arriving at a unanimous point of view but I think that a study in committee would be of some value and I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland who expressed some concern about the nature of the amendment will also find it acceptable.

So before I move the amendment I would like to point out just what I propose will be the effect of the amendment, and if honourable members care to look at the resolution as it now appears before us then they will see when the amendment is proposed that I intend to take out the numbered items as they appear throughout where they give examples of what may be good, what may be indifferent, what may be adverse and what may be completely impractical. I propose to delete those so that we don't get hung up in commitments on each of the particular items and indeed by doing so we may well be leaving out other important items which are deserving of consideration. Also as I previously indicated, I would like to put back wording that is similar to the wording proposed by the Honourable Member for Riel, because as I indicated on Friday last I am not opposed to the wording he wanted, I just objected to the fact that he deleted some other wording in his proposal which were put in by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose which I thought were desirable. So that for clarification I am to some extent rewriting the amendment so that it would be rather clear. I propose therefore when I move the amendment to accept the first portion of it down to the preamble which starts speaking about the proposals and then to give the whole of the proposed new wording which I think honourable members will find will be in accordance with that I have now described.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the proposed resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "people" where it first appears at the end of the third paragraph and substituting therefor the following words:

"AND WHEREAS some of the proposals are desirable and long overdue;

AND WHEREAS other proposed changes could be acceptable if properly implemented in a manner which will not hinder development;

AND WHEREAS other proposed changes may have serious effects on development and growth of new business on the transfer of family funds and on residential housing in Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS other proposed changes are absolutely impractical, unfair and in many cases unworkable;

AND WHEREAS other important and fundamental social considerations are at issue together with economic factors;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that the people of Manitoba through their government make known the views of Manitoba on these proposals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House refer the whole question of the federal White Paper on taxation to the Standing Committee on Economic Development for immediate study."

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

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The proposed resolution of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Roblin.



MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed).

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood) Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this resolution for the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and I wonder in his absence could we have it stand till Friday in his name. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I haven't too many comments except that we are celebrating Manitoba's Centennial this year. Although Manitoba as a province is far more than a hundred years old, there's been people here for an awful long time. We must realize that when these people came here from different countries that their differences must have been far greater than what ours are now, because now we have people from different racial origins, countries, and from different nationalities and inter-marrying and they seem to be blending together fairly well. There's no doubt there's always been private schools and probably these people when they thought about it years ago thought that if they wanted their own private school and wanted to bring their child up just the way they wanted that they should pay for it themselves and not use the public's money for it. I think myself that this is the way it should be. If we keep separating these people I think that we don't bring the country together more and on the other hand our education costs are high and if there's something wrong with our public school system, which probably these people must think because either the guidance isn't right or the discipline or something -- if there's something wrong with it that they want to keep on with their private and parochial schools well then maybe we should take a little bit harder look at our public school system and see that we don't maybe correct it.

Now I don't want for a moment to discredit the work that these private and parochial schools are doing, because they really are doing a wonderful job. Probably all of us can think of boys or girls that went there which were apparently heading off in the wrong direction and due to the correction they got and the discipline and probably some religious training that they came out of it good and turned out to be fine citizens. Now if this is so, and it is so, we must admire them for it, but probably we should take a look at some of the things in our public school systems and maybe do some more correcting there.

I also think that these people that formed these private and parochial schools done it for a special purpose. They want to more or less keep their children away from the public school system for certain reasons, and I feel that if they start getting these grants -- if they do get them -- it'll actually end up by defeating the very purpose that they started out to achieve; because if they're going to be getting public money put towards them, then they're going to want a say in what kind of schools they have and how they run them. So I think that by doing this that the people that started parochial and private schools might be defeating the very purpose for which they set these schools up; so I myself feel that we shouldn't support this motion.

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

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see my friend the Minister of Mines and Resources is tapping the desk. I hope that's an indication that he's going to support this resolution -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry. Now I'm insulted.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this resolution, not as an elected legislator but as a Christian, a taxpayer and a parent, and of all the resolutions on there, in fact of all the bills on the Order Paper, I'm not ashamed to say that I think this is one of the most important. And again I say I speak not as an elected legislator. --(Interjection)-- Yes. Yes. Don't misinterpret that.

Seventy-five years ago the Supreme Court made a decision, Mr. Speaker, and according to the record this decision has never been complied with. In other words it would appear that we as legislators of previous administrations have been operating the school systems in contempt of court. Now I'm not going to use that as an argument that we should change, although it's a good argument, but I'm not suggesting that we change the system because we've been living in contempt of court for 75 years, but I think that there's a very basic principle involved

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . here that we should all consider. One of the first things that we find as citizens after we get out of school and we grow up and we go to court, for example, we are forced to swear on the Bible, and we're forced to swear by God and if we don't, of course we could be charged for contempt of court and thrown in jail. Now that seems strange that we have a system where we recognize and ram God down everybody's throat except to kids in school. We take the position that God doesn't exist and therefore we're not going to teach it, and we teach them Godless atheism. For 75 years we've done this and I think it's hypocritical of the judges, it's hypocritical of the lawyers and it's hypocritical of the legislature that would allow a system like this to continue. As a matter of fact, Mr Speaker, I don't know of any legal transaction you can do today without bringing in some swearing in ceremony. In fact, I think when we're sworn in to this Legislature there's mention of God made. It seems rather strange that us grownups say that's fine to talk about God and the ten commandments and religion but when it comes to schools that we say that it doesn't exist and we have no right to teach it. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if you examine the statistics you'll find there's more people that believe in God than there isn't, and yet in school you'll find the majority is not being able to express its wishes. It seems to me that we have been living under a system where there is a kind of a tyranny by the minority; and in this case there's no question the minority of the people are saying to us what should be taught in schools.

I recollect in about the Fourth Grade my youngest daughter Sandy came home one day and she said: "Is it true that God created Adam and Eve?" I said: "Of course it's true." So she says: "Well, my teacher said that that's not the case." She went on to explain what the teacher told her. I said well -- you know, I was in a very difficult position; if I said what the teacher said was true then I would be admitting that the wife and me have been teaching her lies and that the priest and the church is teaching lies; or if I said the teacher is lying, you know you could, Mr. Speaker, visualize the situation that would develop; a child going back to school and looking at the teacher and thinking well, the teacher lied in this case, you know -- the situation would be most unhealthy. Yet this situation I am sure is repeated in the schools throughout the province where the parents are faced with the situation where the school teaches one thing and we as parents teach them another thing.

It seems very strange that we the taxpayers that are paying the teachers a salary, we're paying for the building of the schools, we're paying for the upkeep of the schools -- and I think if anybody seen the school budget would realize that we're paying a pretty penny for it -- we're paying for them to teach our children something that we basically disagree with. Mr. Speaker, those that are against the teaching of religion in schools can speak all they want, the fact of the matter is that if we're going to go on the basis of right, then surely we have as much right to ram God and religion down their throats as they have, and have been for 75 years ramming atheism down our throats. You know, if we say to them, this is not a fair way of settling them I would like to see some solution arrived at where, as my late father used to say, where the sheep shall live and the wolf will be fit. Now I don't know what the solution is, but I would suggest as legislators, surely to God we can find some solution where we can accommodate those that don't want religion and those that do want it.

If we look at the British Commonwealth, I believe there's only two places in the entire British Commonwealth, British Columbia and Manitoba that have this system where there is no aid. I think this in itself is a good argument, a very good argument. We say that's a terrible system and we shouldn't have it, then I have to ask them, are you suggesting that all the nine provinces in the countries of the British Commonwealth are stupid or fools, you know, or dictators; they all accept it, they don't have any problem. I was born and raised in Saskatchewan; I don't recall of any difficulties there. If you have property - my sister has property in Regina, and she is asked "do you want your school taxes to go to public schools or private schools, religious schools," and she says "I want my taxes to go there because that's where I'm sending my children." They have no difficulty in Saskatchewan and to my knowledge there is no difficulty anywhere in the country, except Manitoba and British Columbia. What the reason for this is I don't know. Maybe it's something because it's been around for such a long time that it's difficult to reverse the thing

I'm encouraged by the fact that the Member for Lakeside got up and made a speech. I hope that he has enough colleagues on his side that will get up and speak on this resolution, and I'm also hopeful that the boys on this side will have sufficient gumption and sense of justice and fair play that they will get up, that they will get up and support the resolution. Now I realize

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . it's just a resolution. All it says is "consider the advisability of" which the Minister of Mines and Resources explained and what view we take of such a resolution, so it's not a binding resolution but I think it's an indication of the feelings of the legislators and I think if the feeling is expressed in votes here in this House is sufficiently strong, that it may give an indication to the cabinet here and to the government to come through with some type of legislation next year, or hopefully during the term -- I'm assuming we're going to be around for four years -- and sometime during the term of office that the cabinet here will consider this resolution sufficiently important that they will draft up some type of legislation, perhaps not the whole loaf, maybe 75% of the loaf. You know, I think, those of us who want such a resolution to have some meaning are prepared to be reasonable and reach some type of compromise.

Mr. Speaker, in sitting down I would urge the members on both sides of the House to really give this resolution serious consideration and for a change vote with out conscience, say to hell with party line, vote on a basis of what you believe. Thank you.

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

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Well, Mr. Speaker, we've heard some honest words on this resolution and I think we'll hear some more as this debate continues. Each of us in this Chamber knows something about the Manitoba school question, and we know something about the bitterness and division that this question has raised in the history of our province to the people of Manitoba. There have been books written about it and countless essays. I think that many of us feel a little bit reluctant to take a clear position on this question because there are strength to both sides, because there's been so much bitterness and division in the past and maybe because we feel a little humility in thinking that after all these years of division and strife over this question; the Member for Lakeside said last when he spoke on this question, perhaps finally at this Legislative sitting this question will be resolved.

I've listened myself with very great interest to the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Thompson, Mr. Henderson, and I appreciate the arguments that these men have made but I can't say that they have expressed my own feelings about this question. I think that each of us will probably have to deal with it in terms of our own perspective. As for myself, I choose to ignore the constitutional questions, I choose to ignore the historical questions, legitimate questions which other members may speak from, and I'll choose to ignore the religious questions. I know that there are many issues involved. These are some. But for me debating the question is as follows: Is the public school system as it is presently constituted a success or a failure, and if it has important failings will the public financing of alternative school systems contribute to the over-all educational experience of our children? For me that's the question.

I noticed during the debate over education that many members were reluctant to discuss the quality of education. In fact someone mentioned that we should only be concerned with the matter of financing education; the question of quality and content was beyond the jurisdiction of the Assembly. Well, all matters of finance are of importance to the members in this Assembly, but for my point of view the question of public aid to private schools must revolve around the question of the quality and content of the public school system and whether or not education in our schools could be improved by implementing a resolution such as we have been presented with. So I feel I have to give a little perspective from my own point of view before I comment on this resolution.

It's no accident I think that the public school system first emerged with the development of industrial society. Previously before the middle of the 19th century in Europe and North America, education was available but it was available to a small minority, to the privileged few; and education provided them with the tools, the concepts which they needed to rule their countries, to rule their domains, provided them with the culture with which they could enjoy their leisure in the style that was appropriate to the times. The economy was pre-industrial, it did not require a literate, trained population and so a widespread educational system was not necessary for the viability of that kind of economic system and so it never developed. Well, the industrial revolution changed all that and industrial economy requires a literate labour force, a trained labour force, a labour force with some minimum acquaintance with mathematical skills and so a public school system became a necessity, compulsory education was necessary for economic viability. And then as the economy became more and more complex, as technology became more complicated, more and more education was required - secondary

May 19th, 1970

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . . . education, higher education, university education; again to complement the economic system. Another way of looking at this is that as education and training becomes universally necessary, becomes more complicated itself and more expensive, businesses are no longer willing and are no longer able to finance the training of their work force and so the expense is shifted on to the general population.

Now I think this is the background to our present educational system; no doubt it oversimplifies the situation but I think that in general my analysis is correct, namely that the educational system is by and large an adjunct of the economic system. It trains children so that they will have not only the requisite skills to work in our economy but they will have the values, they will have the habits, they will have the correct behavioral attitude so that they can fit into our economic system and work their way through it. That's why, for example, competition for grades and awards and gold stars is so important in our educational system. It's training people in the art of competition. It develops a kind of competitive and antagonistic relationship between students as training for the outside world. That's why there's such a strong authoritarian structure in the school today, and always. Students are trained to take instruction from their superiors; obedience above all else is what is stressed. Students are trained to be passive consumers of the truth of right answers. There is a kind of top down system of authority in the schools and democracy is shunned even at the high school level and the university level, and all matters of important decisions are made from above. So children are trained from the kindergarten through the university to accept authority, to regurgitate the truth, to avoid asking why, because that is just what is not rewarded. If they are trained well in the schools then they will grow up to be good consumers of things and cheerful spectators and they will grow up to be good obedient employees in industry and government, accepting authority and giving it, and as good civil servants and corporate servants they will be able to work their way through the bureaucratic ladder. . . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the member reading from a speech?

MR. SPEAKER: Well I hope that the honourable member is complying with that rule of debate.

MR. GONICK: I have extensive notes, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think I'm reading it, in the general understanding of that term and its use in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I'm perhaps painting too general a picture, and I know that there are exceptions, there may be some movement away from the direction that I'm describing, but I think that I'm speaking of a general tendency in our schools and everyone familiar with our schools and our universities would recognize that my description is more or less accurate of most schools, most classrooms. I speak from my own observations as a student and as a teacher and as a parent, but I would like to quote very briefly from an authority that has observed much the same as myself. The authority says as follows: "We adults destroy most of the intellectual and creative capacity of children by things we do to them or make them do. We destroy this capacity above all by making them afraid, afraid of not doing what other people want, of not pleasing and making mistakes, of failing or being wrong. Thus we make them afraid to experiment, afraid to try the different and the unknown. Even when we do not create children's fears, when they come to us with fears ready made and built in, we use these fears as handles to manipulate them and get them to do what we want.

"We destroy the love of learning in children by encouraging and telling them to work for petty and contemptible rewards, gold stars or papers marked 100 and tacked to the wall, or A's in report cards or honour rolls or dean's lists or Phi Beta Kappa keys - in short, for the ignoble satisfaction of feeling that they are better than someone else. We encourage them to feel that the end aim of all they do in school is nothing more than to get a good mark on a test or to impress someone with what they seem to know." In other words, Mr. Speaker, school is a place for right answers. Children are forever placed in a position of trying to judge what it is a teacher wants, what it is a teacher wants to hear, what it is the right thing to say . . .

MR. GRAHAM: On a point of order. Would the member table the - identify the author of the paper he was quoting from?

MR. GONICK: Well, I would be glad to table the -- I don't have the author here but I'll be glad to get the author's name for the member, by this evening or tomorrow.

I think that what this authority is saying is that the classroom is drenched in fear. Children are afraid of failing, afraid of giving the wrong answers, afraid of embarrassment and of punishment. They are subject to intolerable pressure, forever being tested. It's a

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) . . . . . kind of a game where the teacher warns the class there will be a test, hints at what kinds of questions will be asked so that the kids can cram like mad and turn out the right answers to the questions that they are going to expect; and if they succeed in giving the right answers, they are called achievers; if they fail they are called non-achievers and they are siphoned off into some commercial course down the educational ladder. Throughout the school years and even into the university the student is told the current doctrine and trained to give it back. There is a uniform world view and all the new teaching methods that have been introduced in recent years for the most part simply reinforce these tendencies toward the monolithic educational system. They lock education into the mass media and the result is a more efficient instrument for uniformity. Our kids are compelled to work for 12 continuous years, and if they are in the middle class, for 16 continuous years to work on assigned lessons. They cannot follow their nose in reading or work away at a project that intrigues them or get a job in the interim or travel or get involved in political or community action, because this takes them away from the all important test which everything else is directed to.

I agree with the Member for Thompson when he says that many primary schools are run as minor tyrannies - hands folded, all heads to the front, total silence, endless threats, hundreds of rules, rigidly enforced. By the time they get to junior high schools, in spirit at least, most teenagers are already drop-outs. It has been estimated that the average youth in high school is really there only about 10 minutes a day.

Schools almost seem designed to isolate youth from the real world; apart from families, children have little contact with the adult world except in schools, and at school it's only with professional teachers, and through the primary grades the professional teachers are always women. They do not know the real world first hand; they do not know the inside of an office, the inside of a factory, the inside of a farm, lessons are abstract, as a community the school is unreal. So that the mass media, Mr. Speaker, I contend, train kids to be passive consumers in their leisure hours as a school trains them to become passive consumers through their years of education. And yet after all these years of conditioning, brain-washing them to give us the right answers back, refusing them responsibilities, we expect our young people to be people of initiative, people of independent judgment, strong individuals and responsible citizens, and we are surprised when many aren't and we call them apathetic and we condemn those that do - do exercise their independence; because as strong individuals they often come to reject the truths that their teachers in the classroom or in the mass media have handed down to them. They feel that perhaps they've been lied to and conned and manipulated through all their school years, because the truths of the classroom and the media are contradicted by reality. They found a world full of hate, of racism, prejudice, militarism, exploitation and poverty, and they have not been taught to understand that kind of a world. They have been taught about progress, about God, about democracy, about liberalism, about the merits of free enterprise and the horrors of socialism; but this is the generation that was introduced to Viet Nam, this was the generation that was introduced to Czechoslovakia, and these kids wonder about progress when they find out that the rich around the world are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer, and they ask if democracy really works why aren't the Negroes in United States, why are they excluded from the affluence in society, why are the native people in Canada excluded? No good for whom, democracy for whom, they ask, and in their own lives they see just how illiberal and intolerant so many of their teachers are towards new ideas or different ideas; they see how undemocratic their own schooling is and how powerless they are in a school situation, and so they come to disbelieve; they grow up without a sense of values to guide their behaviour.

I don't believe that a good educational system will solve the world's problems. In fact I think that the educational system by and large reflects what is happening in the world around us throughout society. I should hasten to add, and I think I have mentioned already, that I think that there are good things happening in our schools, in our public schools, there are dedicated teachers that are struggling to protect the traditional values of education, to create an intellectual environment for students, to encourage independence and initiative, to permit the young to take a full part in our society, but I think that this is an exceptional situation. I think that we should recognize, at least for me, I recognize that the public educational system as it has developed has not fulfilled these traditional aims and that education has become little else than apprentice training at public expense.

I think we should also emphasize, at least I'm prepared to say that we don't have the answers, that nobody seems to have the answers, that maybe there isn't any one single answer,

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . . . and that maybe we will have to try a lot of things. That is why an idea that was mentioned during the educational debate struck me as being a very good idea; and that is that in the Province of Manitoba there be established a kind of task force on education which will involve the entire population in asking these questions about the relevance of education, in evaluating the direction of education, involving our teachers and our students and our parents and the experts in a total involvement of the content of our educational system. I think that would be very good at this time; I think we need it. I would take the attitude, let a hundred flowers bloom and let a hundred systems of education contend. I would take the view, let us end the monolithic public school system; open it up to fresh ideas, allow individual schools to develop their own styles, allow teachers and students to develop their own curriculum and approach, allow parents to become more closely involved if they wish to, as part of the educational system, as learners and teachers. I would like to see for children above the age of 14 a far wider freedom of choice. I do not believe that in matters of education there can be growth to freedom through coercion. If the young as they mature can follow their own interests, choose their own topics, choose their own time, teachers; and if the teachers teach what they are themselves most interested in, and that's all they can teach well, then I think that they'll be much more lively, independent, a responsible and inventive people that develop from our school system. I would like to see stupid regimentation ended, the proliferation of rules stripped to a bar minimum.

Now all these developments can occur within the public school system, and they should occur within the public school system, but changes in the public school system are slow to come by. It's my position that everything possible should be done to create a more flexible and varied and diverse educational system. I would like to see Summerhill schools in Manitoba; many more Montessorri schools. The educational authority, Paul Goodman, described a system of mini-schools in New York City that I would like to see attempted in Winnipeg, and I would like to read from his description of this school system: "An elementary group of 28 children with 4 grown-ups, a licensed teacher, a housewife who can cook, a college senior and a teenage school dropout, those are the teachers. Such a group meets in any store front, church basement, settlement house or housing project. It goes about the city as is possible when the student-teacher ratio is 7 to 1. An experience at the First Street school in New York has shown that the cost of such a little school is less than for the public school, with a student-teacher ratio of 30 to 1. The school is located near home, so the children can escape from it to home and can escape from home to the school. The schools are supported by public money but administered entirely by its children, teachers and parents.

What I'm saying is that the public school system is failing. In no sense am I saying that it should be abandoned. It needs, in my opinion, a good shaking up. Nowhere in our society is there such a state of oppression as I think exists inside the school room. I think that if this party accomplishes nothing else in government except this one thing of shaking up the school system, of re-evaluating, reformulating the functions of the educational system, of liberating the schools in short, I think if it accomplishes nothing else but this, it will have earned the right to govern. And to facilitate this, I think it should be possible for any group of teachers to get together and initiate their own schools and run their own schools at public expense. I think it would be possible for a group of parents to get together to run a school for their children at public expense. Of course I assume that the general educational program and the budget receive the approval of the Department of Education, but beyond the minimum educational requirements required by the Department the school should be free to teach in whatever language, in whatever religion or philosophy espoused by the organizers of the schools. Ultimately I would like to see the distinction between public and private and parochial schools entirely eliminated. I would have the entire educational system run at a decentralized basis within the framework of minimum standards set by the Department of Education.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would accept the amended resolution of the Member from Rhineland as a step in the right direction, but it should be obvious from my remarks that I could accept it only by making a brief amendment of my own to the amendment by the Member from Osborne, because the amendment by the Member from Osborne requires that the curriculum be formulated and prescribed by the Department of Education and I think that gives too much power to the Department of Education. So I would move, seconded by the Member from The Pas, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Osborne be amended by deleting the word "prescribed" where it appears in the third line thereof and substituting the



(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . .the word "approved".

MR. BEARD: Playing with words Cy.

MR. GONICK: Think about it, think about it.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the sub-amendment I find myself in agreement with much that the Member from Crescentwood had to say. But I was interested very much in the question of the Member from Pembina when he said that some people ought to go to private schools for certain reasons and I couldn't help but think that I would have to share with this august group one of my own personal experiences. Now as a teacher, as a pedagogist or an educationalist, I'm quite familiar with the techniques that are used and I think in certain areas that it's permissible. For example we do teach -- as the Member from Crescentwood said -- by rewards and punishment. Now not to get into this debate whether we should or shouldn't use rewards and punishment but just to give a brief example; for example with young children we say, we tell the children, we get them up there and we say two times two is four and we come back a few days later and we say two times two is . . . the child says three and we say no, that's bad, that's wrong, until the child comes out and he says two times two is four and then we smile at him all nicely. Two times two is four, good. So what we're doing -- I hope I get across to you this simple example of the reward and punishment. Two times two is three - bad. Two times two is four - good. And we make a valued judgment -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry?

MR. ENNS: It's possible that two times two could be three.

MR. BOYCE: Well I'm sorry if I changed that base that I'm operating in. Two times two is four on the base ten that is true. It is true because we say it's true and for no other reason. But now we come to another point. I took my child out of a public school for one reason, one reason - that a Grade 12 student with one year teacher training told my child that her Art was poor. Poor. And that child comes home to me and says, "Daddy, I tried." With tears in her eyes she comes and she says, "Daddy, I tried." Now I defy anyone, anyone to tell me that they are God of aesthetics that they can tell a six-year-old child that their Art is poor. Now I removed my child from this public school because I had no other alternative. I sent her to a private school. She is learning French which is a concomitant occurrence, and the child at nine years old has overcome this lousy exposure to the public school system and is now doing well. I find this very, very, very, disturbing. We spent this morning, two hours, this august body, debating whether optometrists should be called doctors of optometry -- Grade 12 or Grade 13 plus four years of training -- these people are going to become involved with treating people's eyes -- and fellow members I'm shocked at the lack of attention that this particular group pays to what we are doing with people's minds. Yes, I'm quite prone to draw on some of my old friends -- Socrates, and they rib me around here. Yes what's Plato got to say today, yes. But I repeat that they got you when your minds were young and they -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon?

MR. BILTON: Who did?

MR. BOYCE: Who did? Well the people that persuaded you that values have to be the same, that what I say is true. Relative to this point, the Minister of Transportation doesn't need me to defend him at any time. But for example, I am a theist and that is my own personal responsibility. But when I teach biology I teach the theory of evolution, and that's what I teach, the theory of evolution. When a child asks me as a teacher, do you believe in that, I say no, because I don't believe in it. But the two words, the difference between the two words - knowledge - I know and I know with a degree of certainty, or I believe, I believe this, I know that. I know two and two is four because we say it is so, so therefore I know it is four. But when I say I believe in something then that's exactly what I do, I believe. I don't necessarily know it.

Now relevant to this cost, relevant to the cost -- yes, I get quite involved in this and I've been sitting in the back benches and the Member for Emerson says once in a while how come the back bench hasn't got anything to say. If it was left up to me as an individual member of this government I would place the matter that I'm addressing myself to right now far ahead of car insurance, but I have to make a choice as a member of this government -- (Interjection) -- I beg to differ with you, I do have a choice. But consider one point, consider one point. How much is a family in Manitoba paying to haul their big fat caucuses around this province. I

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . . . would suggest it cost in the neighbourhood of \$1,200 to transport me from here to there, but yet when we start talking about taxing ourselves at the rate of \$300.00 per family to educate our children, to educate our children, \$300.00, cost of education, cost of education.

The Member for Crescentwood and I disagree on one thing, among others. Profit, profit. I think education is an investment. He disagrees with me because he hates this word "profit." But I think the word "investment" means doing something so that you can reap a return, you can reap a return. Now fundamentally -- let me digress from what I was saying just a moment -- (Interjection) -- oh I got another 30 minutes next day or so -- (Interjection) -- well perhaps I should stop. You know this is one of the reasons why I disagree with the Member opposite for River Heights because I think this is what debate is all about. You know if there's no give and take of opinion in this House you know we just might as well all mail in our ballot, because I for one don't intend to waste my time.

Take for example some of the things that flow from a fundamental right that we insist upon. We insist upon the right in our society that men and women should marry whoever they want. Now in my view, in my view one of the concomitant occurrences which we have to accept the responsibility of is that we have to accept as a social responsibility the necessity of educating, taking care of the progeny of such marriage which may not be within the capacity of the parents themselves. I don't know if you follow me or not, but this to me is part of education. The Minister of Health and Social Development -- my heart just went flump like this when the illustrious Minister changed that name from Welfare, a dole, a dole, to the Department of Health and Social Development. Now let me bring this into this -- no, I'll take that up next time.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may continue when this matter next appears on the Order Paper. It is 5:30; I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.