

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, July 18, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Industrial Relations begs me to present the following as their third report:

Your Committee met on July 12, 13, 14, 15 and 17, 1972 and heard public representations with respect to Bill No. 81 - The Labour Relations Act.

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 81 - The Labour Relations Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the White Paper on Corrections. This paper has been in the making for the last year and a half. It indicates the policy direction that this government may take in the future after more discussion and more study by different groups in the province including the Department of Health and Social Development. Copies will be made available to every member of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): My question is to the Attorney-General. It relates to a letter I believe he received from Lydia Freier and is in connection with the Mount Carmel Clinic in the recent in camera hearings held at the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I wonder if it's the intention of the Attorney-General to commence any prosecutions as a result of the information supplied in the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition repeat from whom the letter is alleged to have been ...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a letter sent from Lydia Freier. It relates to Mount Carmel Clinic and recent in camera hearings held by the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

MR. MACKLING: I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the letter to which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to is a copy of a letter that is addressed to me, probably dated just today or the day before yesterday or something like that. It may have gone to one of my staff for review. I haven't personally seen the letter. Any allegation of any breach of any act would certainly be referred to the appropriate council to review.

MR. SPIVAK: My question then is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. It relates to the same letter a copy of which was sent to him. I wonder in view of the letter whether if he's prepared to retract the statements made in the House concerning the question of confidentiality of the medical files of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to retract any statement that I made in the House. The statements that I made in the House were based on information received from officials within the Department of Health and Social Development and these statements and information received haven't at this stage been contradicted.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister of Health and Social Development can inform the House whether he's had an opportunity to discuss the contents of the letter with his officials to see whether they are still of the same position they were when they advised him before.

MR. TOUPIN: No, I haven't.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if then the Minister of Health and Social Development would undertake to have such a discussion and then inform the House whether he's prepared to retract the statements or not?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I can undertake to do so if we're still in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. JENKINS: My point of personal privilege is that an incident occurred this morning in Law Amendments Committee and being as there is no report available to be tabled before this House I am forced on a point of personal privilege to raise this point. During questioning of a witness before Law Amendments Committee this morning I ruled the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party out of order and in the ensuing points of order that were raised the Honourable Member for Morris referred to the Chair as a complete idiot. I asked him to withdraw the remark, he refused to do so and left the meeting. And I realize Citation 295 Subsection (2) of Beauchesne does not cover this so I appeal to the House to rectify my personal grievance and I'll read Subsection (2) of 295: "A committee has no authority to punish one of its members or other person for any offence committed against it as by disorderly words or contemptuous conduct, as for example when a witness refuses to testify or prevaricates but can only report such offences to the House for it's animadversion." And I appeal to this House that the Honourable Member for Morris, not being in this House, and I must report this at the earliest opportunity, I appeal to the House to right my point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Minister of Labour on the matter of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the Honourable Member for Logan, it is true that the incident referred to by the Honourable Member for Logan did occur this morning, and that the Honourable Member for Morris is absent. We did attempt, Mr. Speaker, to contact you knowing that it was the intention of the Honourable Member for Logan to raise this point. In conversation with the Honourable Member for Morris he intimated to me as House Leader that he did regret the incident and the statement attributed, the accusation levied to the Honourable the Chairman of the Committee on Law Amendments. I undertook, Mr. Speaker, that I would draw this point to the attention of the House, that the Honourable Member for Morris regrets in a spirit of emotional outburst he did say as indicated by the Member for Logan and I'm conveying this to the House, not as a colleague, politically, of the Member for Morris. I indicated that I would, and I trust and hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Logan and the members of the House will agree that the Honourable Member for Morris having drawn this to my attention with his apologies, that this will be accepted, not only by the Chairman of the Law Amendments Committee but also members of the House and I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this be accepted and the incident be considered as being closed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (IZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege. I was in committee when the --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: The Leader of the Liberal Party was not there I believe at the time of this incident. He may have another matter that he wishes to raise, but I'm wondering in order to clarify the situation in respect to the Member for Morris that we may have a voice agreement or otherwise insofar as the proposition that I have raised for the House.

MR. SPEAKER: What we are agreeing to is the acceptance of the presentation made by the Honourable Minister of Labour on behalf of the Member for Morris. Is that agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a similar point of privilege. The incident that occurred, to which my honourable friend has made reference on his own point of privilege began with an

(MR. ASPER cont'd) exchange between the Chairman of the committee and myself. I absented myself, I left the committee because I believed it was being run in an arbitrary and undemocratic manner. Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Before the honourable member proceeds, I wish to inform him of his procedural right. Citation 232, Beauchesne's Fourth Edition says: "If a member wishes at any time to call and question the conduct of the Chairman in the execution of his duties the proper course is to give notice of a motion to that effect in due course." There is no criticism accepted on the floor of the House in any other fashion, so I want the honourable member to know his procedural right. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege I was making was that in the absence of the Member for Morris, who should be allowed to speak for himself in response to the claim made by the Chairman of the Committee, that the matter is not resolved, unless the Minister of Labour is suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that he is the agent for the Member for Morris and that he has the authority of the Member from Morris . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The reference to the Member . . . Order. The reference to the Member for Morris has been adjudicated and settled by agreement of this House. It is not any more under discussion. If the honourable member has a privilege matter of his own he will state it and then we will discuss it. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, insofar as that nobody has risen on this side of the House or from this party to comment on the remarks made by the House Leader, let me assure you, Sir, and the House Leader that we are quite happy and prepared to accept the apology that was extended to the Member for Logan by his House Leader, the Member for Transcona, the Honourable Minister of Labour, for the action taken by my colleague, the Member for Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Directing a question to the First Minister, I wonder if he can advise if the announced plans for Manitoba Hydro to flood South Indian up to 850 feet has been completed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, there were one or two key words in the honourable member's question which I did not hear completely and the whole meaning of the question turns on those words - if I could ask the honourable member to repeat it.

MR. BEARD: Could the First Minister advise if the announced plans of Manitoba Hydro to flood South Indian up to 850 feet has been completed?

MR. SCHREYER: The honourable member is asking whether I can advise if the plans announced by Manitoba Hydro or the raising of South Indian Lake up to 850 feet have been completed. Then, Mr. Speaker, it becomes necessary to know with greater precision just specifically in what detail the honourable member is referring to these plans. There's no question but that the basic plans have been completed, but certainly all the detailed engineering design and planning has certainly not been completed.

MR. BEARD: Well then, a subsequent question. I understand that members of the Hydro Board indicated yesterday to some of the faculty of the University that alternate plans could be considered before the actual program did take place; there could be an alternate plan arrived at before the present announced plan was contracted.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's at least, I find it a very difficult question to answer. I'll attempt to answer it by saying this, that in terms of theoretical possibility I suppose it could be said that it is still theoretically possible for some alternative location of diversion to be accepted, but in terms of practical probability I doubt very much if there's any meaningful probability that this might happen. I could advise my honourable friend that - all the while however - that refinements and greater detail on precision is being worked out. And as a case in point, only yesterday certain officials of Manitoba Hydro and certain persons from the University Engineering Faculty met to discuss very technical detailed specific aspects of alternative diversions, but I believe this to be regarded as being in the nature of a triple or quadruple check of data and decisions already arrived at.

MR. BEARD: Well, on the last supplementary question then. Would it be possible that

(MR. BEARD cont'd) the Utilities Committee then would be asked to sit either before or immediately following the closing of the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in order to determine precisely the best course of action before the House Leader or I give any indication on that in a specific way, I'm hoping that sometime later this afternoon it will be possible to come to some agreement to discuss with honourable gentlemen opposite informally as to when it might be most convenient and desirable to convene such a meeting if it is during the session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the well-known facilities, industrial facilities located at Rivers, would he tell the House what if any steps he took or members of his department took in order to induce Pioneer Electric to locate in Rivers rather than in Brandon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party does not know that the company referred to has been in Brandon for many a year and experienced a fire a few months ago and 52 people were unemployed, 52 residents of Brandon were unemployed.

MR. ASPER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the plant was already in Brandon, as the Minister advises, why was it necessary for the government to loan the company a quarter of a million dollars just to keep them in Brandon?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member seems to want to get into a matter of negotiation. I can tell him quite advisedly that what we did was necessary to sustain employment in that area, and if he thinks otherwise let him talk to the 52 men and women who were unemployed for the last several months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he tell the House when the paper on Corrections was prepared?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate in my opening remarks when I tabled the document that it had been in the mill for about a year and a half. We've only finalized the few corrections on a couple of pages in the last few days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will there be sufficient copies available that those in the community who are interested in reading it will be able to secure copies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, at this stage there was only sufficient copies to have a copy for every member of the House and for the members of the Press Gallery and additional copies will be prepared and made available in the future but they're not now available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Last week I believe he indicated he took some eight hundred and some odd people off welfare, for which I congratulate him, but I wonder if he could give us some breakdown on communities, the areas where these people were placed and the areas where they were taken off welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, when the question was asked of me by the Member for Portage la Prairie, I happened to have the figures before me and I did give a breakdown then which is in Hansard. So far as the communities north of the 53rd parallel, I haven't got them before me now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I ask this in view of the drought situation in some regions of Manitoba which will result in shortage of fodder especially in the fall. Will it be the intention of the government and is it permissible by the now existing statutes to advise the farmers of Manitoba that assistance, financial assistance for regional transportation of fodder will be available this fall?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member would know there is a provision within the Estimates, a token amount, but there is a provision which allows for emergency relief programs of one sort or another and it is a matter of policy as to whether there will be a program in this connection this year. The department at this time is doing a survey of the entire situation across the province to determine whether in fact there is some need - province-wide or localized - for the provision of hay or what have you.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question put to me a few weeks ago by the Member for Rock Lake, and that was whether or not the province was involved in the purchase of cattle in Ontario and the United States. The answer is that we have taken inventories of cattle offerings, possibilities of purchase of cattle for the dairy farmers who might be interested in entering the new Market-Share Agreement for which we do not have sufficient dairy cattle in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could advise the House as to whether or not he has received the report from the committee that is studying the viability of the Sprague Mill and if so could he advise us at this time whether or not the Columbia Forest Plant is considered viable?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have not received the report referred to by the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister of Agriculture made any representations to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources regarding sufficient water in the Assiniboine River to provide for irrigation in those areas that are desperately in need of moisture?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite ought to know that Cabinet works as a team and all things are considered in that way so that that kind of a question is rather ridiculous at this point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, supplementary.

MR. GRAHAM: If the Minister has not made representation will he give the House assurance that he will?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture. With regard to the previous answer, could he advise the House of approximately when we could expect a policy announcement so that the farmers that are worried about this now can know what to rely on, at least when to get the information?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, as is usually the case, after a survey is complete we will be in a position to make a policy decision and the extent of the problem will determine the length of the survey. It really speaks for itself, I'm sure to the amount of damage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the environment. Is the University of Manitoba still dumping raw sewage into the Red River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: To be precise, I suppose I should contact them but I believe that they are still doing so.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister indicate when or what appropriate construction in sewage treatment is contemplated to end the sewage disposal and pollution problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not a new problem; it's been considered by various people, the University Administration, the Metro government, the former Metropolitan Government of Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg, the new City of Winnipeg Government and there is a program to cope with this particular problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister inform the House, does the same problem exist with dumping raw sewage into the Assiniboine River by Headingley Jail?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I should take that question as notice unless the Minister of Health and Social Development has the answer, because as you know he is responsible for the Headingley Jail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party can recall when we discussed the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development that we had within those Estimates amounts allowing the Department of Health and Social Development to correct the situation that we've had in Headingley for so many years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister of Health then advise us when in the case of Headingley Jail we might expect the end of the pollution problem?

MR. TOUPIN: The completion of the work being done at Headingley Jail itself hopefully will be completed in 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Insofar as, Mr. Speaker, that just shortly one of the features of Supply - Management Program has come to an end with respect to poultry, can the Minister tell us how many thousands of chickens were killed in Manitoba to facilitate this particular aspect of Supply-Management Program that he advocates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Supply-Management Program, if that is what the member is suggesting, I suppose it could be interpreted as such, was really administered by the Government of Canada and of course it was up to individuals as to whether or not they wanted to participate in that program, purely voluntary. So that I don't think that it's all that important from the point of view of government policy. However, I will take the question as notice for my honourable friend because I have no knowledge as to what the poultry producers of Manitoba did or did not do.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Honourable Minister taking the question as notice and it is not my intention to ask the question of government policy, but simply to ask the direct question of the Minister of Agriculture how many thousands - was it 10, 20 or 50 or 100,000 chickens in Manitoba prematurely met their deaths. That's really all that I'd like to determine.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it's premature or not that these chickens had met their deaths. I want to indicate to the Member for Lakeside that that kind of a program was underway long before the Government of Canada undertook a subsidy for such a program, so that I don't know the relevance here at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question. In determination of death, I differentiate it, chickens having a death by ...

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is arguing the question.

MR. ENNS: ... bureaucratic action not natural action.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think we are getting into a debate. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Colleges and University Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister whether he's prescribed any techniques or whether he's setting up any intersessional machinery for attracting and examining public opinion on the recommendations contained in the White Paper on Health Services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of University and College Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the government hopes that there will be considerable dialogue with various disciplines and professions who would be interested as well as the public at large and meetings might be held and probably will be held, but there is no formal structure through which this will be done and it will not be something which the Legislature as a whole will be involved.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can it be assumed then that public meetings and intersessional committee meetings of a type are being considered by the Minister as a means of eliciting this kind of comment and feedback?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as I said at the very beginning when this paper was tabled, we welcome public discussion and will consider all manner and forms through which public discussion can be held.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can public discussion be generated and obtained without leadership from the government in this respect? In other words, will government innovate and stimulate public discussion?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the government will innovate and lead as it has for three years despite the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder whether he's in a position to give any additional details of the new federal program for self-help among the aged called the "New Horizons Program" and its implications for Manitoba? --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, I think - the comment from the Minister of Finance from his seat was heard by myself, and I'm not quite sure that the Federal Government is that clear insofar as that program is concerned and I'm surely not in a position to react at this stage.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the Minister can inform the House whether he's intending or has already contacted Ottawa to try and obtain some details of the program?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, we've had informal discussions with officials in Ottawa at this stage. It's not that clear to either parties what can be done, and I'm not in a position to relate to the House any additional information that the member hasn't got.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could at this time make an announcement of some changes of the standing committees? With respect to Law Amendments, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Craik will be substituting for Mr. Jorgenson; Mr. McKellar for Mr. McGill; Mr. Johnston for Mr. McKenzie. And for the Standing Committee of Agriculture Mr. Blake for Mr. Jorgenson, Mr. Girard for Mr. Watt, and this will be for the remainder of the session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Would my honourable friend repeat the changes on agriculture?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Blake for Mr. Jorgenson, Mr. Girard for Mr. Watt.

MR. PAULLEY: Will be replaced?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes ... Mr. Girard ...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the rules of the House, I would like to make the following changes in the Municipal Affairs Committee: the Member for Radisson for the Honourable Minister of Highways, the Member for Osborne for the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs, the Honourable Commissioner of Northern Affairs for the Minister of Universities and Colleges, the Member for St. Vital for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. This is on the Municipal Affairs Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, on the motions that were just submitted by both the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Radisson, we have had frequent announcements of changes in committees, and what are the real purposes in making these changes? Is it ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to inform the honourable member the procedures of this House. There was no motion, there was just an indication of what was taking place, which is I understand the procedure of the House at the present time.

At the present time we are under procedural item which is Oral Questions. If the honourable member has a question I shall entertain it. The Honourable Member for Rhineland,

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order then.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. FROESE: I think these changes that are being proposed ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member state his point of order.

MR. FROESE: ... should not be just a matter of procedural arrangement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to hear the point of order.

MR. FROESE: The point of order is I want to know are the changes made just so that meetings can be held simultaneously or what is the reason for the changes?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Environmental Management, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I would like to ask the Minister what steps are being taken to remove the dead animals along the Assiniboine River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the same Minister who is also responsible for Natural Resources, make sure that members of his department are informed of any decisions that are taken by the Environmental Management Committee.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I understood the logic of the last question. However, with regard to the question earlier asked I would appreciate it very much if the honourable member has any information as to the whereabouts of dead horses along the Assiniboine River that if he would advise me of it, we will see what can be done.

MR. GRAHAM: Purely for clarification, Mr. Speaker, may I inform the Minister that it has come to my attention that there are numerous dead fish in the Assiniboine River for various reasons and ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the provision to assist villages to direct or establish treatment plants regarding sewage, will this apply to the distribution system only or does this apply to lagoons and sewage treatment plants as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The program is a complete program and whatever the requirements of a community are fall into that category of subsidization if they are eligible.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary then. Will those villages or towns that have lagoons at the present time, if they make a changeover to treatment plants is this assistance going to be provided for them as well?

MR. USKIW: Well, every community will of course have to be evaluated as to its need and to its cost and the department of course is prepared to do so. On that basis if it's warranted that additional public works be undertaken and that grants would be available pursuant to the legislation which we are passing at this session, then that will be done as well.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Finance. I think he was the one that engineered the Bill 109 to committee. Would he provide members other than members who were on the committee with the amendments that were added to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I've already given to the clerk of the House copies for all members of the House thinking that we would be dealing with third reading today. I can ask him now to see to it that they're distributed this afternoon, and then having once done that then there won't be copies available for final reading, but I think we can do it now and the honourable member will get it. Mr. Speaker, may I only say that the copies that are being distributed have just a few typographical errors which will be pointed out at the time we deal with third reading, but in the main they're the ones that were adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Does he agree with the Premier of British Columbia that ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would suggest to the honourable member there's no procedure that calls for a question asking whether there's agreement with or not in respect to the First Minister or any other member of this House. Any other procedure we might entertain. The Honourable Member for Rhineland wish to rephrase his question?

MR. FROESE: Yes, I will. Does the First Minister subscribe to the proposition that Quebec should have a plebiscite as to whether they're seceding from the Confederation of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues on which I agree with the Premier of British Columbia, there are a number in which I don't. I think it would be a rather lengthy catalogue to index the ayes and nays on that; and insofar as what is best in the interest of Quebec and Canadian Confederation, I think that is a matter better left to the Governments of Canada and Quebec and to all of the 265 members of Parliament of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether there has ever been any serious discussion among the Premiers of the provinces for a plebiscite to be given to Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, that has certainly not received any serious attention or consideration by the First Ministers of this country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether or not that same question has been given serious consideration by the National New Democratic Party assembled in committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, to about the same extent that it is by the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I can't remember which Minister took as notice for the Minister of Tourism a question of mine yesterday, but I'll restate my question to the Minister of Tourism. Has the province made available, or the province intend to make available, to the City of Winnipeg financial assistance for the purchase of a riverside park at the junction of the Red and the Assiniboine Rivers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I'm not aware of any request from the city or any consideration being given by the city to this problem. If the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is aware of information as to what the city is planning and requesting I'd be happy to hear from him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question was directed to the Minister of Tourism and what I wanted to - the question put another way: does the Province of Manitoba have a riverbank acquisition policy, and does it have funds for that purpose allocated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, as for the first question, I can only answer in the same way that the Minister responsible has; I haven't received any request for that at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Health. Do the hospital districts in the Province of Manitoba have to have the approval of either the Minister or the Hospital Commission when disposing of real estate property of the particular district concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there is certainly a discussion between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the hospital district in question and the approval is given by the Health Services Commission, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, there's one further change on Municipal Affairs Committee. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon for the Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a further question for the Minister of Health. Could he give us a breakdown on the towns where the welfare recipients were taken from were placed; and also could he indicate to the House when charges will be laid against the inmate who attacked a guard at Brandon a couple of weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the first question: details have been given I believe last week and they should be found within Hansard. If the honourable member can't find

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) those within Hansard, I will give him a separate copy that I gave in the House, I believe, last week. On the second question, it is not my jurisdiction to determine when those inmates will be sentenced or charged.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Could he indicate when charges will be laid, or if charges will be laid, against the inmate who attacked and severely molested one of the guards at Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the precise details of any altercation there. If the facts are as indicated by the Member for Thompson, then I'm sure that the probability of charges being laid is very great. However, I'm not in possession of the facts; I have asked my staff to enquire as to whether or not such an altercation did occur. I haven't had a report yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, a further question for the Minister of Health. Could he indicate if he is going to financially assist the day care centre which is on the verge of going out of business due to lack of funds? I believe he has a letter from a Mrs. Ballantyne requesting assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Thompson made reference to an aid day care centre, I didn't get it. Which one did you make reference to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the day care centre I'm talking about is operated by some ladies. Mrs. Ballantyne has made a trip to Winnipeg last week especially to see someone in the Minister's department and has left a brief with the Minister --(Interjection)-- in Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, pertaining to the brief presented by the lady from Thompson in regards to the day care centre, it is being considered by my department and the recommendation will be made so far as what is possible to be done by the Department of Health and Social Development. The honourable member is quite aware, and I did indicate this in the House in the last few weeks, that we do have limited funds for day care centres, but we do have funds available for those who are referred to day care centres to allow say a parent to go to work instead of being on welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the House Leader. Can he indicate to the House where there is a provision, either in the statutory or House rules, that enable members to make changes in committees without a proper motion when same have been established by a resolution of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's a historic occurrence in this House that when it is desirable by any party, or indeed any person, to express a desire to change from one committee to the other, on Orders of the Day this is announced and I've never yet heard any opposition to the change being made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that I've made objection several times . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member place his question? Would the honourable member place his question? The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate to the House if Hydro is going to contribute any money towards the bridge to Rat River and part of the highway since the government has decided to go for low level flooding, which means there will be less area flooded? Is Hydro going to contribute any money towards the construction of a bridge and part of the highway?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that varies with the particular road in question. As the honourable member may know the Manitoba Hydro is paying for the cost of the road from the Sipiwesk Road to Jenpeg, and that is of course primarily because if it weren't for Hydro requirements there would probably not be a road going in there for some time.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) They're also paying for the cost of the decking, the bridge decking over the Jenpeg installation.

Insofar as the Rat River bridge is concerned, it would be accurate to say that there has been no final decision taken on that as yet. I can't say that there is a decision to - that Hydro will or will not be paying any part of that, and similarly as regards to 391. Perhaps I could allow myself the observation that with the building of a control structure on the Rat River near Notigi, that since the control structure would be required in any case that the building of the decking over it would be a matter of economic cost advantage and no precise formula however has been arrived at as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if the - I think the Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs might want to respond to an unanswered question. Does the Government of Manitoba through your department have any policy or program related to river bank acquisition throughout the province? The question wasn't answered and I'm not sure that the Minister didn't want to answer it or missed the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that it wouldn't be right to say we have a policy or we haven't, we would have to look at a situation but my honourable friend should remember that in the City of Winnipeg there is a Minister that's responsible for that. There are no provincial parks in the City of Winnipeg, so therefore I think they should be directed to the Minister responsible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Then a specific question to the Minister of Tourism. Has the government entered into any negotiations with the Federal Government with the objective of including the Carberry desert area in the Spruce Woods Provincial Park?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'll have to take this as a notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, sorry. There's just one addition to be made to the Committee on Agriculture. Inadvertently I mentioned it yesterday in committee that the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland should be added to the list of the members for the Agricultural Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think any matters of this type should be done by resolution so it's properly done before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, it was the decision of the House earlier in the session to determine the composition of the committees. The Agricultural Committee was supposed to be composed of 17 members; ten government, five opposition, and two other members from the opposition for a total of 17. There are only 16 on the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It relates to the 45 head office employees of Autopac being transferred to Brandon. The question is, will the government continue to lease the space in the Bank of Montreal Building after they have been removed to Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): If it's necessary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion taking place as to the possibility of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Law Amendments meeting simultaneously this afternoon at 4:30. It's my understanding that I had, that there is agreement between the Official Opposition, the Liberal Party - I had some discussion with the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and it seems to me that he was favourably inclined with one reservation. I'm sorry I wasn't able to talk to the other three independent members of the House and I hope they concur, if indeed there is concurrence. The reservation of the Honourable Member for Rhineland was that he had some amendments to propose, if I recall correctly, in Agricultural Committee, and now that he's been named an official member of that committee

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) of course he would have the right to propose those amendments which he wouldn't have had priorly, and the Honourable Member for Rhineland had some reservations insofar as some matters that he wished to consider in the Law Amendments Committee. I indicated to him that if he was particularly concerned with some of the bills before Law Amendments precisely, that I would ask the chairman if he would defer considerations of those bills for the time being. It is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Agriculture will conclude it's business in about an hour - that would be between 4:30 and 5:30 - and then it was also considered that this evening we would not have a meeting of the House, but that Law Amendments Committee would meet to try and dispose of the consideration of the bills before it, together with any representations as yet not heard. So I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether I have the agreement of this procedure, and if I have agreement as House Leader, if I have agreement accordingly then the House could adjourn, Sir, at 4:30 to go into the simultaneous meetings of Agriculture and Law Amendments and would not meet again until tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. So, Sir, I would like to know whether this is agreeable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite matters I will agree.

MR. PAULLEY: That being agreed, I give notice that the two committees will meet at 4:30 to consider their business, and at 4:30, Sir, naturally the formal adjournment of the House will be made until tomorrow morning.

I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether you would call the resolution of the Honourable the First Minister, the adjournment standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. GIRARD: On a point of order. Just before the Minister leaves the suggestion that both committees would meet, I wonder if he'd indicate where which committee will meet?

MR. PAULLEY: I would believe that arrangements will be made, Mr. Speaker, for Law Amendments to continue in 254 and I'll undertake to see that Room 200 would be available for the Agriculture Committee.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, during an earlier session of this present Legislature, a resolution was put forward by the Member for Rhineland and in the debate and discussion on that resolution I went on record as approving the government's considering the advisability of extending aid to private and parochial schools. Now, in my view, if indeed the Premier of this province needs the approval in principle of this House before bringing in legislation, he received that authority then. Now we are asked to help him circumvent the will of his caucus and his Cabinet by giving him the additional favourable votes that would enable him to present a bill.

Mr. Speaker, even though we give him that assistance he will still have to get that future legislation approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, his Cabinet, before it can be presented to the Assembly for consideration. There is no reason to believe that the present members of his caucus will reconsider and change their position on aid to private and parochial schools. Perhaps the Premier is expecting that in the meantime there will be a provincial election and he will find himself with a more manageable group that will follow where he leads.

If we project into the future the effects of passing this resolution, we will foresee a committee of all parties which will have to study a great deal of material, hold public hearings throughout the province and then come to some agreement as to the recommendations which it will put forward. We know from previous debates and resolutions the government does not feel bound by votes on resolutions, nor does it feel obligated to act on the reports of committees. As an example, we have the Local Government Boundaries Commission report on the reorganization of Greater Winnipeg. In that instance it was written into the legislation that the Commission should report to the Assembly, that the report should be received and discussed and that was never done.

The Premier has prepared for us a reference paper on selected topics in education. In it there is mention of anomalies in the Shared Services Program. Mr. Speaker, it's within the power of this government to correct those anomalies. It mentions the need to re-identify the

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) educational experience within the system, but that can be done within his group, which after all has something - I believe it's eleven teachers and professors within its own caucus. Surely they are the real experts.

The umbrella system has been put into effect so he has proved that he can accommodate those private and denominational schools that may desire to integrate into the public schools. They have their private boards that are still able to determine what will be done after school hours and when the regular classes are finished, and have their own programs in sports or music or religion.

Undoubtedly there is a great deal of room for improvement within the public school system and it is difficult to judge the effectiveness of that system. We know that some children fail school and we know that in other instances the schools fail the children. I think this happens by the very fact that the school system is so large and inflexible, but it is not beyond the ability of the government with its large number of experts on which to draw, to re-examine and to continually improve the curriculum and the facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a private enterpriser at heart; I believe in freedom of choice, and I cannot see the alternatives to the public school system collapse. I believe that they are essential to our community. Most of them are doing a very good job and they certainly give more attention to the individual child than can be secured within the present monolithic public system. I believe that the principle of aid was approved many years ago with the Shared Services Program. The Premier has been given the approval of this Legislature to proceed in considering extending further aid to the private schools. In my opinion, a committee to give this matter further study is an unnecessary expense and delay. I am quite certain that the Premier knows what he would like to do; I feel that the committee is an unnecessary expense in procedure, that I shall have to vote against this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this motion appears before the House in the name of the First Minister, and it makes some very bland assumptions. It makes a bland assumption, Sir, that nearly all the people of Manitoba favour some type of financial assistance for private or parochial schools; and that, I feel, Mr. Speaker, is not the question as it exists in Manitoba today.

We have many major problems facing education in Manitoba and certainly not the greatest one is whether there should be or should not be aid to private or parochial schools. What the people of Manitoba are primarily concerned about in the field of education, in my estimation, Sir, is: (1) the cost of education; (2) its quality; (3) its function as an institution that will enhance the quality of life in Manitoba and in the Dominion of Canada.

The resolution, Sir, that appears before this House at this time is very narrow in its scope. It is couched in terms that leave no room for those who oppose state aid to private and parochial schools in any way, shape or form, to be able to make any contribution towards this study. We read the resolved of this resolution, Sir, "Therefore Be It Resolved that a Special Committee of the Legislature be appointed to consider and recommend on proposals submitted in a reference paper" -- and there are some suggestions in that reference paper that seem to make some bland assumptions that such and such is fact; and that's not true, Sir. "That this Committee be appointed to consider and recommend on proposals submitted in a reference paper on options for greater community and parental involvement within the public school system and which also includes the concept of accommodating those private and denominational schools that may desire to integrate into the public schools". And so it goes on and states what has happened.

If members of this Legislature and members of the public are wondering just where I stand on this question, I'm not going to keep you wondering for very long. It has always been my feeling, and I have deep feeling on it I can assure you, that the cost of education, public education is the responsibility of the state; the cost of private and parochial school education is the responsibility of those who seek to enhance or have something outside. I know that there are many arguments, Sir, that people will advance, that people have a right to determine where their tax dollar will be spent, and I say that's a fallacious argument; because if that argument, Sir, is pursued to its ultimate, we would have taxation anarchy in this province and also in this country. Because those who no longer have children in school, those who are childless couples, would say that their taxation dollar should not be spent on public, private or parochial school education. There are those who are aged who would say that their tax dollar should be spent on health and welfare benefits. There are those who drive automobiles who say they should be

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) spent on roads. This sort of proliferation of our tax dollar is one that concerns the people of Manitoba and concerns them very deeply.

You know, we hear much from people who say that they want to decide the type of education that their children want, and I say that this is a noble concept. But I can give you some examples, Sir, of when I was a public school trustee in the Winnipeg School Division, and we had a hundred people come down to the School Board and they decided that they wanted a public school board system to enhance the teaching of languages within the Ward 3 area. They asked for the teaching of Ukrainian at three or four schools in the north end, and the board agreed. And you know, Mr. Speaker, when it all boiled down, the same people had to come back to us three weeks later and say that they couldn't even get enough people, enough young people, who were interested to even form one classroom.

At Greenway School we set up three classrooms for the teaching of languages, and I admit it was on an extra curricular activity but we supplied the facilities. The first week all three classrooms were full; the second week one classroom was full; the third week there was nobody there.

If we're going to make education meaningful to the young people in our society, then I say that these young people have got to have some determination in what the curriculum will be.

Yesterday, when the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development spoke, I thought he made a very sound, dispassionate dissertation on aid to private and parochial schools. He touched on a point, Sir, one that I have always held, that what we should be teaching in the public school system is a comparative study of religion and have it as a subject on the curriculum. And when I say a comparative study of religions I don't mean just the religions that embrace Christianity; I mean all the major religions of the world. That is the type of a religious educational program that in my estimation is what should be striven for, not only in this province but all around the world. Because how otherwise are we going to be able to sit and talk and listen to our neighbours with tolerance if we have no understanding of their religion? But if we're going to get up institutions where one particular dogma or tentative religion is taught, then how in God's name can we expect those young people when they graduate and become citizens of our country and of our province, how they can have tolerance for someone else's religion when they've never been taught it.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly on this subject. We only need to look around some other unhappy spots of this globe and we see what is happening when people are divided on issues of religion. And you know, Mr. Speaker, we ask that a committee of this House -- you know, I don't think that this House could even agree on who should sit on that committee, because we have people who are pro in the predominance, the people who are anti on the question are going to not accept it; and if it's going to be vice versa we're going to be back to where we were. And supposing the committee does come in with a recommendation one way or the other, those who are pro, supposing the position comes in that is anti, are these people going to accept it? I can say no? And the people - I can assure you that if a resolution is passed and it comes in on a recommendation, that I don't want to be tied. I don't want to be tied, and I can tell you right now that I'm not prepared to accept the recommendation that members of the Opposition are going to have a hand in, and I don't say that in a disparaging manner, but there's only one way that legislation is going to be passed in this House, and it's going to have to be a government bill, and I don't want the members of the Opposition to draw up a piece of legislation, or be a part of drawing up legislation that I as a member of this side of the House must support. I think that legislation has to be government, and I can't see any other way. Any other way of doing it is doing no more than begging the question, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion. I am going to vote against it, and I give notice, and I extend a caveat that if this resolution passes and the recommendation comes in next year, that I have my rights, my conscience, the same as any other member of this House, and my conscience will not allow me to support that type of legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion there is little that can be added to the statement made by our Premier with respect to this resolution. My remarks therefore will be confined to a brief review of what I personally consider to be some of the more pertinent facts in the hope that they might influence those still undecided to the support of the principle that this government should be responsible for the financing of the teaching of the curriculum authorized by the Department of Education to all children in the province in legally constituted schools.

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd)

Since I presume all of the members in this Chamber believe that the curriculum does not support any one particular religious belief, or political persuasion, but insofar as it is possible is neutral in these respects, in our deliberation we cannot adopt the position that the Department of Education through its curriculum is financially supporting any religious belief or political persuasion, and therefore this aspect can be completely omitted from this discussion. No one is requesting the Department of Education to inject religious or political content into the authorized curriculum and financing the same. I consider, Mr. Speaker, the key words of this resolution to be "therefore be it resolved that a special committee of the Legislature be appointed to consider among other things, the advisability of revising the program of shared services and assistance to students of private schools."

Basically the question before this House is whether we as a group of legislators will continue to have our Minister of Education annually present a budget that considers the total financial needs for approximately 240,000 of the school children of our province, while only in varying degrees the needs of the remaining 8,000; of being concerned only about the salary grants and the pension rights of approximately 10,000 - and I'm guessing at that figure, but I know it is somewhere in that neighbourhood - teachers, while totally ignoring the remaining 500; of being concerned with the wishes of a majority of parents in the financial aspect of the education of their children, while almost totally ignoring the wishes of a sizable minority. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this situation is unnecessary and harmful to the development of our federal system of government, of our province, and our social fabric. It surely cannot be justified on economics, constitutional, or past juridical decisions, so one has to accept the fact that this state of affairs exists for purely political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, in our Premier's remarks he asked that we approach this issue with open-mindedness and with tolerance and not to place political consideration before the constitutional and juridical factors.

Mr. Speaker, my plea goes further, the human factor should be uppermost in our minds. Constitutionally the rights of these minorities were presumed to be protected, not only the right to have but also the right not to be prejudicially affected by our legislation. Section 93 of the BNA Act and Section 22 of the Manitoba Act, supported by a number of judicial decisions, substantiate that. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to repeat here what can be gleaned from many books written on the subject; suffice to state I am personally convinced that on the basis of constitutional provision and juridical decisions, not only do denominational minorities have clearly defined rights, but also that this province has clearly defined duties in the field of education.

I am further convinced that in Manitoba no government can seriously refuse aid to denominational schools for the teaching of a curriculum authorized by the Department of Education and subject to provincial inspection, and seek support for that position in either the constitution or judicial decisions.

The course that has been followed, Mr. Speaker, means nothing more than promoting the will of the majority, irrespective of the rights of the minority. It is a sad but true commentary, Mr. Speaker, that in this province it is not by the permission of a majority that parents in our society are permitted to choose the educational environment of their children, it is instead because of their rights as parents as stated in Article 26 of the Declaration of Human Rights that "parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children".

Our private schools in my opinion are as legal and constitutionally based as those schools that receive state funds. They are in fact denominational public schools. They receive all those who wish to attend. They receive however no fees other than the financial assistance through Shared Services for the granting of instruction. It has never ceased to amaze me, Mr. Speaker, that in this aspect the legal and the constitutional, those honourable members of the legal profession who are opposed to the extension of aid have remained peculiarly silent. You would think, Mr. Speaker, that they could have made their most valuable contribution to this debate in the area in which they have been trained, not as they have chosen to do in the philosophic or religious and in the political areas, since we are approaching this problem, not on a partisan but on a free vote basis, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they have chosen to avoid the legal and constitutional implications, partly as a result of their legal training and partly because of preconceived notions. Mr. Speaker, as for the legal training I think it fair to say that in general in order to be effective it had to accomplish within them, within the recipient, a more

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) or less violent alienation from his prior self. Let me illustrate: he had to become an argumentative personality who could listen to what someone else was saying only for the purpose of disagreeing, and in addition he had to also become an analytic rather than a receptive person, one who dominates information rather than respond to it, intensely competitive and self-assertive. It can readily be seen, Mr. Speaker, that these are not the personal qualities that should be brought to the fore in the consideration of this resolution. Rather may I suggest as honourable members of this Chamber we should approach this question with empathy and with a spirit of understanding, in particular with tolerance, tolerance for the religious beliefs of our fellow citizens as expressed in the ecumenical movement, tolerance to share freely not grudgingly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the former Conservative Government should be complimented for the courage in which it attacked this problem and for instituting the concept of shared services. I can recall conversations I had with Dr. George Johnson when he was Minister of Education, and I have great respect and admiration for the part he played in proceeding towards a just solution of this problem through Shared Services. In my opinion it still appears to be the course we should follow and to expand upon when and as conditions warrant.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it incumbent upon me at this time to make a few observations about the contribution made by the Honourable Member from Inkster. The Free Press last week expressed its appreciation to him with the headline "Green sees School Aid Sapping NDP". We know that not only are they opposed to NDP policy but also to the principle of aid, but if the Winnipeg Free Press is being consistent in seeking our downfall, is the Honourable Member for Inkster? On the federal political level he tries to promote the view that the NDP are opposed to minority rights in education, when in fact the Saskatchewan NDP Government supports the concept, and the Ontario NDP fought for an extension of these rights in the last provincial election. Mr. Speaker, I have a pamphlet "Equality for Separate Schools" and it's written by Mr. Donald C. MacDonald, Leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party in the Ontario Legislature March 3, 1970. He further attempts to leave the impression that party policy in Manitoba is opposed to the concept of guaranteeing minority rights as stated in Section 22 of the Manitoba Act, and goes even further to imply that the allegiance of a NDP member's support to party policy as determined at the annual convention, should supersede one's allegiance to the constitution under which our rights as legislators was granted. Of this I am certain, Mr. Speaker, it is our party's leadership convention that our leader is selected and in that area we have no right to assume otherwise; his overwhelming support should have left no doubt. And further, Mr. Speaker, I campaigned and was elected as a Social Democrat, and I have a definite view of what social democracy means to me. I presented these views in one of my replies to the Speech from the Throne. I have been in contact with the CCF NDP movement ever since the 1930s, the late 1930s, when I joined the lending library in, I believe it was, the Old Grain Exchange Building, and I know that the aim of this party is the establishment of social democracy, not socialism, period.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is not wrong, it is not wrong for a Social Democrat to assume that just as in economics we have been able to accept public enterprise and private enterprise side by side, we should be able to, and must in conformity with our ideology, also accept public schools and a sphere for private initiative in matters educational. This is being consistent, not what the Honourable Minister from Inkster is advocating. To opt only for socialism or public enterprise, only one American type, non-sectarian, monolithic, state controlled, school system is incompatible with the ideals of social democracy and most definitely with true Conservative and Liberal thinking which in economics tends to prefer private enterprise over public. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but how long can true democracy flourish if all our citizens have to be cast in the same mold. The foundation of our freedom lies in the varied outlook of a well informed electorate.

In reply to the Honourable Member for Inkster's query as to whether I would be willing to support a Communist school, I say has anyone ever heard of a Communist being dissatisfied with the public school system as it is? Only recently I received a pamphlet, presumably from the Communist Party, urging me to shun private school aid and to strengthen the public school system.

And in any event, Mr. Speaker, to pay the cost of teaching the curriculum authorized by the Department of Education does not commit the province to the support of any religious, philosophical or political ideology. Our need lies not in making our public schools even more

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) acceptable to those groups but the further satisfaction of the rights of those who in conscience feel obliged to send their children to schools of a religious character. Let me emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that these schools seek financial assistance only for the teaching of the curriculum prescribed by the Department of Education which does not insofar as it is possible, promote any religious belief. So the allegation continually made by the Honourable Member from Inkster that state funds should not be used to promote any particular religious belief, will be adhered to in a greater measure than now exists, for if aid is granted since then not only the citizens of this province whose religious belief is that religious training is not an integral part of a school curriculum, will receive the same financial support from the state as those citizens whose religious belief it is that religion should at all times permeate the school atmosphere. The state will then not be favouring one belief over another. This in my opinion would result in a more correct and precise interpretation of the American principle of separation of church and state. But would we not as honourable members of this Assembly be much more consistent in promoting the best interests of the citizens of this province, in this great nation, if we followed both the Canadian and British traditions rather than the American, and fell in step in unity with the other 18 million Canadian citizens?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to reiterate that while I admire the courage and the vigor with which the Honourable Member from Inkster presented his case, I could see no reason for the necessity of his resignation from a cabinet post over this issue since at the outset he knew there would be a free vote. His completely negative contribution to the debates thus far leaves much to be desired. Aside from the Honourable Member for Inkster, is there anyone in this Chamber who does not feel as capable as fellow members in the other legislatures of this nation who have successfully grappled with this problem and implemented both the spirit and the intent of the federal and provincial legislation in the field of education? What ingredient is lacking here? Aside from the Honourable Member for Inkster, is there a Social Democrat here who is still in doubt about whether this government should provoke the best interests of both public and private school systems in order to better reflect and support our philosophy that both private and public enterprise can function side by side for the betterment of the human condition?

And finally, is there a Conservative or Liberal who will support private enterprise in the economic sphere, yet oppose private initiative in the field of education? Mr. Speaker, it is in the power of this Assembly to act now on a non-partisan basis to make a positive, not a negative, contribution to the educational system of this province and to the fulfillment of minority rights as guaranteed in Section 22 of the Manitoba Act. We have it in our power to bring in the dawn of a new era when all citizens of the province will be able to say that they no longer are prejudicially affected by our legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before taking part in this debate I would like to make sure that it's understood that if I'm not through with my remarks at 4:30 when we adjourn, that I'll be able to continue these remarks to my full time if need be.

Mr. Speaker, on June 5th the Honourable Member for Inkster tried to lure me in a debate on this state aid. At the time I mentioned that I didn't think that this was the proper time to do it but I did say that certainly I would be interested in debating this question with him, and I think that the time has now come.

On July 7th my honourable friend spoke on this subject, on this debate. He agreed with the First Minister that when debating this issue we should proceed dispassionately, and he said that he had spoken all over the province without trying to inflame people. But then he added that if the Premier had meant that those that were advocating state aid were inflaming people, then he agreed. I think that the fact alone that one might say, "I don't intend to inflame people; I want to be tolerant!", doesn't necessarily make it so.

My honourable friend repeated on many occasions that he will do anything and everything in his power to prevent this resolution from going through, prevent state aid to be accorded. Now I certainly don't fault him with that, but I suspect that this later statement rather than a denial of wanting to raise the passions is more factual. And he started early, Mr. Speaker. It was on March 23rd when my honourable friend and myself were asked by the New Democratic Party to inform the people to take part in an evening of information in the constituency of St. Boniface. I discussed the situation then with the executive of the Party and I was told that they did not want a debate, that they wanted each of us to express our views and set the chance for the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) people to ask some questions from the audience - the audience to participate. I did inform the committee that I was ready to conform with any rules that they wanted to make, because I felt that we should both work under the same rules. I discussed this with my honourable friend on two or three occasions and he agreed. We even discussed the time that we should speak in French seeing that it was a French constituency - and we agreed.

On that evening, my honourable friend being the visitor in my constituency I felt that he should have the advantage, if it's an advantage, and I agreed to speak first. I had a prepared text I had prepared over the weekend and I tried to give my views without trying to invite any other people, or certainly without referring to my honourable friend. But when he spoke, his whole speech was a rebuttal on what I had to say. I mentioned that during that evening and my honourable friend - and I have his words here, answered this way: "Mr. Chairman, I regret that Mr. Desjardins found my references to his remarks as being somehow outside the rules. I did not feel that they were. I don't see how it is possible to continue what you call calm, tranquil, unemotional debate when he refers to the people as being more tolerant and therefore more willing to accept the facts that we should give aid to separate schools. I mean, that kind of remark I just cannot live with."

Now he was referring to these remarks that I'd made, Mr. Chairman, and I quote: "There is no doubt in my mind that Manitobans have grown more mature and that they are less guided by prejudice than they were a few years ago. The passing of Bill 113 during the session of 1970 by unanimous vote certainly proved my point. The acceptance of bilingualism is another indication and I would say that the rejection of biculturalism in favour of multi-culturalism is also an indication that we have come of age, that we are ready to tolerate others and their views, and in fact that we're even ready to graduate from tolerance to acceptance." Now, Mr. Chairman, this is what my honourable friend objects to living with. I have a copy of his speech also and I have to live with a lot worse than that because he and I do not agree.

Now on June 5th, going back to June 5th, I did not speak in this House but I did interject when my honourable friend stated that we wanted to start financing the support of certain religions. Now at that time, Mr. Speaker, he was I might say pretty rough; maybe I had it coming but he had it pretty rough and practically insulting, and I quote from Hansard. He said that - he was talking about myself - "Then you are even less credible, you even make yourself less credible than I already know you to be." And he also added: "And now I find that not only is he misleading the House but he is misleading himself. You know, I hesitate to refer to my honourable friend as a bumbling buffoon but the fact is that he is making himself more and more susceptible to that kind of charge."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that my honourable friend waited a long time to say these things - in fact, two full years. I think probably it dates from the time that I said that he acted like a frantic fanatic, and he has a long memory.

Now I'm sure that my honourable friend believes that I have this coming to me and I can't fault him with this; I might say that all right, now we're even. My hope is that during the balance of the debate my credibility will improve, that I will not act like a bumbling buffoon, and of course that my honourable friend will not be a frantic fanatic. And then we will start again from scratch, Mr. Speaker.

But my honourable friend, I'm sure, would be very disappointed if I did not challenge some of the statements out of the red herring that he has introduced in this debate. My honourable friend is a very clever debater and most of the time he succeeds in having the members of this House debate on his terms. And his terms are not automatically right, Mr. Speaker. Now in his remark he's appealed to the NDP; he said that it's sapping the New Democratic Party, but as my honourable friend from Gimli said, they didn't think that in Ontario and they didn't think that in Saskatchewan. I don't know why all of a sudden you can do a certain thing as a New Democratic Party member in a certain province but you can't do it here. I thought that the only difference between Ontario and Manitoba is that in Ontario they had to expel the Waffle group. I thought this was the only difference.

My honourable friend has talked about the loyalty to the First Minister, and he's asked for a free vote and the members of this House have asked for a free vote. The First Minister in a moment being candid, although some people would call it weakness, dared to say what he thought as an individual. But he was chastised quite rapidly and he was told that as a First Minister he did not have a right to say certain things and he was man enough and big enough to say publicly

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) that's fine, he recognized that he didn't have the right because he had a certain responsibility as a First Minister. And then he did very clearly indicate that this would be a free vote. Why then does my honourable friend have to introduce this element of the New Democratic Party being in trouble if they voted for this. It's a free vote, it doesn't enter into it at all.

Now my honourable friend made the statement, and I wasn't here unfortunately, I'm quoting from the Free Press of July 7th: "The notion that a politician should not seek political support is foreign to my thinking." And he did admonish, and he's very successful because it looks like they're doing exactly what he wanted them to do - and I'm talking about the Conservative Party. He said that if all the members who oppose state aid followed the example set by the Premier, do what they really believe is right, this resolution will not pass. "Mr. Green said the impasse, the issue as created within the New Democratic Party affords the Opposition with a golden opportunity to defeat the government." I can't see if it's a free vote how they can defeat the government. "But I am going to hope against hope, that they, the Opposition, will not seek to take advantage of it."

Well it's clear that people that have accepted the resolution of the Honourable Member from Rhineland just a few years ago, people who stand up in their seats, such as the Honourable Member for Riel and say I agree, I agree with page after page of this White Paper, say no, that this is wrong, the government should have taken the responsibility themselves and on this I will oppose it. And as another member that we heard today, it's quite clear that the members of the Conservative Party will try to take advantage of that, but it's a free vote and I think that they will only hurt themselves and nobody else. It certainly will not defeat the government. They might defeat this - this is what I'm saying and I'm not, I'm not quarrelling with my honourable friend, it was quite clever to use this and I think it's working, I think it's working.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is misquoting my remarks. I did not say that it afforded them a golden opportunity to defeat the government by defeating the resolution. I said it afforded them an opportunity to defeat the government by passing the resolution. My honourable friend has the text and he should not misquote them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: I will quote the Free Press again, maybe . . . and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: . . . remarks. I said it gave them a chance to defeat the government by passing the resolution. If my honourable friend does not have the Hansard, I ask him to accept that that is what I said to this House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, that's fine, Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it may be that the Chair will be called upon to have to make a determination from time to time as to whether or not a point being raised is in fact a valid point of privilege. As for myself I can assure you, Sir, that during the course of this debate I have refrained at all times from rising on points of privilege, even though at times I felt my statements were being grotesquely misinterpreted. However, be that as it may, in this particular case if there is a misquoting taking place I suppose it is a valid point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I did say that I wasn't here and I didn't have Hansard, I'm quoting the paper and I'm very pleased then, and I'll accept the correction of my honourable friend. I'm pleased that I quoted because it affords him a chance to make this correction, and I don't quarrel with him at all.

Now I think my honourable friend makes it quite clear though that the notion that a politician should not seek political support is foreign to my thinking and he's never shied away from admitting that in the past, but he is introducing something here that he might feel might be to his benefit as a politician. But this is certainly his choice.

He also mentioned many times that the party has never promised that they would do certain things, but the party I don't think at any time stated that they would not do certain things and I think that it was clear, the First Minister was a member of this House before going to Ottawa and I think that his views were well-known and I think that the support - I would agree with the Honourable Member from Gimli the support that he received, I think that the people would certainly feel that this is one of the things that he wanted and only as one individual I can

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) say that I chose to support him instead of Weir, and this certainly was a big factor. There was no sinister motive, there was no promises or anything, but I knew his views and I thought that this is something that I feel is very important to me and I felt that I had a much better chance with a person such as the First Minister heading this government, and I think there are many many like myself.

Now on June 5th also my honourable friend who did not want to excite passion, but nevertheless said that the resolution of his First Minister, of his Leader, was a hoax, was a joke. And he did say, and this is where he misunderstood this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: . . . point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am being misquoted. I never said that the resolution was being a hoax or a joke. I said that other people were making it a hoax or a joke by suggesting that they would vote otherwise when the committee reported. I never said that it was a hoax or a joke. I said that other people were making it such.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest that if the Honourable Member is going to attribute remarks, he should read them out of Hansard or else not . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I can't hear a word you're saying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest that if the honourable member is going to attribute remarks, he should either try to cite them out of Hansard or else indicate that it's his opinion, so that we won't have this continual rising of privilege, because it is one of the procedures of the House not to misrepresent or misquote a member. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't find this at this time. I certainly will try to find it, but I think that my honourable friend certainly at the time that he admonished me, he - I think, that it was clarified later on that he misunderstood my interjection and he felt that I was fooling myself, and we were fooling ourselves if we said that we agreed that a committee could change our mind. I think that we clarified that between - he and I - but I will say that this is not quite the case. Those that are definitely opposed to state aid have no business supporting this. There is no doubt at all, and if I was in my honourable friend's shoes, I would feel exactly the same. If he introduced, or somebody introduced a resolution, or an amendment, stating that we should also look to see, like he suggested on that day, that we should remove Shared Services, that he doesn't want to give anything, I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, right now, that I would have no hesitation at all, but my honourable friend stated that I was trying to fool myself and the members of this House when I said that this committee might have some bearing on me and on some of the members, and that I refute, because in all the times that I have debated this issue, in the early days, I was never ready to accept that we should all go within the public school system. And there are many members here that spoke 10 years, 14 years ago, well maybe not 14 - there are just a few of us left - 10 years ago, that said that they would like to help recognize parental rights but they felt they were - their biggest fear was to hurt the public school system, and if this could be done within the public school system they would buy it, and that I could quote verse and chapter, and this is what we are asked to do.

My honourable friend from Logan seemed to take the First Minister to task to say that he didn't really have the right to introduce this resolution - I'm not talking about the legal right - because he felt that it's not what these people wanted. But nevertheless are we kidding ourself, are we wasting our time, for didn't the majority in this House vote in favour of the resolution, asking this House, or the government, to look into this thing to see if there was a way that we could give aid to the private schools. This is what the members did. This is certainly what the member did Mr. --(Interjection)-- so I say that there are certain members, and I don't have to name them, that could change their mind on this if it's done within Shared Services even though - of course those that are all in favour of state aid will support this, like myself, that's true.

But if it was something I wasn't ready to accept a while back, I could now accept this committee, if this committee can come out with facts to show me - my main purpose in this is equality of opportunity for our children in Manitoba and parental rights in education. This is what I am interested in, and if this committee can bring something on this, I would buy it. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that I shall refute the fact that definitely I am kidding myself, that nothing that this committee will say or do will change my mind, or some of the other members, although I do recognize that those that are definitely against have no business voting for it, and my

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) honourable friend said, -who is going to sit on the committee? I don't think that in conscience they could accept to sit on a committee that had terms of reference that they cannot accept. I never sat on a committee on Shared Services, because I refused to sit because I could not accept those terms. I certainly will go along with my honourable friend on that. Certainly I'll sit on this one if I'm asked. I would be very pleased to sit on this one, very pleased, very pleased. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know what my honourable friend's point is. I don't know what it is; I don't think he knows himself, but nevertheless I would say I would be very pleased to accept.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something else that I wanted to quote. My honourable friend, also from Inkster, took the First Minister to task on another thing, and apparently the First Minister had said that for 80 years or so governments had been trying to give some recognition to this, and I think the facts are there, resolution after resolution was brought in, Shared Services was brought in, and my honourable friend is not consistent because this is what he said: "The Premier assumes that for 80 years we have been dying to find our way to give aid to private schools," and then talking about Shared Services, after saying this is not the case, that it's the other way round, they've been trying to prevent aid but then he says: "There were many of us at the time", talking about Shared Services, "who said this was a subterfuge to give aid to private schools." So he can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. I think that this is something that should be determined.

Now I would like to leave my honourable friend; I'd like to mention now some of the red herrings that I figured he brought in, and I hope that my honourable friend will be able to listen to this with the intent that I give it, and maybe we could debate on this. First of all, there's this question, the famous question of separation of church and state, and this has been misunderstood for years. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, is it your wish that I carry on, or the wish of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't know, Sir, precisely what time the honourable member commenced his address. Assuming it was approximately 4:05 that would be 25 minutes, another what? Fifteen minutes. If the honourable member could indicate whether he intends to speak more than just - or less than 5 minutes, we may be inclined to carry on. If it's clearly 10 or 15 minutes, or more, I think we would probably adjourn.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that what I have to say as far as I am concerned is quite important, and it probably will take more than five minutes so I'm at the - I'll go along with the House. I would like to ask leave if it's the wish, but I was going by what the First Minister said. I'm in the hands of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if it's a question of 10 minutes or so, I don't think that there would be any indisposition to allow my honourable friend to carry on. There's no set time for the . . . Let him make his contribution uninterrupted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to thank members of this House.

I was talking about separation of church and state and I would say that those opposing aid are anxious to cite the first amendment, the first amendment of the American Constitution on Separation of Church and State. They adopt it as their own without understanding the intent of it. They confuse between means and principle, between the wall of separation and the preservation of religious freedom, and, Mr. Speaker, the reverse was the intent. The wall of separation between church and state is only a means to preserve individual freedom of conscience. The state may not compel any form of religious observance. This does not however prevent all co-operation between church and state. Thomas Jefferson in 1882 in a letter to the Danbury Baptist stated, and I quote, "It cannot be urged too strongly that the basic phrase is not the wall of separation between church and state but the preservation by government of freedom or religion." You see separation was never intended as an end in itself but rather as a means to preserve the basic liberty, Mr. Speaker. Freedom of religion as a means to guarantee the ultimate liberty, that is the ultimate freedom of religion. Separation ordinarily promotes religious freedom and is essential so long as it does and only so long. The new world was

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) populated by people coming from all the diverse European countries and in most of these countries there was, or had been, a state church. This could not be in America with so many different diverse people, or the freedom of religion of all minorities would not be safeguarded. It is because there is confusion of ends and means that we are now infringing on the liberties of parents and children. And then a lot was said about this business of aiding the church or promoting a certain religion. Where here again there is a complete misunderstanding on this and that is the reason why I say that so many oppose it.

The aid or financial assistance should certainly not be directed to a school or to a religion but rather to the child and the parent of the child, and I certainly, Sir, endorse the principle of parental rights in education and also the equality of education for all. I know that we have another bill in front of us, and you've allowed a bit of latitude in that, we have something on censorship, and I know there'll probably be a debate soon on people that believe in parental rights even if it's something that is definitely obscene, in every extreme case but they say, who are you to tell the parents what they should do, if they want their children to see the smut - some of these same people don't believe that there should be parental rights in education. I can't follow their thinking at all.

Now there's another red herring that the honourable member said, he said, well if this is the case then you should agree with all, that you should promote all the religions; you should help give grants to any schools, or finance any schools when requested, and he did get some people on this, and they said no I would not go for communist schools, and right away they were stuck, and my honourable friend said that he would have trouble going to a fascist school but this is a red herring. These schools, the private schools, and I say they are not necessarily religious schools, they are private schools, and these schools are open now. We agree, the Department of Education, the Department of Education will decide what curriculum is to be accepted or not. So I don't think that this is at issue here at all if you do recognize certain parental rights.

I think that the main thing that we forget that the object of education process is of the child. The education of the child is not only the right but the duty of the parents, and the school is only a means to educate that child, because you can't open a school in every house, in every home. We have talked about equal opportunity for all children; some will argue that this exists. But, Sir, it is not the case. Some will compare the situation of taxpayers, and my honourable friend from Logan did. They say that some don't own cars but pay their share of the highway construction expense, but this is a poor comparison because no province has a compulsory driving law, but every province has a compulsory education law and every taxpaying parent is compelled to send the child to some school. If they exercise their freedom of religion to send their children to a non-public school and they say that that freedom is there, then they must pay taxes to support the education of other children in public schools and must also pay the additional burden of paying the educational expenses of their own children in a non-public school. This highlights I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the injustice of it all. Those who in the exercise of their freedom of religion choose one way of educating their children rather than another, are deprived of property and denied the equal protection of the law precisely because of their religious conviction. They are faced with an unfair deprivation of constitutional liberty, and they are given an unfair choice, perhaps unwittingly, but nevertheless an unfair choice. They can exercise freedom of religion and pay heavily for the exercise of this constitutional freedom, or they can present the unfair burden of the loss of their property by surrendering their freedom of religion and using public school contrary to their religious convictions. When people have no money for bread it is useless to speak of their freedom being cake, Mr. Speaker. I say that the freedom of religion in this way is being taxed out of existence.

We say the teaching of religion - well what is religion? What is religion? Here again there are many misunderstandings; many feel that religion is mainly belief in a god and the reciting of prayers, but I think that you can find religion that's faith, belief, conviction, inspiration of the heart and reason. It could even be belief in socialism - to some people in this House this is a religion. Belief in freedom, and for some religion is belief in material things only, although this might not be called religion, the important thing is that religion cannot, and it should not be divorced from everything else. It's impossible, Mr. Speaker. It is what motivates us. It is therefore impossible to separate religion as I've just defined with the rest of education, and it's false to say that schools can be neutral. Now this is a point that's really false, how can you have a neutral school? You either have the kind of school that my honourable friend from Inkster wants, where material values are the important thing, a secular education, or you have

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) the kind of education when they talk about creation and they talk about the creator, and so on, and if we haven't the right to choose that kind of education for our people, there's something wrong, and let no one, Mr. Speaker, in this House say that they have neutral schools, this is not true. This is not possible at all.

A Christian school is not a school in which students are segregated - they have other schools in other parts of Canada, and I don't think they are less tolerant than we are, such as my honourable friend from Logan would seem to indicate - in a school where God is truth, is life, and integrated into the entire curriculum and life of the school - and I'm sure you can say the same thing about a Jewish school. Many who do not believe in the Judeo Christian principle talk about wanting a neutral school but as I said, this is impossible. Some people in conscience, and this is the important thing, in conscience could not accept this kind of a neutral education which is faced with the impossible task of explaining to youth his origin without mentioning his creator, of instilling into youth a high purpose without mentioning his ultimate purpose, of teaching truth without excluding truths' very source, as far as some people see it. I am not saying that my honourable friend is wrong in the kind of education he wants; what I'm saying, he might feel that I'm wrong but damn it I should have the right to make that decision the same as he has, and I think that the minority certainly has their rights here in society, and when we talk about tolerance, this is tolerance. Tolerance is not just do what I say you should do, don't rock the boat, and if you fight for certain rights which you believe, then you're intolerant, I don't think that this is it at all. Again my honourable friend from Logan referred to certain countries, well all right well this is wrong; there's trouble in certain countries, in Ireland, and Biafra, in Vietnam, in Korea, in the Congo, everywhere without exception, Sir, it is caused where there is intolerance, where a majority, or a group, tries to impose its belief, its religion, its language, on others. That's where it is, you cannot fuse people together when they want their freedom. Those that say that they are intolerant, they are intolerant when you do not see, when you try to look at things from your eyes and say, all right, this is it, I believe in parental rights in everything, but in education, the State is supreme. As far as I'm concerned, Sir, the State is not supreme, the State is there to help, to do things that the people cannot do by themselves. This is the way it was started. It's impossible for every one of us to be a contractor, a builder, a teacher, a doctor, so we delegate these duties in society and they are supposed to - we give them that right, everyone of us. These rights come from somebody higher up than the State, and I think that this is an important thing.

Of course freedom of our citizens, freedom of religion, I think that we should have these options. And I believe, sincerely believe, that this can be done without destroying, without harming, our public school system, and this is one of the things we are asking this committee to look at. I think that rather than that it would help . . . it must. My honourable friend mind you who was against Shared Services felt that it had gone too far, and correct me if I'm wrong, and I'm certainly not criticizing him for that, but I think that his own child was at a place that received Shared Services, and which is supposed to be a school, a religious school. So I think that he must feel that there's that kind of education that is not harming the public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is referring to my child, my child attended not only such a school, but a private school, for which we paid his tuition.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well this is fine. That proves my point that these schools aren't that bad. If my honourable friend believes that they're good enough for 'his child, and I said that maybe they paid, and this is not the point, I think he's entitled to the things that I'm demanding now, but it's true that St. Boniface College certainly profited, certainly received some help from the government under Shared Services, so he took advantage of that, and this is not wrong, I'm not quarreling with that at all. And as I said I don't think that this will destroy the school system. It hasn't done so in other provinces. I think that it would make it stronger and I think that it's possible, now I believe that maybe we'll find a way that will be possible to have this in the school system. Of course if there's no intent to opening all kinds of schools - this is the next we've done that's going to destroy it. The same thing was done in this same House with the --(Interjection)-- Thank you, Mr. Speaker - the same thing was done here when we talked about French as a teaching language. Well it hasn't destroyed anything, and there are certain safeguards, Sir, were put in the act, and I think we've lived with it. Now is it so bad? How can anybody except of course somebody - and I don't fault them for it - as I said, somebody that definitely do not want any State aid at all felt - in fact they feel that there's too much now,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . they have no choice. But how can anybody else who has any doubt, how can they refuse to let a committee come in and to see if we could work something in our own public school system that will do two things. Recognize parental rights, recognize parental rights, people that believe certain things in conscience, that this is not only their responsibility is their own duty, their obligation, to guide their children -- there's too many that don't give a damn where the kids are going these days. And some people are in conscience -- it doesn't matter if they are poor or rich, they feel that they haven't the right. They might be wrong, they might be damn fools, but in this society they should have the right to exercise that right of parental rights. And then what about equality of education for the children? Let's take an example of a certain person that all his friends are going to Kelvin, his friends are going to a public school -- maybe I shouldn't mention any school -- and his parents are forcing him, so they are forcing him to go to another school. What is the equal opportunity of education because the difference between the two in financing is so great, is so great that you are getting in certain things, that you are getting so much inferior teaching because of the high cost of -- (Interjection)-- I beg your pardon . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm talking about inequality in the same -- either in a rural area of Manitoba, comparing it to the same people in rural Manitoba, or I'm comparing this to the Greater Winnipeg area, and I'm saying that there's a school, and I've seen schools, and I've seen public schools and I've seen private schools, and I've seen what the kids in private schools had to do without because of conviction of their parents, because of their . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DESJARDINS: My honourable friend can make his speech after, I'll listen, but I don't know what he's talking about when he's talking about rural Manitoba; I'm talking about public schools and private schools no matter where, no matter where you find them, no matter where you find them. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that when we've talked about tolerance, this is tolerance. It's to be able to see things through other people's eyes, not the way we want them to see. And it's not tolerance when we say to them "don't rock the boat". If you don't agree with the majority you're rocking the boat, you're a troublemaker. I think that we have to see the way these people are looking at it and if we were tolerant -- I understand that there was tolerance shown in committee when there was a bill, a labour bill brought in. We accepted, we accepted certain things that was in the conscience of people -- and I don't know who brought this in, I understand this was agreed, and this is good. Can we do less here? And some people are going to talk, are going to talk about in the Censor Bill about the rights of parents, parental rights, can we do less here? Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the honourable members that they should allow this resolution to go. There's a lot of steps, they won't be forced into anything else, and anything they don't want to do. There will be a report of this committee, and then, only then, will there be legislation if it's so recommended, and I certainly hope that my honourable friends will support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour, House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was agreed that the Committee on Agriculture and also the Committee on Law Amendments would meet following the adjournment of the House; it was for 4:30. We've gone beyond that hour; may I respectfully remind both committees that they do not of necessity need to adjourn at 5:30 if it is the inclination of the committee, respective committees, to continue, and also that the Committee on Law Amendments, and if indeed necessary, the Committee on Agriculture will meet this evening at approximately 8:00 o'clock to carry through their deliberations without any time limit being imposed upon them, so that they may complete their hearings.

With that idea in mind, Mr. Speaker, and also the fact that the House will meet tomorrow morning, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning (Wednesday).