

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfild, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SMELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Viriden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, February 21st, 1961.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, just as you called it 5:30 I was going to say that insurance companies that carry health insurance plans are there for a profit angle. They're not there for a humanitarian angle at all. They are there for the money they can make. They hope you stay healthy so that the premium they make, they'll keep. And with the private insurance company they have so many deterrent charges in most of their plans, so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that we don't believe that private insurance companies could take over the health problems of the people of the province, the people of Canada.

Earlier in my speech, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the cost of drugs and I said I wouldn't bore the House with the list of names of the different drugs. On reflecting I thought perhaps I better mention a few, because the ones I had mentioned was aspirins, and somebody would say, "Well, what the heck. What are aspirins?" Well they're cheap. But I'll try and read these out, Mr. Speaker, and they're taken from the same article that I was reading before. I'll try and twist my tongue around them because they've sure got some fancy names here - Benezdrine tablets cost \$36 a thousand under the branded drug name; under the generic name, and I won't try and pronounce this one, \$3.50 per thousand; Bexedrine Sulphate, \$35 a thousand, \$2.80 under the generic brand name; Equinol or M..... tablets, \$81 a thousand and only \$17.50 under the generic name. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that I won't list any more of the drug names. I think that's sufficient proof that the drug business should be taken out of the hands of drug companies and brought in under a national health scheme.

Mr. Speaker, if I might just take another minute or two to try and convince some of the skeptics that say that national health plans don't work, I'd like to read from the Packinghouse Worker of February 2, 1961 on the health insurance in Great Britain. In its December 20th issue, Look carried a powerful article which provides an overwhelming "yes" to the question "Does socialized medicine work in Britain?". The article written by Edward M. Cory, the magazine's European editor, riddles every charge that the American Medical Association, the Doctor's Lobby, has levelled against the British health system. Then the article explains that the British health system has been in effect for 12 years and every independent survey has found it to be an overwhelming, almost a unanimous popular success. It is financed partly by payroll deduction. The worker pays 27¢ a week towards the system; the employer adds another 6-1/2¢ for each employee; while the self-employed person pays 31¢. For this small weekly sum the family is offered virtually complete medical, surgical, hospital and other related services. The only extra charges are token sums for drugs. The national treasury through general taxation foots the rest of the cost of the system.

Continuing, Cory refutes another A. M. A. charge that fights the fact that the comprehensive British system costs only about 3% of the gross national product in Britain. Summing up, writer Cory says the British national health scheme has crossed out the financial factors in doctor-patient relationship; has meant the fair distribution of health for all classes regardless of income. It has done wonders in distributing physicians more equally around Britain. It has resulted in a big increase in the number of students taking up medicine; and finally, it has brought order out of chaos in the British hospital system. The crucial choice the British have made, Cory concludes, is to place health on the list of essential services just as we do with education, sanitation, water supply, police forces and armed forces. It's a life and death matter, the British say, and they have acted accordingly; and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the day isn't too distant when we, too, will take the same stand. Thank you very much.

MR. WALTER WIER (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I find myself taken by surprise tonight, as much as probably most of the members of the House, because up until fairly late this afternoon it had not been my intention, Sir, to rise and congratulate you on resuming your post, which you handle so capably, at this Session. I had not counted either on congratulating the mover and seconder of the Reply and Address to the Speech from the Throne; nor had I counted on welcoming that charming lady who now represents Pembina. But owing to the charges of insincerity that were thrown around this Chamber this afternoon I came to the conclusion that maybe I should stand up and sincerely congratulate all you people and sincerely make a few

(Mr. Wier, cont'd.)....other comments.

I sincerely suggest to you, Sir, that there is nothing wrong with the amendment that was made by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. I sincerely suggest that he could not possibly have put that amendment on to the end of the amendment that was made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. One would have defeated the other. You cannot enact the one scheme while still knocking down the Public Debt in cutting costs and doing all of the various things that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition accuses us of. I would like to suggest, with all due deference to the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye who, according to press releases and news broadcasts, feels that he has the qualities that are required as one to lead that grand old Liberal Party in Manitoba, I feel, Sir, that if he is as qualified as he appears to be -- I think that he has those qualities -- I think that he has the opportunity tonight to show exactly how he stands on this matter of prepaid or comprehensive health scheme. I do not feel that the argument that he used this afternoon for approving it and for following the leader, so to speak, holds water. He indicated, Sir, that he intended, before some meeting that is coming up I understand in April, that he intended to traverse the Province of Manitoba; speak in all 57 constituencies; and talk about the program that he has in mind. Mr. Speaker, might I humbly suggest that the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye save his time, his gas and his breath. There is only one person that is going to benefit and that is the Provincial Treasurer, from the gas tax that he is going to use, unless he proves this evening that he is as sincere on this comprehensive health plan as he has indicated that he is. Now the excuses, I feel, are weak. There is an old line of Shakespeare that I thought might bring things to mind, and it says: "There is a tide in the affairs of man that, taken at its height, leads on to fortune." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the tide is approaching. It is about time for the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye to make up his mind; to decide which horse he is riding. I would suggest, Sir, that tonight he has the opportunity, to coin a phrase that was used on Friday night last, to "jerk the rug from under Doug". Thank you.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate you in your high office, and they tell me that you will mellow with age. I am just hoping that since the last session you have mellowed to a nice golden hue. I also congratulate the mover and seconder on their fine replies to the Throne Speech because, Sir, it is quite difficult for a government backbencher to give government policy or criticize a government, so it is very difficult for him to say very much. I would like to welcome the new member for Pembina, and I believe it is a great honour and privilege for her to hold a Seat formerly held by the Honourable the late Maurice Ridley and originally held by her late husband, and I'm sure she will be an asset to this House.

Now, Sir, I have heard enough about the comprehensive health plan, for and against, and I'm just wondering what we are afraid of. Also, I wonder where the forward and eager look of the Conservative Party is. It's just, I believe, that somebody shifted into reverse gear and locked the gears and they're going backwards. A friend of mine, Mr. Speaker, was over in England this year and he met the Minister of Health and Welfare. Naturally he is a strong Conservative, being a member of the Cabinet. Twelve years ago that same member stood up in the House and voted against a similar plan that we are discussing here tonight. A very good friend of his, this summer, happened to move to Toronto -- a strong Conservative; a good friend of his; a good mechanic, tool and die-maker. What happened? His wife got sick. It cost in the vicinity of 2 or 3 thousand dollars. He had to move back to England. He couldn't afford to live in Canada. So he said to my friend, he said, "The sooner you fellows get a comprehensive health plan into Canada the sooner my friends and Englishmen can move to Canada, otherwise they can't afford to live in Canada."

One of our newest nations in the world, the State of Israel; they've got a comprehensive health plan that supplies everything from eye glasses, teeth -- everything. It don't cost the people a cent. It's all done from state funds. And what are we afraid of here? I'll give you some of my own experiences, Mr. Speaker, whether we are afraid of losing this plan or whether we are going to hang on to it. Last summer my wife suffered with gallstone attacks and I believe she suffered for about three weeks before I got her into a hospital. I pay a semi-private plan, not that I'm complaining about paying, maybe I'm fortunate I can pay, but nevertheless I pay, and couldn't get her into a hospital. This fall she suffered a kidney ailment. It's too bad

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.)....my friend the Honourable Member for Elmwood left -- he was over there a couple of times -- for over two weeks I couldn't get her in a hospital -- Semi-private plan.

This afternoon I had the opportunity of speaking with the Minister of Health and Welfare. I went to see him about a man, a pioneer of this country, 89 years old --89 years old, remember that -- pioneer -- King George Hospital -- his son had been informed there's no room for him --there's no room for him. He can't afford to take him home because they'd have to pay \$12 a shift, at least, for a nurse. To take him in a Nursing Home it would cost him in the vicinity of \$250 a month. This gentleman, he earns about \$300 a month, and I informed the Minister he's willing to pay at least \$4 a day, \$120 a month in any Nursing Home; but the Nursing Homes we have, they don't provide medical care. Right now, thanks to the Minister, he's taken this case under advisement -- I don't know where we're going to get.

Last night after the House prorogued I went home; had a phone call. My mother's a widow, she lives alone. Had a phone call my mother slipped -- accident -- so naturally I phoned my sister; nobody at home; nobody there. I enquired around the hospitals and found out she was taken to the Victoria General Hospital, the only one she could get in. I enquired from the clerk, "What room is she in?" I couldn't understand at that time a kind of slight smirk and she said: "On the second floor." So I said to the wife, "Let's go on the second floor and see." She was on the second floor all right gentlemen. She was on the second floor, in a hallway, and she stayed there all night like a doormat in the hallway. This morning I went there and there was no room in the hospital, so I took her home. Is that the type of plan we're afraid of losing? And I'm paying a semi-private. So I believe, Sir, that I don't think we have nothing to be afraid of, nothing to lose if this is the type of plan that we're afraid of losing and gaining another plan. Well I say let's lose it right now because we have nothing to lose, Sir.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'm very much like the Member from Minnedosa in this case because -- nor did I intend to enter in this discussion at this stage and I will save my congratulations for a little later. But I must say that his comments have prompted me to getto myfeet because, after having listened to the speeches on this particular sub-amendment, I find that my honourable friends across the way have still to let us know how they feel about this issue. We did get a little closer to it this afternoon when the Honourable Member for Wellington gave us his theological discourse and I gathered, through the material that was coming forth this way, that he was opposed to any scheme of medical coverage for the Province of Manitoba. I must say, however, that in the comments of my honourable friend from Minnedosa I was unable to discern where he stood. And on reading carefully the second installment of the serial of my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, unfortunately I was only able to catch the first installment on Friday due to previous commitments, I can't find there either what his stand happens to be in this matter. He spoke at great length about the hospital plan; gave us all the reasons as to why he had to increase the rates; but said not a word about a medical plan. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, exactly where these honourable gentlemen stand? I expect they will vote against the sub-amendment. That's fine. That is normally to be accepted in the parliamentary system. This is a non-confidence motion in their government, but does that at the same time mean that they are opposed to such a scheme? When my honourable friend picks on the Member for La Verendrye and says let him get up and vote for it if he is for it. Well the fact is that my honourable friend, as a number of others on this side, have said that we are in favour of such a plan. We were at Ottawa -- in spite of what my friend from St. John's has to say we were there -- a number of us were in the caucus that settled on this particular issue of the medical plan. We know the details of it, in spite of what my honourable friends of the CCF have to say, and we have got up here and said that we are in favour of it, but that the mechanics that my honourable friends choose to use are designed particularly to make sure that we don't vote for it in this particular manner, and in spite of what -- laugh if you may -- laugh if you will -- all I suggest is that you find out what the rules of the House are. My honourable friend the Attorney-General proved to us yesterday that he doesn't even know the rules himself, which he proceeded to write last year. I suggest that he read them further. The fact is we are in favour of the plan that we enunciated at our rally. That plan is quite clear. It is in detail, It's not the type of plan that my honourable friends over here are suggesting apparently, but they haven't come out yet with a

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.)...suggestion of what they will do. They talk about a plan. They don't tell us what it is. They don't tell us how it is going to be financed, but they do say they are in favour of the principle. So are we. I am asking my honourable friends across the way now, exactly where do you stand?

..... Continued next page

MR. SCHREYER: I don't suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I could, like my honourable friend from Ste. Rose, say that I hadn't intended to speak. I really wasn't sure whether I would or not. However, I thought that in the event of further jockeying for position on the part of my friends to the right, I should be at least somewhat prepared. At the outset, let me offer customary congratulations to you, Sir, to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and to the new member in this Assembly. I, like the Member for Minnedosa, make this wish with all sincerity.

After having listened to the speech of the Leader of the Official Opposition, I felt that there was, in part, something that we in this group could certainly go along with. We feel, like he, that there has been perhaps a little bit too much in the way of promising and too little in the way of backing up the promises with concrete action. However, almost in the same voice, I must hasten to add that at least there has been action to some extent from the government opposite and I think that the people of Manitoba should be, to some extent, grateful that there was a change of government in 1958. I say this with conviction and I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Preaching for a call, Ed?

MR. SCHREYER: I wouldn't worry about that. One thing specifically that I felt the Leader of the Opposition had struck home on was to the effect that the many and various speeches made by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- it was a good deal of high-flown oratory; a good deal of promises of good things to come; but, in effect, very little action on the part of that department. And I refer to page 20 of Hansard, where the Leader of the Opposition is saying that he is quoting from the Throne Speech, and I quote: "My Ministers will recommend the establishment of a committee in Manitoba's economic future to study and report on measures necessary to maximize economic development.". Now, Mr. Speaker, this is precisely the kind of talk that we have been getting from that Honourable Minister for the last three years, and very little has materialized. I would ask, at this time, if the Honourable Minister intends, and I am sorry that he is not in his seat, but I would ask him if he intends to set up a study committee to study the studies that he has called for and to study them studiously. I think that he could certainly take those words seriously, even though I might appear to voice them rather facetiously at this time. I think that we must watch our honourable friend a little more closely. I recall well the first session held under the aegis of this present administration, when the Minister was making a glowing speech referring to a big, huge, grand Northern development scheme.

MR. SPEAKER: The question under debate is the amendment to the amendment, not a long speech dealing with

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable the Attorney-General just two days ago -- (Interjection) -- Oh, in that case I -- if that is the case then I shall try and limit myself to the things -- I shall try and stick to the sub-amendment which we offered and I shall

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the point of order, no doubt what the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is coming to is that he is going to make the point that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce likely has a study going on Health Insurance.

MR. SCHREYER: Now that could well be, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that I wasn't in this Chamber when you brought in your ruling. I was, however, going on the basis of what you and the Attorney-General had been saying yesterday; namely, that you would allow latitude. Now if there has been some change of view, I shall then attempt, Mr. Speaker, to stick to the sub-amendment as closely as did the Honourable Member for Wellington, and you know how closely he stuck to the terms of the sub-amendment.

I do have, Mr. Speaker, a good deal to say on the subject of the accusation made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding election bribery and patronage. However, in view of the fact that you will rule me out of order on that, I shall proceed to other things. I also had wanted to deal with the matters pertaining to Crop Insurance, etc., but there too, I shall wait for another opportunity. I would say, however, to those who have got up in this Chamber and said that the time is not now right to establish in principle the idea of a comprehensive medical plan, I would say to them that certainly there is nothing wrong, it's not ill-timed to establish the principle now, because even if we do, action will not follow for 18 months, two

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.).... years from now. And surely by then the economic recession will have passed. Or does the Honourable Member for Selkirk think that it still will be with us two years hence?

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Sir, I never — I told the House that I accepted the principle, but I said the time was not right to establish the plan.

MR. SCHREYER: This sub-amendment, I think, asks for the establishment of the principle more than it calls for the establishment of the plan. Take the initiative in proposing is what it says right in the sub-amendment. Well, in any case I dare say that my friends to the right are hard pressed for an answer as to how they shall stand on this rather important question -- rather hard pressed. And I dare say that it must be uncomfortable to jockey for position and try and ride astride a razor-back hog, because if they slip the result shall be uncomfortable. In any case we shall watch with interest.

Enough has been said in this Chamber about the mechanics of the scheme itself. I think that my colleagues here presented that adequately and well. I would like, however, to make the following points. First of all, surely all of you here are aware that under present voluntary medical plans there is no coverage or provision for people suffering from congenital disease. This is a hardship to many. Secondly, there is a vacuum in fact existing with all those people who are in the post-retirement age. They belong to a voluntary medical scheme which covers them while they are in their years of employment, but at time of retirement they lose the benefit of this and are unable, in almost all cases, to qualify as individuals. I mentioned this third point, Mr. Speaker, last year. However, I repeat it again because I think it is worth repeating, and that is that those people who require medical care most are those who can afford it least -- the large families, people with income insufficient to guarantee adequate nutrition and so on. This usually brings with it a measure of less than good health which requires medical care. They are the ones who can't afford it. I don't think it will be too much of a surprise to honourable members to note that in Canada just a little less than one third of the people, wage earners, earn less than the amount which would require them to pay income tax. I would venture to say that at least one-quarter to 30% of the citizens of this country often try to skimp to save money, oft times at the expense of not having medical care when they should have it. I'm not saying that this is as serious as might seem at first glance because if they're obviously ill and they know it they will go to a doctor whether they can pay or not, and I think doctors will insist that this is so and I know that they take pride in the fact that they do help out those people who often can't afford it. But nevertheless, the method of the modus operandi in which we are today, insofar as health coverage is concerned, is less than adequate for a nation which has one of the highest standards of living; one of the highest gross national products per capita in the world. Look at our neighbor to the south. This citadel of free enterprise, as the Member for Wellington would mention, is now embarking and has a brain trust working on the matter of providing medical care for the aged, comprehensively, and to a little greater extent than the Medicare card system that we have in effect here now. These things, Mr. Speaker, are inevitable. We make no apology for the fact that we have re-introduced this time and time again. This year it seems as though we find other groups somewhat embarrassed because they find that their more progressive counterparts in other provinces at the National Rally have put them on an embarrassing spot.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of ado was raised about the fact that we had deleted the entire amendment to the Address and Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Last year it was couched in different terms and we could add to it without going against our own thinking in these matters, but this year the Leader of the Opposition and his group saw fit to bring in an amendment which, in effect, criticizes the government for adding to the provincial debt and for spending. Now according to the Honourable Member for River Heights, we in the CCF don't know very much about economics; but I think we know enough to realize that in times of recession, certainly when a government does take the initiative to find the pump, to put it perhaps in oversimplified terms, that's hardly something that they should be criticized for. The Leader of the Liberal Party nationally says and advocates himself that in times of recession sometimes it is necessary to budget for a deficit, to spend to a greater degree than incoming revenue. And so certainly we feel justified in emasculating the amendment because we certainly don't support it. Is this so surprising? This was done not with any direct intention, any intention

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.)..... to put them on the spot, so to say. We did it because we simply don't agree that this is the idea or principle upon which we should vote against the government. This isn't the most important thing by far.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, would you rule me out of order if I propose to deal with some of the remarks made by two of the golden boys from across the way here? I notice that both of them took us to task for certain of our beliefs, certain of our statements. We had a dissertation in theology this afternoon and the honourable member wasn't ruled out of order, so you'll allow me to continue?

MR. SPEAKER: It's rather difficult to make a decision when you don't know the subject the member intends to speak on.

MR. SCHREYER:Mr. Speaker, actually, if one were to look at what I have to say with a fairly, shall I say fairly broad-minded view, and I'm sure you have a broad-minded view, then you'll allow me to continue, because it has to do with progress and progress has to do with bringing more services to the people of this country, to wit: medical insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: You may go ahead but I reserve the right to call you to order if you overstep the line.

MR. SCHREYER: Well this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, we were given a dissertation on the evils of socialism and the unchristian character of socialism. According to the member it has a repressive influence on individual character and so on and so forth. These are views of reaction, Mr. Speaker. They were held fifty years ago. I doubt that anyone can hold them with justification today. I happen to have been reading this afternoon a speech made by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Honourable the First Minister which they made in 1958 when they sat over there. Both of them took a great deal of time to come out asking for a greater amount of regulation by the Public Utility Board; regulation which would protect the consumer and avoid unjust pricing by the Natural Gas Company. This is regulation; this is an amount of socialism; this is precisely what the member for Wellington was protesting against. It would seem that there is divergence of opinion on socialism across the way. Do we want the kind of society where common good is sacrificed for ragged individualism, the kind that we had a hundred years ago? Apparently this is what the honourable member opposite wishes. Do we want the kind of society that is based on the law of the jungle, where the weakest perish and the strong survive? What is the concern of Christianity Mr. Speaker? It's the concern of helping our brethren, and with this in view I think that Christianity is a teacher and that it teaches us to have compassion for our brethren and to take whatever steps are necessary to help them. It means more than just talking, it means this, that people should be willing to take government as a social instrument. Government is a social instrument.

MR. SPEAKER: I fail to see where the honourable member is talking about health insurance.

MR. SCHREYER: I'll come around to that in about thirty seconds.

MR. SPEAKER: Well make it soon.

MR. SCHREYER: It's this, Mr. Speaker. All those who oppose socialism so violently obviously fail to realize -- those who fear government so greatly obviously fail to realize that government is nothing more than a social instrument of the people which they may use to help themselves, if necessary, in the fight against entrenched privilege and against power and vested interest. We need regulation in today's economy because it is no longer economy based on the family unit. It's more sophisticated. Things are too complex. We can't afford to leave things to chance. We must depend upon regulation for the common good. Members opposite called for it. Why stand in the way of progress? Why get up and spout puerile effusions about the dangers of governments doing things? Why criticize a health scheme which will be designed to take care and help people take care of their health needs, simply because Legislative Assemblies are the place at which they are initiated? I say to all members that they have an important choice to make. Are they going to vote against a comprehensive medical scheme for the fifty or is it fifteenth time in a row? Or are they going to now wake up to the times and become as alive as their national counterparts and the National Rally and support our amendment?

In closing, Mr. Speaker I would like also to take exception with those who have not so much criticized as poured abuse, to be blunt, poured abuse upon our group for our stand in this

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.)....issue. We have taken this stand consistently for years. We are not now changing our stand -- they are. If not now they will be a year or two from now. And so to laugh and say that we in this group do not know much about economics, we don't know much about the practicality of government, I say to them it's we who have been consistently on the paths on many of these requirements and it's they who seem blindfolded, and all of a sudden they change their mind and they think that all is well. That is because we realize that in so doing, in calling for medical insurance, in calling for certain needed departures in our economic system that we may be too far ahead of public opinion, consequently we lose it. We lose the support. But in the end, who has done more for the people of a nation, the group that has allowed itself to be led or the group that leads? And in the words of Bruce Hutchison, has done more to see the kind of things that wanted done in this land than any other political movement. And Bruce Hutchison is not or has not been a known CCF'r. I would like to say that when we have advocated this it has not been out of a sense of political jockeying, but out of a sense of realization that sooner or later this would be done and that it was needed. And when this summer comes around and the New Party comes into being, then no longer will my friends to my right be dealing with a relatively weak movement, but rather with a movement that has surging and powerful possibilities, and well may they persevere.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? Would the honourable member agree that by voting in favour of the sub-amendment presently under discussion that we would be automatically voting against the main amendment?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand that.

MR. MOLGAT: In voting against the sub-amendment presently under discussion, if he will read the sub-amendment and the amendment, would he not agree that we are automatically voting against the amendment?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question this way. It could be technically, that by voting for this sub-amendment they would be voting in fact against their own amendment, but here is one way you could have shown to the province and to this Assembly how you stood simply by indicating in your speeches you were in favour of it. You have that opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the Amendment to the Amendment to the Throne Speech moved by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. The Amendment reads as follows: That the amendment be amended by deleting all the words after the word "government", and adding the following: "Has not taken the initiative in proposing a provincial or a Federal-Provincial comprehensive plan of Health Insurance which would provide for the mental, physical and social well-being of the citizens of our province."

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

Yeas: Messrs: Paulley, Gray, Schreyer, Reid, Peters, Harris.

Nays: Honourable Messrs: Roblin, Carroll, Johnson, McLean, Lyon, Thompson, Hutton, Messrs: Lissaman, Shewman, Hryhorczuk, Campbell, Prefontaine, Alexander, Scarth, Martin, Cowan, Groves, Corbett, Tanchak, Hillhouse, Guttormson, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Stanes, Smellie, McKellar, Weir, Johnson, Baizley, Bjornson, Klym, Hamilton, Froese, Dow, Shoemaker, Roberts, Desjardins, Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 6. Nays 38.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for St. Johns, and had I voted I would have voted against the sub-amendment.

MR. A.E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce and had I voted I would have voted for the amendment to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the amendment to the Throne Speech which reads as follows: "But this House regrets that Your Honour's Government, with many of its pre-election promises unfulfilled, has added greatly to the burden of Manitoba taxpayers,

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.)....both Provincial and Municipal, and at the same time has drastically increased the Provincial Debt." Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I find it sometimes amusing, Sir, to listen to the words of congratulation offered by members who rise to speak in this debate. I wish to assure you, Sir, that my words of congratulation to you on your post are quite sincere and hearty and that I have greater confidence in your permanence as Speaker of this House than some who have spoke. I would like at this time to offer my sincere congratulations to the Honourable Member for Arthur and the member for Cypress who moved and seconded the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I can remember the trembling I felt when this honour was mine and I would assure them that they acquitted themselves well in this task. I would like also to say, Sir, how very happy we are to have an addition to the ladies in our ranks in the person of the Honourable Member for Pembina. We are proud that we are the first group to ever have two ladies in this House at the same time.

When first I became interested in the politics of this province, I came several times to sit in the galleries to listen to the debates of this House, and I can remember well thinking that there were certain members of the House who were outstanding in their fields and, of course, at that particular time the positions in the House were reversed and the members who were in prominence at that time were mostly members of the Liberal group. I remember quite well the admiration I felt for the late member for Rhineland, the Honourable W.C. Miller, who was then the Minister of Education. I remember, too, listening to the Member for Carillon who was then also on this side of the House and admiring his Gallic's fervor and his emotional oratory. I remember, too, listening with a great deal of interest to the then Leader of the CCF Party, Mr. Stinson, a very skilled debater. But my impressions at that time were that there was one man on this side of the House then who was perhaps the most outstanding, and I refer to the now Leader of the Opposition. I admired him then for his quiet dignity and what appeared to me to be his unimpeachable integrity and his complete honesty. He appeared to me to be a man who placed political considerations last and he approached every problem in this House with complete honesty, but I'm afraid that when he rose to amend the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne that he did quite a bit to destroy the image which he had previously created. I found that this idol, too, had feet of clay. When he began to talk about the highways program, this sounded very much to me like a "sour grapes" attitude. He said at that time that the road program was still being used for political purposes, and I would thank the Honourable Leader of the CCF for drawing the attention of the House to the fact that he used the words "still being used". We presume that he means that we have profited from the teachings of a very able teacher. If he meant, and I don't think we can take any other meaning from what he said, that this government is using the road program for political purposes, of which I do not admit but deny, then I would suggest to you, Sir, that we had a very able teacher in the person of the Leader of the Opposition.

I would ask him if he would remember what happened during the 1958 election campaign. I remember it very well. This is the first time I have ever said anything about it in public but I think this is a good time to say something about it in public. For years the people of my part of the country had been trying to persuade the government of this province to take over the road then known as the "Turkey Trail" as a Provincial Trunk Highway. Their representations to the government had always been listened to with a great deal of courtesy but they had never met with any success, until suddenly in the middle of the election campaign the announcement was made that the "Turkey Trail" was to become No. 45 highway; and in the middle of the election campaign the crews from the Department of Public Works began to put up the highway signs on the "Turkey Trail". Perhaps that wasn't using roads for political purposes, I don't know. It certainly appeared that way to me. And I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he remembers, in the 1959 election campaign, when he stood on the platform in the town of Birtle and told the electors there that if he was returned as the Premier of this Province the road from Birtle to Shoal Lake would be rebuilt as a first class highway. Perhaps this was not using roads for political purposes. I don't know, but that's the way it appeared to me.

Now, Sir, I have named names; I have given specific instances; and I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to do the same. He stood up in this House and he offered us a ridiculous challenge. He challenged the Minister of Public Works to challenge him to tell this

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.)....House the instances to which he was referring. Well we accept your challenge, Sir. We would ask you to tell this House of these nefarious deeds that you allege. Who said it? What did they say? When did they say it? And who heard it? It has been suggested that we should have a special committee to look into this matter. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, we don't need a special committee. The charge was made in this House. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes to indict this government, then let him produce some evidence. There is no information and we cannot have an indictment without first laying the information. I am quite sure that this House will not accept a trial by innuendo. Perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes us to believe that where there is smoke there is also flame, and if he can raise enough smoke, that somebody will believe there is a flame. Well let's have the smoke, let's get it over with. Let's hear what it is all about so that it can be brought out in the daylight where all can see. Then he went on to speak about flagmen, and I found this rather amusing because last summer I had in my employ a young man who is quite active in the Liberal movement of this province and he made a trip from Russell down to Virden one day over No. 83 highway, which was then under construction, and when he came back he soundly berated me for the fact that he hadn't found any flagmen. Perhaps this is just some more of the confusion in which the Liberal Party seems to find itself at this time.

And then, Sir, he went on to talk about the standards of roads. Well, Sir, when the Liberal Party was the government of the province they commenced the construction of No. 4 highway. To give you some idea of what standards they had, they built the road in sections, with which I have no argument, but within 30 miles from the town of Russell we find roads built to three different standards -- all on the same highway. There are three different widths, three different standards of construction on one highway within 30 miles, within a period of about 4 years. Oh, they were getting better; they were gradually improving. But then he went on to talk about the strip of road from Gladstone to Neepawa, and he told us that because the Honourable Minister, the Minister of Public Works had said that this road was built to a new standard and we expected that this road would last at least 15 to 20 years, that the Honourable Minister was making a mistake; that this was something for which the Honourable Minister should be chided. I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he has driven over that next section of No. 4 highway from Neepawa to Minnedosa that was built by his administration since the war, Sir. Are you proud of that portion of the road? It is less than 15 years old. Do you suggest that this is the standard to which roads should be built? I would suggest, Sir, that we should not chide the Honourable Minister for his modesty and I would certainly expect that the major portion of the road from Gladstone to Neepawa will be in much better condition 15 years hence than the road from Neepawa out of Minnedosa is today. So again, Sir, I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to name the names and tell us when and where these statements were made. Let us have this with complete honesty and let us clear away this cloud that he wishes to raise in this Chamber. Thank you.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other members of this House in congratulating you on the fine way in which you have been carrying out your duties. I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address to the Speech from the Throne as well as the new member on her election to this Legislature.

Sir, most of us have read this editorial from the Winnipeg Free Press, dated December 2nd, 1959. Nevertheless, with your permission, I would like to read it here this evening. "The Royal Commission on Education has opened up a problem which has rent this province's public life on too many occasions in the past. Perhaps it is well that the subject has been brought into the open and can be discussed freely. It must be debated calmly and with candor and every thoughtful citizen, from whatever faith, will hope that those who speak openly about it can do so without beingwith false.....of bigotry and religious bias. If it can be discussed frankly and without rancor and hypocrisy, much will be accomplished whatever the outcome". Sir, I wholeheartedly subscribe to these wordy sentences. but unfortunately, it seems that the Free Press forgot about these commendable thoughts. It is with deep humility that I arise today to make this the most important speech of my short political life. I say with humility, because I feel so inadequate and so unworthy of being a spokesman for this cause. I say most important, not only because it is directly important, so directly vital

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . to so many of my constituents, but also because it is so important for the welfare and the survival of this democratic province, this democratic country. I also feel that it is so important, Sir, for an opposing minority who has seen its rights denied; and this could now be rectified.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable member tell me how he connects up the subject matter with the amendment to the Throne Speech? I can see where he could make the speech on the main motion but

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, the motion mentions that the government did not live up to its promises of the election. The government promised during the election that it would provide equality of educational opportunity and the gentleman's speech is on equality of educational opportunity, and I think that he is well within his rights in speaking to this question at this time.

MR. ROBLIN: I would support the Honourable Member for St. Boniface's right to continue at the moment, because I believe that if he wished he could certainly connect that with the spending of money. Undoubtedly this does work in to this particular aspect of the matter. I wouldn't agree at all with the view put forth by the Member for Carillon because, as he knows well, it is not connected with anything that took place in the last campaign. But I would humbly suggest, Sir, that the honourable member who has launced on this speech should be able to continue because it is obviously a matter of grave importance to him to make it at this moment.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PREFONTAINE: on a matter of privilege, I think that the motion does not mention only the last campaign.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, today, Sir, I would like to speak not as a member of the Liberal caucus but only as a free citizen of a free province in a free country; a citizen of democratic Canada; and if there was a special place in this House where independent members could speak from, this evening I would like to speak from such a place. Sir, I beg the honourable gentlemen here this evening to listen to their conscience. It is not too late. They should remember their oath of office. Let us forget that we are Conservatives, Liberals, and CCF, or should I say -- maybe I should say, remember that you are Conservative, and as one of the ministers said -- the Honourable the Minister of Public Works said not too long ago that you believed that the citizens of this province share authority and that they are not mere subjects living under authority. Remember that Conservatism stands for the defence of the rights of minority. Sir, it is easy to lead when everyone is on our side. There is not much to gain in this, but it is difficult when there is rebellion, although this rebellion is unjust. We have an example in the south of United States where Governor Faubus's political career is assured for a few years, probably, but what will history reserve this man. Wouldn't it be better to admire men such as Judge Wright and others? Many federal judges, saddled with civil rights burdens -- southerners whose personal emotions ran contrary to what their consciences dictated them to do. They acted at great sacrifices of friendship and political hope, but collectively they launched one of the great orderly offensives in legal history. Judge Wright himself a Southerner was born in New Orleans, he had to accept round the clock protection, police protection, an unlisted phone number. Remember that you are Liberal and that Liberalism stands, is proud to stand for the defence of individual rights. Remember that the one Socialist government in Canada is very sensitive to the rights of minorities, to the rights of individuals and that the parochial school rights have been respected and extended in Saskatchewan since the year 1944. It has been suggested that I should not refer to separate schools as Catholic schools, because of course not all separate schools are Catholic schools, and it was felt that I should keep religion away from the subject, but I feel that this is impossible. This I cannot do. I am a Catholic, should I hide the fact, should I be ashamed of this. It has never meant any difference to my friends before and I have very many friends who are not Catholic, and in a democracy I always felt that it was my business, and my business alone. And besides let us be frank if we are going to discuss this. We know that a large majority of those who are opposed to state aid do so because they are afraid of the Roman Catholic Church. It would therefore be hypocrisy on my, it would be hypocrisy on the part of the opponents if we are afraid to mention the word Catholic. I have said Sir, and I still feel that those that are opposed to the state aid fall into

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.)....three categories. One yes, a very small part fortunately, but some are out and out.....and fanatics who are not interested in listening to reason and who do not want justice. Sir, we should not knock them, we should pity this group. Then the second group, they are those who favour some help at least to these schools, who think that maybe there is an injustice, or who never even bothered reading the report at all, but nevertheless some -- some whose only guide would be the political and material advantage to them. I hope that we will not find too many in this House. Now the third group and definitely the largest, composed of well intentioned, honest people, but people that are uninformed. And before I am accused again of mud-slinging, let me say that when I say uninformed or ignorant I don't mean people who are without education, people that are stupid, but people who are unaware of the truths, of the facts, who haven't bothered to read the report, who do not understand the Catholic religion, but in this group there are very many honest and sincere people, and today I would like to appeal to the members of the last two groups. But there are also the newspapers, and if not careful, like segregationist newspapers of the south they can render their province and the people of this province a great disservice. I feel that one of our newspapers in its editorial has done just that, and I can only hope that soon it will realize its great responsibility, realize how much influence it has on its reader and how easy it is to play on their emotions. I know very well how vital a part of society, of democratic society, newspapers are. But because of this great power they should be very just, very charitable, very open-minded, and I don't feel that their main object should be sellin newspapers. Sir, it would be so nice if this motto, "liberty of religion, equality of civil rights" were not an empty word for the Free Press but that this important daily would start defending the principles of democracy.

I feel Sir, that it is the right of the parents to educate their children. I feel that this parental right comes from God and for those that do not believe in God, comes from the natural law. No this right does not come from the state, it is not a constitutional right, only a totalitarian government would claim that it has this right and the duty of a democratic country is to see that these God-given rights are protected, that every free citizen of this country is in a position to take advantage of this natural right. And that is why Sir, I feel that no one can dispute these facts, that the parents are free to select for their children the education they feel will serve them the best, provided of course it is not hurting others, provided of course it is not encroaching on the rights of others, provided of course these teachings are not against our country, against democracy. Is this right of education protected here in Manitoba? Yes and no, Sir. In theory yes. The Catholics are permitted to have their own schools, provided they follow the curriculum set up the the Department of Education. But in practice, what would you say Sir, if you wanted to buy a bottle of milk for your children and you were handed a bottle of whisky. Would it be sufficient to say buy the bottle of whisky and then you buy the milk. You would have this right in theory yes, but where would you stand, especially if you had enough money to buy one bottle. Well this has been going on here for close to seventy years. And what is worse the government is paying more and more money, more of a share of public education, more revenue are needed, more taxes have to be collected. The private schools to compete, to stay on the same footing with these schools will cost a great deal more. Sir, we have reached a point of strangulation. I do not say to you Sir, "believe that I am right, believe that I the Catholic am right, that the teaching of my church is right and that all others are wrong." But I say, that I believe that I am right, that I believe that the teaching of my church is right, and God, if I felt that I wasn't and if the other Catholics felt the same, how fast we would leave this difficult and demanding religion. Would it be just for you to say that you are right, for you to impose your rights on me, your beliefs on me; would it be fair to say that the Catholics are only misguided people or dedicated to the doctrine that their children are different and better than others. Has anyone ever heard a Catholic say that. No our children are not any better, but they are important to us, the same as yours are important to you, and we want the best education possible for our children. Yes, you have probably heard it said that public schools are Godless. But we are not referring to the teachers, we are not referring to the children. We are saying that these schools are Godless because God has not a proper place in these schools, because God is not properly recognized. I do not personally believe in the Protestant Church, in the Salvation Army, nevertheless I have always respected people

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.)....from all these faiths. During the war when I felt lonesome and sad, as happened to most of us, I spent many hours in the Salvation Army Hostel and there I could see the genuine kindness of these people and I certainly respected them, and this is all we want, the same respect from you people as you are entitled to get -- as we are entitled to get. Our religion, our beliefs, our conscience tell us that we must give our children a Catholic education. We might be all wrong, you might think that we're crazy, but nevertheless a great many of us believe this. Why should we be prevented from exercising the right that is rightfully ours?

Now you might say well how could this be rectified, something that has existed for so long without causing a hardship to anyone. Well Sir, a few years ago the then government of this province assisted I believe by the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Leader of this House and with the unanimous consent -- approval, if my information is correct, decided to name a Royal Commission on Education to study all the problems in the education field. Now this Commission was composed of five members of which one was a Catholic, only one although the Catholic population of Manitoba was about one-third. Now these people, every single one of them respected citizens of this province, studied for over two and a half years everything concerning education. They listened to many delegations, they read many, many briefs, I would say that they certainly should qualify as experts, and at the end of two and a half years they brought in a unanimous report. I repeat Sir, a unanimous report. Now most of the first part of their report was immediately implemented by the Department of Education, but Chapter Eleven, the most important one, for a large minority, was not acted upon. Why? Because most of us are politically afraid, because the Premier of this province is politically afraid. It is our duty to be guided by our conscience and our judgment. We should take the trouble to read this Chapter Eleven and it would be wise to let the people of Manitoba know what this Chapter Eleven is all about. In a nutshell it would provide funds, public funds for parochial and private schools but only when these schools were no menace to the existing public school system. Only if these schools should meet the requirements and follow the curriculum of the Department of Education.

Sir, let us now try to enumerate and answer the would-be objections of sincere and honest opponents of this plan. But before doing so it might be well to explain what is a Catholic school. A Catholic school is a Catholic school, a school where all the children are Catholic, where all the teachers are Catholic, where the Catholic religion is taught half an hour or an hour a day? No Sir, if this was the only thing that was necessary to make it a Catholic school I myself would oppose aid to these schools. The Catholics believe that not only during certain periods should you talk about religion but that religion which is after all the relationship between God and man should enter every subject. Sir, it would be difficult for you to teach English literature without speaking of Shakespeare and other authors. Well we believe that the study of nature, for example, should help the child realize that the beauty of the sky, the flowers, the trees, should reveal the beauty of God, and that the sunshine, the thunder, the rain, should proclaim His power, His love and His might. The question is this, do you believe or do you not believe that God exists. If yes, we must admit that God must be the centre of education; if no, we acknowledge that social studies must be the centre of the education picture. We do not wish to force our views on others but we must insist that our right to provide what we believe is the best education for our children should be protected. Another question Sir, is there such a thing as a neutral school? I feel that either we are Christians, Catholics or Protestant, Jews, pagans or atheists, such as Communist and Nazi, but there is no such a thing as a neutral school. If God is excluded well then we are favouring the atheist.

We know that the public schools are definitely a "must". It is definitely impossible to please everyone all at once, but when a large minority are of the same belief, wishes to teach the same belief to their children, why aren't they allowed to do so? Now the objections. Could this be harmful to the existing public school system? As I said a public school is a "must", we definitely recognize that, and nothing should be done to harm it, therefore we agree with the Royal Commission whose wishes are to protect these schools. We feel that these recommendations are justified and I think that you will see if you read chapter X1 on the following pages page 176 of section (e); 177, sub-section (i); 178 paragraph 6; 179 paragraph 9; and 183 paragraph 17.

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.).....Now another objection. This would cause divisiveness. Are we serious? Do we think that the citizens of the eight provinces that do recognize the do we feel that they are more divided, more disunited than the people of this province? Our neighbors to the south have tried to solve everything with this great melting pot of theirs but they are still democrats or republicans, segregationists or anti-segregationists, pro-labor, anti-labor, and there is more juvenile delinquency in the United States of America than any other country. Sir, are we advocating that we should all be conformists, that the state, the government should make all our decisions for us, that it should take all our responsibilities away from us. Is that what we're advocating? Well then we are preaching communism. No, I do not feel that it would be devious. But I feel that if this aid was given it would be beneficial to the province because it would encourage experimentation and diversity in education. But if by saying that the private schools tend to create divisiveness, it has meant that children attending these schools are inclined to have less patriotism, to be less Canadian, to be less interested in the welfare of our country, I'd say that this is not true. I attended private schools all my life Sir, and I was glad to join the Navy and defend my country. Am I less of a patriot? Am I less of a Canadian than anyone here today because I attended these schools? The number one citizen of our country -- has anyone read his biography? Was he less of a patriot, less of a soldier or less of a Canadian because he attended these schools? Did her Majesty the Queen err in naming him to represent her in this fair land of ours? What about the great man, the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent who did so much to unite all the people of our country. The Honourable Sir Wilfred Laurier and others. What about them? Are there many regiments who received more decorations than the Most of the members of this regiment attended the same kind of schools that I attended. Sir, I would say that the separate schools are often more of a social melting pot than public schools because here there is no problem of theneighborhood segregation by race or by income.

Sir, the public schools as such are not acceptable to us. Not that we are any better, but our conscience tell us that we can't rightfully send our children there if we can help it. Now we are not saying to you, teach our way in public schools. We are not saying that. If we did that then we could rightfully be called arrogant, and you can rest assured that if any non-catholics would like to come to our schools they would be most welcome.

I would like to read this short editorial from the Tribune at this time Sir, if possible. "We suppose democracy itself is divided in that it recognizes the rights of minorities to their views. Manitobans rejoice that they live in a country where this kind of divisiveness is recognized and cherished, but the argument that government aid to private schools is divisive is simply not in accord with the facts or with experience. Manitoba is one of the two provinces that does not make such grants at present; surely it would be unrealistic to claim that Saskatchewan where government help is given, is more divided than Manitoba. It would be improper to claim that the protestant school system in Quebec was divided. In England and Wales more than one-third of the schools are voluntary or denominational. Private schools in Scotland are state financed. There is certainly no evidence of disunity in the United Kingdom on this account. The divisiveness argument simply does not stand examination." Another argument; this would be furthering the cause of the Church of Rome, and why should a Protestant pay for the education of catholics. Sir, not too long ago a member of this House asked me that if this aid was given, what percentage would go to Rome. Well for those of us that understand, it is comical; it would be comical if it wasn't so sad. Why this great fear of the catholic religion. Why this question mark in the minds of so many honest, sincere and well intentioned non-catholics. Another gentleman was frank enough to tell me that he was not against financial help to these schools because it was divisive, because it would be harmful to the public school system, but because it would help the catholic church. Are these reasons valid Sir? Are they fair? Let me assure you that the catholic church would not in any way gain financially if this aid was given. I would say that the usual title of it itself: "state aid to private schools is misleading. It gives the impression that a gift is asked, that a group is receiving an unfair privilege. This is why so many Protestants ask: "why should we pay for Catholic schools." This is erroneous. We are only asking that some of our own money should be used for the education of our own children. We pay municipal taxes, provincial and federal taxes. We do not object to this, but we feel that our children are entitled to some of the money earmarked

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . for the education of children in this province. Actually we are entitled to the same amount. We are not second class citizens, but we would be satisfied with what has been recommended by the Royal Commission. We would see no return on our municipal tax, that it be a tax on education, and if we received but a portion of what the government grant other children in this province, this would be acceptable to us -- if we were to receive only half, approximately half of what it costs to educate a child in this province. It would be another safeguard against schools mushrooming all over the province, because I am sure that people who are not completely convinced, whose conscience did not dictate to them that their children should go to these schools will not remove their children from a school where everything is free to send them to another school where they would still have to pay a substantial part of educating their children. And I also feel that they should be ready to make some sacrifice for our convictions, but this is no longer possible, we are being strangled now. Teachers are penalized, the cost of salaries, construction, maintenance, all this is continually rising. Don't forget that to qualify we must meet the standards of these public schools. Not one cent would go to the church; it would be wrong I feel to turn any of this money to the church; it would be wrong I feel to turn any of this money to the church or to any private corporation. I would not agree with this. But right now the opposite is true. The Catholic church at the moment is making a substantial contribution toward educating the children whose parents are contributing to the funds earmarked for education but who do not receive a single cent of this. Don't you think that it is insulting Sir, to hear people run down the teaching Nuns, these dedicated ladies who are performing a labour of love. Most of them qualified teachers receive \$40, \$80, a 100 a month. \$800 a year because they are Nuns where their diplomas, where their degrees entitle them to receive upward of \$4,800.00 if they were teaching in a public school. Does this make sense, Sir? Don't you think that it is unfair to discredit these ladies, especially in this province where we see what the members of these religious orders are doing in the field of hospitalization, and I think that the Honourable Minister of Health would certainly back me on that.

Now there is this question of separation of church and state; where religion as I said is the relationship between man and his God and government is the relationship between man and his neighbor. Now it is inevitable that somewhere along the line they will meet, they will cross. It is impossible to completely divorce church and state, and I think that we must admit that together often they will do a better job than one could do alone. I agree that the state should not establish a religion and especially here in North America that we should not have an official religion. I agree that clergymen should stick to their pulpits and not meddle in party politics and purely political affairs -- problems, and the reason why this separation of church and state has been advocated is that it was rightly felt that no single church should be singled out, should be favored, and that we should have complete freedom of worship. It was never meant that there should be any co-operation between these churches and state and it certainly was never meant that there should be discrimination against any particular church. As this man said; "I am only against this because it would help the catholic church." When a government-- I'm not referring to this government of course -- when a government is contemplating passing unjust and unfair laws well then it would become the affair of the church -- not only the catholic church but any church to step in. The church you see Sir, would not be interfering because then it would be the state that would be observing the right and the responsibility of the church. The catholic church does not intend to interfere in government affairs. Why is it that some Protestants are so worried; why do they feel that they should be the watchdog, self-appointed watch dog of the catholic church? Maybe they should think of their own church, think of their own problems before. The Most Rev. W. F. Barfoot, the former Archbishop of Rupertsland and an eminent citizen of this province, a man, yes, who was afraid of the power of the church of Rome as he says, but nevertheless a man who was frank enough, a man who had enough judgment to warn his fellow Christians, fellow non-catholics, and let me quote if I may from one of his addresses and I quote: "Perhaps it will serve some useful purpose if we explore the real reasons why Protestants are in general opposed to the plan. Underlying their opposition is the feat of the Roman Catholic church. There is really very little concern for the way in which public funds are to be used. There is such concern for educational efficiency; there is, let us be frank, a deep-rooted fear that parochial schools would merely be another instrument

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) in the hands of Rome by means of which he will gain power, political as well as theological powers." Now this could go on and it would be maybe well to read this, but I'll try to shorten this a bit. One reason why I feel that there are so many opposed to this is that they do not really understand what a private school is -- what a parochial school is. They feel that it is a special school; that it is a kind of finishing school where the children will get a better education at their expense. Well as far as better education, we agree with this, a better education because you cannot exclude God and have as good an education. We believe in this, but not true, Sir, in the sense that the Catholic Schools will have better buildings, higher salaries, more money to equip their labs, their libraries -- quite the contrary. By depriving our children of this help it is the opposite -- this money is theirs. We are collecting taxes to educate all the children of our province, but a certain group does not receive anything. Where does that money go? To educate the other children at the expense of those of these private schools.

It is also said, Sir, that the Catholics are arrogant; that they are frustrated because their convictions are not shared by the general public; that they are pressure groups; that they should be satisfied when they are allowed the privilege of having their own schools. Well this is wrong, Sir. I started my speech by saying that I was speaking with humility, but no one here heard me say that it was with shame. I am not, and we are not asking for hand-outs for our people. We do not subscribe to the theory that we have been granted a privilege. We are fighting for our rights and I would like to quote here a few lines from President Kennedy's inaugural address. I quote: "The same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebearers fought are still at issue around the globe. The beliefs that the rights of man came not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God." If it is arrogant to defend our rights, well then we are arrogant and we will continue to be arrogant. How can anyone attach us Sir, insult us, insinuate that we are not free men, and then turn around and call us arrogant because we have the nerve to defend ourselves.

In the field of hospitalization a certain sum is earmarked for the care of citizens. We have heard so much about this today, but the people are free to go to the hospital of their choice. Nothing is ever said about this, it is not divisive. Many of our best hospitals are administered by the same Nuns that we were knocking a while ago, and the catholic hospitals have some rules that everybody has to follow, but we do not complain about this. Why? And this same example could be carried on in this society in this democracy of ours. Nobody is worried about that this will cause all kinds of hospitals to be built all over the place. The government is careful about this, and the government certainly would safeguard the public school in the same manner. Sir, I mention all these objections, not to pressure you into adopting my beliefs. I am not insisting that you should share my convictions, but I only wish to give you a better picture of what really it is. Don't subscribe to anything I have said; don't believe anything; but be fair enough to recognize my rights to educate my children as I think is right, as my conscience dictates me to do. Let us remember also that a right becomes a right only if it is efficacious, only if it is within the reach and grasp of the people. It must be a right in practice as well as in theory to become a right. We cannot compromise when we are deprived of our rights and I, as well as most catholics, and as well as many many fair-minded Protestants, non-Catholics will fight until justice is done. Ignoring this question will not make it disappear gentlemen, and as far as being a pressure group, we have been subject to much pressure ourselves. Many untruths have been said about us ever since this report came out. Who has been unfair? Who has applied pressure? Here -- this is clearly my marked advertisement, two of them, they have been in both newspapers. Why, if it wasn't for pressure? Sure, we did have certain meetings. The people of Manitoba wanted to let their representative know that this question was very important. It was a vital question to them and I do not claim that all our meetings were perfect. At times some of us have let our emotions get the best of us. I feel that the Honourable Member for Radisson, the Honourable Member for St. James were not treated with enough dignity. This is very unfortunate. For this we are truly sorry, Sir. I am anyway, to feel that on these occasions we have lacked the tolerance that we have asked of you, but other meetings have been organized by other groups also, and I feel that we have been abused.

When we are told, Sir, that when we demand our fair share to send our children to schools

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . where God is not forgotten; when we are told that this is utter arrogance; that it is anti-Christian; how do you think we feel? Sir, so far I have talked mostly of Catholics, but I want you to know that I have not forgotten the others. I do not know as much about them as I know about our own schools and I did not want to take the chance of saying something that was not quite true, but we certainly respect their rights and recognize their rights as well as ours.

The questions that should be answered at this time are these: Do we believe in the principle of democracy? Do we believe that certain rights come from God? That the rights do not belong to the state to pass around as privileges? That these rights must be made efficacious? Then there is only one answer. If I have been fortunate enough, Sir, to have reached some of you this evening, to have reached the Leader of this house, I hope you will be anxious to correct this injustice. Even those of you who have made up your mind that you should oppose this aid, if you see that you are wrong, there is nothing humiliating in changing your mind. I think that this would be rather a sign of a great man, and in this connection I would like to quote -- it may be helpful to quote a footnote from the book, "Clifford Sifton, in Relation to his Time" by John W. Dafoe, Macmillan, 1931, Page 302. In a letter bearing date, June 1st, 1926, Sir Clifford wrote, "I personally drew the school provisions of the Alberta and Saskatchewan Act. I was not very enthusiastic about them when I drew them, but time is proving that they have established unquestionably the best school system that is possible under Canadian conditions, and if all the other Canadian Provinces would adopt these provisions they would be better off." He used very similar languages in an address prepared for delivery to the Canadian Club in Regina in the year 1925, but this was not delivered owing to family bereavement. "At the time I had some doubts about whether I was justified in agreeing to the compromise, but I have no doubts now. Time, reflection in the experience of the workings of your educational law has convinced me that the educational provision of your constitution constitute the wisest and best solution of the vexed question of separate schools that has been reached in any province of the Dominion." The above statements were made by Sir Clifford Sifton, a few years before his death in 1929. They are a tribute to the sincerity of this eminent Canadian for they express the more mature judgment of the one who was most responsible for the single national school system in Manitoba.

Sir, I hope that my speeches might have helped some of you and that you might say, "Perhaps we cannot have a school system like that, but if you want that kind of school system, then why should we interfere with your right to have it? Why should it not become efficacious? Why should you be asked to support two school systems? Go ahead, have your separate schools, we will give you your share and at least give your own children that kind of education".

Sir, it was a great disappointment to me when no mention of this state aid was made in the Throne Speech. I at first intended to bring in a resolution, but such a move might only cause more prejudice if the government has no intention of correcting this existing injustice. But, Sir, I make this last desperate appeal to the Leader of this House, to his government, and to all the members of this House. The Leader has spoken about leadership. Well then, let him lead. Although I realize how difficult it is at this time, how very difficult, but he has accepted his responsibility. He can't dodge it. He has been with both sides too long. He cannot pass the buck any longer. He must face the truth or step out of office if he can't. Let all the members forget their party affiliation. If they are satisfied that an injustice -- that no injustice was done, well they can say so. But if not, let us have the courage to correct the situation now -- at this session. Let us be fair to all the citizens of Manitoba. Let us do our duty, no matter how difficult; no matter how much opposition we have. We will have to live with ourselves for a long time, Sir. Let us be fearless when it is time to defend the principle of democracy. And Sir, if nothing is done, I for one will be ashamed of the government, of the Leader of this House, of the members of this House, of the people of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: I think it will be generally agreed, Mr. Speaker, that after what appeared was a rather slow opening, today's debate in the Chamber has been marked by some excellent speeches. In fact, I have been so impressed with what a number of members have said that I feel that my contribution may be something of an anti-climax, because many of the things that I might wish to have said, many of the views that I might wish to have expressed, have already been presented to the House. But, Sir, under the necessity of leaving for Ottawa before we meet again, I think you will agree that it is incumbent upon me to say a word or two at least as

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) to why the government should be continued in its trust to the people of Manitoba. And as I shall not speak on the main motion, Sir, I think, perhaps it is in order for me to add my good wishes to those that have been expressed to you and my confidence in your common sense and good judgment as the Preceptor of this Assembly. I also add a word of congratulation to those that have been given to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I never had that privilege, though I have enjoyed many in this House, of taking part in the opening of that debate. Sometimes I think it is a rather difficult assignment, because if they praise the Government, then they are considered to be preaching for a call, or at least a sychophant or something of that sort; and if, on the other hand, they criticize or they bring in some constructive suggestions, why then the administration is falling apart and it seems there are some members of the House that can't resist the temptation to perhaps poke a little fun at the people who move and second the Speech from the Throne on those accounts. I, myself, commend those who spoke as I believe they spoke in a natural way, expressing what they felt. I accept the praise, perhaps I'm not entitled to it, and I certainly take notice of the constructive criticism because I feel that is the kind of thing that the government must be prepared to accept from whatever quarter of the House it should happen to come. And of course, Mr. Speaker, I take some satisfaction in the fact that we have a government supporter in the new member for the constituency of Pembina. I agree with what has been said about the fact that this makes history, two women on the same side of the House for the first time in our history, and I take a little bit of pride when we say in fact that that record has been established by the supporters of the present administration.

I would also like to say that I think the campaign that was fought was a clean campaign, a fair campaign. I have no complaints to make about the conduct of anyone in that campaign. I've been through one or two and I'm also able to say, Sir, that as far as the government is concerned it ran on its record. It ran on the record of achievement in its period in office so far. That's what the government ran on and the record was sustained, I think, by the endorsement of the electorate at that time.

Now, Sir, I come to some of the speeches that we have heard in the Assembly, and of course it is my principal duty I suppose to make some comment on the one that was offered by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as well as the one that was offered by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. One is fighting for the leadership of his Party; the other has been confirmed in the leadership of his Party; and, personally, I wish them both well. I can't say that I have any great enthusiasm for the content of some of their speeches. However, I think both parties in opposition may yet have an opportunity to prove themselves at least partially right, on occasion, by voting for the government in the particular debate that is before us at the present time.

I must chide the Honourable Leader of the Opposition now, and I hope he won't take it unkindly, by telling him he's a little bit unfair to us in this Assembly to have given us the same speech all over again. It's the same story that he has laid before the people in two general elections and in the Pembina by-election. It's that sad conducted tour back over those old unhappy far-off things in battles long ago; issues that have been settled, matters that have been decided upon and conclusions that have been reached by the electorate of the province. But I must admit that he had one or two little digs to throw in just to liven the mixture up a little bit, so perhaps we must give him some credit for that. And at the end of his speech he produced this interesting motion of want-of-confidence in connection with the following words: "but this House regrets that your Honour's Government, with many of its pre-election promises unfulfilled, has added greatly to the burden of Manitoba taxpayers, both municipal and provincial, and at the same time has drastically increased the provincial debt." Well my honourable friends are very fond of that resolution. They certainly didn't want it tampered with this afternoon. There was a very stout effort made by some honourable gentlemen to tamper with it and it was resisted just as stoutly by those who proposed it; but it really produced a rather interesting and amusing situation, because they opposed -- the Liberal Party opposed the efforts of the CCF Party to produce this resolution of their sub-amendment that has just been voted on.

I think a fairly reasonable explanation for such opposition was given by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and I confess that I agree with the good sense of much that he had to say. But then he was followed by others in the same group who felt that they could not support the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.).... resolution that was offered in addition, in amendment, or subtraction to their own, because it would mean abandoning their leader and because it would mean repudiation of the main thought of that amendment; namely, that the government was at fault for its overspending in various fields. And then they accused the CCF Party of indulging in a trick; that this was a calculated device, this amendment of theirs which wiped out the main amendment, in order to embarrass people in the Liberal Party; and they were accused of being insincere in offering that sub-amendment. Well it isn't often that I come to the rescue of the Leader of the CCF Party, he really manages to do quite well without much assistance from me, but I should have thought he would have had a vote of thanks from members of the Liberal Party because he took them of the horns of a most uncomfortable dilemma. If, for example, he had added his resolution to the Liberal motion, as was suggested by one of the honourable members opposite, who then promised to vote for it if it was added to the motion, you would have had the ridiculous situation of an amendment saying you are spending too much being added to by an amendment saying spend a little more. That's exactly the situation that you would have had, and some of the honourable members in the Liberal Party are quite prepared to vote for both. They're quite prepared to vote for too much and they're quite prepared to vote for not enough. They're quite prepared to vote for too much; and they're quite prepared to add a little more. Now that's the kind of unpleasant dilemma in which some of the gentlemen opposite found themselves, and I think they owe a vote of thanks to the Leader of the CCF Party for so neatly removing them from that particular hook so that they could at least, with some satisfaction to their own thoughts in the matter, vote against him and vote for their own resolution. Well they had a narrow escape from that difficult situation that confronts "Mr. Facing Both Ways". However, I suggest to them that they're going to have to resolve this little difficulty of facing both ways, and I suppose they're looking forward to their meeting next April as an opportunity to do that. I think it's probably a fair prediction to say that this is the last session from which we will ever get from the Liberal Party a resolution of the type that is before us at the present time.

I have a hunch that they're going to see the error of their ways; to see the virtue of a government policy in building and expansion and faith, and hope in this province, and to support the government measures to that end; and perhaps they might even be induced to bring in some of their own. Because, Mr. Speaker, today, what's the matter with the Grits over there? What's the matter with that great party? A constructive suggestion? An alternative solution? A new policy in what their leader presented to us now? I didn't find one. Surely it's not up to me, it's not up to members on this side of the House to remind the official opposition that they are supposed to represent at least the possibility of an alternative administration in the Province of Manitoba, with all that implies in terms of policy and a program, and if the Liberal Party carry on this way they're going to find that their title of an official opposition is a courtesy title indeed. And let me also say to the Leader of that party today, who will be up for reelection, that he's worrying me seriously. I still think -- I haven't changed my mind -- I still think he's the best man to lead them. That is my own view and I'm saying it in no jocular way, but I want to say that I'm worried about him because if he carries on like he's carrying on in this House so far he's going to make things difficult for his friends to return him to the office which he enjoys today.

Well, he's worried about a good many things in his speech, Mr. Speaker. I don't think I'll wish to detain you by mentioning all of them but surely there are some. Of course he always worries about Federal politics, that's one of his principal interests. He worries about high taxes in Ottawa and he has a right to worry because I don't know just how he managed to square what went on at the Liberal Convention with his views on that matter. I wasn't at that convention -- nobody asked me. If they had I'd have been tempted to go. I don't know whether they'd have paid any attention to me but they're a nice bunch and I would have enjoyed being with them, particularly the members that went from Manitoba. But I read about what they were doing in the Economist of recent date. That's a pretty reputable international journal and perhaps if I quote them as my authority for what went on at the convention I wouldn't be accused of being unfair in what I said. But they reported about Mr. Gordon's outline of a policy to cure unemployment by tax cuts, easier money, widespread distribution of Federal grants, loans to junior governments -- hurray -- and business, and a scheme of universal non-contributory

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) medical insurance. The Liberal policies adopted at the convention could easily be added up to one billion -- one thousand million -- or we would say, one billion extra annual expenditure. Well of course Mr. Pearson was wise enough to hedge himself on that program by making some statements about having to finance this kind of thing out of a productive and expanding economy, and I'll certainly agree with him on that. But I don't want to lever that point, we're not here to discuss Liberal politics. Let's admit that there's nobody in this House that can control what Federal Government or Federal political parties decide to do, and I think that unless we haven't got anything more important to talk about of immediate interest to the people of Manitoba, that Federal issues can well be left outside this Chamber.

Well my honourable friend did mention one of our local problems. He was commenting on the evidence of economic uncertainty; made a few general observations which perhaps I can take the liberty of referring to; claims that municipal tax sales are worrying him. Well it never pays to underestimate or to minimize any events that are taking place in that particular field, I think it would have been better and more helpful if he had obtained the facts of the matter so that we could see whether his, to me, serious alarm, was justified or not; and without attempting to minimize in any way the statements that my honourable friend made, I think the latest figures indicate what the facts are. Preliminary surveys of tax collections for rural, suburban, villages and towns, 1959, \$21 million-odd, being 79.5% of the taxes imposed; 1960, \$24.9 million, being 84% of the taxes imposed. That really doesn't suggest that this indicator at least is one that should give us concern at the moment, although this is always a problem that is with us and let us recognize that fact. I can tell him and I think it is of some satisfaction to note that tax sales in '59 were actually less, slightly less than tax sales in '58, so I think it is wise to put the facts on the record rather than make a sweeping statement that perhaps would leave us with the wrong impression.

Then he talks about Manitoba's unemployment and refers to it as being as bad as the average or perhaps worse. "If you compare that to the population of Canada I think you'll find that Manitoba is just as bad as the average, perhaps worse." Well, Sir, unemployment is bad enough. Unemployment is a problem that bothers us all. Whether we agree on the solutions or can support unanimously what a particular government is doing, none of us will disagree about the difficulties of it. And I suggest to you that there's no sense making it any worse than it is, and unsubstantiated statements of that sort with their overtones of pessimism and gloom don't help us at all. All you have to do if you want to get the facts is to read the newspapers. Regularly they publish there the percentages of unemployment in the various parts of the country. The last one that was published early this month indicates unemployment in the prairies at 7.5% and there is nothing to be proud of in that figure, let me assure my honourable friend. But, Mr. Speaker it's lower than any other section in the country, and by a very considerable extent it's lower than other sections in the country. And the estimate for Manitoba, which my advisors give me and I'll have to admit that it's an estimate, is that Manitoba is even in a more favourable position than the prairies as a whole. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not much of a point, and I don't want to make too much out of it except to say that if people want to be understood properly, and if they want to make their point, you must get a little closer to the facts than some of my honourable friend's statements do, otherwise one really doesn't take them seriously.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask my honourable friend if he would comment on the figures then? Does he object to the 35,000 that I gave as unemployed in Manitoba? If he relate that to the less than 7,000 in Canada? Does he not agree?

MR. ROBLIN: Well my honourable friend will have to allow me to be guided by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which, whatever one thinks of the basis of their count, is at least the same for all parts of the country, and those are the figures that I am using here tonight and I think they represent reasonable accuracy.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interfere with my honourable friend's trend of thought, but he accuses me of not presenting facts. I ask him if he's in the position to contradict the numbers of unemployed that I gave in Manitoba -- 35,000. Is he in a position to contradict the federal numbers that were given very recently as less than 70,000? There's the calculation.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, he will have to conduct his argument with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as they are the people that calculate these percentages. Those are the percentages that I feel I'm justified in relying upon. Now carrying on, there were just so many statements that have been made here that covered, fairly thoroughly in my view, and I mustn't bore the House by making too great a reference to them. There is the statement here -- at least the implication -- perhaps the actual statement that the Minister of Health or the government or somebody deliberately failed to bring the report or the information about hospital premiums to this House at its last Session with the aim in view of avoiding a public discussion or avoiding the debates in the House that would transpire. Well I think the statement of the Minister of Health pretty clearly indicates that it is an unjustified statement in every sense of that word; and I can tell my honourable friend that if he is unwilling to take my word for it or the word of the gentleman on this side, he can talk to the Commissioners when our special select committee meet and can satisfy himself of the exact sequence of events, and I think that I can say without any fear of misleading the House on this point that we did not act in the manner in which my honourable friend charges us in, what I believe to be, a baseless innuendo.

I wouldn't wish the leader of the CCF party to think that because I didn't speak on his sub-amendment that I am not interested in the topic or that it is a discourtesy to him and his group. I knew that I would be speaking tonight and I felt that two speeches from me on one night is one too many. Some people say that one speech is one too many, but however that may be, he raised a most important point and it is certainly one that fits in to the question of the financial conduct and character of the administration that is under discussion now. I am going to say this about the hospital premiums. I think there is one thing about which we can come to some measure of agreement, that we do not contemplate with an easy mind the fact that the burden of premiums rests on all regardless of their ability to pay. We believe that we did the right thing at the time; indeed I believe that under the statute, as it existed then, we had little alternative in what we did; but I think we would be foolish if at any time we closed our eyes or our ears or our minds to reasonable alternatives that might be available to us. It is possible that changes in tax rental arrangements or other matters of that sort may have a profound bearing on the kind of solution that may be open to us in dealing with this matter, and I invite honourable members to approach this problem of premiums in that way. If those on the other side wish to criticize the government for its actions in the matter, why naturally we respect that right, and far be it from us to claim that we are above criticism. But I do think that having reached this stage; that having the facts before us now and the prospect of a Special Select Committee which I hope may be announced very soon, in the early part of next week or shortly thereafter, that we may do our best to arrive at a common judgment as to what the next best step is, because we are faced here with a financial problem of proportions that indeed are impressive and this is a matter that will require our best and united judgment if we are to find a better system than the one that we are following now. When the bill was introduced I remember so well the present Minister of Health saying -- at least the Minister of Health at that time saying -- there are only two ways to finance the hospital plan, premiums or sales tax. Is he right or is he wrong? Are there other methods that are open to us? I make no statement on this matter at the present time because it will be the subject of discussion in the committee that we will form quite shortly, but it seems to me this is a matter to which we must apply our best judgment because of its impact on those who are in the lower income groups in the province of Manitoba.

I don't propose, Sir, to re-open the debate on the sub-amendment because that matter has been dealt with, but perhaps I could advert and refer to the fact that the question of finances in any extension of our present hospital services or health services or medical services is one which must occupy our very careful attention and I do not feel that it would be responsible of me or of my colleagues in the House here if we were to advance at this time some radical or deep-rooted changes in our present system of attention to the health of the people of our province until the financial character of the situation was a little clearer. It seems to me that we would be well advised if we grappled with this hospital plan; if we placed that on the kind of a sound financial footing that our people would be prepared to support. If we had a clear assessment of the increased costs that we are faced with, and if we had a

(Mr. Roblin, continued..) reasonable policy of handling those costs in a way that best meets the public interest, I think that is the immediate and challenging problem before this Legislature. I'm easier in my own mind in making that statement because I know that while I would be the last man here to claim that the Medicare system is a perfect solution to all our troubles, I will say that it gives us the opportunity of applying our money to the point that needs it most and that is something that I don't think is fully appreciated by some members opposite. We have to make that choice. We have to make our choice as to how our limited resources are to be applied, and at the present time and under present circumstances, I think that applying our limited resources in the field of medical care for Medicare is the right thing to do. I don't say it is the everlasting solution to the problem. In fact I look forward, as conditions change, to increases and developments and improvements in whatever system we have; but as of today and as at the present time, I think we are justified in making a good job of what we have set our hand to before we start off on other measures of policy. And that of course is one of the themes that run through the whole of this Throne Speech. We are doing our best to make a good job of the things that we have set our hands to before we move on to those other progressive measures that in due course will arise.

Well, Sir, in dealing with my honourable friend the leader of the Opposition, I find myself in a little disagreement with him about the constitution but I really think he knew what I meant. I think he knows perfectly well that the province can't issue money on its own hook. We don't control the fiscal policy. We can't give orders to the Bank of Canada; indeed it's a moot point these days as to who can give orders to the Bank of Canada. We certainly can't use the Bank of Canada to help us in our approach to the money market and we don't influence the interest rate; we've nothing to do with foreign exchange; we have little recourse to indirect taxation; and we must look to the federal authorities to influence the national economic climate. I don't know why it's necessary for me to say that because, surely to goodness, that's something that we all know and appreciate in dealing with our problems.

Now I come to one point, Sir, which I confess has caused me some trouble; caused me to pause, as to what I should say; and that is in connection with the allegations that have been made about election bribery and threats and what have you. I don't know if I can find the exact section in my honourable friend's speech where he spoke of these things, but he talked about the road program being used for political purposes, still being used for patronage, being used for election bribes and threats. I really am puzzled to know what he means by that. Does he mean the kind of thing that was referred to by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell? Is that what he's getting at? Is he complaining for example about our policy, and let us admit frankly, our policy of going before the people with a pledge and a promise to do something about the road system and to build better roads and to build more roads in the Province of Manitoba. Is that what he's referring to? He shakes his head and I should think not, because after all we give out cash allowances to old age pensioners; we pay money out for schools; we spend our provincial funds in all sorts of ways that we undertook to do so on the election program; and all I can ask him is to give us the facts. Perhaps I should amend that and say give us his allegations, because I'm not sure that they're facts. He mentioned two items - the road from Notre Dame to Manitou, and said that somebody said it wouldn't be completed. Well I can categorically deny that it was not I who made that statement nor did anyone that I heard speak in the campaign; and it is pretty obvious that I spoke in quite a number of places and heard others speak. I did a little campaigning myself and I never heard anyone make that particular statement. I won't say it wasn't made - Heaven only knows - but I certainly say that it is a statement that could never be said to be the policy of this administration. That particular road is a matter which was decided quite some time ago and we are proceeding with it. We didn't run on roads; we ran on our platform in that particular by-election.

And then he talks about in 1959 there were unnecessary flag men in some places in the province. Well if it's wrong in '61 it was wrong in '60 and wrong in '59 too, I suppose, but I think the public are entitled to know what my honourable friend's charges are and know them in detail. I think he should put an end to this shadow-boxing because there is a great temptation among some of us to say that this kind of loose talk is standard Liberal propaganda these days, and to ascribe it to sour grapes or perhaps campaign of innuendo - some call it smears. I wouldn't accuse my honourable friend of that, but I say it's a two-edged sword. I say it's a

two-edged sword and I ask him for a clear and explicit statement of what he thinks is wrong. What the politicians say to one another in the course of a campaign is, as my honourable friend the leader of the CCF said, may be rather trivial. We say many things in the campaign which perhaps we regret having said afterwards, and some of them sound pretty silly. Fortunately the public don't take all of us too seriously, but I think my honourable friend's implications extend beyond that. I think he is raising a charge of maladministration. I think he is raising a charge of waste of public funds. I think he may even be referring to the creation of unnecessary jobs. All those things are at least raised in my mind as the result of what he said, and I think the public is entitled to know. I suggest to my honourable friend that if he declined to give it to us in his speech, that he rise on the Orders of the Day tomorrow and give us the charges in detail. I suggest that if that doesn't appeal to him that he table a written statement of his views on the table of this Chamber, because I think his failure to come clean with what it is that is bothering him is a disservice to the public and certainly something that I know he would not like to have said about him. I say let him ventilate his grievance. I say let him put before us the instances that he thinks are improper and wrong and I tell him that we will give the full co-operation that we can give to get to the bottom of any problem or difficulties that he wishes to raise; and I think that in common decency he ought to tell us when and where and what and who, and he ought to tell us now.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the Honourable, the First Minister if he wouldn't agree that the best place for the matter to be pursued is in the committee on estimates which will then, of course, lead on, if our Honourable friend the Minister accepts the invitation I have extended him, will then lead on to a discussion in front of public accounts or, as has been suggested, some sort of a judicial tribunal, because does my honourable friend not recognize the fact that we can not bring witnesses into this Chamber?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't mind which committee my honourable friend ventilates his charges before. All I say is that he should give this House, the place where he made the charge, that he should give us the facts and give us the details. How are we in a position to know whether it is a prima facie case? How are we in a position to know whether he is not just giving us a statement of a position which on examination may prove to be without foundation? How are we to know just what he intends to complain about? If the charges he has given us seem too insignificant to merit the seriousness which he obviously places upon them, then I think that it is our right to have that kind of a statement from our honourable friend and to have it right away, and I will not back down from that particular request that I make of him now.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask my honourable friend if he really thinks that I would make charges like that if I didn't have the proper information?

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend has the facts, let him produce them. That is the question that we are asking and we want him to produce them now. He has kept us in suspense-- we've been dangling on the cliff -- he has had his name in the paper, there has been trial by newspaper release, if you like, as far as the conduct of the government is concerned, with no solid charge against us yet that we can face up to. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not anxious to avoid my Honourable friend's grievances. If he has one that is well founded we'll do our best to get to the bottom of it; but I think he should tell us now and in this Chamber what it is that is on his mind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going on to another charge which my honourable friend made about crop insurance. He wasn't very pleased with me because, as he says here, "The First Minister, just on the very eve of the election in Pembina, took occasion to announce that the crop insurance premium rates were going to be reduced". Well he didn't really say that that was election bribery; he didn't really say that I was corrupt, he didn't go that far; but I must say that the inference he left with me was pretty clear, that he thought this was a nasty trick; that this was taking advantage of my position as Leader of the Government in possession of information; ability to influence policy; to reap something that would be helpful in the campaign in which we were engaged. Well, I don't think that charge is justified. After all, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend was here and voted for the bill establishing crop insurance. He knows perfectly well that one of the clauses of that bill is that a Board is set up which regulates the details of the crop insurance operation. He voted for it. I dare say he knows the names of the men that are on that Board today, and I don't think that he will find them

(Mr. Roblin, continued...) political hacks that are taking their orders from the political chiefs of the government. I think he will find them men of integrity, men of probity, men of good judgment. Well, anyway these are the people who decided about the discount schedule on crop insurance which I referred to at the time that he mentions. They decided, and what did they do? Well, Mr. Speaker, in a publicity release of November 18th, which was I think, nomination day, or anyway 21 days before the voting, on their own initiative, with no prompting from any politician, they got out their usual routine letter which they send to all the people who are in crop insurance and many others who were interested, and it got into the paper as well, giving the full details of this discount schedule. When I come along and pick up this stale piece of news, 20,19,18,19,20, 21 days later and offer it as a piece of information to an election meeting, then I get the kind of criticism that my honourable friend lodges against me tonight. I really don't think that that kind of thing is worth the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I felt that in order to set the record straight, I should be quite clear that I did not indulge in the kind of practice that my honourable friend implies I am guilty of. Well, I suppose if my honourable friend had read it in the paper or was paying attention to business, he could have told them all about it too. However, he would be very reluctant to tell them anything good about the present administration in a situation like that.

Well, what else is there? He doesn't like our finances -- oh we are going to get into trouble -- oh yes I forgot this, we are going to get into trouble with this Manitoba Bond Issue of ours, this Savings Bond. He doesn't think we are going to get much of a reception from the market. He thinks we are in pretty poor shape all around as a matter of fact. Talking about us, he says he thinks the investors, even though they know the Province of Manitoba itself is sound, they would be inclined to take a pretty careful look at the financial record of the government the day before they invest very heavily, and if they take that look, I am not too hopeful of my honourable friend securing very much money in this regard to bail them out of their present financial difficulties. Well, there is no charity in the bond business, in the sense that one overlooks the failures of the administration or the soundness of the risk, and I suspect that anyone that lent money to the Province of Manitoba took a pretty fair look at it before they did. I wish my honourable friend would get up to date on these things because he must surely know, he reads the papers, that I think about ten days ago we sold \$25 million worth of Hydro Bonds in less than 24 hours at a rate that is comparable indeed to that secured by the Province of Ontario. This hardly sounds like a province that is on it's last legs, and as for this bond issue, our advisors in the trade have informed us that unless we want more money than we feel we can handle under the particular circumstances of a cash issue of that sort, we better restrict it to the Province of Manitoba only because we will get far too much money; and if my honourable friend thinks I am exaggerating in my own favour, let him consult his own friends in the investment business and I think he will tell them just about the same facts. Yes, interest rates are high and we don't like paying that, and it only underlines the folly of the previous administration in not borrowing money when money was cheap. If they had done that these roads that we have to pay for now, we would have had them, and we would have had them at a lower interest rate than we have to pay at the present time. But they didn't believe in that kind of thing. They didn't do it, and that's why they are over there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on something in which is indeed a difficult topic, the most serious point to which I wish to refer on this occasion and that is, of course, the situation that faces the Province of Manitoba in respect to the question of private schools. I rather regret that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is not here because -- oh he's here -- good. Well I can get into this report right now. I wanted to make some slight comment on his presentation here tonight, but first of all, I must say that the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition was a puzzle to me, and I say that with bold emphasis. It was indeed a puzzle to me because he started out by quoting himself, with obvious approval and I quote him with approval too in this, where he said that the importance of this question emphasized the need for it being considered in this House on the very highest plane and with out greatest degree of statemanship; and I think that is the position which not only I personally but my group will now take and will continue to take as the debate proceeds. Well I must say, speaking of the contribution made a few minutes ago by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that none of us could fail to be moved by his sincerity in the presentation that he made; and although at one

(Mr. Roblin, continued..) or two points he challenged the government to show leadership and perhaps in one sense may have been thought to throw a political harpoon into us, I really don't think he intended to do that. I think he intended to restrict his contribution to this debate to a high level, to approach it from a non-partisan basis and to say nothing that would really give offence. When one makes allowances for his feelings in this matter from the political point of view and I appreciate that approach on his part, and if he said one or two things which some of my colleagues may think a little unfair about being afraid politically and things of that sort, perhaps it was just in the heat of debate, and I forgive him.

I don't feel quite so well disposed toward what the Leader of the Opposition said, because after pledging himself, repeating his pledge to deal with this on the highest of levels, he then made what I think is regarded in many circles as a very cheap, perhaps deeply political attack on the administration for its conduct in this manner; and I want to assure you, Sir, that I will resist the temptation to reply in kind to what my honourable friend said, because this is a question which does transcend anything that might be considered on a party basis. This is a question, Sir, that wells up from the deepest convictions of the citizens of Manitoba on both sides of this question. It touches upon the dearest religious convictions and the deepest feelings of conscience and it moves, and I am sorry to say it may also divide the public of Manitoba as no other issue can, and I think the original call of the Leader of the Liberal Party for statemanship was good and I regret very much that, in my view, he did not maintain that attitude when he spoke the other day, because when criticizing us, it must have been obvious, I know it was obvious, that the position of the Liberal Party as such was obscure; it was unresolved; it was undeclared; and to use the argument that my honourable friend used against me and against the Conservative Party of the government as the reason for that situation because they can't make up their minds in thirteen months, I don't believe that at all. Is it because, again to use his statement, they flounder in doubt? No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's so. Is it because they lack the courage to face the problem? No, I wouldn't accuse my honourable friends of anything like that. Is it an abdication of responsibility and a dereliction of duty, to use my honourable friend's phrase, for the official opposition, the alternative government of this province, to be in the position of which he's in tonight? No, I do not make those charges against my honourable friend. It has been said, and he can read it in the newspaper, that one of the reasons why he doesn't want to deal with this matter is because of difficulties within his own ranks. I don't believe that. In my opinion Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason why my honourable friend has taken the attitude he has and the Liberal Party takes the stand it has. There's only one reason and it's not a discreditable reason, it's an entirely creditable reason; and I want to emphasize that. I believe he takes that stand because he and his friends believe that it is not wise, that it is not in the public interest at this time that they, as a political party, should take a stand of the kind that they might have been expected to take on this matter. I think that's the reason and I impute no other motives to my honourable friend -- none -- and I call him no names and I've no criticisms to offer because I think that is a sound reason, if they do not believe it in the public interest, that they should do otherwise. But I say, Mr. Speaker, they should reflect on that fact when they consider the actions of others because this issue is above politics. This deals with the deepest and most profound of human emotions and convictions, and it is above a party consideration. We are searching now, in one way or another, to find that point where the general public meets the most deeply and passionately held convictions of an important section of our society and I do not believe that we will find that answer as party men and as partisans, but only as citizens. I don't know, Sir, of any easy or obvious solution to this debate which is taking place in the hearts, in the minds and in the consciences of the people of this Province at the present time. I think we need to continue the discussion of the issue; we need to continue to review the facts; we need to continue to assess the position which we find ourselves in a calm, dispassionate, and above all, non-political manner.

Well, Sir, this brings me pretty close to the end of what I had to say here tonight. We come to this amendment which is presented to us for our consideration, the main point of which I think seems to be a criticism of the financial policy that is followed by the present administration, and I think perhaps I should say a word about that. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker that this was a common sort of a criticism to come from my honourable friends opposite but I

(Mr. Roblin, continued..) take the view that they disqualified themselves pretty thoroughly from criticizing the financial policies of the present government, because what costs money? The roads that my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works is building; the social allowances plan which we have in force today; the very large increases in the grants for education; the prison reform that the Attorney-General has under hand; the establishment of roadside parks is under the control of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources; the building of hydro-electric plants and the expansion of our telephone system, essential elements in the development of this province; the Agricultural Research Institute and matters of that sort that are under the direction of my honourable friend behind me. These are the things that cost money. And, Mr. Speaker, you name it, and they voted for it. You name it and they voted for it. Can you find a single capital money bill that my honourable friends opposed? Search the records. Can you find a single financial appropriation bill that my honourable friends voted against? Can you find any serious criticism of spending policies in the Committee of Supply? Not many, but you can certainly find lots of requests for more expenditures from my honourable friends, and if anyone thinks they want more now, just wait until after they've had their convention and we'll be hearing a lot more from them in that respect. And I say to you, Sir, that when their voting record follows their talking record, then we may be able to deal with a resolution like this seriously. But at the present time it's a piece of political flimsy; it's harmless; and it's certainly unconvincing. I would say to this House, Sir, that up to the present time no very good reasons have been advanced as to why the government should not carry on. We welcome, we hope we will receive constructive criticism as to how we may improve. We're conscious of the need for improvement. We recognize that one of the greatest functions of this House is to provide that constructive criticism so that we can improve; and I can say that within the limits of frail mortality, sometimes that's fairly limited, we are going to try to take advantage of the constructive criticism that we get from whatever section of the Legislature that it may come. But I believe, Sir, that on the record of what we have done so far, that we should be allowed to continue to give this province good government.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland wishes to speak.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Dufferin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell and the amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. We had some difficulty with this the other evening and I had a look at Beausheune in respect to the advisability of accepting the amendment offered by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and I am prepared at this time to give that ruling. I would refer you to Beausheune's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, 1958, Page 236, Citation 286. It is important that a motion for the appointment of a committee should state whether the committee shall report from time to time or if it should report once. Without having been given such powers it will be defunct, but may be revived. Special authority should also be given to sending for persons, papers and records. Now this is the operative part of it. A Select Special Committee ceases to exist on the moment it presents its final report to the House. The report cannot afterwards be sent back to the committee with instructions to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired it is necessary to revive the committee. That, I would think, substantiates the judgment that I gave the other evening, that the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is out of order and cannot be entertained by the House.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask if you have considered the citations that I quoted?

MR. SPEAKER: I did, yes. But I feel that this one is more applicable to the case and certainly covers it better.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I had planned to appeal the ruling if it did not allow this motion, but inasmuch as you are quite sure of the ruling I won't waste the time of the House by appealing, but I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Carillon that the report of the committee be not now concurred in but that the committee be reconstituted and the

(Mr. Campbell, continued..) report referred back for consideration of the section and clauses that I mentioned. Now it would take me a little while to write that out, Mr. Speaker, but I could do so if given time.

MR. SPEAKER: Two motions -- one to set up the committee, the other motion to refer back.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour perhaps it might be agreeable if we suggested that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition might draft his amendment and be given permission to present it the next time this matter would be raised on the Order Paper rather than asking him to deal with it under pressure at this particular moment. If that would meet with your views, Sir, I think probably the House would concur in it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreeable to the House?

MR. CAMPBELL: It's agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That will bring us to the end of our Order Paper.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the house do now adjourn.

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