

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 19th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin), in the absence of the Minister of Health, introduced Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Registered Nurses Act.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas) introduced Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Secretary) (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MR. McLEAN, in the absence of the Minister of Health, introduced Bill 115, An Act to amend The Physiotherapists Act.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18696, 18760 and 18764.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2).

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution standing in my name.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolution, recommends it to this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act by providing, among other matters, for the creation of a new judicial district in the northern part of the province, and as a consequence of which additional court facilities and officers may have to be provided therein.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable members of the Committee will realize that this presages the introduction of the amendment to The Municipal Boundaries Act to provide for the alteration of judicial district boundaries in Manitoba. It is brought in by way of money resolution, not because there is anything in the amending Act itself dealing with the expenditure of money but because by the creation of a new district for the north, other sections of the existing Act will come into play requiring clerks, bailiffs, a sheriff, etcetera, to be appointed in paid positions to service this new judicial district.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, does this mean then that there will be just the one additional judicial district? Will there be no change in the boundaries of the other districts that presently exist; and also, does the Minister have any intention of changing any municipal boundaries as such under this Resolution?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, this merely presages the introduction of the amendment to The Municipal Boundaries Act which will bring into force all of the new districts. Only one of them, the northern, is the one that is requiring this to be brought in by way of a money resolution, but the bill itself, when members see it, will have the new boundaries for all of the districts. Number (2), it does not contemplate the changing of any of the municipality boundaries at all -- No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain Resolution,

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd) directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act (2).

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the Speaker's gallery where there are six members from the Manitoba Social Credit Auxiliary with their leader, Mrs. Lacy. This group comes from the constituency of the Honourable Member from Rhineland. We are very happy that you have chosen to visit with us this afternoon. We hope you have enjoyed your tour of the building and that what you see and hear in the proceedings here this afternoon will be interesting and beneficial to you. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to speak of an important impending anniversary date. As a national Vice-President of the Canadian Jewish Congress, I would like to bring this date to the attention of this House. In 1940, by Nazi decree, well over 400,000 Jews from many parts of Hitler-occupied lands were walled into the Warsaw Ghetto, an area of some 1.3 square miles surrounded by an eight foot brick wall topped with broken glass. From 1940 to July 1942, living in these squalid conditions, Jews died in the streets of the Warsaw Ghetto in the thousands. In July of 1942, under orders of the Gestapo chief, Heinrich Himmler, there began a planned deadly process of extermination; and 20 years ago this month, in April of 1943, a last-ditch stand took place.

Last month the President of the United States issued a proclamation for the observance of the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, on April 21st of this year, which is the day recognized by world Jewry as a memorial day of sorrow. I'd like to read just an excerpt of President Kennedy's proclamation. "In April of 1943 the surviving Jews, suffering from malnutrition and disease, with pitifully few weapons and virtually no hope of assistance from any source, determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible. They engaged the Nazis in battle. The result was known by the Jews to be foredoomed, yet though they lacked both military resources and a military tradition, they were able to conduct their struggle against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than three weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism, an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered." And here on a local level the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg recently issued a proclamation of a similar nature. In Winnipeg there will be a memorial meeting this Sunday addressed by His Excellency, Michael Comay, the Ambassador from Israel to the United Nations. This meeting will be duplicated in Jewish communities on the same day all over the free world.

Madam Speaker, during this last war, six million Jews and many, many non-Jews were tortured and massacred, and there are indications even today that there is suppression of the freedoms of minority groups, especially behind the Iron Curtain. There are many new Canadians in Manitoba today who are survivors of the Nazi Concentration Camps, and these are not only Jews. These people have come here to build new lives and to rear their children under democratic skies. In their honour, and in sad remembrance of the many millions of marchers, both Jews and Christians, who did not survive the mass murders which took place in our lifetime, I would ask the people of Manitoba to pause and meditate for a moment this Sunday on this dark spot in the history of mankind and to reaffirm their intention to see to it that this will never be repeated.

MR. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (River Heights): Madam Speaker, may I add a few words -- this being the twentieth anniversary of one of the most heroic episodes in history, the Warsaw Ghetto revolt led by the Jewish fighting organization. It began 20 years ago today on April 19, 1943. As the honourable member has just said, by that time the Nazis had deported all of Warsaw's 400,000 Jews to the death camps except for about 50,000 who remained in the rubble of the devastated Ghetto. We know what happened through two sources, the pitiful handful of survivors and hundreds of written documents set down by eye witnesses and either smuggled to the outside world or buried in the ground. In the "30's", we as Canadians had it

(Mr. Steinkopf, cont'd) within our power to grant visas and to save these lives. We didn't do it. Let us remember this day so that the likes of the Warsaw Ghetto revolt and all that it entailed shall never, never happen again.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to associate the members of our group in the statements made here this afternoon. I know that not just the members of this House, not just Manitobans, but in fact all the people who value freedom in the world join in this anniversary. It is a sorrowful anniversary in that it indicates that, in spite of its many years, mankind still has great improvements ahead of it. It's a glorious anniversary in the sense that in the annals of the fight for freedom, here is a group under the most difficult circumstances stood up for the freedom that all of us believe in.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if I may, before the Orders for Return is put, lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order No. 13, dated March 26, 1963, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. And while I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, I wonder if I would have leave to raise a question of our agenda this afternoon and to make the suggestion that after we've dealt with the Order for Return, which is the next item, that we then go over to Page 10 and take the second reading of the four private bills that show on Page 10 so that they may be advanced a stage, I trust, and be sent to the Private Bills Committee on Tuesday. I make this suggestion because the time for private bills is running out. Then we would revert to the regular order of business if that met with the approval of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: No objection as far as we're concerned, Madam Speaker.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Return to an Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On March 29th, I requested an Order for Return No. 18, listing new industries in the Province of Manitoba. I wonder whether the honourable member can tell me how quickly I might get that?

MR. EVANS: I shall try and inform the honourable member, at least privately today or before the Orders tomorrow if he wishes -- Monday -- the next day -- (Interjection) -- I will advise you as soon as I can.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNLACK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The following particulars relating to properties leased by the Government and its Boards and Commissions: (a) Name and Location. (b) Nature of use. (c) Term of tenure. (d) Rental payable and escalator clauses if any. (e) Any other costs payable by the lessee under the lease. (f) The cost of capital improvement paid for by the government. (g) The names of owners at the time of leasing. (h) The names of the present owners. (i) Any options to renew or purchase under lease agreements.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 37. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 37, An Act respecting Industrial-Talcott Financial Ltd., for second reading.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 53. The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon) presented Bill No. 53, An Act to incorporate Providence Ste. Therese, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BARKMAN: This is simply a bill for the incorporation of Providence Ste. Therese, a charitable organization which operates a home for the aged and infirm at Otterburne, Manitoba. The Sisters of Charity of Providence have been and are now operating this

(Mr. Barkman, cont'd) Home at Otterburne. They have for some time used this name, the Resident Ste. Therese Home for the Aged and they wish the passage of this Act.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 76. The Honourable the Member for River Heights.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 76, An Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Art Gallery, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: For many years there has existed an unincorporated charitable association known as The Winnipeg Art Gallery, and the purposes and objects of this Act are to incorporate that body.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 79. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 79, An Act to amend "An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts incorporating 'The Fidelity Trust Company'" for second reading.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster as amended. The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I was not in the House on the occasion that the Honourable the Member for Selkirk spoke on the resolution here and moved the amendment which is presently under consideration by the House. I have, however, read his speech in Hansard three times since that and would like to say, or to congratulate him upon it, because he has in the course of his address spoken in a most thoughtful and helpful way upon the general subject which is the subject matter of this resolution, and has made some very worthwhile suggestions.

The original resolution is one which has been moved on a number of occasions by the Honourable the Member for Inkster. It arises out of his very genuine and real concern for, I believe in particular, the deaf children for whom special educational facilities must be provided. This is so, even though the terms of his resolution go somewhat beyond the area of the deaf, and it is in fact to that larger group that the Honourable Member for Selkirk addressed himself when he spoke in this House.

With respect to the -- just speaking of the children, the deaf children, I think that it is more or less accurate to say that the problem which has always been envisaged by the Honourable Member for Inkster is actually taken care of by the fact that all of the children who reside within the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg and whose parents desire them to do so, are permitted and accommodated at the Day School for the Deaf here.

With respect to deaf children from other parts of the province, they are in attendance at the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon, certainly one of the finest institutions of that kind on the North American continent. The concern which the Honourable the Member for Inkster has about these children being away from home, would of course be the same concern if they were in a residential school in Winnipeg, because they would be in fact away from their respective homes. I make that comment, Madam Speaker, to simply indicate and re-emphasize something which has of course come out in the course of the discussion, and came out I believe in the course of our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Education when we were talking about the number of deaf children in Manitoba and their location, insofar as educational facilities are concerned, as between those who attend the day school in Winnipeg and those who attend residential schools outside of the province.

I would like however to read, if I may, just one or two excerpts from the address of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk because I believe, as I have already indicated, that what he has said indicates in a very clear way the general problems that we have here, and I

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) am quoting, Madam Speaker, from page 801 of Hansard of Friday, March 29th, 1963 from the address of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, and just quoting one or two sentences from his address. He said this and I now quote: "The question of handicapped children is indeed a problem and I feel that it must be faced in its entirety objectively and without thought of partisanship. It is a problem which will not be solved by oratory, rhetoric, or emotionalism. It's a problem which will require for its solution well co-ordinated total community planning; and one of the greatest errors which we can make in facing or approaching this problem is in over-simplifying it." And in those sentences, the honourable the member has certainly set out what would be my own views concerning the over-all problem that is involved in dealing with the education of what I believe are now referred to by the technical people as exceptional children, that is to say children who in some way or another depart or are -- yes, depart from the normal child.

Still in the same address, Madam Speaker, and quoting again if I may, the Honourable the Member for Selkirk made this suggestion and I now quote: "I feel that there should be some committee so that this problem can be looked at in its entirety." -- I'm leaving out a few words here -- "I think that we must sooner or later lay down a blueprint by which we are going to be guided in dealing with this problem in its entirety." And then again: "It's a problem which affects many departments of the government." And it is with respect to this that I now wish to just say a few words. I believe that it is a problem which requires careful study and I noted that in the amendment which the honourable member moved, and which is present before the House for our consideration, he suggested in the paragraphs of his preamble the reasons for having such a committee. He suggested in his operative clause some of the things which he thought such a committee should do and, in a general way, indicated the guidelines which he considered were advisable under the circumstances.

It is my opinion, however, that it perhaps would not be wise to limit the investigation to the matters which are set out in the operative clause, because while they appear at first reading to contain almost all of the matters that should be considered, I think it would not be wise that we should confine the work in this respect to any particular features, and that perhaps we ought to make it of a somewhat more general nature. I believe also that we should begin by a committee of departmental people, recognizing of course the number of associations which are particularly concerned in one or other of the aspects of this problem. I believe that for the present it would not be advisable to include representatives of the various groups, if only for the reason that it might make it difficult to get the work done, because it is a fact that these groups have a special interest in their respective fields and perhaps may not be knowledgeable in other fields which are part of the over-all problem. I am therefore of the opinion, Madam Speaker, that we would be better advised to limit the committee, as it were, or the investigation or the study, whatever term one uses, to that of a departmental group who would approach it from that point of view, but making use of the experience and the assistance that undoubtedly could be given to them by other groups.

Finally, the suggestion of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk is that any study should result in a report to the Legislature. It is my opinion that any reports should be made to the government who in the end have the responsibility for presenting policy to the House for its consideration, and that we should not depart from that principle in respect of this matter.

Bearing in mind, Madam Speaker, what I have said, I now wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "of" in the second line of the fifth paragraph, and substituting therefor the following: "Continuing their study of these problems in consultation with those interested associations and organizations, with a view to providing an appropriate policy on these matters for the consideration of this House in due course."

Madam Speaker presented the motion and started to put the question.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, some of the members would like to adjourn the debate, Madam Speaker.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, the mover of the amendment is not in the House. Personally, I am very thankful to the Minister for the sympathetic view he

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) has taken in this case to prove that we were not entirely wrong in submitting a similar resolution in the last many years. I believe he would agree to the amendment as amended, and that's something better than in previous years when it was "whitewashed" by an entirely different amendment in "killing" the resolution. This is the first time that the Minister and the Honourable Member for Selkirk has taken a sympathetic view. Although my original motion is not carried, I'm prepared to accept the amendment to the amendment in this particular case. Let's get a half a loaf -- it's a start for the moment.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, unless someone else wishes to speak at the present time, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on the 15th of February, 1963, the Toronto Globe and Mail carried the following article, and I quote from the first paragraph: "Perhaps there has never been a question of importance before the Canadian people on which so much misinformation, confused thinking and emotional reactions have appeared, as over the acquisition of nuclear weapons for the Canadian forces." This was the opening sentence of the statement made by the Honourable Douglas Harkness who had just resigned as Minister of Defence.

Madam Speaker, so far in this debate, I think there is no disagreement between any of the speakers, and certainly no disagreement on my part, that all of us want to prevent war. None of us want to see a war of any kind and particularly not a nuclear war. There's no question that a nuclear war would be a catastrophe, not just for those nations engaged in it but for all of mankind, and it's obvious therefore that all of us as individuals and all nations must bend their best efforts to prevent the development of war to begin with, and particularly of nuclear war.

It seems to me that Canada has taken a leading role in this in the past, regardless of which government was in office. We have made some very positive contributions to world peace. We have done this in the Suez crisis; we've assisted in the various activities of the United Nations. All Canadians, I think, join behind their government regardless of its political stripe in this field. I'm equally sure that the new government which will take over on Monday next, under the Honourable Lester Pearson, will continue in the cause of world peace.

Canadians are proud that in our almost 100 year history we have never been an aggressor nation. Our only role has been that of defending ourselves and participating with our friends and our allies in the defence of our own country, the defence of the country of our allies, and in the freedom of the world. There are many, Madam Speaker, sitting in this Chamber today, who participated actively in these activities. I am sure that all of us agree that we don't want to see Canada become an aggressor. On the other hand, I'm sure all of us would agree as well that every individual has the right and the obligation to defend himself and so has every nation.

Now how can Canada do this best, Madam Speaker. There are some factors in Canada's national existence and in her place in the world community over which we do have some control; but there are many others, Madam Speaker, over which we have no control whatever, however much we Canadians like to believe that we have. One of the first aspects over which we have no control is our geography. We are part and parcel of the North American Continent and, in the final analysis, the security of our neighbour to the south is the security of our own country. We have no control over our economics. To the extent that we belong to this North American Continent, our economic complex is part and parcel of it; and while we can control it to some extent insofar as any aggressor against the North American Continent, they will make no difference between Canada and the United States because they consider our economies to be totally inter-dependent, and an attack against the United States would be in effect an attack against us.

A third factor over which we have limited control is our natural alliances and our alignments. I have dealt with our alliance and alignments with the United States because of geography and because of economics. We have, as well, alliances with the European nations in particular. Because of our background, our history, our culture, our way of life, we are most closely allied to them. The result of this, Madam Speaker, is that Canada realized long

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) ago that in the field of defence we could not go it alone. Because of the reasons that I have mentioned, Canadians have accepted that we are inter-dependent as well in our own interests. I believe that we realize that because of our small population, our large area, our particular problems, we have advantages in co-operating with our friends in the field of defence. I don't propose to go into a discussion of the relative merits of one weapon against another, of Bomarc versus planes or manned bombers versus missiles. I don't believe that we are in a position in this House to discuss these problems because we are not armed with all the facts. I don't think that we can make a decision on this type of an aspect.

I do want to cover though, Madam Speaker, the general principles which I believe underline the security of our country. First, that it's clear that our defence, from an historical standpoint and from a necessity standpoint, is based on a system of alliances. Second, I believe it is clear from past history that a strong defence is the best guarantee against war. Had we here in Canada, and had the United States and had our European allies not allowed our strength to fall, not allowed our alliances to weaken in the period from 1919 to 1939, I think that there were great hopes that the Second World War might have been averted. The aggressor would not have moved forward the way he did had he known that he would have been met with resolution and with strength. Madam Speaker, the only way for Canada to have a strong defence is to play our full part in the alliances that we undertake. If we expect our allies to play their part, then we must be prepared to play ours. How can we expect those who join with us in alliances to live up to their commitments if we, as Canadians, are not prepared to live up to the commitments that we have made.

Well, Madam Speaker, I know that there has been a great deal of discussion as to whether or not we have made commitments. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that those who should be in the best position to know whether we have made commitments or not are those who were directly responsible for this aspect of Canadian security over the past few years. I quote again then from the statements made by the Honourable Douglas Harkness. He says: "Canada does not possess, nor has ever had any intention of obtaining strategic nuclear weapons of any sort." He goes on to say: "Canada's air commitment to NATO requires nuclear armament for the CF-104 aircraft in its present strike reconnaissance role." Further on in this same statement he says: "In the meantime, we have accepted a commitment and, if that commitment is to be met, immediate steps must be taken to ensure that arrangements are made to obtain the accepted armaments for the CF-104."

I quote as well, Madam Speaker, from the statements made by the Associate Minister of National Defence, the Honourable Pierre Sevigny, and he says when he issued his statement on resignation: "I know war. I hate war and I hope that disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, will become a reality. But as we stand, our only defence rests in the strength of NATO, mainly supported by the United States of America. We have specific commitments towards NATO which we must respect. These commitments may change in the future but this does not justify a lack of respect of our present obligations. Such an example by Canada could be followed by other nations and the strength of NATO would be greatly impaired." Madam Speaker, there are the two gentlemen who have for the past few years been directly responsible for Canadian defence. Those are their statements.

I believe there is a further factor, Madam Speaker, which possibly has been overlooked in this discussion. When we accepted obligations under NATO, we accepted to send a brigade of Canadian troops to Germany. For some years now we have had there, as part of the British Army of the Rhine, a Canadian brigade -- boys from every part of Canada; boys -- one battalion of whom have been raised right in this province, when the Royal Winnipeg Rifles here raised one battalion -- I should say one company -- to form part of the Rifle Battalion that was sent overseas, and this was repeated in every province of Canada. Madam Speaker, we have there at this very moment, in Germany, in the front line, a Canadian brigade. They have across the lines from them, facing them, a potential aggressor. They are not there for aggressive purposes; they are there for one purpose alone, and that is to defend our alliance and to defend Canada by that purpose.

Surely no one disagrees with the role that NATO has played. When you look at the events in Europe following the Second World War, as step by step independent nations were

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) taken over by Russia; as Czechoslovakia, an independent nation became under Communist rule; and the same thing in Hungary and the same thing in East Germany. NATO was erected then to stop this onward march and we accepted then, Madam Speaker, to send Canadian boys there for that purpose. Can we now say to these soldiers that we've sent there: "We are not prepared to arm you with the best defence that we can. We are prepared to put you in the front lines facing other troops armed with nuclear weapons, but we will deny them to you." Madam Speaker, I say that this is criminal. We have no right to put any Canadian soldier in that position. Either we live up to our commitments and arm them or take them out of that position and put them in another role.

This is the situation that we face at this time, Madam Speaker. This is the decision that Canadians must make and I'm not prepared, Madam Speaker, to vote in favour of this Resolution because I believe that we cannot on the one side expect other people to stand up for our defence if we are not prepared to play our part. I'm prepared to listen to an argument that we should change the role that we presently have. This is logical. If we can make a better contribution in another way, then let's make it. But in the meantime, Madam Speaker, we cannot put Canadian soldiers and Canadian airmen and Canadian sailors in positions where they may have to defend us and not be prepared to accept the complementary obligation on ourselves.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member of Lac du Bonnet, that the debate on this item be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, quite a bit has been said on this. I don't know whether I'll add too much useful thought to it but I'll try. To me, television is a wonderful teaching aid that modern science has given the people of Canada, Manitoba and the rest of the world, and I use the phrase "teaching aid" because I do not think that really we can solve our teacher shortage problem, nor will it very greatly overcome any ineffectiveness of the inferior teacher in our system. I think that it is a great teaching aid and it can benefit the school children infinitely. I am not suggesting, nor did my colleague Member from St. Boniface suggest that TV replace the teacher. I do not think that it is possible. We must have personal contact. It is impossible in fact, but I do think that we have not given enough thought to the use of TV, to use it effectively.

Most of our programming, as far as TV is concerned, has been on a "touch and go" principle -- a lesson on this, a talk on this and a series on this or that or something else. Very little is prepared with a specific grade and subject in mind. There has been no attempt made to teach a complete course or even a complete unit in any one subject of any specific grade. I think this is the only way that TV can teach, otherwise it only enriches the course and supplements the teacher. This is the only way TV teaching could be used effectively.

Again I stress that it was not the intention of the original mover of this Resolution to replace teachers by means of TV but simply to supplement the teacher, but I do believe that there are certain fields or areas in which the Department of Education can do some definite pioneering and really apply TV to the teaching of certain subjects, but still under the supervision of the teacher. For example, I would like to see a complete self-help course for say any grade, say Grade X or Grade XI, produced and presented in the Province of Manitoba, because we can hardly expect our teachers to be teachers and at the same time to be doctors. Why not broadcast a health program conforming with their prescribed course of studies dealing expertly with the health problems of human beings, say the evil effects of alcoholism and the evil effects of smoking, as has been discussed in the past. Maybe something similar to this could be done in say civics, on patriotism, more extensive use of the TV to supplement the teaching probably in social studies, geography, where the child or the student could visualize what he's trying to grasp.

Another field in which the TV could be used most effectively, according to my way of thinking, is in the teaching of conversational French. My five year old granddaughter has been watching the children's program on the French station for several months or weeks and

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd) now she can use simple French quite effectively, in fact in some cases she uses it better than I do. I think that I am right in saying that even the Teachers' Society will admit that there are very few non-French teachers, or even qualified teachers who can properly teach conversational French. Why not start with a complete and more extensive course in this, say in Grade VII. I believe that teaching by means of TV has great possibilities and should be used more extensively.

I heard the answer made by the Honourable Minister of Education in reply to the Member from St. Boniface and to me it's not too clear. The speech implies that the Honourable Minister either was not too interested in that -- I may be wrong and I am not accusing the Honourable Minister -- but that's what his speech implies, or well he wasn't too well informed on that or it wasn't just quite as important to him as some of the members on this side thought it was. He was very undecided in the first part of his speech, I think a good quarter of his speech was related to policies and corrections and apologizing for probably not saying the right thing, so to me it implies that the Minister wasn't quite ready or didn't really know the subject he was talking about and maybe I don't either, but that's what it implied and I'll just read a few of them. He says: "Perhaps I may have left some misunderstandings and also some misunderstandings with respect to our arrangements with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation." -- he may have left some misunderstanding -- then further he goes and says: "I now realize that I should not have perhaps indicated that there were problems ahead insofar as financing was concerned." Then another paragraph: "I would like on this occasion to perhaps clear up that impression I may have left." And further on: "This problem might have to be considered at some early occasion." And so on he seems to be apologizing. Then he says: "Secondly, perhaps I indicated and I noticed that the press reported that the use of television had limitations, and of course having spoken without preparation" -- I would suggest that anybody who knows the subject well, probably doesn't need too much preparation -- "and certainly without any text or material in front of me at the time, perhaps I used the wrong words." Maybe he did, but I say about a quarter of that speech delivered was excuse and apologies. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, he did in one place.

Now let's come to the amendment to the amendment. I don't see that it changes the amendment very much. If you read the first one, "greater use should be made of the knowledge, ability and competence of the outstanding teachers, and television is one of the means which may be used for such a purpose." We have no quarrel with that. We agree with that and the honourable members would agree with that. No quarrel with that. "And whereas television can be used to add variety to the presentation of subject material," -- the honourable member said that too. There's no change. Of course the Honourable Minister practically deleted the whole amendment and added his own. "And whereas the television coverage is gradually being extended to most parts of Manitoba" -- we have no quarrel with that. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface said that too, but said it in different words. "And whereas the use of television in the field of teaching has been successfully pioneered" -- successfully pioneered, that's the two words that I exactly do not agree with. I think it has been experimented with in Manitoba. The rest is a tribute to the broadcasting corporation and some of the other people who have helped with that, and even mentioned it had also been used in other provinces with success. I think that's irrelevant. It's not too important as far as that goes.

Now the last paragraph: "Therefore be it resolved that the government continue its work" -- I don't like the word "continue". We hear it quite often in all these amendments. I think even in the amendment just amended before this, the same word was "continue", "continue", and "in due course". That to me seems like delaying and procrastination as usual -- "its work in the field of educational television with a view to making it as useful" -- as useful -- I would rather have something else there more definite. This isn't definite -- as usual, as practical. I think we should have as useful, not as useful but a permanent type, something definite that you can sink your teeth into. Therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that the amendment be amended as follows: 1(a) By striking out the words "successfully pioneered" in the second line of the fifth paragraph and replacing them with the words "experimented with". (b) By striking out all the words after "Manitoba" in the same line in the same paragraph thereof. 2(a) By striking out the word "continue" in the

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd) first line of the last paragraph and replacing it with the word "accelerate". (b) By striking out the words "as useful and" in the second line of the same paragraph and replacing them with the words "a permanent type program as".

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. J. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, my remarks will be short, and I do not wish to adjourn this resolution. Speaking to the resolution of the Honourable the Member from St. Boniface, I would support the -- (Interjection) -- speaking to the amendment to the amendment would it? I feel I'd like to support the amended resolution of the Honourable Minister of Education. I listened quite attentively to the Member from Lac du Bonnet as he quoted --

MR. EVANS: Order. I wonder if I might interrupt my honourable friend. As I understand it, there is a sub-amendment before the House and that my honourable friend is addressing his remarks to the amendment. I would think perhaps my honourable friend would agree that a later occasion when the amendment is before the House would be the time for him to make his remarks if he's really addressing himself to the amendment instead of the sub-amendment.

MR. MILLS: Whatever the Speaker wishes.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the sub-amendment presented by the Honourable Member for Emerson. Do you wish to speak to the sub-amendment?

MR. MILLS: No. I'll adjourn the debate -- seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, I wish to adjourn the debate.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): If the honourable member doesn't object, I'd like to speak on this before he adjourns this debate.

Certainly I will support the amendment of my honourable friend, Madam Speaker, because it seems again that the government is trying to scuttle one of our suggestions -- another one of our constructive suggestions. Now for the second year I've been bringing this subject, talking about this possibility of television in the field of education, and for the second year the Minister is throwing cold water on it and apparently doesn't believe too much in it.

Now I might say, Madam Chairman, that we will support this amendment to the amendment in view of the fact that the Minister in presenting his amendment, as was mentioned, after saying that this was a good idea for a couple of years, but finally stated that it was too costly -- finally stated that he didn't know if it would be too costly. I think I should quote from him from Hansard on page 1048, quoting from the Honourable Minister's speech: "And I now realize that I should not have perhaps indicated that there were problems ahead insofar as financing were concerned, because in actual fact there have been no negotiations or no discussions between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with whom we deal insofar as the province and the Department of Education is concerned, and I would like on this occasion to perhaps clear up the impression I may have left, because in fact from the meetings about which I speak, there were no conclusions. It was rather an exploratory discussion and I suppose, one might say, just a preliminary indication that this problem might have to be considered at some early occasion." This is what the Minister said. And as my colleague said, he also spent most of his speech in apologizing for not being prepared and for not knowing too much about this.

Well, Madam Speaker, there's not too much that the members of the Opposition can do without the help of the government. All we can do is suggest, bring in what we consider are good suggestions, and of course the government is not forced to accept. They can refuse all our suggestions. That's their responsibility and that's up to them. I feel that we've done something anyway by bringing it to the attention of the Honourable Minister, because he said himself in his speech that he was driven to study the matter only because I placed it on the Order Paper. So if nothing else, I think that we've achieved something, because this is going to come up and the Minister, as my honourable friend said, wasn't too well prepared, but I think that he's going to take the trouble next time of reading a little more about it, finding out more about the subject before speaking. Oh, he did say nice things about Miss McCance, but he was only seconding my sentiments of a few weeks ago, and we won't quarrel with him on this.

Madam Speaker, as I say, the Minister, the government do not have to agree with us, but I don't consider it fair, Madam Speaker, and I don't think it's right for the Minister to try

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) to make me say something that I haven't said at all. I think that it is rather unfair that a Minister should stand up and say something -- I won't accuse him of saying this -- to scare the teacher, but maybe it was one of the reasons, or to cloud the issue maybe. Nevertheless, the Minister in his speech, Madam Speaker, said this, and I quote again: "Dealing particularly with the resolution which has been placed on the Order Paper by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface -- and I want to commend him for sincere and obvious interest in this subject -- I believe that he is under a misunderstanding because of his views of the -- or the suggestion which appears from his resolution, that educational television can be used as a substitute for teachers. This word appears in the first two "whereas" clauses and upon examining into this matter carefully, I find that it is not regarded as being in any sense a substitute for teachers and indeed cannot be used as a substitute for teachers. In fact, the whole experience in that educational television is only useful and helpful when used in conjunction with good teaching, so that if there are problems such as are suggested in the introductory paragraphs of the resolution, they are problems which stand rather on another footing and have to be dealt with separately, but they cannot, in my opinion, be cured by use of educational television, and educational television was never intended to be used either, as I say, in substitution for teachers or by way of qualified teachers."

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think that that is quite cricket for a Minister to bring a statement -- he's not too sure where he's going on this, but he wants -- or I might say he suggests to me anyway that he intends the people in the teaching profession to misunderstand him. The Minister that is answering somebody that's made a resolution, somebody in his department should take the trouble, especially if he's not too versed in it, to read what that person has said before coming out and making statements like he did. This is what I said on Page 302 on March 15th, 1963. "Although the first paragraph of my motion states that there is a shortage of qualified teachers, I hasten to say that the qualified teachers will never be replaced by TV." I do hope, however, that the poor teachers should be, those that aren't qualified, should soon be replaced in any case, which he has been advocating himself. By taking advantage of television, we'd be able to make real use of our good teachers, the very best ones, those who are tops in their respective fields, the experts, the specialists. I can't say it any clearer than that, Madam Speaker, and I think the Minister should not make statements like this. He achieved probably what he was after. The reports were more or less insinuating that TV was no good because it might tend to replace the teachers if my motion was carried. Now because of what he said -- I thought that my speech was very clear what I wanted -- that he was speaking without a text, he hasn't too much on this -- so I'll give him some more information that he can think of before he speaks next.

This is what some experts say about this education: "Television in education has been called the most important educational tool since movable type. In less than a decade, hundreds of colleges and universities, thousands of elementary and secondary schools, and millions of students of all ages in formal classes and at home have already experienced television's ability to overcome limitations of distance, time and cost, and to make the exceptional teacher available to thousands of students" -- the exceptional teacher -- "whether serving as part of a planned course with specific objectives, as a complete course in itself or for selected enrichment purposes, television has thoroughly demonstrated not only its remarkable versatility but its effectiveness in maintaining or improving the quality of education. There are approximately 33 out of 50 states with television closed circuits, television in education."

Now the Minister told us that there are different classes. There's the educational TV lesson as provided by ordinary stations, and then there are the closed circuit television. Well when this discussion first started, I stated that we'd have to start by taking small steps definitely and I suggest that with co-operation such as another -- Nova Scotia, I think -- enjoyed with CBC, that would help greatly. I felt that the day would come probably where we would have our closed circuit. He felt that this was not feasible or was too costly and it wasn't worthwhile. But these things exist. When we talk about pioneering, it's something that we take a chance at times, and we study certain things. There's lots of pioneering -- if we listen to campaign speeches, there's a lot of pioneering done by this government up north. Well maybe they could pioneer in something that is worthwhile also.

I have in front of me a booklet from the South Carolina Department of Education, and

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) they have here right on the first page: "Beginning in only one high school in September, 1958, closed circuit educational television in South Carolina now reaches out to 70 high schools in 21 of the State's 46 counties, including practically all of the major population centres as well as many rural and small town districts. Responsible to the Legislature for the operation of the system is a seven-man educational television commission. This commission evolved an eight-point policy statement in July, 1960." I won't name them all, but there are some I'd like to read. The first point is: "Employment of the finest teachers available for essential basic subjects, including mathematics, sciences, languages, history, vocations and others. That is the best qualified teachers whose talents in the past have been limited to a small number of pupils in a single classroom will be able in the future, working as a team with classroom teachers," -- I'd like to repeat this for the Honourable Minister -- working as a team with classroom teachers. They don't say to "kick 'em out". Let's get this clear so I won't be misquoted -- "to project their knowledge and techniques to thousands of pupils including those in the most remote rural schools."

Another point was this. "Encouragement of TV teachers who will be responsible for only one lesson a day to extend their scope of instructional knowledge in techniques, thereby keeping abreast of the rapidly changing world in which we live." I might say that all teachers chosen for TV were experienced and respected classroom teachers of proven ability. "The South Carolina Education TV Centre has placed an almost total emphasis on basic difficult-to-teach subjects, thus seeking to help solve the crucial shortage of qualified teachers." This is what I meant, and this is what I said, Madam Speaker.

As I said, I won't repeat them all, but I'd like to say this here of the findings of South Carolina. "One of the South Carolina's major contributions to the development of educational TV has been in the use of closed circuit distribution for wide geographical areas. Where closed circuit television has been used in other states, it has been largely within the confines of a single school or college. South Carolina saw at once that the open circuit station may be forever limited to one channel, meaning that there could never be more than 12 half-hour subjects a day for an average of only one subject for each class. Furthermore, only four open circuit educational stations had been allocated to the state by the SCC with an effective geographical coverage of only a third of the state. With these limitations in mind, South Carolina investigated the possibility of closed circuit to existing and planned facilities of the telephone company. It was known only that no circuit TV would allow as many channels with as many subjects as might be desired with excellent reception at every point. The difficulty was that there were no closed circuit educational television network in the nation, and no telephone company anywhere had costs figured for educational TV." In short, ETV advocates in South Carolina were seeking information that did not exist. This is truly pioneering, Madam Speaker.

It goes on here: "The result was that the legislature could be shown that every high school in the state, a total of 413, could be served with three channels of broadcasting, offering 36 daily half-hour subjects at an average cost of \$12.67 per pupil a year. This cost also included the studios and transmission lines for the three summer months, as well as afternoon and evening hours whenever needed year-round, for wide variety of educational service at all levels. This means for adult education also. The legislature was so impressed that it appropriated all that was asked for the 1960-61 school year when the South Carolina system went state-wide. The \$643,000 appropriation enabled the system to expand to 31 high schools in 11 counties, using only one channel, the closed circuit." And it goes on -- this is just a bit of information.

Now there is in Jefferson County, Kentucky -- they wanted to try something out there too -- "In February 1957, our school board decided to go ahead with an experiment in teaching with closed circuit television. In order to assure control of conditions, we decided to institute the experiment in just three schools." Well that cost them \$25,000 for three schools -- their first three schools. We know that this is modest, and this includes also fifteen 21-inch RCA monitors for use in classrooms and so on. This is modifying different buildings for studios, and this is all included in this amount.

Now in closing I wanted to read some of the advantages by people that have really studied -- not people that came here without texts not prepared, not knowing too much about it -- people that studied this. This is what they have to say, and I would suggest that the

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) Honourable the Minister should maybe get some of this information and really look into this. "All the advantages of our TV teaching program have not been fully analyzed. Here are some which have become apparent. (1) It eliminated some of the need for additional construction by increasing the capacity of present buildings." -- very important -- you can't measure that too much in cost of TV. "(2) It reduced the number of pupils in the regular teachers' group. (3) The program frees the regular classroom teacher from routine interruptions, such as preparations for visual education, lunch, physical education, music and other activities, thus enabling the teachers to do a more effective job," -- not to chase 'em away -- "to do a more effective job of instruction in the basic skills. (4) It provided a better quality of instruction, because teachers specially trained to teach in the special areas such as music, art, dramatics, science and physical education, are now able to reach more children more often. (5) The program relieves regular teachers of many time-consuming non-teaching duties, thus providing more time for individual pupil attention." -- not replacing them, giving them more time. "(6) It provided for fuller utilization of large areas presently available in the schools. (7) It made instructional supplies and equipment potentially more meaningful and perhaps more economical. (8) Less expensive furniture was required. (9) The program made possible financial savings for better teacher salaries and more school services. (10) It enhanced the importance and need of a good teacher by requiring skilled teachers. (11) It provided in-service training possibilities for all employees." I can go on -- there's quite a few, but I'll give this information to my honourable friend if he wants it and he can study it.

Now we have some teacher reactions. "It is so interesting," reports Mrs. Jessie McLellan, fourth and fifth grade Science teacher, "that I will work long hours at night after the family has gone to bed. This I could not do if I were grading papers, but TV teaching is so wonderfully effective that I am truly excited about it." That's the teacher that speaks like that. "The time we spend before the TV cameras, 20 to 30 minutes, passes so quickly we must use it to utmost advantage. Therefore, we take more than usual pains in lesson preparation. We spend an average of eight hours preparing for one lecture. I collect film strips, exhibits from museums, make charts and get all sorts of visuals together." "It's not only fascinating to the teacher," according to Miss Wilma Howard, TV teacher in social science, "but it's rewarding in pupil response. We are getting through to students in a way we never did before. The youngsters are listening and responding. This we know because of the specimens, animals, birds and other offerings being brought in constantly by the many interested students." And here they finish this brochure here by saying, "Television is used to complement existing teaching methods. Its chief importance is that it makes possible redeployment of teachers, using them in such a way that the greatest benefit will resolve from their professional training."

A lot of people have been studying this in the United States and I have here summaries of two outstanding research reports on televised instruction. The first one gives some of the results reported. "TV lessons are more carefully planned than conventional lessons." This is the national program re use of television in public schools, a report of the second year 1958-59 issued by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. "More material can be covered by TV than by a teacher in a conventional classroom. TV can bring to students educational experiences far beyond the potential of the conventional classroom. Outstanding resource people can be seen and heard. Places of interest and illustrative materials can be shown. With rare exceptions, discipline has not been a problem in the large classes. Students are learning at an early stage of their educational career the art of taking notes and the ability to concentrate." This is very important and if the people would learn this they wouldn't misquote other people that speak before them. "TV teaching has proven to be a valuable means for in-service training. Studio and classroom teachers can work together as a team to do a much more effective job of teaching than either of them could do alone. The classroom teacher, far from being relegated to a minor role, has assumed new importance. TV for direct instruction should be introduced early in the elementary grades so students will become accustomed to it early in their school careers. Large numbers of adults are tuning in on TV lessons which helps promote a greater interest in education. The full potential of TV for making subjects like history come alive for students has not yet been adequately explored. Students have had

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) to accept more responsibility for their own learning and have done so. Advance planning and careful preparation anticipate many students' questions. Many students like the idea of the presentation of the lessons without interruptions. Classroom teachers learn to handle students' questions in the follow part of the classroom." I would like to have this in Hansard so the Honourable Minister can use this. "Copies of this report are available at no charge as long as the supply lasts. Write direct to the Fund for the Advancement of Education, 477 Madison Avenue, New York 22, New York."

Now they had another one in the Chicago TV College. They have a report of the first three years' experience by the Chicago City Junior College. They had a panel of distinguished educators representing the areas of higher education, evolution, research, who made this report. This is the last one but I think this one is important also. "Courses at the junior college level can be brought effectively to a home audience by television." You see you can reach practically anywhere with this television, Madam Speaker. "The results on this point were most impressive and convincing. When junior college work is offered by TV, it brings in an older group of students, most of them housewives who are strongly motivated to continue their education. Many of them plan to become teachers and are an important group to train. Television builds an appetite in the community for higher education, so other than TV classes are also in greater demand. The cost of educating students by TV in Chicago is a little more than educating them in classrooms, just a little more, but when the registration increased by a third, the cost of TV teaching would compare with the cost of classroom teaching." Then you'd have all those added benefits.

"Junior college courses are of value to non-credit viewers and this service should be considered as valuable to citizens of Chicago. Sixty-five percent of the TV students finish their course and take the examination" -- sixty-five percent. "This completion rate is quite remarkable when compared with other forms of adult education for credits. The project has demonstrated that an effective classroom teacher can learn to be an effective TV teacher. Practice, self-criticism and a great deal of detailed planning are necessary. The experiment appears to have generated a healthful ferment throughout the junior college system in Chicago. The early fears of teachers that they might be superseded by a picture tube appears to have been mostly done away with." This is an important point. "Whereas at first it was difficult to get volunteers for TV teaching, now applications greatly exceed the openings. We note with pleasure that the service is being continued beyond the three experimental years" -- and again this information is available.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have read quite a few of these ideas to have it in Hansard because I think that this is important. I tried to be objective in my first speech and the meaning of my motion was destroyed by the amendment. There was no reason for that. It's, as I say, the duty of the members of the opposition to bring in their ideas. There's nothing to force the government to accept these, but at least let's keep the things the way they were presented. Let's vote for or against it and let's not try to scare the teaching profession in thinking that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface is trying to replace them with a picture tube.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, there's one thing for certain in this House, that the Honourable Member for Emerson and the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, with their small, narrow, one-track minds, can be depended upon to drag any debate down to the level of trivial personalities. There's no use of making any useful suggestions or any comments, because of course they can't understand any kind of debate of that sort. For the record, I might remind the honourable members that when this matter was raised first it was during the estimates of the Department of Education, and when the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface made his speech about television, I didn't make any comment. He pressed me -- he wanted to know, what did I have to say -- he wanted to know right there and then on the spot. Well I got up and said that I -- and indeed, Madam Speaker, I would be the first to admit that I haven't got the slightest personal interest in television -- not the slightest. I think it's a medium of some use, but that it's also a matter of great abuse in our society. We have only had a television set in our own home for about 12 months and even now I don't look at it, so that I want to make my position with respect to television quite clear. I presume that's what I'm supposed to do, to bare my soul and establish my position. I suppose I would be described as an old Tory and something uncomplimentary of that sort.

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)

Not only that, Madam Speaker, but I have not made any special study of television in relation to education. Madam Speaker, there are a million things more important in education than the subject of television, and it's just trivial nonsense for us to talk in here as though it was the most important aspect of the whole educational process. What kind of silliness is this anyway. But in any event, I made some observations and I said at the time, and I'm speaking now of -- yes, I said at the time that I was not prepared -- I hadn't prepared any speech about television. Goodness gracious, there were a lot of other important things that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface didn't talk about during the presentation of the Estimates of the Department of Education, much more important than television.

Then the Honourable Member brought his Resolution forward and I prepared myself to say a few words about it, and I was hopeful that I had indicated that I thought he was interested in this subject -- in fact I said so. I did not distort what he said. I read his Resolution and he's entitled to take any view of that that he likes. He made the Resolution, not me. I want to remind him that I didn't get the Press that -- he gets much better Press than I do, Madam Speaker -- what I say is very seldom reported. I'm sure that there isn't one teacher in the whole Province of Manitoba that got the least bit excited about what I said on the occasion of my speech. I pointed out the very things that he has been trying to say now -- not what he said in his first speech but what he is now saying, and the

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, please. I speak on a point of privilege and I will read again what I said -- not now, but what I said on March 15th of 1963 on page 302; "Although the first paragraph of my motion states that there is a shortage of qualified teachers, I hasten to say that the qualified teachers will never be replaced by TV." If that's not clear, Madam Speaker, there's something wrong here. If that's not misquoted I don't know what it is.

MR. McLEAN: If I may proceed, Madam Speaker, I tried to indicate the course that the use of television insofar as schools were concerned had taken. Madam Speaker -- and this is for the benefit of the Honourable the Member for Emerson, and I'll speak about his amendment in a moment because he's very sensitive of any suggestion that perhaps the present government had ever done anything -- I was careful to point out, and I read from the book that said so, that the beginning of the use of radio and television in the schools of Manitoba began obviously during the time of the previous administration. I claimed no credit and made no suggestions that our government had in any way instituted this work, nor did I indicate that we were desirous of taking any credit for it. One is entitled to whatever view one wishes concerning the amendments which I presented, but there was no suggestion of trying to "scuttle" the Resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. As a matter of fact, it's the same idea, in essence, expressed in language which I considered to be in keeping with the practice that had grown up and the work that was being done.

Now my speech has been subjected to that scintillating scrutiny that only the member for Emerson can do, and he doesn't like it because I apologized. Well, Madam Speaker, I'm sorry, but I don't possess the capacity which the Honourable Member for Emerson has of always being dead-right on the first throw, and would be the first to admit it, and I strongly suspect there will be many occasions when I'll have to apologize because I don't presume, and I suppose he would like me to, but I don't presume to know everything about everything.

Now he has said he doesn't like the works "successfully pioneered". I just repeat what I have already said, that I was only paying a compliment to the previous administration in this province, because they did successfully pioneer the work in this field, and that's what my resolution says. He doesn't want to pay any compliment to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the other people who have been involved. Well I think sometimes it's not a bad idea to say thanks, and certainly we're all in the debt of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private television stations who have been most helpful to us in the carrying of these programs. He wants a permanent type of program, but Madam Speaker, the point I was trying to make and obviously didn't get through, at least to the Honourable the Member for Emerson, was, that the teachers, the people that we've been working with, the committee of teachers, the folks who work with this, they have said that we're not yet at a point where we can say with absolute certainty that this is worthwhile or that it must be adopted on a permanent basis, nor

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . indeed that it can be adopted for teaching any particular subject in any particular grade. The most enthusiastic people with respect to television in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, would be the first to say that that's the one thing that we should not do; that is the one thing that would kill the whole project deader than a doornail, because we might easily pick some subject which could not be properly presented in this fashion, and it's only with this process of experimentation, using the facilities on a national and a regional as well as a provincial basis, of using different subject matter, of using different teachers with varying qualifications in the various fields of learning, that we can determine where best to use this medium. Now the Honourable Member for St. Boniface may not think I've read very much about educational television, but I've read enough to know that, and if he will do a little further reading, with some proper, some good material, I think that he'll come to that conclusion as well.

I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, to have become somewhat exercised, but I'm fed up to the teeth with this idea that when anybody on this side gets up and makes any kind of a reasonable speech that it must be interpreted of course as being personal, and we've got to be pinned down to these personalities. I'm not interested in personalities. I made a suggestion in the form of my resolution with respect to television, and admitting all my ignorance, I'm still quite prepared, and we are still quite prepared to carry forward this work on the basis as we have been doing and as it was started by the previous administration in this province, and I believe, Madam Speaker, that that's the best thing for all of us to do in this province at this time with this subject.

MR. MILLS: Madam Speaker, to observe correctly the rules of this House, I now beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. Continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, and the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin and the sub-amendment of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, by the sound of things my speech is going to be pretty brief. I thought that the Honourable Member for Dufferin had covered things pretty well and that there wouldn't be too much further discussion on this point but evidently the Honourable Member for Neepawa-Gladstone, hasn't been too satisfied with the presentation of the details and there are a few points that I would like to point out to him. First of all as a matter of detail he got off on the discussion of Harte Siding, and couldn't figure out why there was any mention of the Harte subdivision in the resolution or the sub-amendment, and I'd like to point out to him that the Harte subdivision runs from just outside Fort Osborne Barracks down to the town of Rivers, a distance of some 135 miles, and I think the right-of-way along that stretch of ground is very pertinent to the location of an extra two lanes of highway. It's strange that he got siding and subdivision a little bit confused.

I was also concerned that the tone of the debate from the other side might give the effect, or leave the idea that highway safety in Manitoba left something to be desired. In that regard I would like to quote from the Financial Post of March 23rd where it gives a traffic toll for 100,000 population in the provinces of Canada; B.C. has 20; Alberta 20.76; Saskatchewan 19; Manitoba 14.88; Ontario 20.45; Quebec 17.09; New Brunswick 25.66; Nova Scotia 21.28; Prince Edward Island 16; Newfoundland 12.5. So in highway safety Manitoba has the second best record next to the province of Newfoundland. I think we should also point out some of the causes of the fatalities that have been mentioned. I'd like to deal with the period from 1959, '60, '61 those three years, and we find that two fatal accidents in that period account for half the fatalities, and in both those two accidents liquor was the main contributing factor. I can assure the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that I myself am going to sleep quite easy in my bed if somebody gets an extra load and goes driving on the highway and has a fatal accident. The government has already taken remedial steps in that area. You may have noticed that there are experimental delineators up now hoping that these will take care of possibly three things: the possibility of hypnosis or driving along a long flat stretch of highway; also as an assistance for measuring distances and also for improving visibility in drifting conditions; also deceleration and acceleration lanes have been provided at Elie and I hope that these measures will help what might have been the cause of some accidents in the past. But the thing, Madam Speaker, that any investigation of the accidents on this stretch of highway, 27 miles or even the stretch from Winnipeg right through to Portage, points out quite conclusively, and that is that they have all been caused by driver error rather than highway conditions, and a large percentage of this has been found to have had liquor implications particularly in as I say these fatal accidents and I feel that this in itself is not enough to justify highway construction. There is no doubt I feel that in the near future the traffic count and the traffic on this particular highway will justify a four-lane highway and I'm sure when the traffic count and the traffic warrants it, that this government will be building a four-lane highway along this stretch of road.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, yeas and nays.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielvaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 12; Nays 40.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Motion before the House is the amendment of the Honourable Member for Dufferin.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member from Assiniboia that if no one else wishes to speak on this debate it be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I think we all recognize in this House that Canada is a bilingual country. I cannot agree however with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that it has not been adequately recognized, particularly in areas of mixed French and Anglo-Saxon descent. I agree as well that we should endeavour to promote and encourage bilingualism in Manitoba. There are however, problems even at the present time under the present provisions of the Act for the official teaching of French in Grade 4. The member sponsoring this resolution mentioned this problem and it is of course the finding of properly bilingual teachers. I think we will all agree that French can only be properly taught by someone who is perfectly bilingual, and it is in this field, the field of properly bilingual teachers where we have our largest shortage. The Member for St. Boniface mentioned the shortage of teachers in his resolution on TV, and I emphasize again that this applies particularly in the field of the teaching of French. He's absolutely right when he stated in the House a few days ago that it is rather ridiculous for someone to have studied five, six or seven years of French in school and to graduate without being able to carry on a simple conversation in that tongue. I agree too, that there is far too much concentration in the school system in the grammatical French rather than the conversational. He makes a number of suggestions in his speech with which I am in full accord. Firstly, he suggests that French speaking teachers should teach in English speaking communities and vice versa. He also requests, and I agree, that perhaps part of the teachers' college could be devoted entirely to the producing of French bilingual teachers, and although I do not know how this might work out in practice, I concur in the idea of English speaking students mingling or being exposed to French speaking students and I might say, that this also applies to those adults endeavouring to master the French language -- and about this I will have a few words to say later on.

There's also an economic factor involved, for assuming that this resolution was passed and a hurried-up program of teaching French in Grade 1 was immediately instituted, it would in many cases involve the hiring of supernumerary teachers for which there is no grant. On checking with the superintendent of our school division I find that this is even the case now with teachers of specific subjects. I find also, that school boards are reluctant because of pressure on them from increasing taxes to adding these extra salaries for which there is no provision in the grant schedule. The answer to this of course would be the altering of the grant regulations to allow for these specifics in the grant system, or to lower the number of students per teacher in order to qualify for grants. The Minister of Education and his department would be the ones that would have to decide on that.

I agree with all that has been said about children being taught an extra language at an early age, and I'm all for starting the teaching of French in Grade 1, not only because of the merits of bilingualism as outlined in the honourable member's resolution, but because I am convinced that the studying of an extra language helps one with his own, and in addition, especially with students, is a stimulant to the mind. The honourable member says that he does not advocate that French should be forced upon students, and he puts particular stress on the word "optional". Now, the honourable member, I respectfully suggest shouldn't be so chicken, he isn't usually in some of his other resolutions, and I think in this respect that I would be prepared to go much further than he, for if the studying of a language whether it be French, German or any other language is in fact a stimulant to the mind and does in fact help one with his own, then I think that it is a subject that is perhaps as important as mathematics, social studies, and some of the other subjects that are on our curriculum today.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland stated that French and English have been recognized as the major international languages and I think that this in itself because of the contacts that we have today with other parts of the world that we never had before is an argument in favour of doing all that we can in our school system in teaching French to students at an early

(Mr. Groves cont'd) age, and preparing these students to go out into the world and be able to converse intelligently in both of these languages. I would say, that as soon as we are in a position to do so, that this reason alone is one that we should consider for the compulsory teaching of French in our schools in Manitoba. In our school division, that is the School Division of St. Vital, we are very fortunate in that we have three completely bilingual teachers of French on the staff, one at Glenwood School, one at Varennes and one at Windsor School where my children go. These teachers teach French in these schools from grade 4 on, and I'm happy to say that all of my children have commenced their study of the French language in grade 4 under a properly qualified bilingual teacher.

I think that the honourable member has introduced a very important resolution and I think that this House should take into consideration as well the suggestions that were made by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. I must say, however, that I do regret at times the Honourable Member for St. Boniface bringing into these and other debates a feeling of bitterness or rancour. I think that this is unfortunate particularly on a subject as important as this. He says, for example, in his address -- he asks us if we can honestly say that in Canada there reigns the true spirit of brotherhood, and I say that in Canada we have done a pretty good job of letting the spirit of brotherhood reign, and that in this respect we don't have to take a back seat to any other nation in the world.

He asks us if the Fathers of Confederation would be satisfied with the progress of the past hundred years, and I say Madam Speaker that the Fathers of Confederation would be satisfied with the progress that we have made and that it has probably exceeded their wildest expectations. He suggests also that we should not attempt to answer these questions publicly, and I say that in this Legislature we should not be afraid at all to answer any questions publicly. He says that we should show that we are trying to eradicate prejudice. I do not think that he had to ask the members of this House to try and eradicate prejudice, because although this may perhaps apply to others it certainly doesn't apply here and I don't think that there is any prejudice in this House that we have to eradicate. He suggests that his main purpose in sponsoring this resolution is a gesture of recognition to the French-speaking people of this province, and that the passing of it will no longer make them feel tolerated -- or merely tolerated were his words -- but accepted. Madam Speaker, I think that this is pure and utter nonsense. He talks as if the French-speaking minority in this province were a persecuted minority, and this to my knowledge and in my experience with the French-speaking people of this province certainly is not generally the case. He also suggests in his speech that there are prejudices that should be brought out into the open in order that we may examine them, or eliminate them, and I would suggest that if he really thinks that there are prejudices that should be brought out into the open that it would be most helpful to us here if he would bring them out into the open so that we could see what and where they are.

So Madam Speaker, I do not think we should talk of this resolution in terms of tolerance and acceptance, that we should treat this resolution for what it is, a contribution towards the education of our children in this province in order that we may better prepare them for a changing and shrinking world.

I would also like to say a few words about the subject of bilingualism and the adults of our province. The Member for Rupertsland mentioned the other day in his speech that more and more of our English speaking peoples were taking an interest in learning the French language. I am one who the Honourable Member from St. Boniface described, one of those who left school after studying French up to grade 12 then promptly forgot it, and thanks to the interest of these three teachers that I referred to earlier that are teaching French in the school system where I live, thanks to the interest which they have imparted in my children, I last September went back to school and began to take a course in Conversational French myself, and to review on my own the grammatical French that I had learned in school. And although I have to blame the First Minister of the province for interrupting my course -- he called an election on the 14th of December, and because of that I lost a great deal of time. However, I'm going to stick with it and I hope that in a few years that I will be able to manage quite nicely.

So, I throw out a challenge, Madam Speaker, to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. If I and my children and others who are in this situation do become fairly proficient in the French language, where are we going to get an opportunity, in a province where English is so predominantly used, where are we going to get an opportunity to use it. In fact, all of the children that are

(Mr. Groves, cont'd) coming out of our schools with some knowledge of French must have some opportunity to practice it. I wonder what he and some of the organizations in the French-speaking community in our province could do to help us resolve this problem. For surely, if we go to the trouble to learn his language and we never get the opportunity to use it, we will never really become as proficient in its use as he suggests that we should be, and I agree that we should be. In the City of St. Boniface there is an organization called L'Association d'Education des Canadiens Francais du Manitoba, and perhaps he might be able to influence them to take on a project in addition to the worthwhile ones that they have at the moment, in order to in some way or other provide opportunities for English-speaking students of French to converse and to socially meet with their French-speaking counterparts.

Madam Speaker, in my opinion, the French language is no longer a purely academic subject to be studied only by those of our youth who aspire to higher education, and for the deeper cultural benefits that are provided in our general educational system. A working knowledge of the French language and the ability to converse in this tongue to the extent that one can make one's self understood and can understand others -- speaking French is no longer a luxury but a necessity in Canada today. More and more we see advertisements in professional, trade and financial journals with the requirement of bilingualism. It's just as important, Madam Speaker, that our children learn to understand and converse in French, and preferably to read and write the language well, as it is to learn the rudiments of arithmetic and some of the other subjects that they are compelled to take in our present curriculum. French, like these subjects, is a working tool that we must equip our children with in order, in many instances, for them to be able to make a better than average living in our country today, and to take advantage of opportunities of better employment which in increasing number are requiring French as a basic necessity. And I use no less an authority for that statement than the Glassco Report, when they were examining into the situation in the Department of External Affairs, and this clipping which was taken from the Report says this, and I'll just quote parts: "256 officers of the department have a reasonable good command of French, but another 172 admit "cincompétence" --(whatever that means). Clearly this latter figure is too high." And they go on to say, and this is a quote from the report: "It should be a condition of permanent appointment in External Affairs that the probationer equip himself with a sound working knowledge of French and English languages." And again further in their report, they say this: "Quite apart from the general desirability of having a foreign service that reflects the bicultural character of Canada, there is another reason for stressing proficiency in the use of the French language. For many years French and English have been the principal languages of diplomacy as the international community enlarges with the emergence of new states, a large number of them French-speaking, and French continues to be the second language in many non-French countries; the use of French as a working language is increasing to the point where bilingualism becomes a practical necessity."

Living as we do, Madam Speaker, in a province where French is spoken by so few people, we do not realize how much a handicap it is for our people who live, work or are transferred in the course of their employment to other communities where French is spoken daily, such as Ottawa and Montreal. Again, a point to remember, Madam Speaker, is that within a few years, in my opinion, French will be compulsory for all who aspire to the higher position in the Civil Service at Ottawa; and will be a decisive factor in civil service competitions for most positions. If the French-speaking Canadians are sincere in their desire that the rest of us learn their tongue, they will have to help us in much the same way as we have helped many people that have immigrated to this country from Europe. They will have to supply us with teachers and interesting courses. They will have to tolerate our feeble efforts in their language and to speak to us in French and to encourage us to use the language and to correct our mistakes in grammar, vocabulary and particularly pronunciation. We must commence teaching French to our children in the public schools right from the start and we must teach the French that is spoken in Canada. We must teach it as a basic subject and not as an academic subject, so that those of our youth who do not proceed past matriculation can manage in French as well as their counterparts elsewhere in Canada manage in English.

Madam l'orateur, mon vocabulaire français est très limité et je regrette que ceci ne me permet pas de parler sur cette résolution dans cette langue. Tout de même, j'ai espérance que l'honorable député de Saint-Boniface, tout en souriant, me sera indulgent. Qui sait, en

(Mr. Groves cont'd) persévérant et avec l'aide de mes amis canadiens-français, je pourrai peut-être un jour prononcer un discours en cette Chambre dans sa langue maternelle, sans le lire et de tel façon que même mon honorable ami sera fier de mes efforts.

(English translation) Madam Speaker, my French vocabulary is very limited and I regret that this does not permit me to speak on this resolution in that language. Nevertheless, I hope that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, even while smiling, will bear with me. Who knows, by persevering and with the help of my French-Canadian friends, I may one day make a speech in this House in his mother tongue, without having to read it and in such a manner that even my honourable friend will be proud of my efforts.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yeas and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland in amendment thereto.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 37; Nays 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George. The Honourable the

MR. ROBLIN: main motion, Madam Speaker, the main motion as amended.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. Are you ready for the question -- as amended.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I rise to close the debate on this. When I introduced my motion on March 15th, I tried to be very clear and precise in explaining what I felt my motion should accomplish. My main objective was for the recognition of a principle by the members of this House. I wanted those of us who believe in the great Canadian partnership as did McDonald and Cartier, to show the example to all Manitobans, in fact to all Canada. My aim was not to interfere with the board of advisors or the Department of Education but I felt that this principle should be dealt with by the elected representatives of the people, by the members of this House. If a partnership exists in Canada, Madam Speaker, it should be an equal partnership and neither of the partners should be asked to use the back door. This was my reason for amending the Act. I made it clear that I was not advocating compulsory measures nor was I suggesting the spending of public funds. I was careful in wording the resolution. I worded it in a manner that would not make it impossible or even difficult for the government to support. I worded it in a manner that would not make it impossible or even difficult for the government to support. I also tried to remove all suggestion of partisan politics from the debate. I wanted to give credit where credit was due and I singled out the Premier for special praises -- praise that I certainly believed he deserved.

Madam Speaker, you can well imagine my disappointment when this motion was amended and especially in the way that it was amended. It was most disappointing also because this amendment was made by one of my compatriots. I hesitate to believe that the Honourable Member from Rupertsland realized what he was doing, how much he would hurt the cause he was trying to help. His words would indicate that he had been used, that he was repeating someone else's words. He started by saying, and I quote: "I would like to compliment the honourable member on the broadminded and non-partisan way in which he approached the very important subject." Then later on he says, "I'm offering these changes in my honourable friend's resolution. I do so only because I think it's important that it be made thoroughly effective, that it command support in every part of the House which the honourable member in his remarks last Friday afternoon showed himself anxious to secure."

Madam Speaker, after listening to these words I fail to see where the honourable member, who apparently understood my motion, decided to amend it and distort the meaning I had

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd)intended to give it. It wasn't my intention to either praise or criticize the Department of Education nor the Advisory Board. I did not wish to pass to either of them the responsibility of the members of this House. I had asked that all the members support me in my motion in order to recognize a principle. How can the honourable member say, and I quote again, "It would give to the world a beneficial example of good will and mutual understanding" and then rob the members of a chance to make a decision to take a stand. How can he say "Many of the studies were prompted by the expert advice that teaching of French, as of any other language would be more effective at an earlier age" and then move to strike out paragraph 4, which says, Madam Speaker, "And whereas psychologists maintain that the best time to teach a child any language is up to the age of ten years." This Madam, I fail to understand.

But let us not take only my word and the word of the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, to justify this paragraph. On February 27th, 1960, Dr. Wilder Penfield had this to say to the Manitoba Conference on Education, "There is a time to start language learning. It is early in the first decade. The biological clock of the human brain cannot be altered by the educator to suit the convenience of the school curriculum." This scientific argument is doubly true Madam when it happens that the language in question is of the child's own mother tongue in many instances, as well as one of the official languages of our country.

Striking out the fifth and last paragraph of my motion of course means that the legislators elected by the people will not have the right to vote in favour of a principle. The honourable member stated that he was making these changes because he wanted the motion supported by all the members of this House. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead told us that the members of his party would rather support my motion and of course the members of the Liberal caucus feel the same. Would this indicate, Madam, that the members of the government were not ready to support my motion. Are they against the principle involved? Are they more interested in bringing partisan politics or are they just afraid to make a decision?

The honourable member had this to say, "The desire of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to get things started is fully appreciated and I believe understood. It would, however, not be proper for the Department of Education or School Board to announce their intentions before plans to operate the change are completed. Madam Speaker, I say that this is utterly ridiculous. Since when are the members of this House forbidden to accept a principle until something is done by a board or certain department? Again I repeat that I meant every word of praise given earlier to the Premier. Again I repeat that I am sure that the Premier does not have any prejudices. Again I repeat that I am sure that the Premier is in favour of this principle, but I must add that he is first and foremost a politician and in questions such as this one he is concerned first of all with public opinion. He wants the credit, as this amendment would show, but he will not accept responsibility as this amendment also shows.

I had no intention of speaking this way but this amendment left me no alternative. Am I unfair? Am I unjust, Madam Speaker? As soon as the Premier saw the notice of my motion he chose to speak on the subject and the Honourable Minister of Education also had much to say. They knew then how the Liberal Party felt. This is fine. It's certainly their privilege, but why the delay? Why this unfair amendment? Has anyone denied the good work of the Department of Education? Not that I recall. In case someone here feels that this motion of mine was premature, or that I should have waited for the government to bring something in let us look at what has happened since I was first elected to this House in 1959. On June 21st of 1962 the Minister of Education wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Liaison Committee of L'Association D'Education. The Minister said, "I wish to inform you that the department is going to initiate studies with a view to the organization on a standard basis of French classes in Grade 1, 2 and 3." Madam Speaker, I would ask you to pay particular attention to the words "going to" and "initiate". This is important in view of what I will say a little later. Now this was June 21st and this could easily have been settled by the time classes opened last September. What does the amendment say? Let me read one of the paragraphs: "And whereas the Minister of Education, on the 12th day of November, 1962, referred to the Advisory Board the question of extending the teaching of French in the elementary grades." Remember this date, November the 12th. Just by coincidence this was three days after the Premier had called a general election. We remember the promises made by the Premier when speaking to predominantly French-speaking audiences during the campaign.

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd)

Now let us go back a little earlier. In July of 1962 Mr. Roblin was a guest of honour in Quebec City. He spoke very well and was cheered by the people of Quebec. I quote from a clipping of the Tribune of July 3rd, 1962: "He drew cheers from a crowd of about 300 when he said, 'bilingualism is necessarily the base of Canada's double culture. Only 12 percent of Canadian were bilingual,'" he said, "and an attempt should be made to hasten the goal of full bilingualism. It is incumbent upon the provinces of our country to organize from this point of view schools and institutions of learning." There were more cheers when he said towards the end "Manitoba schools will begin teaching French in Grade 1." It also seems to me that on the federal level one is right in looking for more complete and more frank recognition of the bilingual character of our nation.

And from a French newspaper reporting on the same meeting: Il a ajoute -- aux applaudissements de son vaste auditoire -- que le gouvernement manitobain venait de poser un geste en ce sens en introduisant l'enseignement du français dans les écoles de la Province, de la première a la douzième année. Which means - "He added, to the cheers of his vast audience, that the Government of Manitoba just made a move towards this end in introducing the teaching of French in the schools of the province, from Grade 1 to 12.

Now Madam Speaker, did the First Minister say these words in Quebec City? If not why did he accept these praises? Why leave French-speaking people with the impression that he has? If so, what is he afraid of today? Why did he have to wait so long? Why the delay and why should the Advisory Committee make the decision for him now? Again on another French newspaper, -- Le premier ministre du Manitoba a prononcé un admirable discours sur la dualité culturelle et le bilinguisme.

Ce qui est encore mieux, M. Roblin passe de la parole aux actes. Son intention d'introduire l'enseignement du français dans la première année des écoles manitobaines vaut plus, pour l'avenir de la Confédération, que les discours les plus éloquentes.

Québec n'oubliera pas ces paroles et, encore moins, ces actes.

I'd like to translate this also: - "The First Minister of Manitoba pronounced an admirable speech on biculturalism and bilingualism. What is even better, Mr. Roblin was not merely speaking, but acted. His intention to introduce the teaching of French from the first grade in Manitoba schools is worth more for the future of Confederation than the most eloquent speeches. Quebec will not forget these words, and even less, these actions."

You will notice, Madam Speaker, that Mr. Roblin did not say that we will have to see what the Advisory Board will have to say on this. Either he was not sincere in Quebec City -- which thought, by the way, I will not subscribe to -- or he is afraid to follow his principle when it's time to act, and the amendment is not one of a government of principle. This reminds me of what is often said during campaign speeches. Remember we've seen this on the federal field where Mr. Diefenbaker tried his best, the people thought anyway, to speak French. After he was defeated -- and I will quote from the Free Press of April 10th, 1963: "P.M. refused to speak French. Reliable sources here Tuesday said that Prime Minister John Diefenbaker had refused to speak French in his message to the nation following the near completion of voting returns late Monday night. It was learned that while Mr. Diefenbaker was being made up for his television appearance he was reminded that he had neglected to speak French in his address following the election results in 1962 and that his appearance was to be a simulcast on both the English and French network on the CBC. "I will not speak French on the network" Mr. Diefenbaker is reported to have replied.

This is one of the reasons, Madam Speaker, that sometimes the people ask themselves about politicians. Still earlier, in January 1961, the Association of French-Canadian Public Schools Trustees, in a brief submitted to the Government of Manitoba, recommended this proposed resolution. This was in 1961. Whereas during the hearings of the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education, all presentations concerning the teaching of French were favourable to the early introduction to the teaching of that language. And whereas the Commission recommended that the teaching of French should be done in Grade One, therefore be it resolved that the Manitoba Association of French Canadian Public School Trustees request the government to authorize the teaching of French in Grade 1 in public schools of Manitoba.

Then of course there was the unanimous report of the Royal Commission on Education

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) which came out in 1959, and the Honourable Minister of Education said in June 21, 1962, "the department will start studies." But, Madam Speaker, I can even go back further than that, to May of 1959 before the election that saw me elected to this House. Mr. Roblin, the Premier of the Province gave an interview to Mr. Pierre La Porte of "Le Devoir de Montreal" and I quote from that newspaper: "Nous savons que le Manitoba est une province bilingue depuis sa création. Nous croyons que ce caractère doit se développer de plus en plus. Mon souhait c'est que tous les citoyens du Manitoba solent un jour en mesure de parler et l'anglais et le français." Translated this would mean that "We know that Manitoba has been a bilingual province since its creation. We believe that this character must be further developed. My wish is that all the citizens of Manitoba will one day be in a measure to speak in English and French." And a little further, Mr. La Porte reports: "Au début de mai M. Roblin m'a dit: "Il est probable qu'après les élections nous annoncerons que l'enseignement du français est permis dès la première année de scolarité." Remember this was before the election of 1959, and this means, "at the beginning of May, Mr. Roblin told me it is probable that after the election we will announce that the teaching of French is permitted from the first school grade."

Madam Speaker, am I really being unfair in speaking this way? How much longer should I have waited? I've waited since 1959. Isn't it clear that even though the First Minister and the government are well intentioned -- I'm sure of that -- so far, nothing but promises have been given to us. Madam Speaker, you have the reasons why we have voted against this amendment, and I believe why the members of the NDP would have sooner voted for our motion. This is a protest against a meaningless amendment. But, Madam Speaker, now that it is impossible for us to vote for the motion that I had proposed, and after having registered our protests against this amendment, we will support the main motion as amended in order not to stand in the way of any possible favourable recommendation from the Advisory Board. Of course our protest and our lack of confidence has never been directed against the Advisory Board, but rather against a weak government.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George. The Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, I think I should announce that my modest effort in this debate will be carried on in conversational English.

Shortly before the Honourable Minister for Mines and Natural Resources introduced his estimates to the House, I took the adjournment of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from St. George. In the Minister's presentation of his Lands Branch activities he gave a most complete and comprehensive word picture -- concise, clear, and factual, I thought -- of the policy that this department was adopting in the sale of Crown lands and the leasing of grazing lands and the permits for cutting hay. In fact, I was so impressed with his presentation, which is recorded in Hansard of March the 28th in pages 776, 777, and 778, and I thought it was so complete and precise that it could be used as a working paper or a guide for the civil servants engaged in the work with the Lands Branch, and I thought that maybe some consideration should be given to supplying copies of this very comprehensive presentation to the local government district administrators.

I believe that the presentation as made by the Minister provides for all the matters contained in the proposed resolution, in that local government district lands were reserved because of the concern that the department had for so many hundreds of acres that were being reverted by tax sale, and I'd like to call to the attention of the House that arable Crown lands continued to be sold by the Lands Branch -- they didn't have the "deep freeze", I think they were just refrigerated a bit. Now, in the policy of bringing all the lands, the forestry lands, the Crown lands, local government district and school lands under the supervision of one head in the Lands Branch, I believe facilitates and unifies the handling of this great natural resource of our Province of Manitoba, namely the grass lands; and it permits more careful handling and unification in the method of disposal and the leasing of these lands which is controlled under the supervision of the Land Utility Board and which we have been told the members are made up of representatives of other interested departments of our government.

In respect to the security of tenure of the ranchers and the farmers mentioned in the

(Mr. Bjornson cont'd) proposed resolution, careful consideration was given to the five methods of leasing land, namely three of them which related to leasing of land and grass, and the other two for the gathering of fodder without the land tenure. And they covered the various type of people that would be engaged in this endeavour, the beef cattle producers who we are very anxious to attract to this endeavour if we are to compliment the ten-point program of the Agricultural Department and double the number of cattle produced and finished for the market in Manitoba in the next 15 years. Now, I have no intention of continuing to plagiarize the Minister's speech further in regard to this setting of fees and the other mechanics of operating his plan -- it's in the records, I think it's in the book -- and I'm merely going to say that I believe it to be a good plan, the success of which will depend on how it is accepted and how it is implemented by the ranchers and the farmers of the nation; and we're also going to have to have nature with us and hope that the good Lord provides the all important rain without which no plants can grow -- and I don't think we should forget our near miss of a drought in 1961.

I think the plan is very well set out; I hope it will have great success, and I have no hesitation, Madam Speaker, in moving, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after "whereas" in line 1, and substituting the following: "It is necessary for ranchers and farmers to have security of tenure if they are to improve their land holdings and develop the livestock industry; and whereas it is essential that the grass lands of the Province of Manitoba be managed in a manner that will provide for the maximum utilization for the present and future in the interests of the rancher and the farmers; and whereas, in past experience, the sale of Crown lands without the benefit of assessment of land capabilities, has resulted in destruction of grass lands and the collapse of many family farm units; and whereas the policy of the sale of Crown lands constitutes the sale of only those Crown lands which are considered arable agricultural lands; and whereas the policy calls for the retention of native grass lands for leasing and permit purposes; and whereas such policy will facilitate the proper utilization of land as far as possible, and provide for the preservation of an annual resource, while at the same time preventing the tragedy of abandoned farms. Therefore be it resolved that this House concurs in the announced policy of the government pertaining to the sale of Crown lands, as well as the policy for the leasing and permitting of grazing and hay lands, to provide security of tenure for the leasee and the proper soil utilization for the lessor.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I'm sorry to say that my few remarks will be longer than what would take me to 5:30. I am prepared to go on, I hesitate to -- I certainly wouldn't ask the Committee to stay in session or the House to hear me at greater length. I would ask the Honourable Leader of the House if -- I would have no objection at all if this were a night that we were going to sit after the dinner hour, to breaking my speech, because I think that would be a welcome relief for the members but I think maybe that even I have never run my speeches into two different days; so.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I can offer a remedy for my honourable friend's dilemma and suggest that perhaps it really would be inconvenient if we were to ask him to begin a speech now that he can't finish before 5:30 as we go into government business this evening, so why don't we call it 5:30 and then make his speech on the next occasion. So if that meets with the head of the House I'd be happy to call it 5:30, if you could read the clock that way Madam Speaker and we could resume at 8:00 o'clock in the usual way.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd appreciate that, Madam Speaker, and to show my appreciation I'll guarantee that I'll make my speech no longer than it would have otherwise been, and maybe shorter.

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.