THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 23rd, 1965

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we start our proceedings this evening, I would like you to note that there are some 18 Boy Scouts from St. James in the gallery, under the direction of their Scoutmaster, Mr. J..... These Scouts come from the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. James. On behalf of all members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, could I have leave of the House to remind the members of the tour of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission. The bus will be leaving the front of the building at 9:45 and members of the press gallery are invited to come along.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, before we adjourned I intended to speak to the resolution of the Honourable Member from Brandon but before doing it I want, in all my sincerity, from the bottom of my heart, to commend the lady in red, the Honourable Member from Pembina, for her beautiful words and encouragement to the so-called immigrants -- I call them newcomers to Canada -- some of them call them foreigners, but it's immaterial, but the people came here the last Twentieth Century for one reason only. They did not look to shovel gold in the streets as they have been advertised of immigrants coming to America. They came here to enjoy a little bit of freedom, opportunity and self-respect, which they did not have -- that includes me -- did not have in the countries from which they have come. And I'm sure the words of the Honourable Member from Pembina will be appreciated by all those who have listened to her and interested in. So as one of the immigrants, I want to pay my compliments to her. She doesn't talk very often in this House but when she says something, it is something worthwhile.

As to the motion, Madam Speaker, I fully agree and endorse it. I think that citizenship of a new country, a free country, a country of so many opportunities for each and every one, a country where they could have the highest education that their children could absorb, the country of freedom, the country of democracy, that when they get their citizenship papers, which in my opinion is a very great diploma on behalf of a country to one that came here and seek a new life. I believe in tradition very much and I believe in ceremonies very much. They mean a lot. My people have so many ceremonies and traditional ceremonies that makes them better men and perhaps better Jews because of that, so I'm sold on it, I believe in it, I admire it, I follow it and the resolution of the Honourable Member from Brandon means just that, which I have expected for some time to come from somebody else except for myself. So I want to thank him for bringing it up. I'm all in favour of it and a ceremony, an appropriate ceremony, will register in the minds and the hearts of those receiving it and all their life they have received something that means a lot to them and it means a lot to Canada itself and I hope that this resolution will carry unanimously.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I wish to go along too with this resolution. I think it is a good one and to this extent, I think there are a few things that should be added to it. Down in the United States, after you become a citizen, I've often heard it said you become a white-washed American and I feel that in this country they should be not a German-Canadian, or a Jewish-Canadian or a Ukrainian-Canadian but straight Canadian and that's it. We are of one nationality no matter where we come from or anything else. Let us stay by that. I think that is a good thing. I know when I went overseas there I had to take out a passport, so I put where I was born and what I was. When my passport come back -- I come into this country as a British subject, and I didn't have to take out any citizen papers so I used to speak with the various people that took them out and they said to me, "Well what are you? You've got no papers." I said, "That's right, what am I?" But when I sent away for my passport, and my passport come back, and on that passport was "Canadian" -- boy, did I feel proud! I'll tell you that day I was about that high. I says, "Now I'm home." Thank you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, when I saw this resolution on the Order Paper, I was rather pleased. It was something that I could support. As it was a recommendation to the Federal Government there was a matter that I thought should be brought in at this time. Now we've seen by the newspaper that, oh, a few weeks ago, a month ago, the Canadian Football League brought in restriction for the number of naturalized Canadians that could play professional football here in Canada. Now as I had served on the executive of the Blue Bombers

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....for a number of years, I was familiar with some of their problems, with some of the work that they were trying to do. I think that it was clear that they were trying to protect the players who had learned their football here in Canada and also maybe trying help to keep the cost down a bit but, and I might say that although I have some reservation with this rule, with what they are trying to do, I feel that it is their right, they're running football here in Canada and I'm not quarrelling with this at all. But, Madam Speaker, I was shocked when I saw that they were tampering with Canadian citizenship.

Now, I don't think that they realized this at the time but to my way of thinking anyway they certainly were discriminating against naturalized Canadians. They were making a mistake between naturalized and native Canadians and I think that this should not be done, especially at this time when our country should welcome all those who are anxious to adopt our country as their own and to live here with us.

Now I think that the CFL could very well achieve the same purpose, if this is what they want, instead of talking about so many naturalized Canadians, I think that they could -- well there's a lot of ways they could do this. They could limit each professional team to so many players who have played professional football, professional or college football in the States, but I do think that they should not interfere and they should not play lightly with the term "citizenship" and try to make a difference between naturalized and native Canadians.

Now, Madam Speaker, while the Honourable Member from Brandon spoke here Friday I think it was, I followed him pretty closely. I was rather impressed with what he said until he got off the track a bit. Now he seemed to give me the impression that all the problems that we have in French Canada, or all the problems that we have in Canada because of biculturalism and bilingualism and so on should be placed squarely on the shoulders of the French people. He also stated that the French Canadians should follow the other racial group that came to Manitoba and get busy with the job of winning their place in the sun, as he said, and then he added "with our understanding and with our blessing".

Well, Madam Speaker, these words hurt me deeply. I had always felt that this Member from Brandon was most honest, most sincere, and I still do, and this is probably the reason why it cut so deeply, Madam Speaker. If he felt this way, if he knew so little about the real problem the real cause of these problems, and if he could be so completely blinded by prejudices, what hope could we have for the country, for democracy, for minorities and for the individual? Madam Speaker, I thought of nothing else all weekend. I reviewed what had taken place here during last week and, yes, the part that I had played in the debate. I was really unsure, I was the scourge and I was seriously thinking of throwing in the sponge. Then I reread the story of Confederation. I glanced at my notes on bilingualism, biculturalism, I reread Mr. Pearson's speech, the one that he delivered in the House of Commons on December 9, 1962 -- Two Equal Partners in Canada. I read the speech of the First Minister of this Province in Quebec and the one given in Montreal, I glanced at articles from Bruce Hutchison, Dr. Seraphim Marion, P. B. Waite, Professor Jaenen, and others and then I saw a little light, Madam Speaker. I felt that there was a ray of hope and more important, I felt that it was more important to know the real meaning of Confederation, that this was very much more important than window dressing within ceremony -- and mind you I believe in those too. Yes, Madam Speaker, I even examined my conscience. I think that I have always tried to be sincere in this House. I realize that to succeed in a cause this cause must have many people working for it, all kinds of people, different people, and that these people should do what they can do best. I realize, I do realize that I am limited, but because of my personality, my character, my responsibility as an elected representative of the people, I felt that my value, if I was going to have any value, would be to continue fighting for what I believe are my rights and the rights of others, and to try to correct these injustices, and that I should keep doing this in a strong vocal manner. I do recognize that it is often easier to catch flies with one spoonful of honey than a barrel of vinegar. I do realize that in a struggle such as is going on in our country at this time we must negotiate. We must be ready to compromise. But I also know, and history is there to tell me, sometimes when you are told to wait too long you must rock the boat. I think that we have an example of this south of the border and we have an example here in many countries. It's all right to be patient, but if we always accept this the time will never come, generations and generations will grow up with the same feeling, the same prejudices transmitted from generation to generation, and it will never be the time.

Now, I suppose that maybe a good Canadian takes his place in the sun, I guess if I was a good Canadian in the mind of some people I would say "yes, I would want this but we'll wait

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....a little longer. These people can stand it." Maybe I should say "Yes, those people are fanatics. I don't want any part of them." Maybe I should be ashamed of my people. Maybe I should try to bend over the other way and say, "Yes, it would be much nicer if we only talked one language. It would make a stronger country." I don't know. But I feel, Madam Speaker, that we must refuse to wait forever and somebody should be ready to fight for certain rights, to sacrifice his reputation sometime, and even take the chance of being branded a "fanatic", if he wants to expose certain injustices. Madam Speaker, I also realize that my position was difficult enough that I should make it worse by using languages or language not considered proper in this House. And I have taken the resolution to be more careful, not to let the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or others goad me in this type of debate. I don't know how long it will last but I certainly resolve to be a little more careful in this matter. Now having said this, I am not saying that I intend to be soft or to get soft. I do not intend to accept political injury and cowardice. I will continue to insist on the rights of the minorities, if I feel that these rights should be given.

I feel that if citizenship is a word, something that we could be proud of, well then we should get to know each other better. We should try, all of us, to eradicate our prejudices. And if in spite of trying we can't fully do it, at least we should never be motivated by these prejudices. Yes, there are extremists. But usually they are extremists that go to extremes, Madam Speaker. There are French-Canadian extremists, those who refuse to admit any alternative to total independence. To succeed they must promote discontent. They'll use every possible way to prevent reform to undermine the moderates. They will antagonize the English-speaking Canadian in this country. They will try to create an atmosphere of unrest. We have to use bomb; if this leads to murder, they will do it anyway. They will not hesitate. They will try to tax the tolerance of English-Canadians to the limit. That is true. But, Madam Speaker, that is not French Canada. These are enemies more of the moderate French-Canadian than of the other people in this country, because they are hurting the cause of those who want to do the right thing. And I say, Madam Speaker, to the Member from Brandon and to the other members in this House please do not judge all the French-speaking Canadians by these people. As I said there are also another extreme and this extreme is extremist also. These are the people that want to remove all guarantees from Confederation. These are the people that are arrogant, patronizing; they don't worry about injustice. They want to treat certain people like second-class citizens. They also would resort to anything to discredit the French Canadian. They also wish to have an atmosphere of unrest; but they also do not represent the true view of the well-meaning English Canadian. There are some politicians who try to divide and conquer, when you hear statements made by people such as Gordon Churchill who on many occasions stated that English Canada did not need French Canada. Then Douglas Fisher addressing a Laval Student Congress stated that if the French Canadians wanted to get out of Confederation the English Canadians would be glad to see them go, since they produce only hockey players and strip teasers. Well, Madam Speaker, aren't these people really separatists? What else? What would we call them? Madam Speaker, the extremist be they French or English or any other racial origin do not represent a true Canadian, and I think that we should ignore them, that it's time to ignore them, and as I say I beg the members of this House not to judge any Canadian by judging this group of extremists.

I think the main thing, the trouble is that many Canadians do not know the facts. They haven't studied the Confederation story. I think that they should. I think that all the members if they haven't should read certain books, and this -- we could do worse than start with this book, "The Road to Confederation" of Donald Creighton or the book by M. S. Donnelly, "The Government of Manitoba". There's an interesting chapter there especially the one that deals with provincial rights; and it even has a few pages on separate schools. I think that if we look around us and not stay in our ivory tower and see that the same thing can happen here in Canada as happened in the States. We think this is awful. We're parading around the Embassy, the United States Embassy, when we see things like this. Well, isn't that a little bit of hypocrisy? Haven't we got our second-class citizens right here in our country? As I say this -- to give you an example of the feeling, the way the people understand, the way a lot of Canadians understand certain things -- A gallop poll was conducted and the question was: "Do you feel that the French Canadians are fairly treated?" Now, 43 percent of the Canadian public, according to this poll, felt they were. And these were some of the reasons why they felt this. Of this amount, 56 percent felt that French Canadians have the same rights as everyone else in the country. Others, they want too much; they get too much now. They don't even

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....have to learn English because French is taught in English-speaking schools. They are causing trouble. They are part of Canada and should accept laws of the country. If they don't like it then let them leave. They are dominated by the Roman Catholic Church. Other reasons, 6; and 13 percent did not know why, but they felt that they were treated fairly.

I think that if we look back, and I'd like to quote from the Tribune of April 30, 1964 some of the representations that were made to the B and B Commission in Regina: "The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was told over and over Thursday night that French Canadians should become English-speaking Canadians. If all Canadians spoke English the problems of national unity would be solved and Quebec would catch up with the rest of North America, agreed the majority of the speakers at a Commission meeting here attended by 400 persons from all walks of life." Now, I think that there's a lot of ignorance for people speaking like this, Madam Speaker. What is it that the French Canadian wants? This is what is being asked many times. Well, Mr. Kierans who was in the provincial cabinet but he was not French-speaking says that neither do the French Canadian masses nor the present Quebec Government promote.....

This is something from the Financial Post of Toronto, an editorial of February 2, 1963 and this was under the heading: "No Tempest in a Teacup". "There are two things English Canadians must grasp about this generation of Québecois. The first is they are determined quite properly to remain French. They were charter members of Confederation. Indeed, they were the original Canadians, and they are fully entitled as they intend to remain themselves. The second point of course is that as French-speaking citizens they want complete equality of opportunity and a full share in every branch of Canadian life. This is a just demand. If it is not met there will be trouble. That is what the new separatism means. This is one nation in citizenship but two distinct civilizations co-exist here. In 200 years they have not coalesced into one nation as Quebec understands the word. What is more they never will. Canada will stay bicultural or crack up. Recognition of this tremendous social fact about Canada was never so important for the English speaker as it is now." Madam Speaker, this might explain what some of the French people in Quebec want, but I heard a speech by a Dr. Seraphim Marion, Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, who spoke as a French Canadian from Ontario, and I think that this could be used here in Manitoba or any other province outside of Quebec, and I would like to quote a few excerpts from his speech, because I think that this is the most complete and the best documented speech that I've read on this. Now he says that the same rights and privileges, no more no less than those rights and privileges that have been enjoyed for almost a century by the English Protestant minority in Quebec. This is what the minority in other provinces, the French minority in other provinces want. The man on the street, the English-speaking Canadian, believes that if Canada is cursed as he says with separate schools, it is due to Roman Catholic Bishops who in Ontario and elsewhere have imposed them on their Protestant brethren. What a monumental error. The opposite is true. If we have separate schools in Canada, it is due first of all to the Quebec Protestants. Yes, Madam Speaker, I think that you will remember on November 23rd, 1864, three years before Confederation, Alexander Galt, one of the Fathers of Confederation, and the Leader of Quebec Protestants, said to his electors in Sherbrooke -- and this is three years before Confederation and I quote: "It must be clear that a measure could not be favourably entertained by the minority of Lower Canada which would place the education of their children in the hands of a majority of different faith." Now Dr. Ryson, writing to George Brown who certainly was an enemy of one of the Fathers of Confederation, was an enemy of Catholicism stated, "I appeal to the judgement and the heart of every just man in Upper Canada whether the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada are to be treated with less justice and liberty than the Protestants of Lower Canada." That seems fair enough, Madam Speaker.

On March 2, 1892, Mr. James Fisher, Member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, made a remark along these lines, "From the beginning to the end of it, (talking about the Confederation debate) there was hardly a question raised about the rights that were protected by these educational clauses, except for the Protestants of Lower Canada, hardly one word." The House will now see how utterly far from the truth is the oft repeated and generally accepted statement that the educational clause of Confederation Act protecting the rights of the minority in respect to education was a concession to Roman Catholic demands. Separate schools were brought about in Canada by the persistent demand of the English Protestant minority of Quebec who would not consent, and rightly so in my opinion, to place the education of their children

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... in the hands of a majority of a different faith.

Now a well known educator who was in charge of the Education Department of British Columbia at the time, George M. Weir, said, "there is a widespread but erroneous belief," he wrote in 1934, "to the effect that the Roman Catholics of Upper and Lower Canada were primarily responsible for the introduction of the element of separatism into certain of our school systems. Rather is the opposite concession the true one, and to the Protestants of Quebec does this distinction ultimately belong."

Now in 1963, which is not too long ago, the Orange Association of Canada published a brief entitled "Segregation is Wrong", that is to say segregation in our schools along religious lines, and of course they blame the Roman Catholic Bishop as the cause of what in their opinion at least is a major evil. The Orange Association was knocking at the wrong door. The cause is to be found with the Protestants of Quebec.

Let us go back to the speech delivered by Mr. James Fisher in 1892 to the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, quote: "The only suggestion that was made on behalf of Roman Catholics was that if in answer to the demands of the Protestants of Lower Canada these safeguards were given, it would be only fair that the Catholics of Upper Canada should have the same protection accorded them." Madam Speaker, I can't see, I think that everybody here will have to admit that this is certainly fair. What is right for a minority of a province should be right for another minority in another province.

And now from George Brown himself who opposed schools and Catholics more than anyone around that time anyway. Now he had fought separate schools in a relentless way until Confederation and he said this, he didn't like it -- "I admit," he stated, "that from my point of view this is a blot on the scheme before the House," - he's talking about the compromise on the school question. "It is confessedly one of the concessions from our side that has been made to secure this great measure of reform, but assuredly I, for one, have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of the union." In other words, there never would have been Confederation if these promises had not been made.

There's another one on March 10th, 1875, another Father of Confederation, another Prime Minister of Canada, Alexander MacKenzie said, "for my years I wage war against the principle of separate schools. I hope to be able, young and inexperienced in politics as I then was, to establish a system to which all would ultimately yield their assent. Sir, it is impractical in operation and impossible in politics. Consequently when the Quebec resolution was adopted in 1864 and 1865 which embodied the principle that should be the law of the land, Confederation took place under the compact then entered upon. I heartily assented to that position."

Sir Charles Tupper, Prime Minister of Canada at one time -- "I say with knowledge that but for the consent to the proposal of Mr. Galt, who represented especially the Protestants of Quebec, but for the assent of that conference to the proposal of Mr. Galt that in The Confederation Act should be embodied a clause which would protect the rights of minorities whether Catholic or Protestant in this country, there would have been no Confederation." It is significant that for the clause protecting minorities, the measure of Confederation would not have been accomplished. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What is good for a minority in Quebec should be good for a minority in English Canada. The Confederation compromise on the school question is nothing else than the abdication of the Golden Rule.

Well, Madam Speaker, I think that maybe I should -- I would like somebody anyway to ask me to table this -- not at this time, I haven't got it all -- because I think it would be very good information, this speech would be very good information for the members of this House.

Madam Speaker, there is a, I want to quote Hansard of the House of Commons of the speech of Mr. Pearson which I consider a masterpiece. And this is what he said at this time, December 17th, 1962: "Confederation," and I'm quoting Mr. Pearson, "Confederation, however, involves another price which too many of us either forget or do not wish to pay, because it is inconvenient for us to pay it. Confederation meant the rejection not only of political and economic annexation by the United States but also the American melting pot concept of national unity. Confederation may not have been technically a treaty or a compact between states, but it was an understanding or a settlement between the two founding races of Canada, made on the basis of an acceptable and equal partnership. The settlement provided that national political unity would be achieved and maintained without the imposition of racial, cultural, or linguistic uniformity." A little further on, "to French-speaking Canadians,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....Confederation created a bilingual and bicultural nation. It protected their language and their culture throughout the whole of Canada. It means partnership, not domination. French-speaking Canadians believe that this partnership meant equal opportunity for both the founding races to share in all phases of Canadian development. English-speaking Canadians agree of course Confederation arrangements protected the rights of French Canadians in Quebec, in parliament and in federal courts, but most felt, and I think it is fair to say this, that it did not go beyond those limits, at least until recently. This meant that for all practical purposes there would be an English speaking Canada with a bilingual Quebec. What is called a French fact was to be provincial only. The first important clash perhaps between these two different interpretations occurred when the school question was raised in Manitoba." A little further on, "it is now clear to all of us, I think, that French speaking Canadians have determined to become directors of their economic and cultural destiny in their own change and changing society. They feel that in doing so they are not being isolationists but that on the contrary only in this way can they make their rightful contribution to the true development of Canadian Confederation. To this end they also ask for equal and full opportunity to participate in all federal government services in which their own language will be fully recognized. This right flows from the equal partnership of Confederation."

This also is worth reading, not the whole speech, I'll just finish with this one now, "this means I believe that we have now reached a stage when we should seriously and collectively in this country review the bicultural and bilingual situation in our country; our experiences in the teaching of English and French and in the relations existing generally between our two founding racial groups. Are we ready for instance to give to all young Canadians a real opportunity to become truly bilingual? Therefore, why do we enquire into the means of developing the bicultural character of Canadians. If Confederation is to be undertaken the Provincial Government would have to be associated with it.

Now there is, I think I've been quoting quite a bit, I shouldn't quote too much, but I would like to refer the House to an editorial found in the Tribune of January 27th, 1964 entitled "If Quebec Goes" by Bruce Hutchison, he's not French, I think that we'd understand, if we read this, I think that we would agree with him that without Quebec there cannot be Canada, there won't be a Canada. I think that no one wants to see Quebec separate from the rest of the country or I might say the rest of the country separate from Quebec.

Mr. David Fulton had this to say, "If it is true that French-Canadians should make it better known that they have chosen the Canadian idea, it is equally true that English-Canadians should prove their good intentions by concrete action. The Queen, Her Majesty the Queen while speaking in French by the way, at Quebec City last October, said that "true patriotism does not exclude the understanding of the patriotism of others." I think that this is very important. I think this is probably the trouble. "This country she says "is the meeting place of two great civilizations each contributing its own genius and quality. These qualities are not contradictory but complement one another."

Now as I say, I also looked back at some of the speeches made by the First Minister of this House. In speaking in French in Quebec on Dominion Day, July, '62, and I translate this, it might not be too good, but it'll give you an idea anyway of what he believes, and I think he's absolutely right, and I quote: "Today more than ever I am aware of the fact that we find the true spirit of our Canada in this double Anglo-French heritage. This association is the very soul of our Canadian nation, an association that emphasizes the full meaning and real dignity of our country. It is this Anglo-French association that gives to us Canadians the right to assert ourselves as a nation among the other nations of the world and give us the opportunity to contribute in a very personal manner to the progress of humanity." This is not the speech, there's different inserts here, I don't want to seem to quote out of .....

MR. ROBLIN: .....it sounded better in French, didn't it?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, but I will read one that sounds very good in French: "The unity of which I speak today is not a unity consisting of uniformity, of as much conformity in opinion as in action, rather it is a unity resulting from a harmonious combination obtained in an atmosphere of confidence and mutual consent. This unity is the very foundation of our understanding. The Anglo-French association alone has any meaning to the Canadian nation. We have always needed each other. Our ancestors understood this in 1776. Firstly I believe that the symbol of such a unity, that is this harmonious combination, is to be found in the language. Bilingualism is by necessity the base of this double culture. It is also the very foundation of a better understanding of Canadian citizenship. It is rather sad to note that a

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....mere 12 percent of our population only is bilingual today. Although it is highly unlikely that we will ever achieve complete bilingualism we must nevertheless make a real effort to find the best possible means to promote it.

Now in December of 1963, the First Minister was the guest speaker at a meeting of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce. The invitation sent to the members had this notation. "Let us welcome our Western neighbours, especially since we see them so seldom," and this also was in French. Now Madam Speaker, like the Honourable the First Minister said, it sounds --I don't know, there seems to be something missing if it is not in French. Now unfortunately those that don't understand French will have to bear with me because I would like to read in French some of his words that again I agree with 100 percent, some of his words at this occasion, and I quote:

"Le Canada tout entier est ma patrie. Je suis né au Manitoba; mais je suis tout autant chez moi sur les bords du Grand Fleuve que sur les bords de la Riviére Rouge. La double culture dont on parle est, à un degré ou l'autre, ma culture. Mais personne ne peut me diviser. Je suis un Canadien.

Une partie de mon héritage est ici dans la "belle province" et cet héritage est francais. Je sais qui a gardé le Canada canadian en 1775 en repoussant les armées américaines des murs de Québec. Je sais en quelle langue on a crié "victoire" à Châteauguay durant la guerre de 1812. Je sais qui a lutté en trente-sept pour que le Canada ait un gouvernement responsable. Je sais aussi qu'il y avait autant de tuques que de bonnets écossais à la fondation du Manitoba en 1870. Je connais la valeur de cette idée sans précédent, le concept d'unité sans uniformité, qui est la marque distinctive du Canada -- le sceau de la personnalité canadienne. C'est pour cela que malgré certaines tendances et modes courantes, je ne conçois pas ... Je ne puis pas concevoir ... je ne puis ronconcer a concevoir un Canada sans le Québec ni un Québec sans le Canada."

And a little further:

"Nous sommes redevables à nous-mêmes ainsi qu'au monde entier de démontrer que deux cultures peuvent être florissantes au sein d'un même Etat. Ce que nous --Canadiens de langue française et Canadiens de langue anglaise-- devons maintenant faire, c'est de redécouvrir et de restaurer l'ancien esprit de fraternité qui unissait les Pêres de la Confédération en 1867." And I certainly agree with all these words, Madam Speaker.

(Translation of French will be in tomorrow's Hansard).....

MR. DESJARDINS (continuing).....Now if I may, I would like to make a suggestion. It will probably sound ridiculous to some of you but I think that it would be a good suggestion. I would like to see the members of the House of Commons unanimously accept to have a committee composed of three persons: Mr. Pearson, who is certainly recognized as an authority on such matters, who has been honoured by the nations of the world for his work in such matters; Mr. Roblin, a man who I am sure understands the situation as well as anyone else --I think that this man could do a good job. I disagree with him in certain ways but I think that if he was away from the political intrigue he could do a good job. This is what I disagree with on this. Not his dealings, nothing else, but the way he conducts himself here because he's pressed politically, but I certainly think that he would do a great service to his country if he didn't have to worry about the political part of it. And then as a third man I would like to see Mr. Lesage, another able man who represents and understands the French people of Canada and a man who --by the way the French - speaking Canadians form one-third of the population of Canada.

Now I feel that this committee should study the report of the B and B Commission. They should do their work in camera and it would be required to bring in a unanimous report without political, without any pressure at all. This is the reason why I feel that they should work in Canada, getting all the facts of the B and B Commission.

Now the second step that I would like, members of the House of Commons name a committee of the House composed of members ehosen for their personal qualities rather than for their political affiliation. This committee would also work in camera. It would have to have the full confidence of the House of Commons. Their duty would be to try to follow the recommendation of the Committee of the Big Three and to propose legislation to this House. And then the third step, the House should act on these recommendations without delay and all provincial governments should be asked to co-operate. Now this might seem ridiculous. It probably never will happen; these people are too busy; but I don't see why it shouldn't happen.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....We've got a man at the head of this country in Mr. Pearson who is an authority, who is --this is his strong point. He is ready to go and try and help peace in other countries. Why doesn't he start by his own country? --(Interjection)-- I think well, this --it might be funny to my friend the Leader of the NDP, I don't think that this is funny at all. I'm not talking politics here and I think that everybody will agree with me that in this phase at least Mr. Pearson has done an awful lot for his country, and I think that it is right to say the same of the other two gentlemen.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the Honourable Member that he has four minutes left of his time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much. Now I feel that this would be drastic measures. Maybe this is not possible, but I can't see why --these people know the situation now and this is the most important thing in our country right now. This is not just that we want to scare the people. We can destroy Canada if something isn't done, not just.....but if something isn't done soon, and I think that we should take the best man we have for that and I think that those three would qualify --there could be others-- and I certainly would like to see him do this and if everybody would co-operate I think that this could be done.

Now Madam Speaker, because of the words that I have said, because --I had no intention at first to make an amendment but then when I realized that, I certainly felt that the knowledge of Confederation was more important than the ceremony, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, the following amendment: That the resolution be amended by striking out all the words following Whereas in the first line thereof and substituting the following: "Canada is a living example of how people of many cultures, racial origins and religious creeds can live in harmony and unison without loss of their respective traditions, cultures and beliefs; And Whereas our Canadian Citizenship court could and should, by appropriate ceremony in granting certificates of Canadian citizenship, emphasize and point out that such recipients, and to Canadians generally the benefits accruing from such citizenship, and the necessity of preserving all rights guaranteed under the British North America Act. And Whereas many Canadians, both native and naturalized, are not aware of the rights preserved and guaranteed under the provisions of the aforesaid Act and of the true meaning of Confederation as envisioned by and in said Act; And Whereas certain patriotic and other organizations have recognized the importance of the granting of Canadian citizenship and have by appropriate ceremony given effect to such recognition; And Whereas it is the opinion of this House that the Government of Canada should recognize the importance of adopting a formal and uniform practice to be followed by all citizenship courts throughout Canada in which the benefits, rights, privileges and obligations of Canadian citizenship should be stressed and the necessity of preserving all rights guaranteed under The British North America Act; Therefore Be It Resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada to adopt a formal and uniform practice to be followed and adopted by and in all of its citizenship courts when granting certificates of Canadian citizenship in which ceremony emphasis should be placed upon (a) the benefits, rights, privileges, and obligations of Canadian citizenship; (b) the meaning, purpose, and intent of Confederation as set out in The British North America Act; (c) the necessity of guaranteeing and preserving the aforesaid rights; and (d) any and all such other matters as in the premises should be noted and emphasized in such proceedings.

Now Madam Speaker, before you put this motion I wonder if I could have these words that I forgot. I want to make it quite clear that I talked mostly of the French-speaking group and the English-speaking group, that I haven't forgotten the other people at all. I hope that I will be able to move the adoption of a bill in a week or so and I certainly intend to talk about them at the time, but as I say, this amendment was brought in by some of the words of the Honourable the Member from Brandon. But I do not abandon or forget the other group.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN: (Brandon): Madam Speaker, before you put the motion I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Member for St. Boniface a question. Is he aware that the Citizenship courts only operate in the larger centres of Canada and this would leave a great area of Canada without specific ceremony?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I was under the impression that other courts granted citizenship sometimes, and I think that this would be a start if it's all right to have something to make the people realize how important citizenship is. I think it would be a good thing to make them realize what is meant by citizenship. This is all I want.

MR. LISSAMAN: One further comment, Madam Chairman, the Honourable Member has specifically mentioned citizenship courts.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GROVES: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, 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 Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY: (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, after listening to the oration of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, my constituent, it may seem rather mundane that we get down to the question of relief for taxes in some areas in the Province of Manitoba and the extension of the tax rebate to tenants, and also, in my opinion, leaseholders of property. However, I guess we are living in sort of a fast-moving and conflicting society these days, and I guess in government these things can be expected very frequently in debates in Legislative Assemblies.

The resolution as proposed by my honourable colleague from Seven Oaks suggest that amendments be made to The Revenue Act of 1964 in order to make provision so that the occupants of rented premises will also derive the benefit of the school tax rebate. May I first of all say, Madam Speaker, that we on this side generally speaking have tackled the government on every occasion that we've had the opportunity in opposition to this so-called tax rebate. We maintain, and I say rightly so Madam Speaker, that it is not a tax rebate in the usually accepted sense but just a gimmick on the part of government to give back to the citizens of Manitoba a mere pittance of what the government is taking from them in the first place.

Now I would suggest, I would suggest that possibly the government might consider some of the remarks that we heard the other day by one of the members opposite who I presume was acting under the direction or orders of the hierarchy opposite in replying to the Member for Seven Oaks. I think that he, like another member of the government was the fall guy who spoke this afternoon, was only a fall guy for the government at least to this stage. It's not normal for us to pay too much attention to some individuals when they're making remarks in defence of the government, if indeed there is such a thing as a defence for the government. When the Honourable Member for Roblin was speaking the other day, he said "Madam Speaker, I'm afraid I can't go along with the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks." May I suggest to him rather than being afraid to go along with it, Madam Speaker, he was afraid to take any other position while he is seated opposite.

Then he goes on to say, "There seems to still be some, using a charitable word, confusion in the opposition ranks as to what the principle of government action is in this regard. The principle," he continues," to me Madam Speaker is simply that we are transferring a large part of the burden of education costs from the property owner of Manitoba to the far broader base of the tax facilities that are available to the province."

Well Madam Speaker if this isn't a confusing statement what in the name of goodness is a confusing statement? Because the resolution as suggested by my friend and colleague from Seven Oaks suggested that there should be some relief, or more relief in respect of property taxation for school purposes. What is the situation, say for instance in an apartment block where there are two or three hundred tenants or fifty tenants? Say the building is worth a half a million dollars or a quarter of a million dollars. I would suggest the taxes, school taxes, in respect of a piece of property of that magnitude are tremendous, but what is the tax rebate? One fifty dollar tax rebate. And the tenants in the apartment collectively are paying in full for the school taxes on that piece of property. And let no one misconstrue my thoughts in this regard that I'm coming to the support of the owner who may be considerably wealthy, of the piece of property, but I'm coming to the position of the tenant who in his rent is paying for the school taxes and the other taxes on that piece of property. --(Interjection)-- Oh, I'm coming to that in a second.

So therefore Madam Speaker, when my honourable friend talks about confusion, lack of understanding on their side of the House, my goodness gracious, I suggest to him that he might take another look or attempt to get the Treasurer or the Treasury benches to take another look at the remarks that he made, because certainly they're confusion no end. Transferring a large part of the burden of education costs from the property owner of Manitoba --how ridiculous a statement that is! Fifty Dollars on a tax bill of a -- might include as mine does in Transcona $150 in respect of school costs. Is this a transfer? I suggest it is not a transfer at all, because I am creating the amount of money in order to give me back my fifty dollars by the added costs of operating my automobile, of my gasoline tax, my driver's tax, my gas tax for my utility, my telephone and my lights, and then this magnificent, benevolent, penny-scrounging government turns around to me and says, "Here's a fifty dollar bill." I say the only way that

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd).....I get this fifty dollar bill is because the fact that they've taken far more from me than they should have in the first place. What ridiculous mathematics!

The Honourable the Minister of Welfare the other day, speaking on another resolution, and I'll be discussing that with him some time later, suggested that we can't afford to mete out any better treatment to those in need of help or our old age pensioners in this province, but Madam Speaker -- but Madam Speaker, the same government of which he is a part is going to give to every millionaire who owns a piece of property, fifty bucks on one piece of property, and if he happens to own a dozen and one this very very patronizing government is going to give them a fifty dollar bill on every piece of property, whether they need it or whether they don't. I ask my honourable friends opposite, is there any needs test? Is there any needs test in this regard of giving back the fifty dollar rebate? Because in this case, as I say, the millionaire will get it, a small owner will get it, but there is at least two groups that will not --the leaseholders as we have under the lease agreements in Transcona insofar as legislation is concerned, and the tenants in our homes, apartments. I might say incidentally Madam Speaker, referring to the leaseholders in Transcona, I'm very pleased to be able to report to the House that the developer Myles Robinson of Metropolitan Homes has assured me by letter that the occupiers of the land or under leasehold arrangement will receive the benefit of the fifty dollars, and I think this was a nice gesture on his part. He certainly Madam Speaker has given far more consideration to these 400-odd residents of Transcona than the Minister of Municipal Affairs has given to them, because he will not consider legislation that will put them in the same category as ordinary property taxpayers but Myles--(Interjection)-- No they're not.

MR. SMELLIE: They can be.

MR. PAULLEY: .....Oh, I wonder whether it's closed or not or sometimes whether it's there. My honourable friend interjects and says they can be. I say they can't under our system that we have of land registration --(Interjection)-- My friend has admitted this. He admitted it the other night.

MR. SMELLIE: No I didn't.

MR. PAULLEY: In an interview to the press as contained in the Tribune of last night and I refer my honourable friend to that article. And in the debates in this House from time to time, he's rejected my request that the leaseholders in Transcona on property that they are leasing be given the same rights as the rest of the ratepayers in the City of Transcona and be given the privilege of voting on money bylaws.--(Interjection)-- Yes, and as the member for St. George says, a similar situation at Steep Rock. Yet my friend just now says they've got the privilege. I say he hasn't given it to them but I believe he has the power to give it to them.

But getting along Madam Speaker, my friend the member for Roblin says the transfer of taxes and financial responsibility is taking place in Manitoba this year to the tune of $10 million . "When the Leader of the NDP talking on this matter said that we were overcharging the Manitoba taxpayer twenty million in taxes, so our conscience bothered us a little bit inside and we thought we'd better hand it back to him." Then my honourable friend, I asked him if he would permit a question and my question was, does he not consider as being property owner or holders, those who have to pay the 5 percent utility tax in order to create this amount of money that you're giving it back, what was his reply? "Madam Speaker it might be possible in some cases." Talk about confusion --on this side? Oh, mirror, mirror on the wall, boy oh boy, they're the bestest of them all, only they don't face up to themselves very frequently, Madam Speaker --(Interjection) All right Jimminy Christmas. Then my honourable friend goes on to say, Madam Speaker, "I think that once the principle was decided that property should not bear the cost of education, that the rebate plan as devised by the Provincial Government is the best way devised of relieving this burden." Heavens to Betsy! What profound logic! "Once the principle was decided that property should not bear the cost of education, the rebate plan as devised by the Provincial Government is the best way of relieving this burden." Property owners, occupants, are paying dearly through the nose with their utility taxes, to create the surplus that some get back. Even the government itself admits that only 64 percent will get back the full tax rebate. And at the same time that they were fiddling around trying to make themselves heroes, particularly to the gentry, by the reduction of income tax, they came up with this devious gimmick of a $50 rebate. At the same time as this government is charging the man who may be on unemployment insurance and others on fixed income to have them pass through the means test, while they're collecting from them the five percent utility tax, the fellow who is in the taxable income group in the Province of Manitoba has had his tax reduced by one percentage point. Justice, Madam Speaker? I doubt whether my friends opposite know the meaning of the word.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....

Then my honourable friend goes on to say, and admit --this is the individual in whose mind there's absolutely no confusion; the confusion is all on this side, Madam Speaker. I admit I get confused now and again and it's no wonder when one has to hear day by day and read what the propositions of the government opposite and how flexible they are as the time goes on or the debates start. So I can understand this in some respects of being confused, but I say to my honourable friend the Member for Roblin, in his address to us the other day, surely he indicated abject confusion on a number of occasions. I pointed out one a moment ago, Madam Speaker, when he said in reply that it might be possible in some cases that they're only getting back on the 5 percent basis, but what does he say now when we're talking about whether the tax was equitable or not? After first of all saying that it is an equitable tax then he goes on to say it's not completely equitable; " you're never going to get a completely equitable tax base or tax system. But I think it's the most equitable one. I think it will be a very satisfactory one."

Now I say to my friends opposite that it's not a satisfactory one. It's not an equitable method of taxation, and while it leaves out those who are able or do receive or are entitled to receive the rebate such as the tenants in apartment blocks who are carrying a fair share of the cost of education, and surely Madam Speaker, an apartment block is just as much property as a single dwelling, and surely the resident in a block is paying in proportion to the assessment of the property towards school taxes, but this equitable-minded government says, "We'll get a fifty dollar bill here; notwithstanding any assessment value, notwithstanding any contributions of a multiplicity of individuals, we'll give you a fifty dollar bill and to the single dweller, the same." So I say to my friends opposite, let not your minds be confused any longer. Aceept the words of wisdom from the Member for Radisson. This is not an equitable tax. It's nothing more or less than Conservative political gimmickry. The hope of the government is, I suspect, that after having levied these taxes as they did last August in this Chamber, the true significance of which were not revealed until this year, particularly when our motorists started paying the increased taxes and paying for the increased license fees, we'll get another reminder I presume from the Minister of Public Utilities and the Motor Vehicle Branch in a couple of weeks when we start getting the applications for renewal of our driver's license--another reminder. And then following all of this, Madam Speaker, the masters of soft soap will send out a rebate cheque to some of the people in the Province of Manitoba.

So I say to you, let's cut out the malarkey; let's stop being confused; let's start processing our taxation base on an equitable basis and give to those people at least, while you're attempting to make up your minds as to what to do, at least give them a break, if indeed it would be a break, to those who are contributing through payments in their rentals as tenants equally as much as others in the province. I think, Madam Speaker, it would be well for the government to reconsider the error of their ways, and I cannot agree in one iota with the Honourable Member for Roblin that this is a satisfactory way to conduct the taxation basis in the Province of Manitoba.

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I have listened with some interest to the highly colourful and equally inaccurate comments of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. He refers to the school tax rebate as a gimmick and a devious gimmick, indeed a very serious allegation, and he would be joined, I am certain, by the Member for St. John's who spoke the other day and used some expressions which rather, I thought, slighted some folks by saying "these special people" who are going to get this tax rebate. Well Madam Speaker, it may be of interest to remind the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party that we have received some advice in this reference, some advice indeed from the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the Honourable Member for Radisson. For indeed it was in March of 1963, that the Honourable Member himself called for the dismissal from office of the government here by way of a resolution, in which he asked for, among other things --and I direct his respectful attention to this-- he asked for what? He asked for the easing of the burden of real property taxation at the local level.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right I'm still asking for it.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if we're not in the process of easing --to take his own very words-- the easing of the real property taxation at the local level, if we're not engaged in doing that, I'd like to know what we're doing, because Madam Speaker --and it has not been denied or indeed cannot be denied, that 64 percent of the real property taxpayers, the people spoken of by the honourable member, will have one-half of their school taxes refunded to them

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)..... under the plan which has been announced. Now 64 percent receiving one half of their school taxes, whatever term you want to call it -- gimmick or any other word that might occur to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party or anyone else-- it's a pretty solid contribution to real property taxation, and one could only suggest that it is in compliance indeed with that which was requested.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if I may be permitted a correction.

MR. McLEAN: You made your speech --

MR. PAULLEY: I could do this on a point of order because you're misquoting me. On the 64 percent, I said Madam Speaker, that 64 percent of the home owners will get back the $50.00, not 50 percent of their school tax. There's a big difference.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I may on the point of order I wonder if I could appeal to the Leader of the NDP who gave us a sanctimonious lecture on decorum a day or so ago.

MR. PAULLEY: May I remind my honourable friend, with permission, Madam Speaker, ...

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I'm not particularly interested in what interpretation the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party wants to place on his own remarks. That's his affair. What I am saying, Madam Speaker, to the members of the House is that 64 percent of the real property taxpayers in Manitoba will receive by way of a refund, one-half --not less than-one half-- of their school taxes. Now I'm not making his statement; that's my statement; that's our statement; and that's what will happen, and if that isn't in compliance with what he at one time had asked for then I'm --well , I'd better not say it.

Not only that, Madam Speaker, not only that, but I have taken a lesson from the Honourable the Member for Neepawa-Gladstone and I have taken to reading the newspapers and to clipping out things that are of interest, and I just happened to get this, have this story, just happened to have it from the Dauphin Herald and Press of March 10th, 1965, and I was interested, Madam Speaker, to find that this has nothing to do with the refund on the school taxes. It's interesting to find that in 1965, according to this story in the Dauphin Herald, that the Town of Dauphin will receive by way of provincial grants --these are the grants which will be paid equivalent to real property taxes under the new plan which is all part of this system-- four times as much money as they had received before. They will receive four times --it says here: "Provincial grants for the Town of Dauphin under the new government program to provide grants in lieu of taxes on provincial buildings as well as on land, will increase more than nine" --I said four, I was in error-- "ninefold this year, the Herald has learned this week."

Now Madam Speaker that means some very important and significant things to the people, the ratepayers, the citizens of the Town of Dauphin. It means that the town is receiving this additional money which can be used for improving the facilities of the Town of Dauphin. Not only does it improve the facilities but it increases the value of the property of the very people who are going to be receiving this tax refund on their school taxes, because as you improve the facilities of a municipality or a town or a village, you increase the value of the properties there. And that includes the values of the folks with small homes in modest circumstances just as much indeed as it does the value of other larger and perhaps more expensive properties. And has the Honourable the Member for Radisson who represents the City of Transcona, has he not noticed in the public press a story, I believe yesterday, to the effect that the taxes in the City of Transcona are going to be reduced in the year 1965? Now how does he think that happened? It happened because of this program.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, fiddlesticks.

MR. McLEAN: One small illustration of which I have just cited to the House, because of this program which has made it possible for further funds to be provided to our municipal governments thereby --(Interjection)-- decreasing the necessity of local taxation.

Now Madam Speaker --oh, the Honourable-- and this resolution doesn't really deal with the taxation aspect of this matter but the two get interchanged but I venture to suggest that the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party is not so irresponsible --he may talk that way at times-- but he's not so irresponsible as to think that any government, this government or his government or any other government, could carry out the provisions of his requests of 1963 to reduce the burden of real property taxation at the local level without imposing taxes at some other level. That's obvious. Indeed I am sure he said it in his speech at the time. And that's what we've done and we've done it in those matters where it would seem to be possible to give that measure of relief to real property taxation and provide some alternative means of taxation. And it would be the easiest thing in the world, --it wouldn't have

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd).....mattered, it wouldn't have mattered one iota on the basis of the presentation that he has made in this debate and in other resolutions in this Session so far, it wouldn't have mattered what kind of tax was levied, he'd have picked one of them out and he'd said, this isn't right, because of course he hasn't got the responsibility of imposing the taxes and won't likely have it and merely to garner what credit he can from these people who may have this tax imposed on them.

Madam Speaker, this is not a gimmick. This is doing the thing that he and every other member, and indeed so many people in public life in Manitoba have asked for, and that is to give some assistance to people who have to pay local taxes for school purposes in the province and that is exactly what's being done here. And I think that the presentation that was made by the Honourable the Member for Roblin the other day and there's no need of making any accusations about him being the fall guy. He is not the fall guy. I'm here. I'm speaking, and we are quite satisfied to do that, that the presentation that has been made to the House is entirely in accordance with the facts and that this is a worthwhile measure and is not a gimmick; it is the full measure, deserves the support of this House and we should deal with the resolution before us accordingly.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question.

MR. McLEAN: I'll try and answer it if I can.

MR. PAULLEY: Well you mentioned it so maybe you can answer what you said. You drew to my attention that the taxes in Transcona have been reduced and co-related this to a refund of the tax levy that is under discussion at the present time. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell me on what basis he makes this presumption or assertion, because the refund of course has not come back to Transcona yet.

MR. McLEAN: That is correct Madam Speaker but I'm more than certain that the City of Transcona knows the amount that they are going to receive by way of grants on buildings and lands and that they also know the measure of support that they will be receiving toward their road and street program. All of those things will be completely known to the City of Transcona in the making of their budget for the year 1965.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if I may be permitted another question then. Has the Honourable the Minister surveyed the reasons behind what made it possible for the reduction in Transcona? Because I'm sure if my honourable friend will it was because of the fact that Council now cuts out the four percent rebate which will allow them the two mill reduction, not any contribution from the government.

.....Continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I am prompted to enter this debate and especially -- and I don't blame the Minister for defending himself but when I hear a Minister boast about a constituency that he represents I think that I should get up and say a few words. And he just boasted, the Honourable Minister the Attorney-General boasted about Dauphin and I am sure that the Honourable Minister knows he represents Dauphin. Now he said that the grant values increased something in the neighbourhood of ninefold. Well all I can say, lucky ducks, the people in Dauphin. But I am sure that there are many constituencies, many -- and mine is one of them -- that cannot boast of these ninefold increase in grant values from this government.

He mentioned grants on lands used by the government. There are very, very few lands in my constituency that are being used by the government. True I'll grant him that, the City of Winnipeg with so many provincial buildings in lieu of taxes certain grants, that they will benefit but this is not true of the province as a whole. Only some of the larger centres will benefit through this and I'll just say again that I am very happy that the Honourable Minister takes such good care of his constituents and probably he can do it because he is a Minister.

Now you come to the tax rebate problem and the tenants, and I'll say that I rise now, since I am on my feet, I'll say that I support the principle of this resolution. It should be an equitable tax if we do -- if the government wishes to rebate some of the land property owner tax to him -- it should be an equitable one, and we should not discriminate. I'll say again I do not agree with the principle and the way it is introduced here, the principle of the tax rebate, but I accept the fact that the reduction of property tax is absolutely desirable.

In the apartments or rented houses, for the first time I think I heard the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party plead on behalf of some very wealthy people. Maybe even millionaires. Sure, he did plead on behalf of some of the poorer ones but isn't it a fact that in many apartments, especially in the apartments along the river here, along the Red River, there are people who are renting these apartments who are really wealthy people, maybe even some millionaires would rather rent apartments than own their own homes: so indirectly this time he was also pleading on behalf of the millionaire but that is beside the point. The thing is whether a man is poor or rich, when the government is dealing in tax rebates or taxes or any kind of concession, the government should not discriminate. The tax should be equitable. That is why I support this resolution. And in the rented apartments or rented houses the owner gets the full tax rebate. Well say the $50 on the property, yet he collects the rent but yet his customer, the renter, should be entitled to some rebate because he indirectly pays that tax which I am sure when the owner computes the rent that he is going to charge his customers he includes the tax in it, but in the rent he includes the tax in it, but the owner does not pass this saving on to the tenant and I would say, why divide and ignore the family who pays the rent? Rich or poor, we should not discriminate. And since this government is committed to a tax rebate I think the government, if it merits the name of government, should be able to devise some system of making this rebate equitable.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I was very interested in listening to the Attorney-General. It seems that every time he rises to speak now he makes a spirited defence of either his own position or that of his government, and I suppose that that is as it should be. But I suppose one other reason why he must make such a spirited defence is because it is difficult in fact to defend their position. So therefore it requires more spirit to do so. With regard to the re-arrangement of taxation that this government undertook last summer, there isn't very much that I can say at this time without being repetitious and I try to avoid being repetitious. But I would like to point out to the Attorney-General and his colleagues that there really isn't much point in re-arranging taxation if you don't change the incidence or impact of it and while one cannot deny that there has been some change in impact or incidence, it has been relatively slight. It has not been a change of taxation from taxation based on property or consumption to one based on income but it has in fact been a change from taxation based on property to taxation based on consumption and a taxation that's based on consumption really does not change impact very much.

I pointed out the other day that taxation levels in the U.S. provide a goal for us to aim at, that goal being that we can still afford -- and still be prudent -- we can still afford to tax more heavily on wealth and less on consumption. It doesn't seem to have hurt economic progress in the United States; it doesn't seem to have stopped economic expansion, it doesn't seem to have stopped per capita investment ..... and I don't think it would hurt us quite so drastically as the -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, but despite the tax reductions of last year -- the First

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) .... Minister must realize that despite the reduction of last year, the tax on wealth in the U.S. is still much higher relative to Canada, much higher than it is in Canada. The reductions last year did not change the over-all picture that much. In any case they have also reduced excise taxes, so they're reducing their taxes on consumption almost as quickly as they are reducing their taxes on wealth and income.

So I would argue that just what is this change that took place in taxation in this province? I would argue that there has in fact been no change, or very little change in impact, and so I think my leader is correct when he refers to this as a gimmick. I would only add that it is an outrageous gimmick, if for no other reason because of what it is doing to municipal government and municipal officials in this province. If it was found desirable and necessary to ease the burden of municipal taxation it could easily have been done by means of grants, higher grants to municipalities and school districts, but no, this province is going to make rebates directly to the home-owner and at the same time it will not be increasing grants to local government to the extent that they should. So what is the end result or the net result? Next year and in a few years time municipalities are going to have to increase their taxation because grants have not been increased as much as they should have been, and the people will be quite incensed and angry with the municipal governments and the officials; and on the other hand they will be receiving a rebate from the provincial government and saying, "Oh, we have some heroes in this country still." Well, it's pretty easy for the provincial government to pull this sort of stunt off because they happen to have sovereignty in this regard, but I want to say that I regard them as treating municipal government and municipal officials very shabbily indeed.

I think it's absolutely shameful that local government, which has been the bastion of democracy for a thousand years, should be scuttled, half-way scuttled at least, by this government which chooses to not increase grants to the extent they should be and is instead making rebates directly back to the home-owner. It's quite true that they'll come out of this looking like heroes but I certainly wouldn't want to be a municipal official in the next four or five or six years. And so I would hope that this government deserves the approprium that it will get from municipal officials and those who understand it in the next two years ahead. Why not do things in a proper manner? Why look for gimmicks, and above all if you're going to talk about giving real relief in taxation then look for a change or seek a method of change that will actually change the impact, and you can only do that if you go over to taxation on wealth and income. If you feel that it is not prudent to do so then leave things alone.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, my leader and the Honourable Member from Brokenhead used rather strong terms in addressing themselves to the resolution and to the government on this attitude in regard to this problem. I'm trying to speak in such a manner where I won't add to the attack which was made in the hopes that we could somehow win support from the government for the principle behind this resolution. I really would like to deal with just a couple of the items mentioned by the Honourable the Attorney-General when he seemed not quite to understand what we have been trying to say to him. He quoted the resolution which apparently my leader presented in 1963, where he asked and we asked for easing of the burden of real property taxation at the local level, and then he stated with pride that 64 percent of the real property taxpayers will have one-half of their school taxes refunded.

Now this is all very well, but he did not accept or deal with -- I don't ask that he accept but I do ask that he give us the courtesy of dealing with -- our argument that the real property taxpayer in truth is not necessarily the person whose name appears on the real property assessment roll. Now we've said this a number of times, Madam Speaker, and really in all fairness to us and if not to us then surely to the people of Manitoba, it ought to be clarified whether we're talking a language which is understandable or whether we are wrong and if we are wrong, in all fairness to us and to the people of Manitoba it should be explained. Now we have said that the people who pay rent are the people who pay the real property taxes. We have said that in cases where there are no tenants, no renters, then they are occupants who own the property and in that case they are the persons who pay real property taxes. Is there any doubt that when a tenant of premises, or let me say an occupant of premises, heats those premises that occupant pays the heat, and I say that by the same analogy the person who pays for the upkeep of the premises is the person whose burden it is, and to me it is a pretty clear argument and pretty logical. Now, maybe it's not logical and therefore doesn't deserve dealing with, but I suggest that it is so logical that possibly the government finds it difficult to respond to this

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) .... argument and therefore he chooses to ignore it.

So I state again that to us the actual real taxpayer is not the person or not necessarily the person whose name appears on the assessment rolls, and when the Attorney-General with a great deal of enthusiasm speaks of the fact that our motion two years ago, dealt with real property taxation, or the burden of real property taxation at the local level, I must point out to him that the word and the thought does not appear that the real property taxpayers shall have the burden relief. Now we can play with words, and certainly I don't intend to do that except to the extent that the Honourable the Attorney-General finds it necessary to do so. We spoke about the burden of real property taxation. Now we say that the burden falls on the person who occupies the premises and pays the rent and pays through that rent the taxes, and somehow or other the Honourable the Attorney-General chose to overlook or not to understand or preferably not to deal with this contention of ours. Now he spoke with pride about the fact that in Dauphin the increased grants on government buildings have been increased nine-fold, and this is good and this is right and this is something that I am pretty sure we spoke about in the past. Certainly as a member of municipal councils I had occasion to speak of it as loudly as I could. It is right; it is proper; I think it is a fine step. The honourable the member, however, did not indicate to us how much this nine-fold increase really meant in taxes and dollars to the people of Dauphin. It may have been very substantial, but on the other hand it may not have been and just saying "nine-fold" doesn't mean very much really. So that I would like, and I notice that the Honourable the Attorney-General seemed to suggest that the reduction in Transcona was due to the fact that the government has increased the grants on government buildings. This may be true, but I do doubt it. I doubt it very much Madam Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- Well there are cries close to me that that is nonsense. I would hate to say that out loud to the Attorney-General, so I won't repeat what has been said. I would rather suggest that if he really means what I think he said then I do urge him to spell it out, get the figures, tell them to us, so that we will know that he was right.

More so, I would like to ask the Provincial Treasurer if in due course he can supply us with information based on the projection which he made at the time that he presented this whole plan last August, was it? At that time he spoke of increased revenues of some 20 or 21 million dollars and of various distributions of those revenues in terms of giving the money back, oh in grants, government grants, in this school tax rebate -- although I hate to use the term; the Honourable the Minister of Education probably enjoys hearing the term, school tax rebates -- and at that time I think there was a suggestion that he seemed to be budgeting for about a million dollar surplus in that turnover, and I seem to recall - - and I don't have the Hansard before me -- that he indicated that it was pretty tough to measure just what the revenue would be. There was a tax on cigarettes and who knew what the reduction in smoking might be, how it might affect that; there was a tax on gasoline I think and we weren't sure and he wasn't sure -- and I understand that -- as to just what could be expected; there was an estimate of some $21 million.

I would like to ask of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that before too long he tell us what he has learnt now compared to what he knew then, and give us the information as to the amount of money received from the increase, and I speak only of the increase which was passed last session, and the distribution, and I would like to make sure that when we speak of the distribution of that income that it is recognizable, because the one thing I think that the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer would not like is a suggestion that the money was so blended in that it got lost and that as a result the revenue of the province was increased substantially beyond the rebates or the assumption of responsibilities which were forecast last August. Now there were certain responsibilities undertaken, extended responsibilities undertaken in connection with roads in municipal boundaries. I hope that there is a way that the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer has of indicating to us that, let's say in 1964 the government undertook a certain responsibility for roads in municipalities, this year that financial responsibility has been increased by "X" dollars; so that from that we can get some review based on much more knowledge and experience that he has today rather than the projection or prognosis that he had last summer.

And finally Madam Speaker, having I am sure put ourselves in a position where we will have this information from the Provincial Treasurer and having invited, I hope, somebody who is prepared to discuss our contention that the tenant or the occupant of premises is really the person who pays the taxes and thus carries the burden of real property taxation, I would urge honourable members to look at this resolution and see whether it is

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) .... something that invites so much disagreement as appears to come from the other side of the House. The preamble, the first one, speaks that it has been generally agreed that real property taxes have been carrying too great a burden of school taxes." I can quote the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs to support this preamble. -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't know whether I can quote him reluctantly or he spoke reluctantly, but he spoke in any event and I can quote him in this respect. The second preamble, "whereas The Revenue Act, 1964 was passed to give relief in this regard" -- and this gives the government full marks, full credit, this Act was passed to give relief in that regard. And the third preamble is one which invites some discussion and that is that "whereas The Revenue Act unfairly discriminates against tenants whose monthly rent absorbs the school tax." Now Madam Speaker, there's a statement of fact and there's a conclusion. The statement of fact is that the monthly rent of the tenants absorbs the school tax, and that's either true or it's untrue. If it is true then I suggest that the conclusion that this is unfair discrimination is correct, is appropriate; and to that extent, I think that it merits support. And when the Honourable the Attorney-General seemed to take umbrage at my suggestion that there was a special class of people who benefit, I'd like him to spell out just how I was wrong and whether it isn't true that a special class of people benefit. But I am suggesting that we clarify whether it is true or not true that the monthly rent absorbs the school tax and from that we can decide whether the conclusion is correct. And it goes on to say, "whereas the school tax rebate despite its disadvantages is nevertheless law." Well now nobody can argue with, it is law and it hasn't been upset, it has not been declared ultra vires, it is law, even though it may have disadvantages. So that the conclusion resolution portion of this motion is that the government give consideration to the advisability of making amendments whereby the occupants of rental premises will also derive benefits. Now we know that this is a pretty complicated procedure that was planned in the school tax rebate. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs used the expression "an exercise" a few days ago. I wonder just what he could mean by that. An exercise to me seems to be some plan that one tries out to see whether or not it works. It is a -- I don't want to use the word scheme, in that it's not scheming, but it's a scheme, it's a plan, it's a device, it's an exercise which was designed by the government to accomplish a purpose. We are suggesting in this resolution that that purpose has not been fully accomplished in that there has been a form of -- again, I hesitate to use the word "discrimination", because that's a word that has shock qualities and yet I do say there is a difference in classes here. So that what we are saying is we ask the government to have a good look at this and see whether they can carry out this exercise just a little bit further to take care of the burden which is still carried, the burden of real property taxes, which is still on the shoulders of the people who occupy the premises and who are not on the assessment rolls, thus they do not get this rebate, they are the ones who still pay the tax.

One other point in passing is one that has been made time and again, that when you have an apartment building with a hundred suites there are a hundred tenants there who are contributing to the tax on that apartment block. They are all contributing and many of them have leases, and I think it is generally known that this is true, many of them have leases that provide that when the real property tax goes up, the rent goes up by the same amount. Therefore, these are people, neither they get the benefit of this rebate, nor does the owner of the premises, so that with all the goodwill he may have in his heart, he can only distribute 50 cents apiece to his tenants a year, 50 cents -- 50 cents a year apiece. I am right. It was such a shockingly low figure, I was sure my arithmetic was wrong; but it's not wrong it's correct. If a tenant is a tenant in a hundred suite apartment block and the owner of that apartment block, in all good faith, in all goodheartedness, in all effort to carry out the objective of an easing of the burden of taxation, if he wants to do what he can do, then he can reduce the rent of these people by 50 cents per year. -- (Interjection) -- I don't know how much cigarettes cost because I stopped smoking them once the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer raised the price. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN. Spoilsport.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well if the Honourable the Minister finds it necessary to have his delight in collecting tax on an item which is cigarettes and then says spoilsport because I want to save my health ....

MR. ROBLIN: I'm concerned about that incident the taxation we heard about and I object to your taking that stand.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh please -- repeat that please, I didn't hear what he said. --

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) ..... (Interjection) -- Well. I'm sorry because apparently I said something which wasn't quite the nice thing to say and I didn't intend not to be nice so ....

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I was pulling my honourable friend's leg. I'm sorry to admit.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I'm sorry I didn't hear, so I too could have had the benefit of that. Coming back to my concluding remarks which I'd like to get concluded so that I could sit down. I'm sorry it pains the Honourable the First Minister so much that he has to look forward to my sitting down, but I assure him I will right away.

The 50 cents per year per tenant in this imaginary one hundred suite block is an indication that the people who pay the tax are really not all of them getting the benefit of the rebate. I again urge upon the government to read this resolution carefully and see whether it is really so outrageous or whether it does not merit some sort of consideration. And if it merits any sort of consideration, surely it would be the desire of this government to give that consideration in order to be able to spread the benefit of the rebate and thus ease the burden of real property taxation on the local level in as wide and equitable a manner as possible.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I won't speak on this resolution at length, I was just interested in what the previous speaker said and in drawing his conclusions, I'm not quite sure whether I can agree with him. For instance if a farmer who sells his wheat in order to obtain revenue to pay his taxes do we consider that the grain company who purchases wheat is a taxpayer? The same thing when you apply it for instance to the hog farmer, or the chicken farmer; he has to pay taxes on the building that he has to house these chickens and hogs; and do we feel that the packing plant that buys these products pays the taxes on those buildings? I can't quite follow this. Then also, in the case where a landlord probably has buildings which are not occupied, naturally it stands to reason that the landlord will have to pay those taxes regardless whether they are being occupied or not. So that the real estate owner is the one that has to pay the taxes in my opinion, and while I'm not averse to the resolution by any means, I'm not quite sure whether the stand taken by the previous speaker is quite correct.

MR. WRIGHT: If no one else wishes to speak I move ....

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I was prompted to get up this evening for the same reason that I was prompted to get up the other day and the same man is responsible and that's my honourable friend the Attorney-General. I had no intention whatever of getting up and talking at this time if it had not been for a statement that he made. And I must say now Madam Speaker, that I don't object to him reading the Dauphin Herald and reading all of it, but what I expected that he would do would be to tell us the amount he talked about nine times. Well nine times nothing is still nothing and I think we'll agree on that.

Now when I was referring to this "big deal" on the Throne Speech, I referred to an article in the Neepawa Press of September 8th, 1964, headed, "Sixfold Grant Increase on Government Property. Neepawa to receive the huge sum of $690.00." Now I said at that time, and I'll repeat it again now, "in one fell swoop the government was recouping all this with the five percent tax on our street lighting alone -- one item -- because the Town of Neepawa pay roughly $12,000 a year to Hydro. Now what's five percent of $12,000.00? It's equal nearly to this sixfold grant. Now I wonder if Dauphin is in the same position. I wonder what the Town of Dauphin pay or will pay in 1965 in the way of five percent on all of their utilities, heating on their public buildings, the heating and lighting in all of the town property. My guess is that it will be nine times about equal to what my honourable friend has said.

Now I notice that my honourable friend, the First Minister -- and I rather enjoy listening to him and watching him on TV, because it always reminds me of these propaganda sheets that are put out - - and he's an expert like most of the Ministers opposite are on propaganda -- and you will know, Madam Speaker, that the present series of TV is called "The Changing Face of Manitoba." I think the last one that I viewed was called "People and Politics". I suggest Madam Speaker that the face is changing a bit and mine like a lot of other peoples has taken on a kind of new look with all of the added taxes that we are loaded with. So we have this changing face that my honourable friend the First Minister talks about. And it's surprising too in light of what my honourable friend the Member for Roblin says -- he's occupying the First Minister's Chair there or he was, no doubt he is aspiring to some position -- but he said, "you remember Madam Speaker in that ....

MR. ALEXANDER: It's your usual imagining.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, would my honourable friend like to repeat that and

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) .... get it on Hansard, I ....

MR. ALEXANDER: I said that comment that you made was in line with your usual imagining.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh. Then I take it Madam Speaker that he is not acquiring the position. So now that we have that on record, I would like to read something else that my honourable friend said in that famous Hansard of March 18, 1959. No, Madam Speaker, I am not going to refer to anything my friend the Attorney-General said. Just something that my friend from Roblin said about his taxes. No Madam Speaker I believe it was a year later, it was even in 1960 that the Honourable Member for Roblin said on page 465 of Hansard 18A, 465. I imagine my honourable friend the Member for Roblin will have this in his desk because he made a pretty important statement that time -- (Interjections) -- 465. He says -- he and the Member for St. George were really carrying on an argument because the whole -- there's two pages of Hansard there that is nothing but arguments back and forth between the two of them -- but my honourable friend from Roblin says, "one school district in a thousand, not taking into consideration consolidated districts, it's not. "Nothing of the kind" he says, nothing of the kind. And he said taxes are going down, they're definitely going down. He said mine are gone down. That's what you said. Look it up tomorrow in Hansard. Now I asked the other day, he wasn't in the House but I asked him if they were still going down, because if they are by this time there will be no taxes at all and then he will not be entitled to this $50 rebate, if he doesn't pay any taxes. You've got to pay taxes in order to qualify for this rebate. So if his have been going down every year since 1959 no doubt they have taken them right off the tax roll completely. Madam Speaker, when my honourable friend the First Minister or any of the cabinet or any of the backbenchers, let's include them all, no use being partial in this, every time that they get put on the spot as to why this $22 million of taxes were imposed last fall they say well Michener recommended it. That's it. We hadn't any thoughts on this at all. As a matter of fact my honourable friend the Attorney-General said at their Conservative meeting — I don't think he was there but according to the press and I quoted him the other day, there was no special reason at all for this heat tax, it just happened to be .....

MR. McLEAN: On a point of privilege, Madam Speaker, I must have it recorded for posterity that I did not make the statement as I have reminded the honourable member on I think three previous occasions this session.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I said, Madam Speaker, that I didn't think he was that stupid and he didn't attend the Conservative convention and as long as he wants to put it on record that he was not at the Conservative convention ....

MR. McLEAN: Now, now, Madam Speaker, fun is fun but that's quite improper.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, am I expected to make a reply to what my honourable friend said. -- (Interjection) -- Well, anyway, let's get back to Michener. He's the fellow that my honourable friends like to blame for everything anyway and I suppose that if Michener recommended that it would be in the best interests of everybody in the Province of Manitoba for my honourable friend to go and stand on the corner of Portage and Main on his head at 12 o'clock noon every day for two minutes that they'd probably do it because Michener said this is the right thing to do. This is the way they pass the buck on this kind of thing. But if you go back to what the government said that they were going to do in the Election of 1958 and the Election of 1959 — and I still have these articles that were mailed out, they were not addressed they were mailed out so every boxholder got one and that accounts for me having one. I know that it was not their intention they should fall into my hands, but they did. But in all those elections they were going to perform the same as Dear John had, according to this one, and they were going to do all of these things without increasing taxes of any kind. In fact, my honourable friend the Attorney-General made that statement on page 95 of that notable Hansard that -- and he said he didn't suppose that he would ever live it down but well they may forget about it sooner or later. However, Madam Speaker, there is a bit of a changing face on some of us people, the taxpayers in Manitoba, as my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP has suggested and it is on us people who have to pay these increased taxes. I said on the Throne Speech that I would likely get back $50 on a parcel of land that I have that I pay $1400 in taxes, and it was not my intention to reduce the rent accordingly. It was not my intention because it would reduce the rent by $4.00 and roughly 20 cents a month if I did. So what is the point.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have some interesting figures that I would like to use. Now my my honourable friend the First Minister he delights on these TV performances in using a blackboard and I haven't got one here to use. I would delight in using it too but I know that it is not

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) ..... permissible at this time and I haven't got one here handy anyway. But he likes to use the words 'then and now', and of course 'then' referring to 1957 I think, and 'now' of course is meaning exacty that, now, and he says then and now and then and now about 53 times the same as they did in the budget speech the other day, or 58 times or whatever it was. So I would like to follow this same practice of informing the House of some of the changing faces in Manitoba, then and now, and I might as well I guess start off in the Town of Neepawa, that's a good place to start, and I am going to give you 1, 2, 3, 4 -- four properties there showing the taxes in 1957 and 1964, then and now, on real property, one parcel of land. And if my honourable friend the Attorney-General insists I could get the assessment roll I suppose and read them all. It might take me more than my 40 minutes but I would. I just got this information on the phone a couple of days ago, and I'll give the names, I think that's permissible in the House, to give the name rather than the roll number or the description. I am going to change -- in this case I'm giving you the name: 1957, Olive Jackson, taxes $194.92, now $260.76; Nora Benson, $183.92, now $230.55; All Shulman, then $203.28, now $243.27; Lillian Coull then $97.68, now $149.46. And then of course in addition to these increases they will be faced with all the utility taxes and everything else that was imposed last August. -- (Interjection) -- Madam Speaker, I overheard my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, wasn't it, said "Well what about the rebate?" -- (Interjection) -- Well in most cases it won't be enough. In most cases it will not be enough to place them in the same position that they were then, and I am talking about 1957 as then, the same as the First Minister does. Now so much for the Town of Neepawa.

The R.M. of Lakeview we go right to the other end of my constituency and right up against Lake Manitoba. This time I will give you the roll number rather than the name. Roll No. 101, then 1957 $116.82, now $192.10; Roll No. 259 $94.05 then -- what do you think now, Madam Speaker? $211.88 -- he needs a lot more than $50 there to get Even Steven; Roll No. 617 then $129.60, now $246.00: Roll No. 925, 1957 $106.56, in 1964, $173.60. In each and every case away more than the $50 rebate. Some of them double. I would like to just pause here for a minute to interject that in 1957 I am told that the Municipal Commissioners' Levy, now that's the term that was applied in those days, I believe they call it something different now, but it's more or less for the same express purpose, in 1957 was $262 and in 1965 this year they are being assessed for 1300 and some odd dollars or a difference of $1,000.00.

Now, let's carry on with the changing face of Manitoba. R.M. Westbourne and I have in this case both the roll number and description but I think for the purpose of this evening I'll just use the roll number, and in this case, in this case I want to say this, that not only has there been an increase in taxes but in many of the rural municipalities the assessment has gone away up in addition -- the assessment has gone up, the mill rate has gone up and surely this is a double squeeze. Now from the R.M. of Wesbourne I was told that the mill rate hadn't changed too much in the interval but the assessment has, and I'm going to give you the change in assessment now. In Roll No. 3 in 1957 it was assessed at $800, today $3,000; Roll No. 184 it was assessed then at $1,150, today $3,000; Roll 841, 1957 the assessment is $720, today it's $3,350: Roll 923, $800 in 1957, $3,600 today. Roll No. 966, $800 in 1957, $3,650 today. Roll No. 467, $1,440 in 1957, $3,560 today. Roll No. 660, $960 in 1957, $3,500 in 1964. Roll No. 1986, $1,160 in 1957, $3,950 today. Roll No. 2313, $1,140 in 1957, $4,100 in 1964. Roll No. 2513 assessed for $920 in 1957, $3,950 in 1964. So there's certainly a changing face in Manitoba.

R.M. of Langford. This one, I haven't got the roll number, but I'll give you the legal description. There's only four of them. The NE30-13-15-Wl taxes in 1957, $61.90, $96.00 today. SE 7-13-16-W, 1957 $135.74, $238.40 today. A $50 rebate won't nearly pay that difference. SE 18-14-15-W1, $129.31 in 1957, $211.20 today. SE 32-13-16-W1, $121.20 in 1957, $198.66 today. R.M. of Rosedale. These are all in my constituency Madam Speaker from all of these municipalities. R.M. of Rosedale, NW 14-16-15 $193.18 in 1957, $245 today. NE 10-18-15, $157.56, $303.42. Lots 11-13, Block 3, Plan 428 Kelwood. This is town property, $89.90 in 1957, $161.50 in 1964. My Honourable the Minister of Agriculture looks amazed. The SE 5-15-16, 1957, then $210, today $302.60; and we could go on and on, and I'm going to go on and make one more comment because the ...

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture was amazed that he was still talking ....

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, I'm still talking about this changing face of Manitoba that my honourable friend is partly responsible for, and what I had before me Madam -- the land that

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) .... I am going to refer to at the moment is not in my constituency but is in the R.M. of Glenella, represented ably by my honourable leader, and all owned by two brothers, all owned by two brothers. Madam Speaker, then, the taxes then on the N 1/2 14-18-14, $168.77, now $306.80. The SW 23-18-14, $110.17 ....

MR. HUTTON: Southwest ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: 23-18-14, $110.17; now $160.93. NW 23-18-14, then $112.51, now $170.97. NE 23-18-14. $75.01 then, 1957, $174.16 now -- $100 difference. -- (Interjection) Just taxes. Madam Speaker, he says what are these that I'm reading out. They're taxes.

MR. HUTTON: No, but .... school taxes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: No, these are taxes, and what I'm trying to show for the benefit of my honourable friend is the changing face of Manitoba as regards taxes then and now. I'm using the tactics that my honourable friend the First Minister uses. On the SE 26-18-14 then $75.01, now $139.02: and NW of 26-18-14, $37.21 then, $110.26 now: SW 35-18-14, $37.49 then $59.14 now. NE 35-18-14, $37.49 then, $69.18 now. SW of ....

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe I've allowed the honourable member considerable laxity here. Is he speaking to the resolution?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Certainly. Certainly the resolution is talking about tax rebates, and I am attempting to point out Madam Speaker that even with the rebates it will not, it will not place the people in the same favourable position that they were tax-wise in 1957. And I'm just about to get around to the other part of the ....

MADAM SPEAKER: I would suggest that the honourable member give consideration to the resolution, as it is understood.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, the resolution concerns taxes, for the benefit of my honourable friends opposite, in case they never heard of them they're hearing about them now. Now -- (Interjection) -- I must confess that I was absent in the House on Friday evening, the night on which they discussed this whole issue of the rebate of taxes, because I did want to make a comment about them now. Madam Speaker this is, in the words of the Throne Speech, the real purpose of us meeting here at this session. It said the principle -- I haven't the Throne Speech before me, but it says that this is the whole principle purpose of meeting here is to equalize taxes and so on, so that I suggest that if I'm not quite in order I'm certainly talking about the most important part of legislation at this session. Someone gave me some figures and I must confess I don't even remember who it was, but it doesn't make any difference. It's some startling figures and if my honourable friends would like to debate this question further we can do that when we get to the Minister of Education. He's a very diplomatic kind of a fellow. The article says that the education grants this year, not including the ten million dollars, school grants are $32,387,000 -- and this is a direct quote from the estimates -- and these grants to school districts and divisions represent the province's share of the cost of the following items: Teachers Salaries, Maintenance, Administration Supplies, Transportation and School Construction. That's the capital. Now these grants represent 17.49 percent of the total current expenditures of the province for education. This is how we arrived at them: $32 million, right from my friend's estimates -- $32,387,000 over $185,238,167, represents 17.49 percent. Now in 1955 the provincial grants to school boards were 17.8 percent of the total expenditures. Now while the dollar increase to education are undeniably, he says, very substantial in terms of the total expenditure of the province, they are less than they were in 1955. He's comparing the relationship of the grants towards education as to the entire estimated expenditure for the province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. In my estimation the honourable member is still a long way off the resolution which we are discussing. I would suggest that he read the resolution and speak to the resolution.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Okay, where is it.

A MEMBER: Here it is. Read it out loud.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I shall comply with your request Madam Speaker. Whereas it has been generally agreed that real property taxes have been carrying too great a burden of school taxes, and whereas The Revenue Act, 1964, was passed to give relief in this regard, and whereas The Revenue Act, 1964, unfairly discriminates against tenants whose monthly rents absorbs the school tax and whereas the school tax rebate despite its disadvantages is nevertheless law, therefore be it resolved that this government give consideration to the advisability of making amendments to The Revenue Act, 1964, whereby the occupants of rented premises will also derive benefit of this school tax rebate.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) ....

Now Madam Speaker, I have been talking about taxes generally. I'll admit that. Now the resolved part of the resolution says that we should give some consideration to the tenants and I agree with this. I'm sorry that my honourable friend, the Leader of the NDP has not outlined in more detail what his formula might be but there is no question about it, that since this whole matter of rebate is simply a return of an overcharge, anyway, that the renter is entitled to some of this overcharge. And I estimated when I was speaking on the Throne Speech that the additional taxes that were levied would cost me personally in the neighbourhood of a hundred and eight or a hundred and nine dollars and I was going to get back $50.00 and that while it was a shift, a shift in taxation, it was being shifted from one pocket to the other when there was about $58 got lost in the shuffle.

And all of those renters -- and today I think my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP made the statement that whereas presently there are many very very wealthy people occupying rented apartments -- my honourable friend from Emerson said that. Well I think this is a fact because every time that I drive in from Neepawa, which is frequently, once a week, you can't help but be amazed from the time you enter the perimeter road until you get pretty well downtown at the numerous apartment blocks and real plush ones, real plush ones. I don't know what the rent would be but these people, in my estimation, that are in these places, they're paying huge taxes, there's no doubt about it, and they're certainly not going to benefit. If you take these million dollar blocks, million dollar apartment blocks, -- million dollars, I doubt -- some of them would be away over a million dollar figure I would think. All they're going to get back is $50.00. Well they certainly can't make any rebate to a hundred tenants if they're only going to get back $50 and I think it is only just and reasonable that these people who have made a very very healthy contribution should receive some return of the overcharge.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has four minutes left of his time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you. Now I'm completely satisfied, Madam Speaker, that if the people had known, had known, and had had a say in running the affairs of the province, that if they had known that they were going to have to pay $108 to get back fifty they probably wouldn't have gone for it in the first place, even though Michener did recommend it and I think that since it is an overcharge, and since the people -- we are really committed to return some of this overcharge -- that those people that are occupying rented premises are just as much entitled to it as the other people.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. WRIGHT: In the absence of my colleague, may we have the matter stand please?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Virden.

MR. J. E. JEANNOTTE (Rupertsland): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable member may I have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Burrows, that whereas the farm truck is an essential piece of equipment vitally necessary to the efficient operation of a farm; and whereas most of the gas used by farm trucks is used on the farm and on municipal roads between differently located parcels of farm lands; and whereas the recent increase in taxes by the government of Manitoba is causing a further increase in the cost of producing farm products, therefore be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of providing that bona fide farmers with a farm truck license be allowed the use of purple gas in farm trucks on the same basis as the Province of Alberta has used for some years and the Province of Saskatchewan is now instituting.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I think it is agreed that when the gasoline tax was imposed a few years ago it was the intention of using it as a road tax. Mind you I admit that since then that this hasn't always been followed and the money collected from gasoline tax has certainly not always been used for the building of roads. However, Madam Speaker, it is

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd) ..... usually recognized that this was the purpose and the farm truck now with our modern ways of farming has become a very essential part of the farm operation and is a necessary piece of equipment as such. The farm truck today is being used extensively for many purposes in the operating of the farm and quite a lot on the farm itself, for hauling grain, hauling hay right on the farm and also between differently located parcels of land. Whenever the truck is used for these purposes it is not actually using the roads that are financed by the province and I think should be permitted to use tax-free gasoline because in most cases these roads are being maintained by the municipality itself and the farmer himself is paying these taxes through his public works taxes in the municipality.

Also I think the farmers in Manitoba are contributing to the gas tax more than any other farmer in the west by the fact that we have in Manitoba the highest gasoline tax. In Alberta the tax is only 12 cents, Saskatchewan 14 cents and Manitoba 17 cents. So I think the farmer is contributing his fair share by paying the tax on the gasoline used in his car. Now some might say, well, the gentleman that goes to work has to pay this tax and he uses his car to go to work which is an essential part of his livelihood. Well I agree with this, however, as I said before we must consider that the farm truck is not using paved roads between his farm and the town or between the differently located parcels of land on which the truck is used plus the fact that many miles are travelled on the farm itself.

Also we find that here in the west both Alberta has been permitted to use a purple gasoline or tax-free gasoline in trucks for quite a few years and Saskatchewan this year is passing legislation to this effect where the farmers in that province also will be able to use purple gasoline in their trucks. So I think this resolution is highly recommendable and I think the government should give our farmers here in Manitoba the very same treatment and allow them to use purple gasoline in their trucks.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FRED KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fisher the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, whereas the traffic at the Junction of No. 1 Highway west and the perimeter has greatly increased with the rapid growth of the Municipality of Assiniboia; the year round operation of the Odeon-Morton Drive-In Theatre and the racing season during the summer months has added considerably to the traffic on Portage Avenue West; there were numerous accidents including fatalities Portage Avenue West; the government has commenced construction of a four-lane speedway between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie; that the government when establishing the current year's highway program, consider the advisability of giving priority to the construction of: 1. (a) A cloverleaf and an overpass at the said junction of the perimeter highway and Portage Avenue in the Municipality of Assiniboia; 2. (a) Install traffic lights at the intersection of Westwood Drive and Portage Avenue; (b) Install traffic lights at the intersection of Cavalier Drive and Portage Avenue.

Madam Speaker, I would like to have the consent of the House to make one correction and that's under the third "whereas" Instead of "speedway" I would like to put "highway".

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I believe the members will recall at the last session I presented a resolution for extension and widening of Portage Avenue through the Municipality of Assiniboia, and I think it would be only right to say that the people of Assiniboia are happy that we did get the extension of Portage, or widening of Portage Avenue in our area, but a median divider was constructed as I requested in the resolution at that time. But the second part of the resolution was asking for an overpass and a cloverleaf at the junction of No. 1 highway and 100, the Perimeter on the West of Winnipeg. This part of the resolution was amended and deleted. I'm sure, Madam Speaker, you can appreciate this junction of No. 1 West and the Perimeter highway is becoming one of the most important junctions in the highway system in Manitoba. It is also, I would say, the gateway to the western province and as well to Western Canada.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd).....

With increased traffic on these two highways. the Municipality of Assiniboia and the people of my constituency are greatly concerned about proper facilities in our area, and I think they should be given. full measure of safety should be .....to the residents in this constituency. I know last year at this junction we had somewhere around 20 accidents. There were 18 injuries and I believe one fatality. I would say it is only logical to say, since we spend millions of dollars on hospitals, medical institutions, I would say it is only logical that we should spend money to prevent people getting these injuries, broken bones, and using of these facilities.

Explosive traffic on Trans Canada through Assiniboia and in addition the density of local traffic has greatly increased and multiplied, and I think it will continue to increase. Each summer during the racing season at Assiniboia Downs we have thousands of cars coming in during the summer months, as well as the operation all year round of the Odeon Morton Drive-In Theatre draws cars every evening by the hundreds.

I would say Assiniboia Municipality is growing real fast; in fact it's growing faster than any other municipality in the Province of Manitoba. We had somewhere around 1,000 homes constructed in this area. I believe this will probably be repeated again this year as well. The population has reached somewhere around 16,000 people and by the year end I would say it will be near to the figure of 20,000. Home construction, I'm safe to say, was 40 percent of all the construction in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. There has been also, or will be major extensions to the present Westwood Shopping Centre, which will eventually be the Westwood Village Square. There have been announcements made recently that there will be extensions to the village shopping centre in the vicinity of $5 -1/2 million with construction of a big store, hotel and department store. The whole development will cover somewhere in the neighbourhood of 18 acres of land. There is also planning underway for another shopping centre in Assiniboia right opposite the present one on the north side of Portage Avenue, and this will add more traffic to our area. The housing development in Charleswood will be starting this year and also the announcement of a park to be situated in our area by the government will again add more traffic to this intersection at the Perimeter and highway 100.

The government has not shown that they have plans for adequate highway development, and the construction of the perimeter has been a real good example. I believe the construction of the perimeter north has been almost completely neglected or has been slow. I believe if a cloverleaf was constructed at this intersection of the Perimeter highway and Portage Avenue this would allow the traffic to leave Portage Avenue and relieve congestion through the city or through the Municipality of Assiniboia, City of St. James and City of Winnipeg as well.

I hope there will be immediate action where it is needed and a long-term program for the future. I would like to know if the government has purchased the land for construction of an overpass and a cloverleaf, or are we waiting for the prices to go up? We must also be ready to accommodate increasing volume of traffic in the future. I suggest that the government acquire right-of-way and in due course consider construction of a provincial trunk highway paralleling the railway lines northward and eastward along to Saskatchewan Avenue. When the traffic comes in through Headingley off Portage Avenue or from across the Assiniboia River it could channel into this provincial trunk highway along the railway which would allow heavy through traffic from the west and from the south of Assiniboine to swing up Portage Avenue and entirely relieve congestion on the eastern part of Assiniboia.

Madam Speaker, I was quite concerned about the traffic lights in our area. I believe there has been representations made to this government and to the Department of Public Works for construction of traffic lights in the constituency of Assiniboia. There is a span of somewhere around 2-1/2 miles where there is no break in traffic. We have had accidents, fatal accidents in that area. As a matter of fact last week we had a fatality as well. I am not saying that the traffic light would have helped and the accident wouldn't have happened, but I am sure it would be a safety measure to have a break in the traffic in such a large span when the speed limit is 40 miles an hour.

I think that we should also be concerned that 1964 was one of the worst seasons as far as traffic accidents were concerned in Manitoba, and Madam Speaker, I would like to quote just from Assiniboia and St. James News of last week, and the big headline is: "How Many Will Die This Way?" it was a morning similar to every morning in late winter. I had just turned east onto Portage Avenue from Rita Street. At a red light I drew alongside another car in the lane on my left and proceeded down Portage. I thought idly of the fine job that had been done in

(MR. PATRICK cont'd).....clearing the snow off Portage and decided there was a chance yet that I would get through the winter with my car intact. Then I noticed a woman standing on the centre strip with two small children clutching her hands. She was waiting for a break in the traffic before crossing to the bus stop. The car in the left lane stopped to let her cross, as I did in the centre lane. The woman stepped off the centre strip with her children and herded them across in front of us. I glanced into my rear view mirror and was horrified to see a car bearing down swiftly in the right curb lane. He had obviously not seen the mother and the children. I sounded my horn wondering whether they would make it to the curb before the car got to them. At the last moment the driver of the moving car hit his brakes and skidded, the rear of the car swinging in the direction of the curb and left, the front fender pushing one of the children, a little boy, firmly into his mother's arms. The boy screamed and his mother seemed on the verge of hysteria. The driver's face was white as he got out of the car and lifted both the children to the curb. He apologized profusely for making a ghastly and unforgettable mistake. I sat in my car. The driver behind me was now out of his vehicle shouting and gesticulating at the other driver who was now standing dazed by his car which was crosswise in the curb lane. Who is to blame? A law which always gives the pedestrian the right-of-way and which contributed to this near calamity? That slowness and reluctance of Metro and the municipal governments to establish sensible crosswalks in areas? The driver for being careless? The woman for crossing at this place? How many people will die this way before something is done?"

And this is my concern, Madam Speaker, because as I said there were representations made to the government for traffic lights in this area quite some time ago. Again I would like to point out I am not saying that the accident last week would have been avoided if the crosswalk or traffic lights would have been there, but I am sure it might have been a help, and to briefly summarize, Madam Speaker, I ask this House to direct the government to acquire land and begin construction of a cloverleaf and overpass at the junction of 100 and No. 1; to take adequate steps now for the comprehensive planning projected into the future: and to utilize efficiently the potential of Portage Avenue and parallel auxiliary lanes; and to construct traffic lights on the intersection of Portage Avenue and Westwood, and Portage and Cavalier Drive

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if the member would permit a question. What is the relationship of Westwood Drive and Portage Avenue and Cavalier Drive and Portage Avenue -- the relationship insofar as the Perimeter is concerned. How far apart are they?

MR. PATRICK: I would say approximately a mile, but Cavalier from Westwood is a few blocks distance, Madam Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, not going out that way too often I am not too familiar with the set-up as explained in the resolution before us, but on occasion I do go out that way and I've seen this stretch and driven it, and I think it's well for the member for that area to bring this to the attention of the House. What I would like to know, just what would be the cost involved in such an overpass as is being called for. I think this would be of interest to the members because going north on Pembina Highway this morning, I note that when the traffic comes to the point where they're going to go to the University of Manitoba that you have traffic backing up for over half a mile, and this is slowing traffic up considerably. Here definitely there should be an overpass of some kind. What surprises me most is that we have a Minister, a Cabinet Minister in that area and that nothing seems to be done about it. I always felt that if you had a Cabinet Minister from an area like that, things were looked after, but here on Pembina Highway in Fort Garry something definitely should be done in my opinion. I have seen this happen not only once but many a time, that traffic backing up for half a mile or so, so I think it's good for the member to bring this to the attention of the members of this House, and I certainly would look forward to getting some information on the cost involved for such an overpass.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

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