

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
9:30 o'clock, Monday, May 6, 1963

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Reports.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if the First Minister could indicate to us how he intends to proceed on the Orders of the Day today, and the order of business for today?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): With the Order Paper, Madam Speaker.

MR. J. COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bill for third reading: No. 102, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18696, 18760 and 18764.

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

Sections 1 to 15 of Bill No. 102 were read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 16 is deleted. 17 (a) passed, (b) passed, new section 16 passed. New section 17 (a) passed, 10 passed, 18 passed. New section 18 (2) passed, 18 passed. New section 19, 20 (a) passed, 29 passed, 19 passed. New section 21 (6) - 18 - 1 passed, 2 passed, 3 passed, 4 passed, 5 passed, 6 passed, 6 (18) passed, section 20 passed. New section 21 passed. 22 - 8 passed, 22 passed. Sections 24 - 25 were deleted. New section The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Boniface): What did you say?

MR. CHAIRMAN: These sections were deleted previously. The old sections were 26 and 27.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I would move that these sections be reinstated to make sure that there's no mistake. I meant reinstated as they were when we had third reading. That is, that the original "a" be struck out and then that 12 o'clock be amended from 1:30 to 5:30 PM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . referred to Committee of the Whole from Law Amendments. Is that understood?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, we realized on Saturday afternoon that if there's been a controversial matter before this House, it is the sections of the amendments to the Winnipeg City Charter that have to do with Sunday activities. We realized the controversial nature of this at every stage of the proceedings. Then when we came to the Committee of the Whole there was a verdict on the part of the Committee of the Whole which was of a decisive nature, namely, the passing for the amendment that these two sections be deleted by a vote of 27 to 21. But that was not the final chapter. It was moved later that the bill be returned to the Committee for further consideration, and we are not disputing the right to do that. But it did strike some of us as rather remarkable that while there have been many controversial measures brought before this House -- some very controversial -- I'm thinking one for instance, of the uniform daylight saving time, but it came to the Committee of the Whole for third and final reading, and it's passed. Someone said to me after the session on Saturday afternoon, "Perhaps the members did not know. Maybe they were uncertain about this stage. They weren't sure." And my immediate reaction to that was, if this House is at this present stage in a situation that it's not sure just what should be done, that's a very real reason why the matter should not be decided at this present session. I grant you one thing, Mr. Chairman -- I'm positive of this -- that vested interests are in favour of it; many organizations and groups that will benefit by direct and indirect profits or gain. They'd see no reason why we shouldn't pass this Act. But I

(Mr. Martin, cont'd.) . . . think we've got to rise above -- this is of such importance that we've got to rise above selfish interests, thinking in terms of profits or gain, or even pleasure; or, Mr. Chairman, even of political favour, as individual members of this Assembly.

There's more to it than just the bare fact that this comes within the bounds of a general amendment to The City Charter of The City of Winnipeg, an amendment to that Charter, and that because the people voted for it, well, they're entitled to it. I think that's not enough. No, we may smile, but I do hope we're just taking this seriously and not thinking just of our own selves, or what it may mean to us or to some of our friends. I'm quite sure that the majority of the members realize that this is a moral issue, and when I say that, it isn't just -- one would have thought sometimes during the discussions that this was a seminar on church-going. Nothing of the kind. In fact, I think we've heard more about whether we should go to church or not go to church or when we should go to church, than we would expect to hear in an ecumenical revival. It isn't that, but the thing that we are to decide: Is this in the best interest of the community at large, that we should so secularize the day that in any sense we would surrender it to the encroachments of commercialism? It's just paving the way that leads to a wide-open Sunday. You're doing this this year, and I venture to believe that next year you will have other suggestions made for further widening and loosening the reverence for the Lord's Day.

We've got to think in terms of the whole province. That's our duty as legislators. Not just to give our "rubber stamp" to a recommendation of one municipality who took a vote and the majority of those voters voted in favour of certain things, and then come along and say that because they voted for it they're entitled to it. Our duty as legislators goes beyond the consideration of one municipality. We've got to think in terms of every municipality within the province. Ours is a province-wide responsibility as members of this Legislature. This isn't "The Lord's Day Act, Winnipeg." This concerns "The Lord's Day Act -- Manitoba." And it is of such far-reaching and vital importance -- and I have several things in mind when I talk about far-reaching, but if you have your professional sport on the Sunday afternoon, and while there's no thought for instance of the Blue Bombers -- may I just say something here? I'm afraid that some members -- and I don't want Steve, the Member for Assiniboia, to have a wrong impression -- but if there's one man who's a big booster for the Blue Bombers and proud of their success, it's the Member for St. Matthews -- but if you have the Sunday afternoon games -- and the President of Blue Bombers has said, "we're not doing it this year," but he didn't have the same conclusion when it comes to next year; but if you have it, what's going to happen? We have problems enough with our highway and the question of safety on our highways. If you have these things on Sunday you're also going to have the highways cluttered up with cars that are coming in from all parts. That's what I mean. It is not just something that relates itself entirely and wholly to the City of Winnipeg, and I repeat it's of such vital and far-reaching importance that in my opinion the only fair and equitable way to handle it is not by an amendment to The Winnipeg Charter, but considering the interests of the people of the whole province, that the approach to this problem should be from the standpoint of an amendment to The Lord's Day Act; and so I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that these clauses -- renumbered I take it now, 23 and 24 -- should be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We already have a motion on the floor that they be reinstated.

MR. MARTIN: Well, if it's here -- then I suppose the only thing is to say that what I'm in favour of is that these two clauses should be deleted from the bill.

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I think it is most regrettable that this bill is before this committee again, and I'm not particularly surprised that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface would do everything possible to attain his ultimate goal, but I'm rather sorry that the honourable member to my immediate left was party to this move, which I feel can only reflect upon the members of this Assembly.

I do not intend to burden the House with all that I would like to say on this subject, but I would like the privilege of making one or two observations without, I trust, treading too much on the ground that has already been covered. It has been overly stressed, I believe, that because the majority voted in favour of certain activities we have no alternative but to yield to their request. I submit that this is not always true, nor is it always acceptable to the City of Winnipeg Council when the verdict of the majority interferes with their intents and purposes. For evidence of this we have only to consider the bill before us. Such an argument conceding

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . majority rule is fraught with danger, for if we accept this principle without question, then it follows the throwing of early Christians to the lions was indeed right and proper because the majority in ancient Rome so willed it. The enslavement of people and races can also be reconciled, even to our comparatively modern times when slavery was accepted as a matter of course in the southern states, and what right have we to criticize the people of the State of Mississippi, who believe in the segregation of races and the banning of coloured individuals from their institutions of learning? Unless the majority are compatible with certain fundamental principles, then the course that has been suggested can become a dangerous one. The majority rule then becomes of relatively little consequent when principle is of paramount importance, and this I feel is the fact in this instance.

There has also been some objection raised that actually this matter is one of free choice, and perhaps it is. I would certainly not deny that there is force to this argument, but the organization to which I am proud to be a part is finding an increasing moral and spiritual disintegration in our community, and our task is becoming correspondently greater and more difficult. The members of this House would be appalled at the average age of the unmarried mothers and some of the circumstances associated with their tragic conditions; the growing alcoholic problem with which we are trying to cope; the many individuals from broken homes who are looking more and more to our officers for counselling and advice. The officers associated with our anti-suicide bureau reveal a growing problem and an increase in the calls for help and guidance. What all these people need is not greater freedom to see professional sports. What they actually need is God, and to create a more and more unfavourable climate for our churches and their admittedly weakening influence upon our society is asking for an even greater breakdown in our moral and spiritual values. If our children cannot see that there is something peculiar to the observance of this day we call "Sunday", that it is separate and distinct from the other days of the week, how can you expect them to weigh up the material and spiritual values in a world where atheistic materialism is gaining more and more ground each day. Where will be the ground of their so-called "freedom of choice?"

The Honourable Member for Selkirk advanced the argument that we have several groups in this city who do not observe the same holy days as we do and consequently suggested that we were forcing them to recognize days that were of little consequent to them. But surely this is no argument! We call our country a Christian country, a Christian civilization. Why? Because everyone in it is a Christian? Or because our leading citizens are Christians? No, indeed! We are a Christian people because the laws under which we all must live, whether Jew, Moslem or, Buddhist, Confucian or Christian are the laws that came from God, enforced upon His authority through the mediation of Jesus Christ. Our laws, like all law, apply to everyone alike, whether he be a Christian priest or an atheistic revolutionary, a devout Jew or a Christian-hating Moslem. They are the conditions under which all must live if they profess to remain within this society. These laws must be applied impersonally and with absolute justice. Their end is to protect society as a whole and to perserve its basic structure -- a Christian nation.

A prominent Jewish writer verifies this practically in detail. Writing in a Chicago newspaper, Mr. Sokolsky stated, "We speak of ours as a Christian civilization, but among us live some 50 races of man and some 250 religious groups, many of them not Christian, and they should take no umbrage that we call ours a Christian civilization. Jews, Moslems, Buddhist, Confucians, all the non-Christians among us, realizing that men and women of good will respect their concepts of God and faith, must also realize that in this year, 1967 years after the date accepted as the birth of Jesus, the great struggle is between God and the devil; between good and evil; between Christianity and Marxism."

The Member from St. Boniface states religion should be practised every day of the week and I could not agree with him more. Frail as I am with all the weaknesses of a human creature, this is what I endeavour to do personally and in service to my fellow man, but he misses the point entirely, however, when this becomes the reason we can therefore dispense with our Christian Sabbath and make it indistinguishable from the other days in the week. If we admit that the Ten Commandments are the foundation upon which our civilization rests, then what right have we to weaken their effectiveness by replacing them with man-made laws? This House recognizes the divine source of these laws by the presence of Moses holding in his hands

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . the tablets of stone upon which these laws ere engraved, and yet we feel we have the right to amend the Fourth Commandment, which states in part: "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God and this thou shalt not do any work," and so on. What is to be done with those who have two days off each week and agitate for Sunday as well, I don't rightly know. But the commandment is straightforward enough. It establishes a legal holy day during which work is suspended and the suspension is universal. I know the argument is advanced that some people do work on Sunday, but we have no less an authority than Christ Himself recognizing that work of necessity and mercy has to be done on the Sabbath, and there was more friction between Jesus and His Jerusalem enemies on matters of Sabbath observance than on any other issue, except His claims to be the Messiah, and there is nothing to distinguish the Sabbath Day in nature from any other day -- a Wednesday, Friday, or anything else.

To those who claim we are trying to legislate religion, let me point out that this day is set apart and characterized completely by law which is written and enforced through human activity. For over three thousand years the Hebrew people followed the Commandment of God "to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Legislated religion is you like, but it carried the Hebrew people through many days of severe tribulation from the days of the Babylonian exile to the days of the Polish ghetto, and kept them from alien beliefs; kept them true to their God and their faith. It was indispensable to their civilization and culture, and certainly reminded them as it probably does today of the first creation and the deliverance from Egypt. It was legislated religion with a penalty of death, but without it God's chosen people would have been lost, and knowing these things, I was amazed and frankly hurt that the member for River Heights would seek to weaken the Christian Sabbath on our day for there is no essential difference between the Sabbath of the Hebrews and our Christian observance of the Lord's Day, for the latter carries with it everything that the Hebrew Sabbath implies and even more, for to us it is the day when our Lord rose again from the dead. But the original commandment is still valid. One day in seven must be set aside. It is mandatory.

The first human laws regulating Sunday were passed by the first Christian to rule the Roman Empire, Constantine. There have been matters of law to rule; there have been matters of law since that momentous day when Ceasar, too, fell under the dominion of Christ. The laws probably became far more strict under the Puritans but it is not their rigidity that is under attack now; it is their very existence. We have suddenly become very modern. We have suddenly become very wise. Our eyes are open. Let those who want to go to Church go to Church. As for us, let us go and do what we will. Very good, but what are we going to do with all these laws be they labour laws or the Sunday observance law, that rest upon the original commandment? These laws have distinguished us as a Christian society for over 1,600 years and perhaps for some, as I stated in Committee, like the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, the Christian people have been completely off-base all that time, but at least Christian people have generally agreed, they were right, be they Catholic, Protestant, and Eastern Orthodox to say nothing of all the splinter groups. The matter is one of the simplest reasons on the integral part of the Christian structure. As I pointed out it was absolutely essential to the national life of Israel and was fairly supported by the founders of Christian faith, although he did decline making the Sabbath an end in itself and forcing it to absurdity. The issue, as I see it, is nothing less than whether the Christian system is to be set aside, for we must recognize that the Sabbath is embedded into the very structure of our civilization, and civilization must ultimately follow this.

Much has been said about the apparent circumventing of the Lord's Day Act by the relatively simple matter of requesting an amendment to The City Charter, and although I agree that this is not right and support those who protest, I would say that I would vigorously oppose an amendment to the main Act itself. You know, I am reminded of the words of Mr. Jules Rubin, a local member of the Council in Middleborough, England. He was a theatre owner himself and he was speaking against a resolution to permit moving picture houses to be opened on Sunday. Said he, "I love your English Sunday, your Christian Sabbath, and should be very sorry to see it pass away. If a Jew may be pardoned for making this suggestion to Christians, let me say this: If you sacrifice a Sunday you've been brought up to respect, you will lose something you will be sorry for the whole of your lives." It seems there are many Hebrew

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . brethren who recognize the value of our legal holy day more than we do, and I trust that I'll always continue to reveal the strength asked for by Archbishop Lemieux in a pastoral letter of November 13, 1961, who reminded Catholics of their duty to preserve the sacred character of Sunday. "Let us," he said, "show the courage of our convictions if we want our society to preserve its Christian characteristics." So I say, throw aside the Lord's Day if you wish but I warn you that all our Christian civilization must go with it. It is inevitable, for the profanation of these Christian Sabbaths is a giant step towards a general hypocrisy from God.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I must say that I am vitally concerned, for I am convinced that the world's decisions between atheistic Communism and the Kingdom of God will probably be made within the next 10 to 15 years, and I am not being melodramatic. I am telling you what I believe to be the absolute truth. The struggle may linger on at the edges for many years to come, but the strategic places in the world mind and in the world situation will probably be held by one or the other by that time. The time may be much shorter for we actually are in the moment of great hesitation, and the situation is fluid. In the next few years it will probably turn in one direction or the other. The means of communication are now so rapid, the world mind is now so quickly and easily influenced by world movements, the scattered isolated thoughts of the world are being replaced so fast by world thought that we must forget the tempo of past world decisions. Things are now different. The world stage is more and more being set for a world decision. The kingdom of the atheistic mass man and the Kingdom of God are at the door of the world, and this generation will have to decide which one it will take; the responsibility of preserving and strengthening the bulwarks of our faith is in our hands, and we will be held responsible for what we do, for that too is inevitable.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, you'd think I was suggesting an amendment to the Ten Commandments in listening to the last speaker tell us all about Christianity, and then he started by feeling so hurt that the honourable member to his left is against it, but he understands that the Member for St. Boniface has no morals. That's Christianity. He quoted quite a few things in the Scripture. He didn't say anything about "whited sepulchre" -- he didn't say anything about that. He talked about man-made laws. I don't know who made this law -- who brought this Lord's Day Act in first if it wasn't men. He forgets to tell us that at his work he's required -- he must be required, or at least his company, his station is required to work on Sunday. For the recreation I believe that he works for his television station, and some that junk that I see on that would never replace sports, I'll tell you that, Mr. Chairman. Now it's a good thing this is the last day -- or I hope it's the last day -- because the Honourable Member from St. Matthews also reached the bottom of the barrel with his arguments. He took five minutes to tell us that I had the right to do what I did -- bring this in third reading -- but apparently it's wrong. Apparently it's wrong. He misrepresented that. The other day he told us that he had received calls from people in the theatre -- theatre owners -- and they didn't want this, but now it's all the owners that want all this Sunday sport. No, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is not the end of the world or a tearing down of Christianity. I only have to repeat that it's what's in your heart -- that's where the Golden Rule, or if you believe in Christianity -- Christianity's practice. Let's quote also that Jesus came here and the foundation of Christianity is do to others what you -- treat others as you would like them to treat you. That's Christianity. You might worship -- some might want to worship at home; some might want to worship in the church. This is all their business.

Lord's Day Act -- we say Lord's Day -- I thought -- I was raised to believe that every day was the Lord's Day. I didn't know that he had only one day. I thought that every single day was supposed to be for the Lord, that he had created every day, and then the Honourable Member for St. Matthews told us about "Well, this is not Lord's Day Act, Winnipeg; it's Lord's Day Act, Manitoba." Well I say to him, it's not Lord's Day Act, Manitoba, it's Lord's Day Act, Canada. The morals of all Canadians should be the same. Where are you going to stop? I still can't see -- he's talking now about, oh the highways will be filled by all the people from the country coming here. If that's true then it's Lord's Day Act, Manitoba because everybody wants it if they're all going to leave the towns to come here. I can't see how you can use an argument both ways like he's doing today. No -- and then it was again -- again by insinuation -- we are pretending that sport is wrong and again I want to defend this. I think that sport is

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . very good. It's a very good way to have recreation. It's a very sane way. It's a lot better and -- unfortunately there's not enough sports these days compared to what we had a few years ago, and that's why we're having a lot more trouble with our children at school or with our growing-up boys and girls, and it was stated very, very clearly here that this wasn't done just for any interests such as organizations and so on. The Honourable Member knows it and I think it's most unfair that he should bring this again.

When this motion was made I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that my concern is for the people that want to enjoy sane recreation; the people that are going to watch these games and so on, not the athletes; and let's get something straight here. The Honourable Member from St. George mentioned this Saturday; it doesn't mean a thing to see Steve Patrick or any other professional athlete because they sign a contract and they are paid for the season, and if they don't play on Sunday they practice on Sunday, or they play on Saturday -- there are so many games, so let's not bring that thing in. Those people don't care. They couldn't care less. I would much sooner that the Blue Bombers don't play on Sunday because I like to see on television the professionals from the States. They play good football too, and I'm sure that quite a few of you people are doing exactly the same thing. So let's not bring this religion into this as if we're "holier than thou" and that Christ said not to move on Sunday. Let's not be hypocrites and let's remember that He said: treat the others as you wish them to treat you. And the majority of them, the majority want this; I never mentioned this -- this is the first time that I've mentioned this business of majority. It isn't that at all because even if the referendum had been against, I think that if I have a principle it wouldn't change it, and it showed that how far you have to go when you have to start bringing these things in. I remember last week when the Honourable Member from St. Matthews -- I think he had about 75 percent against because all those who didn't vote were against. No, Mr. Chairman, I think I have as much principle-- the Honourable Member from Wellington and the Honourable Member from St. Matthews might not believe this, but I have as much principle as them and maybe a little less hypocrisy.

MR. SEABORN: . . . the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, was he insinuating that the Member from St. Matthews and myself are hypocrites?

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . Mr. Chairman, then he gets up to say that he's not surprised at the Member from St. Boniface because he has no principle. Yes, I'm saying that that's hypocrisy.

MR. SEABORN: I didn't say that.

MR. ROBLIN: Let's try and keep the debate on a more pleasant level. I don't think anyone should accuse anyone else of having no principles, and I don't think anyone should accuse anyone of being a hypocrite, and I'm sure that is not the feeling of either of the two gentlemen concerned and that the expressions are unparliamentary and that they shouldn't be used. Let's try to keep the debate on a more pleasant level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . both gentlemen that the Chair understand that if these remarks were made that they are now withdrawn. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I believe that every member of this committee believes that we have in Manitoba and in Canada absolute freedom of religion, and to me the mere fact that there is in existence in our province the statute known as the Lord's Day Act is a denial of that freedom, because a certain group under that Act is superimposing upon other people in our province a day which they do not observe as a holy day. I have heard a great deal said during the course of this debate, both here and in Law Amendments Committee, that certain members of this committee would support this legislation if it applied to the whole of the Province of Manitoba. I take the position, Mr. Chairman, that that argument is completely irrelevant. We as a Legislature did endow upon the citizens of Winnipeg through the Winnipeg City Charter the right to submit to the electors of this city any question which they desired to obtain an answer in respect of. The city fathers did in their wisdom submit this question to the electors of Winnipeg and the electors of Winnipeg voted in favour of it. Now just because the other municipalities in Manitoba do not possess that power is no reason why the City of Winnipeg which was given that power should not be able to exercise it, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we take the attitude and stand now that because the other municipalities in Manitoba have not the similar power of the City of Winnipeg, then what we're actually doing is saying that an Act passed by this Legislature conferring that right upon the

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) . . . City of Winnipeg is absolutely meaningless.

MR. M. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I have not taken part in this interesting serious debate since it was presented here or in the Law Amendments Committee, but I feel perhaps that I should express my own personal opinion on a matter of this kind. At the outset I want to say, believe it or not, that I am religious and believe in religion. I don't get any greater pleasure than reading the poetry of our prayers which does a person a certain amount of good. I was an advocate for the City of Winnipeg for years and years that they should apply for a Home Rule Charter. Unfortunately in their wisdom they thought perhaps they could get the Legislature take them out of any trouble -- I wouldn't say political -- or they are unable to decide for themselves. So once it is in this House, in spite of the fact that I believe in a Home Rule Charter for Winnipeg, I feel that I have my right and duty to do what I can right here. If religion has come -- and I'm not speaking about any religion -- religion in general has come to a stage where they have to legalize and almost compel people to go to church or to go to the synagogue, or to go anywhere else in a House of Prayer, then something else should be done by those who believe in it, then vote against the will of people. Even if it's not of the entire province, Winnipeg still has a third of the population of the province, and it is not our fault that the province in general has not asked us for any amendment to permit them the same privilege, if they want to, as we are asking now for the citizens of Winnipeg. So I think perhaps if those honourable members who are opposing it -- the will of the people -- they should direct their attention somewhere else; I direct their attention to education, to the necessity of each and every one have the high principles of religion in their heart, and not close up everything and when they have nothing else to do, go to church.

Even then it's not going to be an assurance that they will go. They have other places to go. They could cut their own grass. Once somebody mentioned you work six days and the seventh day is Sabbath -- rest. What is rest? The Honourable First Minister works here from 9 o'clock in the morning till 12 at night, and then on a Sunday he wants to take out his family -- that's his rest. The man who digs sewers all week and does hard labour work -- what is his rest? To go and see a game; or to go to church if he wishes; or to play golf; or dig his garden; or cut his grass; or clean up the house; or help his wife in cleaning up the house. This is rest. I did not interpret -- and I know the Bible to a certain extent -- I did not interpret the idea that you work six days and the seventh day you rest. Yes, we've got to have a rest in order to check with our own souls, with our own ideas, with our own minds. Check at least for one day, the behaviour, our behaviour for the last six days -- that's what I call rest because otherwise we can't afford it; we can't do it; we haven't got the time.

So I believe that I'm going to support to be reinstated because I feel this is the only right thing to do; and after all this House is not going to be prorogued for life. If we find that this law that we adopted now; if we find that we are going to support the majority of the people in Winnipeg does not work out -- and believe me, I want to assure my Honourable Members from Wellington and St. Matthews that I am not here in any shape or form to destroy religion -- definitely not. But on the other hand, let's try it. Perhaps it will satisfy everybody and then perhaps the people of Winnipeg, at least, or the people of Manitoba and Canada, will find time for everything; will find time for a game; will find time for a movie; and they'll find time to go to church, if they are not compelled to do it. One head of a church or a synagogue -- I don't know -- once made a sermon giving the congregation a lecture why you don't come on Sabbath or Sunday? So one gets up and says, "Your excellency -- whatever they are addressed, the head of a church -- "Why give me a lecture, I'm here. Give a lecture to those who are not here." So I feel, Mr. Chairman, I think the whole debate -- and I've listened to it for three days and haven't said a word -- is in my opinion, not to the betterment of the people whom some of us here try to make saints of them overnight. So as I said again, I am going to support the motion of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. And let me tell you something else, my respect for him -- and I do not disrespect anybody -- has improved in his intelligent debate in the last few days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'll try to be brief. I spoke on this on a previous occasion but in my opinion I think that the members of this Legislature "goofed" the other day by refusing to grant the wishes of the majority of the people. As

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . I said before we gave them the right to ask for a referendum and then we go ahead and ignore their referendum decision. Then we might as well not have a referendum. As far as commercialism -- I did express my opinion on commercialism. I mentioned clipping coupons on Sunday, which some people think is quite all right.

There's something else, and I know -- I had occasion to work in churches and I know myself that there are some people who will accept money for their services on Sundays when they work on Sunday, even in churches, so we'll leave that alone.

And as far as Christianity, I wonder if the Americans are less Christian than Canadians are. In many places in the United States they have Sunday sports -- they even have theatres -- I'm not fighting for the cause of the theatres -- but they have the theatres open and I would suggest that they are not less Christian than we are. As far as religion is concerned, I don't want anybody to force any religion on me. I think that forcing a religion on the people, or forcing them to go to a church, is not conducive to better Christianity because forced religion is not the kind of religion that the people will take to heart. I will not accept this as a good argument that we have to force people to go by denying them certain rights. I'm not talking against the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, he has a right to his convictions; the Honourable Member from Wellington, the Minister of Mines, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, or the Minister of Education -- and I respect them for their opinion -- they have a perfect right to express.

But there is one point that I wanted to bring out here and that's why I got up. It took me a long time to get around to it. We hear quite a lot of complaints about the indifference of the different people when they are asked to come and express their opinion in a referendum or any kind of vote, and Winnipeg is pretty bad. There was mention made that not even half of the voters come out to vote. Supposing we refused them this. In their referendum they have asked to be considered -- supposing we refuse them; don't you members, all the members and Mr. Chairman, don't you agree that this would increase their indifference to vote in future. They'll simply say: "What's the sense of going out and vote? Those fellows in the House, in the Legislature ignore us." I don't think it's the right thing for us to do when they express their wish. I think it is our duty to -- at least, I consider it is my duty -- to go along with the people and give them the wish that they express. I am going to support this as I did in the past.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a very few words on this subject. I said a few before. The Honourable Member from St. Matthews was concerned that this was the "thin edge of the wedge" in if we passed this legislation allowing Sunday sports. I want to tell the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, he doesn't have too much to worry about things opening wide open. I was in England during the war and the pubs are open there on Sunday; the theatres are open on Sunday; they play their cricket matches on Sunday; and they do almost everything on Sunday. He doesn't have to worry if it happens here because I didn't see anybody in England walking around with horns or tails -- they're all every bit as good as we are. And you don't have to worry if everything does open wide open. Down in the south of us they are wide open on Sunday and I don't think they are any more immoral than we are. They're just as good as we are. So you don't have to worry too much about what happens from hereon in.

HON. G. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, this is a pretty difficult subject for members to deal with. I think one thing that everyone of us here in this Chamber must recognize and respect is the right of every individual to feel as he is led to feel by his experience, by his conviction, and to express himself in that way. But I recall in the first speech I ever made in this Chamber that I said that I believed the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba had a prime responsibility to reflect and acknowledge, and support the work of the church in our community and I still believe that. Because let us recognize this, that although we sometimes get an over-inflated idea of our importance and the things that we do which contribute to the well-being of the people of Manitoba, what we can do here in the making of laws is pretty limited in fulfilling the needs and the desires of an individual. The church has a tremendous role to play -- and I'm not referring to the Christian Church -- I'm referring to the church regardless of its persuasion. The spiritual needs of man have to be met and satisfied or all the laws that we make and all the efforts that we make are for naught. And so, if that is true, if what I have said in the past is true about the role of the church and

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . the importance of the work is true, then this Legislature has a prime responsibility to support the work of that church; to acknowledge and to help in every way possible that the church has an opportunity to fulfill its role in our community.

The problem arises for us as individuals in this Legislature in attempting to reconcile our responsibility in this respect in relation to the modern day behaviour and attitudes of people. I don't believe that men are any worse today than they have ever been. I can't believe that. I don't believe that because people are a little more moderate in their views in many respects that they are any less Christian than they were 1,600 years ago, or even a hundred years ago. I believe that the church has been successful in its mission and I would just point to some of the legislation that is on the statute books today that wasn't there a hundred years ago, or even forty years ago -- A recognition of man's responsibility to God and to his fellow men. And surely those of us who believe in the message of the Christian Gospel would want to believe that love has leavened the loaf to the point where people do recognize the gospel of love and charity towards their fellow men. So I cannot believe that we are less moral today; that we reflect less today the faith of our fathers than we did in former times. But as a practical person I must recognize and I think all men must recognize that the mores of society change. I think we have to recognize that even in a given denomination every man's conception of God is different according to his experience and his own interpretation. So we have a problem here. We have a problem of trying to reconcile what everyone of us wants to do to preserve the best part of our religious community, to support it, to back it, and at the same time to make laws which take into account modern behaviour and modern practice.

I have changed my mind in the past couple of weeks about this legislation that is under discussion. At one point I was entirely against it, but like every other member here I did a lot of thinking about it and I couldn't get away from the fact that I was as guilty as the next man of eroding the traditional concepts of observing the Lord's Day. I do it in many ways. All men are responsible for this erosion of the Lord's Day and I wonder if we really do the church a favour if we stand as legislators here, as an obstacle, a frustration to the desires of the majority of the people in the community to observe the Lord's Day as they see fit. That was the reason why I moved an amendment in Law Amendments Committee to limit the hours of such activities from the hours of 1:30 to 5:30. It was simply because I felt that as a legislator I had to support the religious community and the church in its work, because it's tremendously important, and at the same time I felt that one had to reflect the desires and the thought of 1962 in respect to the observance of the Lord's Day. I am bothered also by the inequity of the present legislative provisions for observing the Lord's Day. I think that the amendment that is proposed hardly removes all the inequity. I am bothered by the fact that it is fine for commercialism to move in as a result of some of the freedoms that we have given and yet when we talk about extending other freedom of activity on Sunday commercialism is considered to be terribly wrong. You see if one man goes out and plays golf or he goes fishing or even if he takes his family to the beach there are commercial interests in all these cases. We are making people work on Sunday and yet I'm afraid if anybody arose in this legislature and proposed amendments to the Lord's Day Act Manitoba, that would cut out all these activities I don't think he'd get very much support. I really don't, because we have come to accept these things as acceptable forms of activity for a Sunday. But then what about the chap who wants to take his son to a ball game on a Sunday afternoon. Let's be honest with ourselves. The man who takes his boy and gives that boy the advantage of a companionship which most of us find difficult to give to our children today -- and the lack of it -- of that companionship has been -- and I think with great accuracy -- pointed out as a major element in some of our juvenile delinquency -- When a man wants to take his son to a ball game and enjoy a couple of hours on a Sunday afternoon we say this is wrong; and yet another man with the respect of the community can leave his son to his own devices and go and play golf and we say that's fine. I think we want to have an awful good look at some of our conceptions of what is right and wrong. If a family wanted to go and bowl on a Sunday afternoon, Ma and Pa and the kids, and there's an opportunity for the family to stay together; here's an opportunity to strengthen the bonds of the family, and we say "no". We are going to deny that opportunity because it doesn't conform with our traditional concepts of behaviour for Sunday. So we deny that opportunity for the family to be together, and the fact that a sport -- a good clean sport -- which might have

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . drawn that family together as the result, Pa can go off and play golf and the kids go off to their own devices.

So I think that we have to look pretty carefully at this proposal to see whether it is so completely out of line with our modern day practices and attitudes and whether it cannot in itself honour some of the -- even our Christian traditions and beliefs. All things can be good and all things can be bad, just depending how they are used or abused as the case may be. I don't believe that in the light of modern day behaviour that maybe we do the church and the religious community a great favour by 57 men and women imposing their will on people who have -- yes, behaved differently -- but I think by and large behaved better toward their fellow men than they ever have before. Because I would remind you that some of the greatest crimes against humanity have been made in the name of Christian belief -- some of the most hideous and terrible crimes -- and I would remind you that to those of you who are members of the Christian church that we live under the dispensation of grace and love; we don't live under the dispensation of laws.

I would say one more thing before I sit down and that is that I find it a little difficult to reconcile our willingness to support Sunday sport and bowling but that we deny an individual the right to enjoy a concert on a Sunday afternoon. I think it points up a little bit of the inconsistency and I suspect the turmoil and the inner strife with which everyone of us is struggling when we debate this issue, but I intend to support the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I think that I have no right as a legislator -- in my conscience I can see no right to deny the people of Winnipeg the right to observe Sunday in the way that they see best. I believe that the amendment safeguards the essentially religious approach to Sunday and I believe that we as legislators can support this amendment and still acknowledge God's role in our community and still support the work of the church.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to take this opportunity to say a few words. I certainly respect very much the speakers that we have heard this morning. I personally could not support this bill. I feel very strongly against professional sport in the Province of Manitoba. My reason for suggesting this is that if we are going to have professional hockey and professional ball games in the City of Winnipeg you will find that our adults through all parts of the province will be heading to the city to take in the ball game or the hockey game and probably we'll be leaving our young people to fight for themselves or they can take their old jalopy and head for Winnipeg too. I am very much against this part of it; although I voted against this bill I voted in favour of it coming back into the House and perhaps it could be amended where we could have participating sport within the City of Winnipeg that would not affect the rest of the province. I just wanted to make this clear. I feel that we should not say to the City of Winnipeg that they should not have a bowling game or they should not go down to their park and take in with their son, as the Minister of Agriculture has suggested, and watch an amateur ball game and be permitted to charge at the gate to cover expenses. I think that this is perfectly in order.

In the town of Killarney we have swimming every Sunday; we have roller skating and we have ball games and all through the province we find we have them playing golf. To me this is deliberately getting around the law because they form a club just to beat the law. Now if this is bringing young people up in the right light I can't see it. I think that if we could make it lawful for them to open their bowling alleys or participating sports where you could take your family after church there could be no harm in it at all. You're far better to do that; you're closer to your children. I think that this would be good all over Manitoba. And I do believe that Dr. Martin is correct, that probably this could only be done throughout the province by an amendment to The Lord's Day Alliance Act. I talked to several ministers on the telephone yesterday throughout my constituency, and in each case they suggested to me that if there was any way that we could work out an amendment to The Lord's Day Alliance Act for participating sports that they would be quite happy, but they would not be in favour of a professional sport. If it would come to a vote of the province I think that this would be the feeling of a lot of the province. Thanks very much.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a very few remarks this morning on this matter. First of all, I think we should not change the bill as it came to Committee; I think it should be left that way and that sport should not be included. I

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . think this would weaken the moral fibre of society. Further, this is God's law to man. After all we received the Ten Commandments in the Holy Scripture and this is part of the Fourth Commandment and I feel that the commandments are basic to the laws of a nation and if they're disregarded or not adhered to, non-obedience is suffering and misery. I am sure we've got ample examples in today's world of this where God's commandments are not kept that you have suffering and misery as a result. We are picking away at the foundations of society by doing the very thing that is being proposed, and I feel this is only the thin edge of the wedge as has already been stated. To me, The Lord's Day is a day of rest and meditation and we should give people a time to think. After all this world is getting to be a mad rat race and if we had more time to think things would be better in this world.

Now, I listened with interest to the point raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk re action on City Referendum and I think this was very ably explained by the Member for Lakeside when we were in committee. I think it would be worthwhile to listen to it again for that matter. So this is all that I have to say at this time; I certainly would like to see the bill go back in the way it has come in.

MR. G. E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As one from outside the City of Winnipeg I hesitate very much to do anything to oppose the views of their own form of government here, but I feel that as one of the ones who must vote on this and not avoid the responsibility of voting, I think I would like to say a few words as to my reasoning for voting to support the people of Winnipeg in what they are asking for.

Now, I do not doubt the sincerity of the one, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews here, who has led the forces shall we say, who are opposing this basic change in a law in Manitoba, it affects nearly half the population of Manitoba and it is certainly a serious and a different direction that Manitoba is taking in the future. Now, I would suggest that there are two prongs, shall we say, or two approaches to this problem, the practical one and the moral one, and if we look at the practical one, because I mentioned it first, not necessarily because it's the most important, it wasn't too many years ago that this province faced a dilemma in the fact that they had an unworkable liquor law in Manitoba. This law worked for many years and it worked quite well, but as the people -- tastes change, some of the balance of the ethnic groups changed, the different forces of the world came into play and it was found, gradually, mind you, but it came about that we had on our hands, a law that governed the use of liquor in the Province of Manitoba that was almost unenforceable, the magistrates and the police forces were in a dilemma with enforcing an unpopular law and it was finally recognized by this Legislature and action was taken.

Now we have before us again another thing that has changed over the years in the thinking of the people and this Legislature, as the Honourable Member from Selkirk has already reminded us, has given the power to The City of Winnipeg, to hold a referendum and then come to the province and seek a change so that they may amend and enforce a law which they find through the actions of their people requires a change. I think it would be -- it's very unreasonable for someone from Portage la Prairie; or Swan River; or Churchill or wherever he comes from to stand here and impose his thinking -- and let us face it there is a difference in thinking between the rural people and the city people in not only Manitoba, but in all parts of the world; there's different attitudes to be considered; there's different ways of taking our recreation. For instance in Killarney it's a 10-minute drive to get out to a good fishing spot or a good picnic spot, whereas some people in different parts of Winnipeg have neither the means or the opportunity, cars or anything else, to go and take up a form of recreation they would like to, but they can go two or three blocks to bowl or they can, possibly if they wanted to go to a movie -- and mind you, I'm certainly not supporting movies, but I do support the aspects of this change in law that allows families to take up their leisure time and do with what they will. I certainly cannot understand the thinking of the Honourable Member from Wellington who makes his living in an industry that takes full advantage of a Sunday -- full advantage. They pump the airways full of some of the awfulest garbage you ever came across in your life with their commercials. They put on questionable programs at times and they don't have too much regard for the day that they do these things. They show movies themselves. Just because you sit in front of your TV set and don't pay to go, don't make you any better than the person who would like to go and pay his way into a movie on Sunday.

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd.) . . .

So I would end up my few remarks by challenging the members here, when they look at the moral aspects of how they are going to vote on this, and before they take the vote I want them to consider these few points. Have they ever watched a TV Football game on Sunday? Have they ever curled? Have they ever played golf? Have they ever attended or taken part in a baseball tournament? -- which we know very well is quite a popular summer entertainment in rural Manitoba. Have they ever attended a concert and given a silver collection or let the plate go by? Have they ever entered one of our provincial parks and paid the fee that is being put upon us this year? Have they ever attended a social function on a Saturday night and did they all of a sudden pull down the curtain right at 12:00 o'clock and ring off everything they were thinking and everything they were doing? If these people who are going to vote against this and deny the self determination to the people of Winnipeg who have complied with the law in every way to bring about and ask for this change in legislation, I ask those people who are going to oppose this, that if they have done any of these things, they're -- and I hate to say this word, because the First Minister reminded us we should keep this debate on a high plain, but it's a word that has to be said -- they're "hypocrits", if they can vote against it as --

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . words will be considered unparliamentary by the Chair and should be withdrawn.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'll withdraw that; but I will say I think they are. Thank you.

MR. M. B. STEINKOPF (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, I've learned a lot about people from this debate and I know my life will be a little richer as a result. I'm appalled at some members at their complete disregard of the Canadian Bill of Rights and their really cynical disregard for the democratic way of life process. We have a vote, where almost two to one voted in favour of bowling for Sunday sport and nary a thought to this vote or to the wishes of these people are given by those opposed to this action. I have a lot of confidence though in the fair play and the clear thinking of all members. I do not think this is a form for a debate on religion or religious principles; frankly I'd be very happy to debate this subject with those members that are interested some other place. I think we have a matter here; a democratic responsibility to discharge, and I think that we will discharge it in the manner that we should and that is to permit the Sunday sport and Sunday bowling for the City of Winnipeg.

MR. E. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I feel I should say a few words since I am about to change my vote in this matter, but I want to say that I change it not because of any kind of pressure whatever, but over the weekend I did have lots of time to think about this in more and more detail and it's not an easy sort of thing to come to grips with and decide very quickly. Members will recall that I voted against professional sport on Sundays in Winnipeg, but I also voted to send this back to committee because I feel that the Legislative process is essentially a deliberative process and I don't feel that we were deliberating very much on Saturday.

I feel that the Member for Selkirk has at least on two points brought the issue into perspective for members in this Chamber and I feel that the debate here has been worthwhile because it's one of those few issues where debate can actually hope to change peoples mind right in this Chamber. Members well know there aren't too many issues that we deal with here that debate really does much good because minds are made up, votes are decided upon in advance of any debate that might take place. But in this particular question, I feel that -- in a sense I regret, in one aspect I regret that we are here asked to allow the residents of one municipality to have a particular kind of recreation and so on that is implicitly denied to the residents of every other single municipality. I feel this is a pity. But, many things are changed by the piecemeal approach -- piecemeal social engineering if you want to call it that -- and so we look for change one thing at a time, and on that basis I suppose I justified voting for the bill, because I am afraid that if we wait until The Lord's Day Act or The Municipal Act, or both, are changed to allow for all municipalities to receive equal recognition under the law it might take even as long as a decade, and in the meantime the clearly expressed will of the majority of people in Winnipeg will be frustrated. Now that's not to say that I feel that just because of a referendum that I feel obliged to vote this way, because I want to say to the Member for Emerson and to any other one who feels that way, that a referendum decision is not binding upon members of a representative body because we operate under representative democracy, not direct democracy -- that's why we didn't accept the initiative, the referendum and the recall,

(Mr. Schreyer cont'd) and if a member is not clear on that point he should take the trouble to read John Stewart Mills and one or two other sources. So it's not because of that so much, but I do feel, like the Minister for Agriculture, that over the centuries and generations I can't help but feel that society, at least western Christian society, if you like to call it, has been getting better and better, and that despite the so-called rise of secularism. I'm not sure if that's accurate, but I feel that if by allowing Sunday sport -- professional Sunday sport -- that allow people, working people, professional people, whatever their vocation -- if it will allow them to take recreation, along with their family together I believe that we would be doing the wrong thing to put obstacles in their way.

I must confess that the Member for Selkirk is so right in my opinion when he said that we are an open society, a plural society -- there are so many different kinds of people and peoples tastes. I believe we must honour that difference; we must accept that these differences exist so we must have our laws framed in such a way that this recognition is put into effect. And I accept his last point too, namely that by legislation we gave the City of Winnipeg this power, this right. I accept it, that's why I vote - I suppose I will vote the way he does. But I want to say again that I regret that it has to be done in this piecemeal ad hoc way; it really isn't the best way. But I am convinced now that if we wait to do it *carte blanche* or -- perhaps I shouldn't say the right way -- it might take a decade. Mr. Chairman, I change my vote.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I shall not enter into the philosophical arguments at this point, except to say that I oppose the move to reinstate this on principle and my views were far better stated by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews than I could state for myself. But I think there is an important point to take note of and that is that we've had a referendum and I acknowledge that being confronted with that I have second responsibility and that is to consider the wishes of the people that I represent. Nevertheless this is being decided on a certainly Metropolitan-wide basis and in my opinion a province-wide basis upon a referendum, so far as a referendum has force, that is taken in one municipality alone. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, for example, said there are differences between people in the province; people in the rural areas differ from those in Winnipeg. There may indeed be differences between predominantly residential suburbs of Greater Winnipeg and those of the centre part of Winnipeg. There may indeed be very different views among people that have a very large proportion of people in boarding houses, people who are living in different circumstances from those which live in the predominantly dormitory municipalities surrounding it. So I say that we're doing this at the wrong time in the wrong way. I think the point I made the other day has validity as evidenced by the fact that today the debate has broadened very considerably and many valuable contributions have been made to our consideration here; but we have denied the people in the rest of Winnipeg and in the rest of the province their normal opportunity to express their views and have us take them into consideration, either, if it were possible, for them to have referenda of their own or at least to send in delegations to be heard when we could take their wishes into consideration. In my view this should now be defeated, should be left out of this bill and brought up as a proposed amendment which can be brought in by the same people interested in this, next session for an amendment to The Lord's Day Act, when it can be considered to amend the proper Act by an amendment to that Act instead of as a partial amendment to the City of Winnipeg Charter.

I oppose this. I think this is the last opportunity upon which we can offer any resistance to principle to the defeat of The Lord's Day Act -- and let's not blink the fact that if this is now put back into the Act we have destroyed The Lord's Day Act for all practical purposes, and I for one regret that. We're standing on a point of principle now, and that is that commercial entertainment be not included among those businesses for profit which can be carried on on Sunday, widening the opportunities for money making on the Sabbath and enforcing more and more people to work on the Sabbath. Those are the points of principle on which I stand, and as I said I will not go into the principle to any great length now; but if we have reached this principle of commercial entertainment on Sunday I think we have lost that barricade completely. I have no great regret that we allow amateur sport; I have no regret at all. In fact, I would like to say this, that I see nothing wrong with recreation and exercise and enjoyment and, from the person's point of view, for entertainment or pleasure or joy on the Sabbath. These things have been brought into discussion in people imputing motives and I think it's so

(Mr. Schreyer cont'd) unfortunate that some people can hardly put forward a strong point in this House without imputing unworthy motives to other people and I suggest to some of the newer members that they would command much more respect and their views would be much more listened to in this House if they would avoid that temptation. Now I am then confronted with what I see as the destruction of the last barrier to commercial entertainment and then I see nothing but a logical extension of that principle to other forms of commercial enterprise on Sunday -- and I point particularly to night clubs, to dancing, to other things -- nothing wrong with them themselves, but another cluster of businesses will come into being and from there on where do you stop? In my view we will not stop until the shops and all forms of commercial entertainment and enterprise are undertaken and then if in those kinds of industries why not allow factories to work, and the entire business as usual on Sunday principle will come into being.

It's for that reason that I will not be able to bring myself to vote, if the principle should carry, against any particular form of commercial entertainment on Sunday. I think there is nothing less worthy about a concert or a stage performance, or even a moving picture, than there is about the excellent and worthy entertainment that is provided for us by the professional sports organizations. There is nothing wrong with that activity. I support it. I believe that there's no distinction between it and any other. But surely a concert is as worthy as any other and so that is why in committee I voted against eliminating concerts and stage performances and moving pictures. I do not believe that it is for us to choose here between one form of activity in the commercial entertainment field and another. I of course take no move to reinstate that section but I do explain that it is not my purpose to choose between them. So my one point is we should defeat this proposal of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface now, allow the debate to be taken next session in its proper place and after due opportunity to hear, and if indeed there is such a confusion in the minds of all of the people of Manitoba, as my honourable friend from Brokenhead has said, that it would take a decade to resolve it, surely then it is wrong for us to do this thing hastily now before that mature consideration can be given.

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I have not been a frequent participant in the debates of this House. I have preferred to reserve my right to speak until there was some issue on which I thought I might make some contribution and some issue which I felt important; and I think that time has arrived.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to review briefly a few of the facts here. Winnipeg is the only municipality in Manitoba, to my knowledge, who has the right to take such a referendum and I would say that they acted properly and legally in the circumstances in taking this referendum. The section under which this referendum could be taken is No. 244 of the Winnipeg Charter and it reads as follows: "The Council may submit any matter or question within or without the powers of the City or Council to the general electors or to any class of electors as Council may decide in such formula as it thinks fit whenever it desires to ascertain their wishes in respect thereof." This the City of Winnipeg has done and the electors of Winnipeg who voted on this matter have given a clear decision as to their wishes in the matter. The unfortunate thing as far as we are concerned is that the matter which they were called upon to decide was one of those things which is without the powers of the City and they have therefore had to come to the Province of Manitoba to request legislation to give some effect to the wishes of the electors of Winnipeg.

I think it is our purpose here, Mr. Chairman, to discuss what will be the affects of the request in its present form. As I have pointed out to you, Winnipeg is the only municipality that has this power. The City of St. Boniface so far as I am aware could not bring such a referendum, neither could Portage la Prairie, nor could any of the municipalities where I come from. If you will look at the charters of the cities that we have incorporated recently -- St. Vital, Transcona, to name a few, they come under the provisions of The Municipal Act and under The Municipal Act municipalities may take referenda on very many important matters, such as the establishment of coal and wood sheds in the municipality, community centres, or whether the municipality will go into the gasoline and fuel business; but they cannot take a referenda on any general topic of public interest such as the City of Winnipeg can.

I would like the members of this House to think and reflect for a moment or two, what would be the situation if the City of Winnipeg called for a referendum to find out whether or

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd) not the electors of Winnipeg wanted those commercial establishments allowed and licensed to serve liquor, to serve liquor on Sunday? I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the Honourable Member of Selkirk then would take a very different attitude. They would say then that this is commercial, that we are giving those commercial enterprises in the City of Winnipeg the right to stay open when we are not giving the same right to members of other municipalities in this province. And to me this is wrong in principle and I think they would agree under those circumstances that it was wrong in principle too. I hesitate even to bring up this matter for fear that somebody might take me up on the suggestion and we might have a referendum on this subject in Winnipeg next year, but I think that you will agree that this Legislature cannot be bound by a referendum in one municipality -- (Interjection) -- that's right we don't. An amendment could be introduced here to amend The Lord's Day Act which would apply to the whole Province of Manitoba and which would allow municipalities to have referenda in their own municipalities as to whether or not they wished this to apply in the same manner as is now done with amateur sports, and I think that if this were the legislation we are here to consider that I would have to give serious consideration to supporting it. I think the views expressed by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture are views that I would have to adopt under those circumstances. But, Mr. Chairman, those are not the circumstances here. We are not here to debate an amendment to The Lord's Day Act. We are here to debate giving special privilege to one municipality in the Province of Manitoba, and in my opinion, this is wrong. I believe that the legislation which is before us at this time, the suggestion of the Honourable Member of St. Boniface that this be included in an amendment to the Winnipeg Charter is wrong in principle. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the members of this House are here to legislate for the Province of Manitoba; they're not here to legislate only for the City of Winnipeg. When this matter is introduced on a provincial basis then I think we must give it serious consideration, but at the present time, I would suggest that we can only by this Bill widen the rift between Winnipeg and other municipalities of this province, a situation which I would not like to see.

When the supporters of this idea introduce legislation that will apply to the whole Province of Manitoba, I will have to consider it; but until that time I oppose the motion of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and I would ask all of the members of this House who recognize their responsibilities to a united Manitoba to vote against this resolution.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Chairman, I only rise to state that I'm opposed to bringing this back into the Act and I do so on the same grounds as has been expressed by the former two speakers.

I'd like to just add a few remarks to this debate. I feel that like the Premier has suggested, that this discussion should be kept on a high level simply because I think that if we take stock of ourselves and consider the pros and cons in reference to whether to support Sunday sports or whether to go against Sunday sports, I think we will come to the conclusion that we must recognize and respect the other member's judgment. I also think that we should bear in mind that it is not always our own judgment that is correct, and it seems to me that there is a necessity to respect the decisions of others and at the same time appreciate the wisdom of the remarks of certain members of this committee, because truly I feel that most of them are being expressed and taken in a very serious way. I think it's rather unfortunate that this debate should at times take on certain tones of somebody being able to bring very strongly to the attention of somebody else's viewpoint that he is so wrong or that he is so right. I do not think that it is truly political, nor do I feel that it is ungodlike nor is it a sin because I feel that like many of us here have read different pages or chapters of the Bible, we've also read a certain amount of poetry, and I think we also realize that to believe in God you don't necessarily have to attend church. I think that certain people find the satisfaction of God's pleasure in fields and mountains and I think that it is unfortunate that some members of this committee feel that it is to be considered on such a very strong religious basis. I also feel that there is no debasing of our Sabbath nor are we interfering with any moral decisions in supporting Sunday sports.

I also feel that wide-open Sundays will not result from this, because in the final analysis we still will have control on the subsequent issues. I don't think that we should really stand in the way of progress. I think that we should legislate with the times and give serious consideration to exactly what's before us, I think that I do not need to cover the same ground as the

(Mr. Strickland, cont'd) Honourable Minister of Agriculture covered, and he brings up a very excellent point of true fellowship, whether its fellowship with your neighbour or the fellowship with the man that's going to golf with you, and above all, possibly the true fellowship and understanding of your own children, your sons, your daughters.

I also would like to bring to the attention of this committee that certain surveys in reference to the church-going side of people shows that there is a larger percentage of people not attending church than there is attending church, and I think that this in itself leaves a great amount of work to be desired and done into encouraging these people to come back into the folds of the church. I do feel that we should be broadminded -- and I again say I do not feel that it is a sin nor am I going to feel within my own self that I am more un-Christianlike or that I'm going to be any less of a Christian if I support Sunday sports. And with this, Mr. Chairman, I would like to close, and I would like the members to feel like I do -- and here again I say that you're all entitled to your own opinion, and far be it for me to try and force my thinking or try and influence anybody's thinking -- but I would like them to feel the way I do, that it is not a sin to vote according to your own decision, and for this reason urge you to give serious consideration to vote in favour of this Bill so that Winnipeg may have Sunday sports on Sunday. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the great desire to have this matter dealt with and yet I felt that there were one or two points that I would like to make before the matter came to a decision. First of all I say that I leave to others better able to do so, the debating on the issue the moral and religious aspect of this matter. Perhaps in passing it would not be out of order -- and I don't pose as a historian, while I know that it is now popular to speak disparagingly on occasions of the church and so on, that we must remember that it was the organized church which throughout the ages has quickened the conscience of man and brought us all to the point where we enjoy many advantages today that would not otherwise be the case. Of course it carries within it its own seeds of destruction because the freedoms which the church brought to us throughout the centuries of course is freedom to reject that organization which brought it. However that is by the way and I'm not an authority on that subject.

The point I wanted to make was made very ably by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs with respect to this matter of the referendum. And this line of reasoning was started by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk when he pointed out that under the provisions of the Winnipeg Charter there is a right to take a referendum and that per se from that point if a referendum is taken the decisions made must be accepted. I would like to say that it seems to me that that point of view must be rejected completely. Admitting the right to take the referendum, surely it must be referenda which relate to the matters within the competence of the City of Winnipeg, not within matters which lie outside their competence. For example, if the -- (Interjection) -- well, I'm sorry. Well I'm making my point in any event. If the City of Winnipeg took a referendum about holding school on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday only, and brought in a proposed amendment to the Winnipeg Charter -- and undoubtedly that referendum apparently would be one which they could take under the authority they have in their Charter -- would anyone suggest that we were going to pass that law because the referendum had been passed?

I want to support completely the viewpoint expressed by my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this is a matter to be dealt with within the context of The Lord's Day Act and that it is wrong and improper to be dealing with matters which are the proper subject of consideration by this Assembly for the Province of Manitoba when it deals only with one municipal corporation in the province. That is not to say what my views would be if such a matter were before the House because that brings me to my final point and one which has not been touched on this morning, although I mentioned it the other evening.

I remind members of this committee, some of whom were not present with us on the former occasion in 1960 when the Bill, which is now Chapter 37 of the Statutes of 1960, was before us, and under which amateur sport was permitted on Sunday within the provisions of that Act. I want to make this point very clear, that it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that to open up The Lord's Day Act even in Winnipeg to professional sport at once does away with what

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) we thought we were doing in 1960; that is, doing something to help amateur sport.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is going to remind me that he didn't confine his support on that occasion to amateur sport, and of course he's quite correct. But what I said the other evening was that he pleaded with us, he pleaded with us on that occasion to do something for the boys who wanted to play hockey, who wanted to play baseball, who couldn't get crowds who would pay an admission in order to help them buy their uniforms, buy their equipment and play their games. And indeed the whole House, those who were in favour of it, were asking us to support it on that basis. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface if he reads a little further will recall that he said to us -- Do it. Make it possible at night, because more people will go out at night and the boys will get this money -- and I suppose he said the girls too, I don't remember about reference to the girls -- they'll get this money and be able to carry on this amateur sport. Some of us had our doubts. In fact I pointed out that the very reason that they were asking for this privilege was the fact that there was a Lord's Day Act which prevented certain things taking place and therefore sets this one day of the week in a position of some special category because of the fact that there was a restriction on counter-attractions; or put the other way around there was a larger available market of people who could go to these amateur games because there were other things that were not going on, there were other matters which would not distract them.

But the point I want to make Mr. Chairman, is that it seems to me that if we now make professional sport available we at one stroke do away with the very thing we were trying to do in 1960, namely help those who were interested in the promotion of amateur sport. I reject out of hand the suggestion that of course because there is professional sport that you thereby encourage amateur sport. That's a lot of hogwash and nonsense, Mr. Chairman. It is true that it encourages those -- and I presume this would include the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who has had a distinguished career in sport, and I recognize that fact -- it would encourage him as an amateur perhaps if he had in his mind the fact that he wanted to become a professional. But, Mr. Chairman, the thing we've got to do -- people give me the what-you-ma-call-it during the estimates of the Department of Education because we're not doing enough to strengthen the bodies of the young people of the Province of Manitoba. We couldn't do a thing to strengthen the physique of any person in the Province of Manitoba, or more than a handful, if all we were doing was dealing with those who are going to be on the Goldeye, is it? -- the Goldeye baseball team or the Blue Bomber football team or the Maple Leaf Hockey team. There aren't enough, there aren't enough places on those teams. There aren't enough young men and women who are interested in that kind of thing. What we have got to do -- and I'm talking now about the general proposition of encouraging physical fitness -- we have got to arrange our sport and our activities in such a way as to appeal to everyone. Those who will only do it because it's good sport to do it; those who will take part because it brings within it its own reward, not the reward of becoming a player on a professional team because there aren't enough places; there aren't enough professional teams; there aren't enough people who have the slightest interest in that sort of thing.

But it brings me to this point, Mr. Chairman, and it seems to me to be very important in this argument, that the moment, the very moment that we make it possible for professional sport to be played on Sunday we at one stroke do away with the advantage and the help and the encouragement which we thought we were giving to these people when we passed that Act, that Bill, in 1960. And I would ask the members of this -- and I'm not making any moral arguments, I'm not basing it on religion -- I have my views about those things -- I'm asking the members of this Committee to reject this on this ground because it is obvious that the people who are interested in amateur sport are not, indeed cannot get the help that they expected to get under this other provision if the professional sport is going to be available to them; because it is obvious that those who have the money and time and the inclination on a Sunday to watch a baseball game I presume will obviously go and see the professionals play or the same with regard to hockey or whatever the case might be. And I do urge the members to reject it on this basis. I'm not satisfied that the ability to do on Sunday what Chapter 37 of the 1962 Statutes permits to be done with regard to amateur sport, I'm not satisfied that that's sufficient to give that encouragement which these people need. I'm not satisfied that it's the answer to that great

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) problem which we have of the physical fitness of all of us up here in this Chamber and the other people in Manitoba and certainly the boys and girls in Manitoba. But I do say that that was presented to us as one thing that would help and I'm prepared to accept the fact that it is being of some help. But I say that to do this now would destroy whatever help that matter has been in this important field of our activity in Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the Minister permit a question? I wanted to ask him if he would refresh our memory. In 1960, did he vote for Bill 37, or Act 37?

MR. McLEAN: No, sir.

MR. DESJARDINS: that last question was clear enough. In view of the fact of what was said today, I would say to the Honourable the Minister of Education that I agree with him, that I did plead for amateur sports; and I'm doing this again; I'm not ashamed of it. But I think I made it very clear on Saturday that I was very much in favour of professional sport. Now I won't go into all the details and I won't speak on the moral part of this, because I think this is the only thing that should be concerning us. If we are against it, if we think it's wrong, that's fine. The only point that I want to bring out is this, that we have started by talking about professional sport, and I feel that this is not the true thing. This is not the way to look at it. It's just the same as if we say on Sunday the first thing, the doctor is making money -- and that is wrong; or whoever is serving meals are making money. Those people are there, and a minimum of people have to work for the good of everybody. And this is all that professional athletes do. I'd sooner that we call this professional sport "spectator sport" and this is the point I want to make: spectator sports against participating sports. Again I think that participating sport is much better and I think that we should have as much of this as possible. But there's one thing that was forgotten here today, and one other member said that he discussed this with a few clergymen and they said the same thing, that they were in favour of participating sports but not in spectator sports. I think this is wrong because we have too many, the people that need it the most, people from hospitals, people that are in Deer Lodge that could come out to these games; older people, younger people and even some people that aren't well. I might say that a tragedy that hit my family not long ago brought this point clearly to my mind and I hope that nobody will have the same experience. But I do think that spectator sports is a form of recreation and I do agree that we should go for participating sports; but there's some that haven't any choice but to be interested in spectator sports, and this is the only reason why I am interested in professional sports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the original sections 24 and 25 of Bill No. 102 be reinstated in the form as originally reported to the Committee of the Whole House from Law Amendments Committee.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): A standing vote please.

A standing vote was taken with the following result: Yeas 30; Nays 23.

The Chairman declared the motion carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the sections by their original numbers. Original sections 24 and 25 passed -- (Interjection) -- I'll call that when I pass (3) itself. -- (Interjection) -- It has been moved that clause (b) be deleted. -- (Interjection) -- Clause (b) is "provide, produce, engage in or be present in any form of any public game or contest for gain or for any prize or reward at which an admission fee may be charged; and carry on or transact any business ordinarily carried on or transacted in connection therewith, but which for this Act would be unlawful under Section 4 or 6 of The Lord's Day Act, Canada; and duly employ any other person to do any business or labour in connection therewith which but for this Act would be unlawful under Section 4 of The Lord's Day Act, Canada, except horse races or horse race meetings, dog races or dog race meetings, automobile races, motorcycle races or boxing contests or exhibitions or wrestling, judo or other like exhibitions or contests. Are you ready for the question?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I think there's a little confusion; we were taking the letters that they had and we were thinking this was (a). We voted on the movies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) was defeated in Law Amendments Committee and therefore is not up for consideration at the present time. This is the original (b). -- (Interjection) --

MR. EVANS: Just so that I understand fully. We are voting on a motion by my

(Mr. Evans, cont'd) honourable friend over here that we eliminate professional sports. Is that as I understand it?

MR. MARTIN: The first provision was removed in the Law Amendments. Now I take it that stands and we're voting on the sports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: just to clear up the situation. Your motion then, Dr. Martin, is to remove old (b), the original section (b), that I have just read. Is that correct? Is that correct? -- (Interjection) -- Well this is what I want to ask. This is why I'm asking to clarify the question.

MR. MARTIN: The original (a) was removed in the Law Amendments Committee, so (b) becomes (a). Is that right? But you've got it under

MR. ROBLIN: I wonder if I might clear this, Mr. Chairman. Those who have the Act in front of them, if they will please look at it they will see that the (a) as it stands has been deleted in Law Amendments. The Chairman is now calling the sections of the Bill by their original designations so that we are now looking on section (b), Public Games and Contests, and that is the one I take it the Honourable Member for St. Matthews wishes to be removed and that is what we are now voting on.

MR. MARTIN: I move that the original letter (b) be deleted.

MR. EVANS: just very briefly I must repeat what I said during my previous remarks that I do not propose to support this motion. I take it that the matter has been, as far as I'm concerned, lost on principle. I do not agree to deciding the items individually and so I cannot support my honourable friend's motion.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I have agreed with the stand taken by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce pretty well all through this discussion and I certainly agree with him in this regard as well, because though I am not a supporter of the proposal, I think it goes contrary to the whole concept of our legislation at this time if we should start taking the sections out piecemeal. As a matter of fact to those people -- and I'm not reflecting on a vote that has already taken place -- but if those folks who base their argument on the fact that we were largely committed in principle to do what the City of Winnipeg asked us to do, they should not have agreed to the taking out of section (a). Section (a) has already gone out so there's no point in debating that one; but as far as this one is concerned, personally, once the vote has been made that we're going to have Sunday sports I do not agree with taking out individual sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to clarify one point, that there were two items included in Section 24 which members could have been voting in favour of, one was bowling alleys, one was the sports and therefore I think a motion is in order to delete either one, once both have been reinstated. Are you ready for the question?

After a voice vote the motion was declared lost and the original section (b) passed.

Remainder of Bill 102, including amendments and new section was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted Bill 102 with certain amendments and has directed me to report the same.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

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

Bill No. 102, An Act to amend the Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18696, 18760 and 18764 was read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, it's been some time now since the Budget was introduced. We've had so many bills under discussion that it will be a little hard trying to come back and discuss the Budget as such. The total budget announced amounted to some \$136,061,000.00. It's the duty of the government to see to it and to provide the necessary money for the expenditures that are being proposed in a given year. To me it seemed that there was more concern by the First Minister this year as to whether they were following the

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) right track, whether they were following the right course, and it also seemed to me that he was less sure of his ground in quite a number of respects.

First of all, when the estimates were introduced in the House I noticed under the Department of Agriculture's estimate there was the item of \$7 million for the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. At first instance I was rather surprised because I felt that this more or less would be capitalized and moneys would be borrowed; and seeing this in the estimates I wondered whether the government had changed its policy and was now going to go on a "pay as you go" basis. But in introducing the budget we now know that this is not the case at all, that this government is going to continue its practice of borrowing large amounts each year for capital purposes. In not capitalizing the Floodway it seems to me that the government must consider this a white elephant, something that they don't appreciate and they do not consider an asset as such, otherwise I think this would be the logical item to capitalize and not capitalize such items as research and grants and so on. Certainly here is something that you can show for the amount that you will be borrowing. Certainly there is more reason to capitalize this item than to capitalize on roads which is an ever-recurring item in the budget, and research, grants, universities, etcetera. I notice that we will be spending some \$67 million on this project and this is a large amount when this is only a matter of insurance.

Now I would like to bring to the attention of the House and of the government, the matter of the flooding that took place at Horndean last spring. It was on Good Friday of last year when we had the flash flood at Horndean where a lot of people suffered extensive damage. I brought this to the attention of the House at that time and the Minister of Agriculture more or less assured me that this matter was going to be looked after and that the people would be receiving some assistance -- at least the implication was left to that effect. Then however, long delays occurred before an assessment ever was made. I was in contact with the Department a number of times in trying to get an assessor down and I was told that the assessor was busy assessing Floodway properties and so on so that he was not available. I don't know, are there just so few people in the department that do this kind of work that the delay has to be that long? I would certainly like to know about this matter.

Then I had some correspondence with the Minister on this as well and we were in to see him - both the representatives of the municipal council of Rhineland and Plum Coulee and discussed the matter with him, and this matter was to be reconsidered to find out whether some assistance could be given. However I have now received a letter, not from the Minister, but from one of his officials of the department, saying that this does not come under the classification which provide for assistance. So that these people are now left in the cold after waiting for a year to receive some assistance in the damages that have occurred. These people have suffered heavy losses compared to the assets that they hold. Some amounts might be rather small, or not too large, yet to these people it is a large amount and it's of great importance, and to now find out that nothing will be forthcoming will be heartbreaking. I feel when the government can spend \$67 million on a project like this for the City of Winnipeg, when people have not had any losses but just as a matter of insurance, certainly we should see to it that people who have suffered losses in actuality should receive some consideration. Some of those people affected lost their livestock, lost their means of production; others had losses in their homes being badly flooded, the basements caved in, foundations were demolished so that repairs had to be made, there was no way round. People didn't have the means, so these people went out and borrowed the necessary capital to have the repairs made. I feel that this matter should receive more consideration by the government as such and that these people also are provided with some assistance.

I also feel that we in this province should be on a pay as you go basis and that all costs should be included in current estimates of expenditures. We are now spending money and people are not aware of just how much we are spending, and if this money were collected at the present time that their taxes would go way up. I know that if this -- the balance that is not being provided by the budget for expenditures -- if that were put on gasoline it would mean that the tax on gasoline would almost have to be tripled. So this is just some indication if we really collected the amount that we do spend what the effect would be on the people and what the taxes would be that they would have to pay. It seems to me we're living in a fool's paradise. We think we're having it so good, yet we're just making larger expenses and adding our debt with

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) which we will have to reckon and pay for. It seems that we are like a boat adrift not knowing where we're going, except that we're going downstream, and end up in disaster.

Our income from natural resources in this province is very small -- it's some \$4 million, a little better than they expect to get in the next year. Surely here is an item that should be further explored and we should have more development so that we would reap larger benefits as a province. We know that the provinces to the west are getting large amounts in royalties and fees, through the development of natural resources, and that this is a ways and means of providing for a large part of their budget both in Saskatchewan and Alberta and also in B. C. I know Alberta's getting well over \$125 million annually and that such an item in our Manitoba budget would be very, very welcome. The only alternative I see is that we check our spending. It seems to me that we're more or less following the example that some people make when they go out and buy on the instalment plan. The payments seem very low and therefore they will go into buying and purchasing the various items and just have these monthly payments to make; but all of a sudden they find themselves in a spot where these monthly payments are not as small anymore. They've added up to such a size that they can no longer purchase the necessities of life and still be able to make the payments that the plans call for. It seems to me that we in this government by pursuing this the way we do that we're reflecting the attitude of a lot of people who go to these finance houses and do like financing. Too many people go broke, have difficulties in their family life and very many end up in divorces, crime, drinking and so on because they didn't budget their finances properly. This is no small matter, because we know this from experience in the various finance corporations through which we've gained this knowledge. That is the way people get into difficulties; that is the way small problems grow into bigger ones and that's the result.

I think we should take an example from Alberta and B. C. Both these provinces are on a pay-as-you-go program. Alberta has actually no direct debt. The amount that is on their books is a sum that cannot be paid because they're not callable bonds, and therefore they have to remain until they mature, so that if they do show something on their books they at least have large reserves to take care of these. In fact they have reserves close to \$400 million at the present time; whereas we are in debt by \$160-odd million in direct debt. In addition, they provide higher pensions than we do in Manitoba. The roads that they build are all paid for and so are the facilities that they provide such as hospitals and homes for the aged.

B. C. likewise has no direct debt. In 1952 when the present administration took over, they had inherited a large debt. This has since been cleared up. They also inherited such other items as the PGE Railway which started nowhere and ended nowhere; certainly this was a white elephant and they have now endeavoured to make this a paying proposition. Certainly it'll be much better than our floodway that we are building in Manitoba. In addition they had this year what they term the sunshine budget which wiped out all the tolls on the bridges and there's no new borrowings. It seems that they're in a prosperous economic condition there. The populations in both provinces increased and if it were not for that, that our old age persons moving out there, we would have large amounts to pay. A good many old people, senior citizens, move out there just to get the higher pensions that these provinces provide for their aged. B. C. now pays, I think it is \$85.00. Alberta has increased their's as well; so that the aged out there enjoy a better living through their larger pensions.

Now coming back to Manitoba, the provincial debt as it now stands calls for large amounts of interest. Interest may seem small and trivial at first, but it's a strangler and a killer. It seems that we in Manitoba are trying to borrow ourselves into prosperity. More than, or close to 50 percent of the total required to service our public debt will go -- 50 percent of the amount that we're acquiring through capital borrowing will be used -- 50 percent of that is going to be used to service the public debt, so that we only actually get half of this capital money that we're bringing in to give us better and greater prosperity. Our provincial amount that we pay out in interest and capital are growing year by year. Personally, I feel that the amount that we pay on our public debt should be much larger because we're spreading it over too long a period of time and we're paying enormous amounts of interest year after year, and this will be increased. I know that the interest that we are presently paying would by now provide for a nice road program in Manitoba were we on a pay-as-you-go policy --

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) and this matter cannot be emphasized too strongly. When B. C. introduced a sunshine budget, we in Manitoba produce a cloudy, or at least a smoke cloud budget at that. We are increasing our debt and it will be a heavier load as the years go on. We know this is also the case of our Federal Government; that interest eats a large amount of the new moneys that are being brought in annually. I think theirs is about \$900 million or more that they pay in interest. So that even if you bring in new moneys into the economy that the interest on the public debt takes away a large chunk of it and therefore you do not have the effect that it would normally have.

It is unfortunate the under our present financial system that you have to go into debt privately in order to have some measure of prosperity; but certainly we as a province needn't follow that example, we needn't do it on that basis, to have to go into debt. We should tax the amounts that we require for our purposes and pay for the services from those revenues so that we would not be in a debt position. There's no need for it at all.

I notice from one of the periodicals that came out the other day that United States more or less is also continuing a slight inflationary trend, and it seems to me that we in Manitoba are doing likewise by borrowing for capital spending. This has the effect of robbing our people of their savings. There's not too much purpose in saving if we have this inflationary trend going on, because by the time we will be using those savings in our later years they will have been eaten up through this matter of inflation. It also means that there will be a decrease in the purchasing power because of this inflationary trend, and the only alternative that I can see is that we check our spending more closely and then levy for the necessary amount in taxes.

One matter I raised on an earlier occasion is the matter of savings that go to insurance companies. I think insurance companies are the organizations that receive the most savings from the people both in this province and in Canada as a whole; and they in turn invest those savings in the nation's debt. I think this is rather unfair, but under the present regulations they are not permitted to invest large amounts in other than government bonds, municipal and provincial bonds, and so on; that only a very small percentage can be invested in stocks and in the growth of a nation.

Now I suppose this is a matter of risk and because the laws are so made that the risk involved in business is considered in this matter; and because there's less risk involved there's less attention being paid to them -- less attention has to be paid to the bonds in servicing them, so in the end it comes out that it's more profitable to these insurance companies just to invest in these bonds rather than to invest in stocks and in growing corporations. I think the laws should be changed, that insurance companies could invest larger amounts in stocks and in the growth of our country, especially so in the matter of secondary industries. It seems this is an area where capital is lacking. At least private capital is not readily coming forward; and I feel that this government has a duty in this respect to encourage people to invest in secondary industries and to bring about a better economic climate, provide more jobs and so on, so that here is an area that needs encouragement. I also feel that representation should be made to the Federal Government so that the laws be relaxed so that insurance companies could also invest to a larger degree in stocks and not have to satisfy themselves by investing in government bonds and so on.

These are a few matters that I thought I should bring up in discussing the budget that is before us, and I feel that we're not following the right course, that we should go on a pay-as-you-go program, and that we as a result would derive greater benefits as a province.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I would first like to compliment the Leader of the House in his presentation of the budget. I have not been so entertained since I first read Grimms Fairy Tales when I was about ten years old. Like this excellent book, the report of the budget would have us believe that as long as the present government remains in office everyone will live happily ever after. Unfortunately, there is always the wicked fairy of reality lurking in the background, and things are not always what they seem. On the subject of education, which to my mind is of prime importance dealing as it does with the mental and physical development of our citizens, the Premier makes no mention of the fact that due to the university entrance requirements being upgraded to Grade 12 level in 1964, six or seven hundred extra students -- the equivalent of a whole school -- will somehow have to be accommodated by

(Mr. Harris cont'd) the Winnipeg school division alone. Provision for these hundreds of extra students will have to be made in increased teaching staff and supplies as well as extra space. All this is going to cost quite a sum of real property taxpayer's money. Yet the Premier has not seen fit to mention it in his report, and presumably no allowance has been made for the influx of these students.

Mention is made in the report of two proposed technical and vocational schools at Brandon and The Pas. No mention is made as to how they will be paid for now that the Federal Government's special educational grant of 75 percent has run out as of March 31, 1963. Under this special federal grant which allows each province 75 percent of the cost of new schools providing the province put up the other 25 percent beforehand, it is interesting to note that out of the \$400 million allotted by the Federal Government for this purpose, the Government of Manitoba received only about \$4 million, while the Government of Ontario advanced enough money to obtain \$299 million of this special grant. It would appear that the Government of Manitoba was afraid to speculate on a sure thing, and so we missed out on a number of new schools.

Turning to the physical aspect of education, I would just note in passing that although the Winnipeg School Board has appointed a Director of Physical Education, the Government of Manitoba has no Director of Physical Education for the province, nor are there enough gymnasiums or equipment for such a program, and apparently no provision has been made for the wherewithal to obtain these. These are some of the more pressing aspects of our education as directly affect the taxpayers in Manitoba, but doubtless there are others.

In speaking of social welfare the Premier announced that 24,000 persons in the province are now served by social allowance -- an increase of 71 percent in three short years. This is hardly a statement to be made with any degree of pride. It would surely be much better for the province and the people concerned if there was a decrease of 71 percent rather than an increase, and if these people were working and contributing to the economy of the province and keeping their self respect at the same time. No doubt one of the causes of such an increase is the unfair Fair Wage Act that allows employers to pay their workers much lower wages, so that they find it easier to subsist on social welfare. If all workers throughout the province had the same wage scale as the City of Winnipeg, the initiative to obtain work would be much greater and there would be less people on the rolls of social welfare. As it is, it is not worth the wear and tear on the workers' clothing and tools to go out and work for a mere pittance legally allowed them. The amendment to the Fair Wage Act increasing to 5,000 the number of residents in the town before being eligible to receive the present rural rate, will only further aggravate this situation. The labour management relations resulting from this will indeed be very strained and of no help at all in furthering co-operation in this field.

No mention is made of a more extensive retraining program for the people thrown out of work because of automation. Apparently one has to be an inmate of one of our prisons in order to receive such training. No doubt this training is most necessary in institutions where their former occupation could hardly be acceptable, but surely our free citizens are entitled to the same privilege of retraining, especially since the circumstances of their unemployment are quite beyond their control. Unless such a program of retraining is instituted, and quickly, the population of our prisons may reach unprecedented heights mainly because the government was unwilling or unable to accord to free men what is given as a matter of course to law-breakers.

These are just a few ideas of the labour situation in Manitoba. I believe they are constructive and they are certainly thought-provoking. The community development program for the Indian and Metis citizens looks very well on paper, with the eight field offices in different parts of the province. I note that one of these field offices is in Thompson. Was this field office operating in Thompson last winter when the Indians were starving up there and could obtain no work, and if so, why did it not act to relieve the situation? No mention is made of establishing co-ops to help the Indian people to help themselves, rather than be lifted over the stile. It also appears that there is no housing projects in view for our growing Indian population in the city. These people are forced to take the poorest accommodation available because of their ancestry. The care of our Indian countrymen has been badly neglected by all our governments and it is time reparation was made. It is passing strange that the report signifies the present social allowance medical plan with the despised name of medicare, and

(Mr. Harris cont'd) equally significant that all its recipients must be on social welfare allowance. Perhaps this is the only way that a proper medicare scheme could come into effect under the present administration; that is, if all the citizens go on social welfare. Under the present Manitoba Hospital Services Plan it certainly seems that the private companies operating in conjunction with this scheme are getting all the gravy and the public is paying through the nose.

Now I would like to quote here for a moment. "A factory worker in one of our large cities had a heart attack last summer. On his doctor's orders he was off work for seven months. He is now back on the job, but broke. Why should this illness cripple him financially? Hospital insurance covered his weeks in the hospital. His doctor's bills were paid by the Medical Insurance Plan, but for seven months he had no pay. The food bills for his young family kept coming in. So did his mortgage, fuel and light bills. The children still had to be clothed. Not having any sickness insurance, the patient lost \$2,424.30 pay in the seven months. Had he been able to work, he would have been one of 1,200,000 factory employees in Canada who earned an average of \$81.00 a week. Now he is up to his neck in debt. All over this country are tens of thousands of working men and women in industry, office, shops, on the farms, who, if they fall sick for any length of time, are up against the wall because they have no wage protection for illness."

Now you can see there is a lot of things that we should do here, but it seems that we say, "Well, it's not me -- it's the other man that's going to get it." But I say in all sincerity -- I hear today people talking about Christianity, people talking about churches, but I often wonder to myself, are we sincere in what we say? Are we sincere when we get up to talk, because I don't think we are. We're like the man that's in the glass house you know. People that live in glass houses," as they say, "shouldn't throw stones." That's fine, we should look around because there's a glass house around us too. And are we living in a Shangri-La? I think we are, because when we look all over the world we see different things that should be fixed, but we sit down in our seat and say: "Oh, some day we'll get around to that." But I say, Sir, that "some day" is now, and we should have a medical plan not only in this province but clear across Canada, so that these people would have ample protection in what is rightly coming to them. How much better it would be if the government would operate the whole scheme taking in medical as well and thereby reap the profits which could be used for the health care of the citizens of Manitoba. As it is, under the privately-run medical schemes there is no firm coverage of medical expenses, and the rates are so high that many people cannot afford them, and therefore are unable to get the treatment they require. If we want a healthy population we must have a plan that will adequately protect them and maintain the health of our people, and the only way this can be done properly is through government-administered medicare plans for everyone. Thank you.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words. I see there's only about 12 minutes left. I see the Minister of Education is here; the Premier is here; the Minister of Industry and also the Minister of Public Works. I'll try to make it very brief -- (interjection) -- That's right, you're all here. I'm not going to take too long -- (Interjection) -- The Minister without portfolio is here too. I thank you.

I was just going to bring -- we've been talking a lot about tourist revenue, and I wanted to bring to the attention of the Minister of Public Works regarding three highways which should be completed to the American border and thereby increase our tourist revenue and that is the number 12, the black surfacing -- I had mentioned it before -- and the Mississippi Parkway. I asked the Honourable Minister about the Mississippi Parkway, why there's no action taken there, and I think the Minister answered that the American government was stalling. My information is different. It may be wrong but my information is that it is the Manitoba government that is stalling in this. I may be wrong and -- (interjection) -- Oh, I'll accept the Premier's statement if he says I'm wrong, but my information is to the contrary. Also the 59; this is another tourist road which should be completed to the boundary to bring in more revenue. The same applies to Morden-Sprague; it's a cross section connecting these three.

Now, the main purpose in me getting up today, is that several years ago I asked the Minister of Education, I implored him to include the Ukrainian language in high schools and the Minister did accede to that and I'm not going to take the credit for it if the Minister wants

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) the credit. In his wisdom he thought that that was good, and we do have the Ukrainian language now in high schools and I understand it's on an experimental basis in Grade 9, and I hope that it will be extended to Grade 10 next year and on to University; but I have a letter here which I want to read parts of, and if he wants this tabled later I will table it. I have a letter from the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. Here is what the letter states, and I'm in full agreement with this. "The Ukrainian language has been introduced on an experimental basis in Grade 9 and will be continued in Grade 10 next year. However, the students experienced difficulty because of the fact that the Ukrainian language so far has not been credited as a matriculation subject for university entrance, nor at the University itself. This state of affairs is not fair to the Ukrainians in Manitoba, because in this day and age such undemocratic restrictions are not justified. For example in Saskatchewan the Ukrainian language is fully credited as a matriculation subject in high schools and at the University, and the beginning of next September there will be a correspondence course for those who wish to take the language by correspondence. The establishment of this course is a very important achievement not only for Saskatchewan but also for all other provinces. Because of the fact that the Ukrainian language in Saskatchewan has equal status with other languages, such as French, German, and others, both in high school and in university, the Ukrainian courses there are popular and very well attended. We would have the same condition in Manitoba if present restrictions were removed in this province. In our opinion, Ukrainian members in Legislatures should undertake the necessary steps and create a favourable atmosphere."

I would like the Honourable Minister -- I was tempted before to bring in a resolution to this effect, but I thought that since this was the first year on an experimental basis in the high school, that it wouldn't be quite in order to bring in a resolution in that year because we are really experimenting, so I did not bring it, but I would like the Honourable Minister to keep this in mind for future, and I know that at the university level, they have their own Board of Directors but I'm sure that the Minister could discuss this with them. We'd like it very much if the Ukrainian language was accepted as one of the subjects in the university as well.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that the amendment be amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "and have, despite its various administrative changes in economic organization and taxation policy, failed to give sound evidence that it is providing for adequate integration of our human, capital and other resources in planning for the social and economic advancement of our province."

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

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 7; Nays, 48.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, in view of the rate of progress we've been making in our agenda this morning, I see that nothing is to be gained by -- as far as advancing the business of the House is concerned -- by moving the adjournment, but probably we'd be just as well off if we simply asked you to call it 12:30 and to leave the Chair until 2:30, so that if there's no disagreement to that course of action I would propose it.

MR. MOLGAT: resume debate then on the budget?

MR. ROBLIN: Right. We'd have to anyway. Even if we adjourned we'd come back to that.

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 12:30 and leave the Chair until 2:30 this afternoon.