

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 29, 1968

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I would like to bring to the attention, several guests we have with us today, and in particular I would like to introduce to you a former member of this House. On my left we have an honoured guest in the person of the Right Honourable Roger Teillet, Minister of Veterans Affairs. On behalf of all members of the Legislative Assembly, Sir, I welcome you here today.

In my gallery I'm delighted to introduce to you a group of 40 ladies. They're representing the Souris Women's Institute. They all come from the constituency of the Honourable Member of Souris-Lansdowne, and on behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Sitting in the gallery on my right, are members of the Occupational Training for Adults classes at Eriksdale and Oak Point. Accompanying these classes are their instructors, Mrs. Edith Gibbings of Eriksdale and Mrs. Kathleen Riddell of Oak Point School. These good people are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George, and on behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Proposed resolution. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last Tuesday, when I was speaking to this motion, I had reminded the House of the fact that the department, the Public Information Branch, in the coming year is proposing to spend \$148,610, and this is over 100 percent increase from last year, and as I was finishing my remarks last Tuesday I was using a series of the Fishermen's Commercial Bulletin to show how cabinet ministers can become carried away with the powers that they may have over bulletins that they have in their department, and through showing the six different booklets that I still have here, it was quite evident that over the years that it was becoming partly a bulletin to give advice and helpful hints to fishermen and partly for the purpose of propagandizing certain ministers.

Now my resolution asks for the disbandment of the Information Branch. I had quoted from some newspaper clippings where the Premier of this province, during the by-election at Turtle Mountain, was emphasizing the fact that there had to be a separation of needs from wants, there had to be a cut-back, there had to be a more careful look at the spending of the taxpayers' money. I have here in my hand a sheet out of Time Magazine of December 1, 1967, and there's an article devoted to the leadership convention that had just been concluded, where the Honourable the First Minister had just won the convention, and I would like to quote from this to show that he was speaking along the same lines at that time. As a matter of fact, many of the political friends I have in his Party tell me that his theme was what won him the convention. And I'd just like to quote what was said in Time magazine.

The sub-heading of the article is: "Hold the Line Victor." Now that's not his name, Mr. Speaker; it means the winner. Hold the line victor. Among other things, it said he should be able to kick manure off tractor wheels, but this isn't the point that I was going to make, Mr. Speaker. Further down in the article, it said: "The four contending cabinet ministers sounded curiously like federal politicians as they debated the single issue of the campaign - government spending." Towards the end of the article, and this is in quotation marks from the Honourable the First Minister speaking at his convention: "a need to restrict our increasing expenditures, to increase our tax base by expanding our assets rather than simply by increasing taxes."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said on Tuesday. The First Minister is talking a good game, so to speak, but he's not producing, and he has now been in office long enough to get the controls, to have had a few serious discussions with his ministers, and what have we as a result? At the same time that he has been talking like this, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has increased the Public Information Branch by over 100 percent. So it's only a small amount of money, speaking in government budgets - \$148,000 - but, Mr. Speaker, this is a symbol; this is symbolic. If you can't hold there, where are you going to hold? What has changed from '67 to '68 in Manitoba in the governmental picture? Is there a sudden need for over 100 percent increase in spending in the propaganda department? I think not. I quoted before from the Informational Services where, in my opinion, it was not information. It was either there for a useful political purpose or it was there to intimidate people. And I recall

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)... members of the House to the article I quoted earlier in the session, where the province wins court cases and the Informational Branch sees fit to publish the fact that they had won two court cases on land expropriation, and I asked the question then and I ask it again now from any member of the government who is going to defend this: why did you not publish the Tom Lamb case where he won substantial damages and his claim was increased in the Supreme Court of Canada when he had lost the first two cases here? Why wasn't that published? If you're going to publish information such as this where the province wins court cases, well then you had better publish the other side. But obviously, Mr. Speaker, if the government is going to take this biased view, then they shouldn't be in that business and I suggest to you that they should get out of it. Intimidation is a mild word for it.

Nor do we need ministers' time tables published. The fact that a minister is pouring tea. I don't think this is province-wide information that the taxpayers' dollars should be spent to be mailed across the province to a private mailing list and to every newspaper in the province. The fact that the Honourable Harry Enns, Minister of Agriculture, is pouring tea at 2:00 o'clock at St. Joseph's Church - should this go across the province at taxpayers' expense? I think not. --(Interjection)-- Pretty important in the ... bill went to the minister, I suppose, but hardly suffice that the taxpayers should foot the bill for his social functions. Another one: "The Honourable D. Craik, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, will bring greetings from the province to the St. Vital Junior Chamber of Commerce." Well, that's important to the St. Vital Junior Chamber of Commerce, but I hardly think it's of province-wide importance. --(Interjection)-- No, unfortunately the Honourable Member from Rhineland doesn't qualify for this type of service.

"The Honourable C. H. Witney will be guest speaker at the Hunter Safety Workshop banquet at the Legion Hall in Flin Flon." It just happens that it's his own constituency and I suppose that because it's the Hunter Safety Workshop it's important in that area, but it's hardly of province-wide importance. --(Interjection)-- I'm glad to hear I have some support over there.

So, Mr. Speaker, in putting forward this motion, I feel that a department who has material for a release such as the information of a department for the good of the citizens of Manitoba, let the department put out the release. Then if there are any excesses and anyone wishes to take exception to them, they know from whence they emanated. In the last six months I asked honourable members here what minister on that side has received the most personal publicity of any minister. One guess. The minister who has control of the Public Information Branch. Is that not a fact? He receives more publicity than the First Minister of this province.

Now, to come back to my point. Let every department handle their own informational work. Whether it's a part-time person or someone who is already there, let them do it. In special cases, as tourism and recreation, where they need professional help, well this is fine - they need to have the professional help for that. But you certainly don't need editors at \$17,500 and \$14,000 and \$12,000 and a number at \$8,000, in a plushy office upstairs with \$8,000 worth of furniture, to put out propaganda.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, we've had a fairly energetic debate on this matter in the previous -- substantive debates on the Order for Return that was filed by my Honourable Leader, and also by the remarks, all of which I associate myself with, that were made by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and the members of our Party who spoke on the issue. We feel that the manner in which this particular department has been handled is scandalous. We've indicated that we believe that our opinion is based primarily on principle, on the principle that it is wrong for a party that happens to have control of the administration to use the public funds to further their own political position rather than to disseminate the necessary information which a government would have to disseminate in order to properly fulfill its functions, and if that particular conduct has been scandalous, Mr. Speaker, we feel that the relative nonchalance which greeted the remarks that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has made during the past few minutes is even more scandalous. I would think that --(Interjection)-- Yes, I certainly do, and I think that if my honourable friends still think that this is a source of amusement, then that piles scandal upon the already existing scandal.

MR. LYON: ... the NDP; what about CCF Government in Saskatchewan?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that if I occupied - and my honourable friend said that some day I might be a good minister and I hope he's prophesying correctly - if I occupied those seats and I got the kind of criticism that has been delivered by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and other members, I don't think that I could take it with the same degree of nonchalance, as I put it before, as has been done by these ministers. I think that, Mr. Speaker, that certainly the government benches have to take responsibility for what happens within the department, and I think that sometimes the civil servants, especially civil servants of this kind who have been hired from amongst public relations personnel, are going to employ themselves with public relations personnel and do the kind of a thing that they've been trained for, and I would think that it would be the ministers of the government who would go back to these people and indicate, "This is not what you're expected to do," because we in this Party do concede that there is a need for the department, and in this respect, Mr. Chairman, although we agree with the sentiments that are obviously behind the presentation of the resolution that has been made by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, we can't at this stage, in any event, agree that the department should be disbanded. We have hoped -- as a matter of fact we would suggest that the government would need a means of disseminating necessary information, the kind of information as I've already repeated, that was given to the people with regard to the sales tax other than the photograph of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. We feel that the real problem is not the question of finances, it's not the question of priority, although I repeat, I sympathize with the sentiments, we think that what the government has done has brought this type of criticism upon themselves by what they have done with the department rather than by having the department itself, and it makes a nice argument, Mr. Speaker - and I'm not taking away from the argument - that you're spending money in this area and you're not spending money on Vaughan Street, but we can almost deal with anything that the government does on that basis and it doesn't really answer the question: is it necessary for the government of this province to have the type of department that has been set up? And from all the best opinion, Mr. Speaker, even what has occurred with the Liberal Party when they were in control of the administration, what occurred with the New Democratic Party my honourable friend points it out, when we had control of the administration in Saskatchewan, what now occurs with the Liberal Party that had control of the administration in Saskatchewan, this type of department is maintained.

We feel that the real issue is what they have been printing, and I am not going to repeat everything that has been said. I think that there have been ample examples to substantiate the proposition that this department has not been serving the people of Manitoba, that it has been serving, in fact, the Progressive Conservative Party, and with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, and without belabouring it any longer, I am going to propose an amendment and I wish to assure my honourable friends to the right that I'm not proposing this amendment merely to amend. We feel that there is a question of principle involved here. We feel that it's necessary for us to indicate by this amendment what our real objection is, and we feel that the amendment more clearly deals with the principle than does the resolution that has been put by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and I've already indicated that we certainly back the sentiments of the resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the resolution be amended by eliminating the first, second, fourth and fifth paragraphs thereof, and by adding after the third paragraph thereof the following: "And whereas many of the publications of this Branch are in the nature of political propaganda as distinct from the necessary dissemination of governmental information, Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government be censured for misusing the administration of the Branch to further the political interests of the Progressive Conservative Party." And, Mr. Speaker, I've drawn this to eliminate the present "Resolved" and I hope it does so. If it doesn't, I would like to add that the present Resolved be eliminated as well.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not have the amendment before me but I thought, from hearing you read it, that it seemed that my honourable friend struck out the third paragraph and then it seemed to me that the operative part said put an amendment on to the third paragraph.

MR. GREEN: I believe that my honourable friend is incorrect. I eliminated the first, second, fourth and fifth paragraphs, left the third Whereas in there, and then added words on to the third paragraph.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the current situation probably requires some comment from

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)...the Chair. I merely attempted to read this amendment by the fact that I had accepted one the other day from the Attorney-General, but the Chair would appreciate it very much if these intentions were properly set up and typed and sufficient copies to be passed around to the Leaders of the several parties. I appreciate the honourable member's situation and I just simply mention this in passing. What to do about the situation as brought up by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I had this particular matter that I've just outlined on my mind and I just didn't quite catch where we stand right now with regard to the argument.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest to Your Honour that you receive the amendment and take it under advisement and you'll be able to consider the whole matter. If you're not in a position to present it or feel that you should not present it for debate, I suggest this. If you are in a position and anybody wishes to debate of course, then it would be proceeded with, but in the absence of anybody wishing to speak precisely, if it needs any clearing up or consideration, then I respectfully suggest this be done by Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. As usual he's quick on the draw because that is what I intended to do, was merely take the matter under advisement to get it all straightened out. I believe this will be the only proper thing to do.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to indicate that I regret that the amendment is not put in in a better form and I will certainly accept your injunction to do the proper thing next time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if I could make a comment, I would want only to say that the fact that you have found it very difficult to read the writing of either the Honourable the Attorney-General or the Honourable Member for Inkster simply reinforces that old adage that great men are notoriously poor writers.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take part in this debate. Now would I be speaking to the main motion or to the...

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest at this time you would be speaking to the main motion and I'll hold the amendment in abeyance and see what happens.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I doubt that. You have a proposition before you of an amendment that you have said that you are going to take under advisement, and I think that precludes further debate on the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: You could be very right, but the situation is certainly not clear in my mind the way this is made up, and I would, with the indulgence of the House and the mover of this motion, allow the matter to stand in my care until such time as it is taken care of in order that the Honourable Member for St. George may proceed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't think my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party or I want to keep my honourable friend from St. George from speaking, but I think the awkward situation does arise that you have before you an amendment which you are taking under advisement, which amends the main motion. The main motion, in other words, no longer exists - at least it's in doubt that it exists - subject to the amendment proposed by my honourable friend, and much and all as we might like to hear my honourable friend from St. George, I doubt very much if under the rules we can hear him until you, Sir, have resolved the question as to the amendment. I think that's the point. The Leader of the...

MR. SPEAKER: I believe this to be correct. Probably the Honourable Member for St. George would take the adjournment then.

MR. LYON: Nobody can take the adjournment.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, to facilitate circumstances I will not ask to speak today and I will ask for the right to speak when this matter comes up next.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for St. George for his understanding and co-operation, and I thank the honourable gentlemen for their opinions, and I can assure you the next time it appears before you it will be correct.

The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Virden, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)... of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I for sure will not be long on this occasion. --(Interjection)-- Thanks for the compliments.

A MEMBER: Is that a promise?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Now, in looking over the main motion - and I believe this was the first one on the Order Paper this year and is still pretty close to the front and is not resolved yet - but in looking at the main motion and the amendment and the sub-amendment, it's quite evident that the farmers would appreciate it if they could get to know in advance somehow or other that they had a final payment coming to them at some specific date in the year, and for them the earlier the better. There isn't a businessman, I don't think, in rural Manitoba in particular, that does not agree with the farmers in this regard because most of the businessmen are waiting anxiously and patiently, in most cases, for the farmers to receive their payment so that they can receive payment that is due them from the farmers. Speaking for our own business, our accounts receivable have never been higher in the history of our firm, and they're all honest people that we're doing business with. They're just short of cash. That's the problem.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite see how that the sub-amendment is workable. I mean it is fine and dandy - I'm referring to the part that's in quotes here, "to terminate the various pools it operates not later than on December 31, and issue all payments at the earliest possible date thereafter;" - while this would be nice if it could be done, I just cannot see how we in this House can tell the Pools to arrange their bookkeeping, their finances, their sales of wheat and all of this to accommodate us, because so much depends on Mother Nature in the first place. Are we going to have a crop? And the size of the crop, the size of all of the sales, the size of the crops all over the world, all of the nations - the buying nations - of the world. Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me to be asking for an impossible request and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we will find ourselves voting against it on those grounds that it's just one of those things that is impossible to ask the Pools to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take part in the discussion of this resolution on an earlier occasion. However, it seemed that amendments were being put forward every time when we got to it. So I would briefly like to discuss some of the points that are raised, and to start off with the main motion, the first line we read: "Whereas the Canadian Wheat Board makes payments to farmers on any date in the year suitable to the Board." I really doubt whether this is the case. At least the experience that I have would indicate differently. I think the Government at Ottawa puts pressure on at certain times and that's when the payments are made. This very often happens at election time, and it seems that this year with the leadership convention coming up, they now have payments being made on wheat, oats and barley. Just the other day we read in the paper where it would enhance the Honourable Minister's chances in Ottawa in his leadership race, so that it probably had a bearing on why we got the payments at this particular time. So it's not, in my opinion, completely in the hands of the Wheat Board as to when payments are made.

Going on to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell's amendment, in the Resolved part, and I'd like to read the resolved part: "Therefore Be It Resolved that this House recommend to the Government of Canada that they request the Canadian Wheat Board to issue all payments at the earliest possible date consistent with sound operation of the wheat, oats and barley pools, And Be It Further Resolved that in any crop year where this is not feasible by February 1st, interim payments be made."

Here again, I think political arrangements come in and that it's not always consistent with sound operation of the Wheat Pools. I would certainly endorse the idea of having interim payments when pools cannot be closed out.

The final amendment that is being proposed by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains goes on to say, and here I'd like to quote as well: "to terminate the various pools it operates not later than on December 31, and issue all payments at the earliest possible date thereafter." Here again I think this should read "in the year following" because certainly a pool that would be closed on December 31st would not be the one of the current crop year. It would be the pool of the previous crop year in my opinion, and therefore those words should

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... have been added in my opinion.

Then he goes on in the Resolved part and says: "Be It Further Resolved that the sale of all grains including rye, flax and rapeseed be placed under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board." This is one Resolved that I object to very strongly. I believe in wheat boards or agencies of this type as a tool, and if it can be used to advantage well and good. On the other hand, if it doesn't, then we should not be tied to it and the results over the years I think have shown it quite satisfactorily to me that a wheat board doesn't always mean good prices. In fact, it's been the other way around because we've had years when the Wheat Board paid poor prices and if it hadn't been for the open market some of these grains would still be selling for much less than what we're getting now on the open market. Flax prices, for one, have gone up certain years very substantially, and I have yet to see this happen when you have a board in control of such commodities in that way. You don't have fluctuations - you have stability; but the stability is at a very low rate and I feel that farmers are just losing in this way by boards of this type and are not gaining. We are always using, or in most cases, the lowest common denominator in such cases and we're not reaping the benefits when it is high.

We had a very good example of this during the war years when wheat sold at a very high price across the ocean in some of those countries and the western farmer sold his wheat at a very low price during those periods of time. I have mentioned this on previous occasions. I personally sold Class 2 wheat at \$4.55 a bushel and I hauled some of that wheat into the elevator and got \$1.19. Later on, there was a final payment to it so that increased somewhat, but not nearly to the amount that I got from the other source for the same kind of wheat, so that the western farmer lost actually millions and millions of dollars during those years. They were told at that time that after the war they would be getting better prices as a result. But have they come about? In my opinion they have not, and we're still receiving the same prices that were in effect at that time. Yet all the other commodities have gone up, but the prices of wheat and cereal grains have been at a low level. Sure enough, if our Wheat Board had all the opportunity to prove itself and to increase prices, but this hasn't happened. The wheat prices and the other cereal grains are still very low and I feel that we're not getting the results from our Wheat Board that we should be getting, and that certain other measures should be tried in order to get better prices for the farmers of Western Canada. And I for one, certainly cannot support the last Resolved here of putting rye and flax and rapeseed under the Wheat Board as a selling agency. Rapeseed just recently became a commodity that is being handled by the exchanges and certainly they're trying to go into other commodities such as I think beef or cattle or whatever it is, so that the area in which they're operating will be broadened instead of narrowed - and I feel that it should be broadened.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to support the last amendment. I just do not subscribe to the principle of it. I have some difficulty on the second last one and I might have a word or two on that before we let it go to a vote.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the leave of the House to allow this matter to stand in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable member have leave? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable member have leave? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Official Opposition I rise to support the amendment of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. In supporting this amendment I do so on behalf of my group for the following reasons: (1) I feel, and my party feels, that it removes the implication that municipal councils had not in the past given leadership in the field of recreation, whereas as a matter of fact it was the municipal councils in the past that

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd)...led in the field of recreation. In making this statement, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind the contribution made by the Town of Selkirk in this particular field, and more particularly, the youthcounsellors that the Town of Selkirk has employed over the past years, one of whom is today the Director of Community Recreation Branch of the Department of Tourism and Recreation, Al Miller. I don't think there was any man that I ever met who did more for encouraging a juvenile in all the varying degrees of sport, hockey, lacrosse, everything you could mention in that area.

Now I feel, too, that I should also mention the City of West Kildonan which the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks was too modest to refer to in his remarks, because I know of no city which has done more towards fostering public recreation than has West Kildonan. It was the first city in Manitoba to enact legislation under Section 340A of the Municipal Act in creating a public recreation commission. And before I leave West Kildonan, I think that I should refer to two individuals, who in my opinion deserve a place in the Hall of Fame. One is the father of Andy Bathgate and the other is Vince Leah. I know of no two individuals who contributed more towards recreation than these individuals did.

I believe too, Mr. Speaker, that I could mention almost any municipality in the Province of Manitoba which has made its contribution to sport, and I think that I should mention a few of them. Going north from West Kildonan, I'd start at Lockport, then the Town of Selkirk. I'd take in Clondeboye. I'd take in Petersfield. I'd take in Winnipeg Beach. I'd take in Gimli. Then I'd go across to that diadem of the north, Arborg, and no matter which place you went to on that line or on the line where the Honourable Member for St. George comes, you'd find that those municipalities in those areas had done a tremendous share of encouraging recreation.

Another reason why I feel that we should support this amendment is due to the fact that for a long time I think every community has felt the futility in building recreational facilities when these recreation facilities were already available in the various school buildings in that area, and I feel that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in suggesting co-operation, legislative co-operation between municipalities and school districts, has touched on a matter which I think the government should take into consideration and enact the necessary legislation.

Now, it may be argued that at the present time a municipal corporation and a school division board can enter into a joint use agreement. I'm not disputing that for a moment. But I do feel this way, that since the boundaries of a municipal corporation may be different to the boundaries of a school division - and I have in mind the Town of Selkirk; it's situated in the Lord Selkirk division; it only in part of that division. Now supposing the Town of Selkirk wanted to enter into an agreement with the Lord Selkirk School Division regarding joint use of recreational facilities, gymnasium or swimming pool or what not. There may be a feeling in the other parts of the school division that the Town of Selkirk was getting a greater advantage through that school being there, and I feel that the only way that you could compensate the rest of the division would be by that municipal corporation and the school division making a financial arrangement which would offset the disadvantage to the remaining parts of the school division. And I think that the Member for Seven Oaks should be commended in mentioning that here, because I think it should be enacted into the Public Schools Act and into the Municipal Act, whereby a municipality and a school division can enter into a binding agreement for sharing of costs in respect to co-operative efforts.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resolution, as amended, should be accepted by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion by the Honourable Member from St. James. I appreciate the sentiments that were expressed by the Honourable Member from Selkirk and I well understand his philosophy and the area that he understands and speaks for, but I wonder if he would look at the condition in which I live where I can speak of two municipalities that doesn't have a town within their boundaries. And how are you going to share the recreational responsibilities of municipal government at that level with the responsibilities of municipal government at the Selkirk level? It don't add. And this is, of course, one of the great problems that we face in the province today, Mr. Speaker, whereby things that are discussed and those that get the limelight of the press and radio and television of our province, are reflected on the centralized or the urban areas, but the rural areas where there is no town. In this particular too, the rural municipalities of Boulton and Shellmouth do not have a town within their boundaries.

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Now, how are you going to legislate and provide recreation for these people on the same level as you're providing recreation for the people in Seven Oaks or Selkirk? It's a different story and a different picture, Mr. Speaker, and this is why I rise in support of the Honourable Member of St. James who maintains that the recreation for children and adults is growing in importance, and I support him in trying to influence the municipal people that this is a fact. The recreation of the municipal government must be -- they must recognize that recreation is a part of their program and at the present time we are not in a position to have school facilities such as which the Honourable Member for Selkirk is talking about. They don't exist within the boundaries of these municipalities. We haven't got this big school complex to go and have our recreation facilities. It just doesn't exist. But I maintain, and I'm supporting the Honourable Member for St. James, that the municipal people who are elected must recognize that part of the tax dollars should be shared for the recreation of those that live within their boundaries.

The other thing of interest which I think I should draw to the attention of the House, that I spent some time, Mr. Speaker, this spring in speaking to the municipalities of Boulton and Shellmouth and drawing to their attention that there was a shared program. Grant moneys were available by the Department of Tourism and Recreation which the Honourable House Leader heads, and they were not too sure that such a department existed - to show you that the link, this is how far you are ahead of us, Mr. Hillhouse, in recreation. You have two or three hockey teams in your town. We don't have that, you see, and no hope. But in the meantime I think that if we could support the resolution of the Honourable Member from St. James and get my people encouraged, my municipal government encouraged at the level that he suggests, and then I'd be glad to phase with you at a later date. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to take part in this debate but after listening to the last speaker I think that I should because I think the honourable member missed the point.

I don't know if he's aware, if the Honourable Member for Roblin is aware that a few years ago the Federal Government decided, under the Conservative Government I might add, decided to have a fairly large grant for recreation. And I don't know if the honourable member knows or remembers when the then Minister of Welfare brought in his plan - his Bill - which certainly was not prepared at all. And we said at the time that "you're just putting in a bill so you can stick your hand out and get this money." The Government of Manitoba has not shown leadership in this at all and I certainly will support the amendment wholeheartedly, but not that motion. Not that motion which I feel is a ridiculous motion, which is a motion to say again: "You take over our responsibility."

We have been advocating, exactly for these benefits, those municipalities as well as for all the people of Manitoba. We have been advocating for many years a Department of Youth and Recreation. I remember speaking on this the first year I was elected, in 1959. Talking about this I felt that with all the leisure time that we had, that recreation was very important, that it would become more important. And we talked about this and it's done in other provinces. Nothing was done until the former Minister of Welfare brought in this bill. We've heard very little about it since then. We haven't received any leadership at all. I suggested the same thing then. All right; you can't cover everything all at once. We were talking about the city because you have a concentration of people. That doesn't mean that the people in the country shouldn't have any recreation at all but it's not the same problem, and the honourable member with his amendment is not endeavouring to cover all fields of recreation, I'm sure. And he is saying - I think that this is where I say that the honourable minister has missed the point - he is saying that here in a place where the real property is so high and so on, that it would be logical. Because you build a school; you try to centralize this where it is going to be accessible to most people, to as many people as possible, And you should do the same thing. If you studied the Community Clubs' ideas and so on you should do the same thing. And he's trying to say that we can save facilities, we can save money, we can save property and so on.

There are all kinds of reasons for this. There's the question of the traffic, for instance. Instead of duplicating all those facilities, you have the one place and you might have a room where they can change to play hockey or skate and so on, that they can have an outside door.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... Now, this is not the first time that my honourable friend from Seven Oaks has brought this up, and I brought the same question up, not as clearly as he did, a few years before he came in this House, and I'm not saying that he has stolen any of my thunder because he didn't even know about it. But I mentioned that in 1959, the same thing in 1959; my friend mentioned it the first year he was elected; he brought it last year; we didn't even get an answer from the Minister of Recreation. And what did we say last year? That the emphasis was on tourism. I would like, and I'll ask this Minister during the estimates on Tourism and Recreation: what has he done? He didn't give us one report on this. And now a member from the government side of the House will turn around and say the municipalities aren't doing anything.

The leadership has to come from here. You have the facilities. You have the facilities for the co-ordination for the class in leadership and so on, and this might be an occasion to repeat again that I feel that we should have a proper - not in words alone - but a proper department. You call it what you want. You can cover it under recreation if you want, but not tourism and recreation. That would bring, to my mind anyway, tourism and recreation for somebody coming in; they can stop in the park and so on. This is not what we mean. And remember that in this changing society of ours, where we're having so much leisure time and it is very important that we definitely could have a department of human resources or youth or recreation or leisure, I think that this is an important thing.

I was given a note but unfortunately I can't read his writing - this fellow writes worse than I do. But I think that this is certainly a very important subject. I don't know all the legal aspects of it. I think that this is very important and I think my friend the Honourable Member for Selkirk might have brought in a point, but the meaning, the intent behind the amendment is certainly something good. If my friend would have got up and said, well, all right, this is mostly in the cities, this is possible. What is the other thing giving? This is window dressing. Do you think this resolution will mean anything at all? If we pass the resolution from the Honourable Member from St. James, what does that mean? What does he intend here? What does he intend -- to take our mind away from the lack of leadership that is given here in this province. And I challenge you to show you where our leadership is. You shake your head. I challenge you, I challenge -- you've exhausted your time of speaking, but the Minister can speak after this or maybe he'd sooner wait until we come in Tourism and Recreation, because then we can all get up as often as we can.

But this is an important thing. This is something that we talked about for a long time, and recreation is important. Some people feel that recreation is a waste of time, you're not serious at sports and so on. It's all the time - whatever you do during your leisure time; and that is a wide, wide field. Maybe I'm a little off base here on this amendment. This amendment doesn't cover all this, but it's a start. It's a start. It's something that you can do. You . . . , it's the same people -- all right, maybe we'll have to bring some legal experts and so on to show us how to do it -- but it's the same people. They belong to this school board and they belong to that community and they're interested in the education of their children and they're interested in the recreation which is part of the education of the people. You don't divorce one into the other; it's all part of growing up and it's all part of living also.

I was going to stand up here for one minute and I see I'm taking a little longer than I thought, but I will say that I will, without any doubt at all, I will support this amendment 100 percent, but I for one will certainly not support this joke of a motion that we have in front of us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that one should make a comment or two on the resolution that we have before us, but possibly more importantly the remarks of the Honourable Member for Roblin, because it seems inconceivable to me that a member from a rural constituency should in essence reject the amendment proposed by my colleague from Seven Oaks because of his representing a rural constituency that doesn't have the urban problems, as I understood my friend. I'm wondering whether my friend really meant what he said when he said that, in effect, in the rural areas there can't be this co-operation between school boards and municipal councils in the field of recreation. I suggest that basically that is what he said, because he rejects apparently - I trust that he's not speaking for the government, because it appears to me that he rejects the contention in the amendment that the public school authority or all school authorities work together in concert with the municipal councils to use

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... the facilities that they have and to explain those facilities for recreational purposes.

Now this is the essence of the amendment. The main motion, the main motion seems to me to cast aspersions on the municipal councils because they haven't been achieving the job. The Honourable Member for Selkirk just a few moments ago pointed out where municipal councils have assumed their responsibilities in the field of recreation and given direction. In my own City of Transcona, we for years at the municipal level have produced some of the most outstanding athletes in Canada: Cal Gardiner, for one; Pinky Davey who happened to be here in the gallery last night; Johnny Cherka and others who have made their contribution have done so as a result of municipal council participation. Indeed, our City -- we call ourselves the Park City because I think that with our size we have more areas set aside for recreational purposes than any other community in Manitoba, because of the fact. But we want participation of our municipal councils.

The intent of the main motion seems to me to offer criticism to municipal councils, and the Honourable Member for Roblin suggests that in the rural areas they haven't got the same opportunity for co-operation. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they have more opportunity for co-operation, and it is more needed in the rural areas that legislation should be of such a nature that there can be the co-operation to permit the school boards and the municipalities to initiate and to enter into joint construction and development projects for recreation. That is what the amendment says, Mr. Speaker. How can my honourable friend from Roblin reject this type of a proposition? We're trying to bring our communities together and where better can we bring them together than through the utilization of joint facilities of our school boards and our municipal councils, our community halls. What better a community can we have than that which has within its confines the united effort of school boards, community clubs, private clubs and our municipal councils? This is what our proposition is in the amendment proposed by my colleague from Seven Oaks, and I suggest that the last operative portion of the amendment to the main motion is very pertinent, very proper: "And Be It Further Resolved that this House commend the municipal councils, school boards and community clubs for their efforts in providing recreation facilities despite their limited financial resources."

How can members opposite vote down, as intimated by the Honourable Member for Roblin, a proposition in this House that turns around and says to our local community clubs, rural or urban: "We appreciate the job that you have done"? How can this House, or any portion of this House, say to the school boards who have conducted recreational programs in competition one with the other, that we don't commend you for your participation in the field of sport? How can we turn around and say to the likes of the Town of Carman, we do not commend you because of your efforts in the field of baseball, the contribution that the Town of Carman made during the recent Pan Am games? How can we say to the City of Portage la Prairie, who provided facilities during the Pan Am Games, we do not commend you?

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Honourable Member of Roblin and also the members opposite, they cannot, in my opinion, do anything but accept the proposition of commendation to our municipal councils, our school boards and our community clubs, for the job that they have done despite limited financial resources. And I want to point out to my honourable friends opposite to take a very good close look at this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because we are not asking for additional financial support; we are not asking for an additional five cent piece by this resolution from the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba or from the local taxpayer in his school taxes or his local taxes, but we are saying to the community as a whole, and these three areas of municipal council, school board and community clubs collectively: we appreciate the job that you are doing.

We recognize that there should be additional finances available for this purpose. This resolution does not ask for that. It just says to the men and women who are taking part in community effort in our province: Thank you for a job being done at the present time and for what you have done in the past, with your limited financial resources. And, I would suggest to my honourable friend, the Member for Roblin, that he should take another look at the amendment because it certainly is timely in the province today.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask a question of the Honourable Member of the New Democratic Party?

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly.

MR. McKENZIE: How can you share facilities, the people that reside within the

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)... boundaries of the rural municipalities of Hillsburg or Boulton, share a facility that does not exist?

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend that in the rural municipality of Hillsburg or any other rural municipality, there are villages, there are towns, there are schools, and that they can cooperatively, they can cooperatively unite in provision of services jointly, which they cannot do at the present time under legislation in effect in Manitoba. That is my answer to you.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, earlier I had not intended to get into the debate at this point, but I feel that I must. The first part, or the original resolution, I think states quite clearly that municipal councils should be encouraged to give leadership and direction. Here we have a body that is already established and has been established for long periods of time, and where we have legislation on the books that can assist in recreation because some municipal councils have passed orders to that effect, setting up committees, and I think some grants are available in this respect.

When you come to the amendment it is quite a different proposition, and I would take issue with the Leader of the New Democratic Party in what he just said, because here we bring into play school boards and municipalities, and why do they bring in school boards into this situation? We know that the school boards at the present time are, in most cases where they have the urban centers, under the unitary system, and therefore they would have to draw on funds and they would have to get it from the Provincial Government and not from the municipalities as suggested in the original motion. I think this is where you have the two different aspects and disagreements between what the original resolution asks for and what the amendment asks for. And when they are supposed to enter into joint construction and development projects for recreation, certainly there would have to be some delineation as to what obligations, which of the two entities will take over. We have many schools that presently have large recreational facilities and I'm just wondering whether these are used to the fullest extent; whether or not greater use could be made of what we presently have.

He made great effort on the last Resolved and I don't dispute the effort that has been made on behalf of many people in providing recreational facilities. We have some very hard workers in this field who have given lots of time and money and so on in providing recreational facilities, and I certainly wouldn't be one to discount the work and their effort that they have done in the past. But, to me, the other matter that is proposed in the amendment, I think we should have a definite understanding. I would not want to pass on a blanket proposal here of this nature without having some knowledge of what was actually proposed, and in this Resolved part where you are going to have joint construction and development, who is the party who is going to be responsible, and what is the intention? Are we going to draw on provincial funds or are we going to draw on municipal funds and have the taxpayers of the municipalities pay for these? I think this is the real matter at issue here between the two, between the original motion and the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, unless someone else wishes to speak, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: By leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Order, please.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, are we not under the new rules at the present time? Monday? Oh, I'm sorry. I had to be absent from the House when the

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... rules were passed and...

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I apologized this morning for speaking a second time. To compound the error, the luck of the draw brings me on again, but I proceed for the simple reason that I think that if we're going to get the business of the House done in the time that we had hoped to, that it's better for some of us to set an example of going on reasonably soon with the debates.

This is an interesting resolution, Mr. Speaker. The House is familiar with it, and after the whereases it asks that a Standing Committee on Education be established. I listened with interest and appreciation to the Honourable the Minister giving reasons as to why he thought that it was unnecessary that such a committee should be established. I take the other view and support the resolution because of the fact, as stated in the resolution, that education occupies one of the highest priorities, more money is spent in that department than in any other, the values to be acquired by a good education are certainly going to be as great, if not greater, than any other governmental service that we can provide, and it seems to me that on all these counts that it's only right that this department, which has not up until this time had a committee to which it could refer matters for discussion with a wider group of the people of Manitoba than we have at the present time, should have such a committee established.

I think one of the other reasons, a good valid reason, is that since our rules have rather drastically reduced the time that we are allowed to take in Committee of Supply, that a committee such as this is all the more necessary. Year in, year out, we have spent a great deal of time in this committee on the Department of Education and likely will continue to do so. But now that we're restricted to 80 hours, we will have to try and so arrange our business that we cannot take the time that we have previously done, and so I think it would be of great advantage, Mr. Speaker, if we could have a committee established where not only bills but other matters dealing with education could be referred by the House to that committee, and where we could then hear from the people who are very closely associated with that vital service. This, in my opinion, would not in any way undermine or de-limit the department. The department would continue to have the responsibility for administering the policies, the government would continue to have the responsibility for outlining the major policies, but the great advantage that I see would be that we could have school board representatives, teacher representatives and, probably more important than either, parent representatives and student representatives, come at times and give us their views on this vital subject. So this is my main reason for supporting this resolution. I would think it would be a great advance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a couple of -- make a couple of brief comments on the history of the education expenditures in the time that I have been in this House. The first year that I came here, the expenditures, the whole provincial expenditures for the Department of Education, were less than \$2 million. It was a great many years -- nearly 20 years -- before they reached \$5 million. They were more than 20 actually. They were only \$5 million in the year that I became the First Minister of this province, that is, 1948, so that would be a quarter of a century that it took these expenditures to go from \$2 million to \$5 million. In the ten years that I had the privilege of leading the government of the day, these expenditures on education increased from less than \$5 million to more than \$20 million. That's not quite in keeping with the reputation that I have, I realize that. In fact, it may surprise honourable members who have come to think of me as the real epitome of tight-fistedness that the expenditures all the way along the line increased much faster when I led the government of the province than they had for many years before. That isn't the whole statement to say that, Mr. Speaker, because the times were changed, as you know, and in the period not so long before there had been a war and the resources of this province along with others had had to be channelled first into the war effort and services here had had to be curtailed, but the fact is that that was a period when expenditures were starting to rise very rapidly.

But in the next ten years, the last ten years, as my honourable friend the Minister is so well aware, they have gone from that slightly over \$20 million to estimates before us now of \$136 million approximately. Well, dollars don't tell the whole story, of course, but they do tell the story of the fact of the increasing cost of education in the Province of

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... Manitoba. And while I'll probably get into an argument with my dear and respected and honoured friend the Minister of Education when I say this, yet I still maintain that even these dollars don't tell the whole story because the fact is -- now get ready -- the fact is that in spite of the tremendously increased expenditures that the local taxes have increased as well. So, this is a major area of expenditure by the taxpayers of Manitoba and I would guess by the way things appear at the present time that they're going to continue to rise, at least in the foreseeable future.

Now I think the question that we have to ask, Mr. Speaker, is: are we getting value for the dollars that we spend? This is the essential question in any service, and the fact is everyone agrees this is the vital one. But is the value that we are receiving commensurate with the money that we're spending? I haven't got the answer to that question and if I attempted to make a suggestion that probably we have gone too far too fast, probably we should have digested some of our programs a bit more thoroughly before we took more and still larger bites, that we would have made sounder progress, perhaps at less cost.

But that's water under the bridge, Mr. Speaker, and we have to go on from here. And in going on from here I think that we have to look mighty carefully now at the program as a whole in the interest of - and it must be a balanced interest - of the two main areas. First of all, the students I admit that. First of all the students. Young people are the most valuable resource that we've got and we have to do what is right. But we can't forget the taxpayer and it becomes a question with me of just how far and how much, how fast we continue to increase these expenditures.

Then the other point that I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, and I tread upon this field with a certain amount of trepidation but yet with conviction, because I think somebody has to say it. My honourable friend from Portage la Prairie raised it the other day and I shall venture to say a word upon it now, and that is that I am greatly disturbed and discouraged by the fact that some - and I certainly emphasize not all and not even a large proportion - but some of those students upon whom we have lavished the greatest amount of money and who have attained the uppermost rung of our provincial educational system, the university students, are conducting themselves in a manner that I think is very discouraging. I refer, as my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie did, to articles that have been appearing, not only in the paper which he quoted, which is the publication of the students of the University of Winnipeg, but also in the student paper of the University of Manitoba. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that we here have a responsibility to speak out and to say to the university student group, that if they expect the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba to continue to support their institutions - and they're very worthwhile institutions - with the treasure that we have been committing to their care, that we have a right to expect more responsible attitudes on the part of the people who publish their newspapers.

Like my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie, I would not demean the dignity of the House by even attempting to read into the record some of the things that have been said, but I'll be glad to show you these clippings - one from the Manitoban, the publication of the University of Manitoba Students' Union, and the other similar to the one that was read but a different article, emanating from the student body of the University of Winnipeg. The Manitoban - because the other one has been mentioned and I was glad to see from the daily newspapers that the authorities there have taken at least some action. If any has been taken by the University of Manitoba I am unaware of it. The article that appears in the Manitoban, and I give the date, November 10, 1967, dealing with what was said to be a satirical publication, is so obscene in my opinion that I am amazed that the students would wish to publish it, let alone that no official protest that I know of has been forthcoming. And I counsel anybody who doesn't know of these publications to dig up the issues and read them. There are some - I have several of them here - it pains me to mention, to look at it, but I think this has gone far enough, and I saw by the papers and then later on on television, that one of the universities in Ontario had been staging some kind of a demonstration or something, which seems to be so common these times, and when the authorities of that particular institution had attempted to deal rather severely with the student body because of the actions that they had taken, the Minister of Education - I believe his name is Honourable William David - in the Province of Ontario intervened and sort of ameliorated the disciplinary measures that the authorities had undertaken to administer. I think it's time that somebody takes some action here. Because I think it's so unfair to the rest of the student body. This is a very, very

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)...small minority. Why should they be able to inflict such articles upon the rest of the students?

Mr. Speaker, I think it is two years ago, it may be longer, when I saw published in the Manitoban the fact that it was intended to hold a debate on a certain subject. It was either an inter-collegiate or international debate and the subject was listed, was advertised in the daily newspapers as well as the student newspapers, and the subject for discussion for a debate at that level was so stupidly inappropriate that I thought seriously of bringing it up in this House. I consulted with three of my friends who were students at the University of Manitoba and they counselled me not to do it. They told me that they thought that matters were under consideration out there that would correct these extravagances, and that only added difficulties would ensue if the matter were raised in the House. I didn't do it at that time. In spite of watching the -- reading the papers that have emanated from these two institutions in the interval, I've been trying to -- hoping that somebody else would bring it up rather than that I would have to do it, because I know that when this comes from a person that was born in the other century that there's a tendency on the part of young people, and some people not so young as well, to say, "These are old fogies that are talking. You're not with us; you're not hep to things." They probably forget that we folks were young once too. I thought it would be better if someone else brought it up and when the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie mentioned it with no previous discussion from me the other day, I thought that it was perhaps time that something were said on this matter.

Now I do want to repeat that where I think the greatest unfairness lies here is to the vast majority of the student body themselves, because this does not reflect, I'm sure, their thinking. And it's unfair to them. The public, especially we folk that were born in the last century, can slough it off by saying, oh, well, they're young and they'll get over it, but to the people who are their fellow students this must be a distinct embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to put the Honourable Minister in any unfair position with regard to this, but I want to read onto the record of the House a letter which appeared in The Uniter of January 18th of this year, and just as I say that some of these things I marvel at the people who would have the temerity to put them into print, similarly I'm glad to see that the view that I am sure obtains among a vast majority of the students has been raised by one young man in Arts II at the University of Winnipeg, and I think his letter is so good and says what I've been trying to say in better words than my own, that I will read it into the record. I'm always glad when I see somebody write a letter to the paper and sign his name. It shows that he has the conviction of -- he's convinced of the merit of what he's saying, and I'm sure that in this case that what he is saying is endorsed 100 percent by the vast majority of the students at the universities in the Province of Manitoba.

Here under the heading of "Letters, letters, letters, letters," the Uniter of January 18th, 1968, is what George A. Hogman, Arts II, says, and the heading is, "Objections raised to dirty approach to life." "Dear Sir, there appears to be some confusion in the thinking of certain people with respect to what life is like. It seems that some writers are smitten with a perpetual fear that some of us may get through life without knowing how dirty it really is. Lurking at the backs of their minds is the painful dread that possibly not all people in the world have minds as dirty as theirs are. For that reason, there issues from the cesspools of these minds a continuous flow of putridity which, if accepted for printing in a student newspaper, assures them that everyone else is as filthy as they are. I write to you, Sir, because the Uniter has been printing its share of articles which are produced by just such writers as I have described. I suggest that in the future you should discourage the writing of indecent literature by refusing to publish any article which employs such vulgarity as appears in "The Student as Nigger." Not only is the publishing of this article in very poor taste but it insults the intellects of your readers as well, unless your purpose is to expose the author's poverty of language and paucity of expression, for he is unable to give adequate force to his statement in acceptable English.

"The same day that "The Student as Nigger" appeared in the Uniter, a history professor read to his class excerpts from the Liberator, which was edited by William Lloyd Garrison, because the writer had a reasonable command of the English language, stands in marked contrast to the puerile utterances of your author. Writers who resort to undignified and coarse language to express their views, do their cause no good. Even if our educational methods need overhauling, as your writer seems to suggest, we will not listen to a would-be

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... reformer who cannot write a paragraph in decent English." And it's signed George A. Hogman, and I am certain that George A. Hogman is speaking on behalf of the vast majority of the students of the Universities in this province, and I think that he has expressed what a good many of the rest of us would like to say, and I trust that some publicity can be given to the fact that we expect these young folks to set a standard somewhat commensurate with the opportunities that they have had.

..... Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I rose to join with the Honourable Member for Lakeside in his appeal. Firstly because I congratulate him on how he demonstrated to us the courage of those who get up and censor, even though they maybe leave themselves open to be called "God". But I believe that it is time to call for censorship of these things and while I don't want to sound as if I'm going into a sermon, it does bring to mind a luncheon that I happened to be at last Wednesday in fact. It was the Rotarian luncheon held down at the Fort Garry and the speaker at that time was Mr. Byfield, who I believe used to be a writer with one of the daily papers and changed over with St. John's, and he said that in the early history of his career he had found that affiliations with the church, that the breakdown of the church came through the fact that there was not family participation such as on the old family farms in the past days. He thought that through the approach of St. John's that they could bring a closer link of responsibility of the youth as they grew up and of course this is the aims of St. John's to try and link the young boys with responsibility, not only during their school but after their school because as he had pointed out, on the family farms, in the home, the young boys and girls all had chores to do, chores that probably took three, four, five, six hours a day sometimes. They had to rise before breakfast and do a certain number of chores and then have breakfast, go to school, come home and do the chores at night, help during the summer, and they felt that at that time -- or he said at that time he felt that probably the children were a part of the economic family, that they felt more a part of the family because they were responsible for some part of the duties during the day and I think that in many ways probably this shows a lack of responsibility. I think that probably if you even went back further you would say that in most cases as we study history that the breakdown of all civilizations has come through the breakdown of morals of the country. And I wonder if this doesn't lie really with the breakdown of the morals of ourselves as parents today and possibly as politicians who scramble around trying to get on the gravy train and trying to get on the right side of a number of young people and possibly, maybe encouraging them to speak out, and if this is the way that we are encouraging them to speak out, by trying to pass the responsibility on to somebody else, I think probably it's time that somebody took the other side of the story. Perhaps we're too old; perhaps the Member for Lakeside and myself and others are living in the past. Maybe we don't see things the same. Maybe the morals of the country are changing. Maybe these things should be -- and if this is the case then perhaps we've been left a long way behind.

I don't mind standing up and saying that I believe in censorship; and I believe in guidance and I believe in responsibility and I believe that these people should have a responsibility not only to themselves but to the people that are reading these papers. I disagree very violently with the fact that you don't have to read something unless you want to because I have a responsibility to my children and to my small family anyway, and I wouldn't like them to read some of the things that are going about, and these things are. I know in our younger days we used to be able to sneak out sometimes and maybe grab ahold of a "Hush" magazine -- this was something that was put under the table. But today there's more and more of this type of thing coming out. It's becoming a way of life and it's not a good thing. Everybody seems to want to get on the bandwagon and probably some of us should stop and think about where responsibility starts and stops.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have a great deal to contribute other than that but I certainly would join at this time with the Member for Lakeside in complimenting him on what he has said.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the last two speakers and also the Honourable Member from Portage have sort of, by the attitude they took, forced me to speak on a subject which I don't really think is on the Order Paper in this resolution, and having said that I suppose you have the right to tell me that I should not proceed. But I do want to deal with these various comments that have been made about smut and obscenity and if these are matters that the Speaker thinks should be dealt with by a Committee of this House on Education, well, possibly that's how they found the opportunity to speak on that issue.

I really don't care very much about this problem. I really don't feel that the sentiments of the gentlemen who have spoken on this problem are worthy of too much consideration -- I'm trying to pick my words, Mr. Chairman, because I know that I am arousing some people,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) and that's all right; I suppose it's good to have discussions on censorship of this type; but I really didn't think it was that important to deal with it except that I also felt I couldn't sit by and listen to it without responding to it. So I propose to do so, probably by antagonizing most of the people in this House, as I look about me, on what I'm saying. I see one honourable member who is nodding her head and I'm not surprised that she is.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I find many things offensive. I find many things that make me shudder, that make me sick, that disturb me very much and many of those things include what was referred to by the honourable gentlemen. I felt not sick but sort of disgusted when I read this publication from the University of Winnipeg newspaper, some word like Uknighter - I forget what the variation was. I thought it was poor taste; I thought it was not funny. It was crude. It was just something that I thought wasn't worth reading. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't worth making a speech about and certainly it wasn't so offensive that it would be harmful to anyone to read it. It was certainly not anything that would drive somebody, after having read it, to go out and commit any sort of act or deed, be it moral, be it criminal or be it anything that would be harmful to himself or to society.

I am not aware that the Honourable Member for Churchill has indicated or shown in the short time I've known him that he was adversely affected by the fact that he used to read Hush or anything else under the table and I am willing to confess that I have read Hush both on the table and under it and more recently I've read magazines and other publications that are more sophisticated, and less so than Hush, which as I recall it was not much to read under any circumstances.

But, Mr. Speaker, words that are worse are four-letter words that are much more common like kill. There are many words that have become pretty standard in our newspapers of what people are doing to other people today in this world which involve much more than this, what to me is unpleasant but tolerable, because people should have the right to say something, be it bad as it is. A word like "napalm" when used in the connotation of kill and burn and maim - and some of those words I've just said have four letters too - are much worse words than appear in those types of publications that are being mentioned and that offends me much much more, Mr. Speaker. And then I must confess that it offends me that people set themselves up to be censors of others' morals. I think that if a person sinks, degrades himself or herself to some degree, until that person is himself or herself affected by it or affects others, then it's really not our concern. We should try to uplift them; we should try to see to it that the media of communication as between people is such which is elevating, which is educating, which is stimulating, which is intellectually arousing rather arousing in other respects. But I don't see that we do so much talking and doing about that aspect of communication as we do on occasion when we hear these kinds of puritanical discussions about other people's morals.

I wish somebody would indicate to us what harm is done. Now I again say I don't justify them in any way, but I guess I do justify the fact that some people with poor taste and very superficial senses of humour, if that's the right expression, do it. The fact that they do it is unfortunate, but the fact that they do it is not as harmful as these other things that I have mentioned. And I wish it weren't -- I'm sorry really that I felt it necessary to get up and take the time of this House. I don't apologize for having offended anyone with what I said or aroused them, because I really felt that I couldn't just sit by and let the occasion go by as if possibly by my not speaking I will be considered to have agreed with what has been said. I hope that in our deliberations as we go along we will do many more fruitful things than to try and discuss the censorship of this type of publication, which as I say, I don't condone, I don't accept, I don't glorify, but by golly, I'm not prepared to censor either.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Chairman it was not my purpose, or intention I should say, to enter this debate. I rather think we have strayed from the main point and the last speaker was largely speaking on censorship and if I may be permitted to do so I would like to pass my comments because some of the things he said I completely disagree with and think certainly one's impressions or beliefs should be expressed in face of such statements as these.

The honourable member suggests at the last of his words I believe that he does not condone this, but in effect, of standing idly by he is condoning this sort of issuance on the part of young people and I must share with the Member from Lakeside a feeling of shock at what

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.) has been happening over the past several years. We see so many of our young people who have had advantages certainly no generation previously ever enjoyed seemingly wanting to discard the standards which have been set up through the ages and tested and tried as a way in which to live and standards to live by.

I think that when one considers very seriously, regardless of whether he belonged to any church, any Christian church or not, he must realize that two great nations on this continent base all their laws and customs pretty well upon the ancient Jewish and Christian religion, and these were if you choose, simply standards set up during the ages whereby the standards were found to be good first of all for the individual, for the family or for the nation and all of a sudden within this last short while, particularly by young people, who have not the experience and the mature judgment to set up standards to replace something as this, there is an attempt to tear down with nothing sound or constructive to replace it by and when the honourable member says he doesn't condone this, he certainly does condone it.

I would suggest, and one of the members of his group made such a speech the other day, that I believe that they are not being completely and strictly truthful, in this sense, that if they had acquaintances or friends that they invited into their home who used the kind of language that we see in print now, and we, knowing their avowed statement that they are opposed to any form of censorship, I suggest that within their own homes, they would use a degree of censorship in that if a guest were annoying and used words which disgusted the family, that that guest would not be invited again and this I suggest would be a form of censorship. I think that surely to goodness all of us must at least agree in a censorship at least based on good use, decency of association and I find that I cannot quite credit the member when he says he doesn't condone this but suggests there are other things that disturb him quite badly and oh well, treat this as a passing phase. I think that's rather dangerous because once general approval or let's say the ignoring of these things and no voices speaking out against them, this implies a general approval which I think must only lead to the degrading of our society, because there must I believe, be standards of decency practised by all. I think it's very much like the rules of a game - you certainly wouldn't want to see any of our popular games have the rules suddenly thrown to the wind and this is much the same type of thing, when you refuse to look straight in the eye the fact that censorship is necessary. While I'm on censorship, I must say that this beautifully sophisticated, I suppose, highly cultured socialistic approach to morals and we mustn't act God and censor people, this would be fine if everyone

MR. PAULLEY: . . . repeat his last sentence.

MR. LISSAMAN: I'm afraid I have no notes and it wouldn't come out identically.

MR. PAULLEY: Surely you know what you said. Your last sentence, in reference to God and socialism.

MR. LISSAMAN: I was referring to this socialistic expression that people were playing God, if they attempted to be censors. That was the meaning I intended. Well now this sort of approach to the world and to people in general would work very nicely if everyone were little white angels but there are people who will destroy and disregard every standard of decency for the simple making of money. I suggest that you must have censorship; it must be used with the greatest degree of delicacy and care but nevertheless you cannot blindly state that you are against censorship in my opinion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on a question of privilege? I didn't want to interrupt the honourable member but he did suggest, well he did say that I was not being strictly truthful in stating that I did not believe in any form of censorship. I think I have a right to clarify and to reject his statement when he suggested I was not being truthful. I don't think I dealt at all with rejecting any form of censorship. The fact is that in the home of mine that he refers to, I reserve the right not to invite again people who offend against me but certainly do not intend to deny them the right to speak as they do in their home. And in the sense of censorship I do not -- and I was a sponsor here of a motion for which he voted, together with all other members of this House some years ago in opposition to permitting hate literature to be distributed where we said that there should be a law, a criminal law involved in the distribution of hate literature or group libel or anything of that type. This is not censorship, that is punishment and that is a different thing and one which apparently the honourable member did not quite understand.

I next reject as a socialist the fact that the mere stating by a socialist -- (Interjection) --

(MR. CHERNIAK cont'd.) I just want to get my - I reject what he said that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order! The Honourable Member for St. John's has the floor.

MR. CHERNIAK: I didn't want to offend against my right, Mr. Speaker, but I did say that as a socialist I did not feel that censorship is necessarily . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman realizes that he was being rather extensive in his remarks. However, I was prepared to accept that, so long as he would bring it to an end at an early moment which I was expecting at any moment, but he has a habit of continuing. I take it he is now finished?

MR. CHERNIAK: Oh yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface. You caught my eye a moment ago, you rose with the Honourable Member for Brandon and I'm giving you the privilege, but as you don't want it, the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to go on at length. I want to get to the motion that we are discussing and that is that there be a standing committee of the House appointed for the purpose of education. I think that the last four speeches probably were somewhat - five was it - removed from the motion, that is not without the sphere of it but they dealt with a subject which probably wasn't conceived by the movers of the motion. However, the Honourable Member for Lakeside did indicate that this related to the newspapers, the Manitoban and the Uniter and the question as to what the House should do concerning them and that the committee on education could be attuned to what is going on in these institutions and then somehow the last remarks were related exclusively to censorship and the Honourable Member for Brandon took occasion to refer to remarks that I had made previously on this subject. I apparently, Mr. Speaker, wasn't properly able to articulate what I thought at that time if what the Honourable Member for Brandon has said has been his impression of my view. I don't believe that I have to like everything or that I have to treat everything that is written with the same tolerance. I assure you that many things that I read disgust me and the article that the Honourable Member for Lakeside referred to is something that disgusted me a great deal. However, Mr. Speaker, I'm of the opinion that on the balance we live in a world whereby the tendency is for people to select the good and reject the bad. I don't have nearly as much a lack of confidence in the selectivity of the people to choose in an area of free speech as does apparently the Honourable Member for Brandon who says that if you let anybody say what they want people are somehow going to buy the stuff that is wrong. I have the confidence in mankind to believe that, given the right to choose from everything, they will choose the good and reject the bad, that on the balance that is a better approach than saying that somebody should in advance tell them which is the good and which is the bad. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, I know in advance that my attitude will permit a lot of disgusting material to appear and I have confidence that mankind will choose the good and reject the bad; I say that that difficulty, which I realize is a difficulty, is something which is preferable than suggesting that somebody can weed it out before it gets to the people despite the traditions and the backlog of tradition that the Honourable Member for Brandon has said has motivated our society. I don't believe in accepting everything but I do believe in not legislating against the written word.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order for a moment, please, there is just one observation I would like to make at this particular time. I have tried to be reasonable and fair. I realize full well that the discussion has somewhat strayed from the resolution before us and regardless of what has gone before, I would ask future speakers to keep within the confines of the resolution that is before us, as reasonably close as possible in order that the business of the House may continue.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there has been some suggestion by honourable members that I was not within the confines of the resolution. Are you suggesting that?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not my point at all, I felt that my remarks were all embracing. We have had a considerable number of speakers and I'm sure the honourable gentleman will agree with me that nowhere in this resolution censorship is mentioned and that has been discussed to considerable length and has been the cause of some irritation to people and I want to avoid that if I can. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker it's a little late to avoid irritation now. I think that one of the previous speakers spoke. I think he said he welcomed the idea of rousing, of antagonizing the people of this House and he has done just that. He has been very successful in doing that. I think this is what he said, that maybe it would be a good idea. Well at least that part of his intention has been achieved because I for one, did not - first of all, I can say I didn't like his attitude to start with, he practically said that the previous speaker had no - well it was a ridiculous speech, he shouldn't waste the time of the members of this House to mention about things that he felt were not important at all. Well this might not have been important to the Honourable Member from St. John's but it was. What my honourable friend said is very important to a lot of the members of this House and to many of the people of Manitoba and I would congratulate my honourable friend for the speech that he made. I think it took an awful lot of courage when the easy way out now is go with the crowd. Let everybody have his day. This is the easy way out. Don't criticize anybody; this is the day of the Go-Go and not the squares.

For a party that has done so little to promote and keep the liberty and the freedom of the individual the party that is for every means of compulsion that you can ask, oh yes, the party that exactly treat the individual with no freedom at all, and this party is going to come and tell us all of a sudden that this is right - that this we should have, there's nobody - and we're being criticized, we are told "Who are you", "Who are you" to come in and say you are going to be a censor, to suggest that there should be censorship. Well who are we to do anything in this House, who are we to decide on anything; just because we are elected we do not become authorities on everything. We do not become authorities on anything we have a responsibility to do; we have a responsibility toward the youth of this nation and this responsibility not only in materialistic things. For some people this is the only thing in the world, others believe something else. Remember that we are dealing with universities now, this was one of the subjects, we are dealing with people that are receiving public funds. Regardless of what these people on my left will tell me, I have a right, I have a duty to look into this. And we are told, well all right, I will not allow these things at home. Well the university is the home of a lot of people. And liberty and freedom ceases to be freedom and liberty when you encroach on the freedom and liberty of the other people. I think that everybody has a right to live in an atmosphere, a good atmosphere when they go to university and I think that there's a right, these people that are so much in favour of strike. My Honourable friend that spoke, my honourable colleague here is suggesting just this, is strike, a strike of a certain group of people that are fed up with this kind of thing that say go easy. This is a strike just as much as any other strike and we are saying that, if these people want to talk, let them go in any hall, let them talk about the subject all they want, but when they are using public funds, we certainly will stand here and criticize this. When they are depriving other people of an atmosphere that they would like, we will criticize this here. I'm sure that we are absolutely right in doing this. Some people feel that you let everybody do anything, no discipline. Why then this anti-hate literature. Why - why? If I don't like a French Canadian or a Jew or anything else why should you tell me to stop? Why should you play God? Why should you censor me -- (Interjection) -- You took another name. I'm not as fortunate of having such a large vocabulary as you, but this is exactly what you meant and I'm just going to bring it on my level, not on yours. I'm sorry I'm not that educated. Now we've had another member, the Member for Wellington, who says I don't believe. Nobody's going to tell me what to do. Nobody's going to tell me what to say; nobody's going to tell me what to read. Then he says, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that nobody - that you don't advertise liquor or tobacco. This is the kind of thinking that we have.

I've been antagonized today. I'm not any purer or virtuous than anybody in this House. I know this is the easy way to say let youth have his day, but we have a responsibility and I don't care how much we're criticized, how much we're designated as "squares" - I think we have a role to play in this, especially when we are dealing with money, with public money and this is - call it discipline, call it anything you want but the Honourable Member for St. John's I'm sure, if his daughter or young son would come in with these words he would give him a little slap somewhere and say I better not hear you say this again. And this is what my honourable friend from Lakeside is doing, slapping those people down because they're not - this is just a small group, a small minority, Sir, that want to exercise their freedom in such a way by robbing the other people maybe, by encroaching on the freedom of others. I resent

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) anyone in here trying to say that I haven't got the right, that I haven't got the duty. I might not do it well, but I'll do it the best way I know how. And the rest of these people too, and if you say you haven't got the right to tell these people, take it easy on this, you haven't got the right to ask the government anything about the Development Fund, you haven't got the right to do a lot of things. Anything that is public government, or public duty, anything that is using public funds, I think that we have a responsibility.

If my friends want to say, well, I'm not too interested in that, this is fine; I'm not going to criticize him in that, this is what he wants. But I don't like him criticizing me for saying, or my friends or other people in this House that have spoken, that are very much afraid of these things, very much afraid, there's something else in life besides dollars and cents. There's an awful lot more. I think that we are probably - not probably I will say certainly that the members on this side, the government and the Liberal Party are certainly doing much more to promote the freedom and liberty of the individual. And then all of a sudden, this is one of the, the only thing - talking about the right to strike and everything for instance when we were talking about this business of censorship or anything like that "let anybody do whatever they want." Where will this stop? Are you advocating that they can do anything they want? Is that discipline? Are we not supposed to say anything when they are laughing at their professors, at the Dean like that? Would you say that I'm right of saying the same thing about Mr. Speaker that these people, these students have said about their Dean? Do you think this would be right? Would you censor me then? I think you'd be the first one, and you'd be right. Therefore I think that we certainly have grounds to - my honourable friend - I wasn't going to take part, in this debate at all. I think that this was a good speech by my honourable friend and also the two members across the aisle and as I say, I think that some of us anyway believe that there's something else besides dollars and cents. I've yet to understand what you people want, what you people want. Like I say with the Honourable Member from Wellington who said, Nobody's going to tell me anything, but I'm going to tell other people what to do. I'd like him to get up and tell me what he means now. Maybe we're not too bright; maybe we'd understand. Maybe we'd agree with you.

But in the meantime, I want to congratulate the Honourable Member from Lakehead and also the Member from Churchill and Brandon. From Lakeside - I always get that wrong. I think they showed courage this afternoon in coming in and making the kind of speech that they have. I hope that this will serve one purpose and I hope that the people at the University level and the young people - we realize the people that are thinking right, the big majority and the large majority of them will stand up and fight against this minority that on the pretext of being free and freedom and so on will encroach on their own. And I think it's time that Legislature get up and tell the people, the professors and so on, Well go ahead, do what you think is right and we will back you. I don't want to see it done as my honourable friend said as in Ontario, when they backed down and said, well, this is what the University wants, this is what you're going to get. They can do whatever they want. We are spending an awful lot of money here and if we haven't got the right to give directive, well, then I'll be one that'll be voting as much as I can against any public funds going to the University, if this is the case. This is the reason why I took part in this debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I do have to get up and say just a couple of words. I'm not taking much time because the Honourable Member for St. Boniface did me the - what should I say - the honour of making mention of a certain stand that I took a year ago and I'm not averse to admitting a mistake. I make no claims for perfection and I don't believe I ever have. I use as an excuse, I have no excuse. But I thought it might be pertinent to the subject to quote a line or two here from a well-known scholar, philosopher, essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson and I hope that the Member for St. Boniface will accept this as my reply to him without direct reference to anything that he may have said about me, but I refer this to myself. It's difficult for people to be completely and 100 percent consistent in everything they say. We may make an error in saying one thing one day and tomorrow contradicting what we said the day before simply because circumstances may seem to be a little bit different from what they are or our understanding of the subject with which we were dealing other than what we thought they were. I am referring here to Ralph Waldo Emerson, whom many people have read and know, and I take the words from an essay that he wrote on Self-reliance where he said - and I take the liberty, Mr.

(MR. PETURRSON cont'd.) Speaker, of reading these words because I haven't committed them to memory. Emerson said, and I like what he said. I hope others may do the same thing because they'll find themselves occasionally in the same situation. He says: "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency, a great soul has simply nothing to do. He may as well concern himself with his shadow on the wall. Speak what you think now in hard words and tomorrow speak what you think again in hard words although it may contradict everything you said today. Ah, so you shall be sure to be misunderstood. Is it so bad then to be misunderstood? Pythagorus was misunderstood, and Socrates and Jesus and Luther and Copernicus and Galileo and Newton and every pure and wise spirit that ever took flesh. To be great is to be misunderstood."

I lay no claims to greatness, Mr. Speaker, but I do feel that on occasion when we appear to be saying things that contradict what we said the day before that this is just a part of ordinary human fallibility. What we do say has to be taken on the face of the things as they are at the present and if they contradict or are too greatly opposed to what we appeared to say before, then that also has to be taken into consideration and we have to face the music. But another reference to Emerson

MR. SPEAKER: . . . accepted the fact that the first piece of poetry was read, but I really must insist that we get back to the subject. I know the mood of the House; I fully realize the mood of the House and all I am endeavouring to do is to get it back where it belongs in dealing with the resolution before the House. And I don't think the poetry has anything to do with it. I think I am being reasonable in interrupting at this time and I would ask the cooperation of the Honourable member.

MR. PETURRSON: . . . ruling, Mr. Speaker. This is not poetry, but nevertheless they are real pearls of wisdom and you don't realize how much the House has missed by not hearing it. Thank you very much.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with you that the debate that has taken place over the last hour has not been confined to the proposition appearing on the Order Paper, namely whether or not there should be set up a committee to consider— a standing committee dealing with the question of education. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that you would agree with me that the debate taking the trend that it has of getting away from the proposition that in all fairness your honour should allow others to take part in the debate on questions not related precisely to the proposition.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry the honourable gentleman has the impression that it was my thoughts to curtail discussion. I think I have done exactly the opposite and I'm asking now for the cooperation of the House and members that may speak to this particular subject and that is all.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, please, Mr. Speaker, - I think you are misinterpreting the intent of my remarks. My remarks are only simply that I should be allowed as a member of the committee to make some contribution, if indeed it will be a contribution, to the debate that has taken place, now that it's off the straight and narrow and I appreciate the fact Your Honour, that you are being eminently fair in your admonition to the members of the House, that we are away really from the main resolution, but I'm sure Your Honour, in all due respect, would allow me as the Leader of my group to make some contribution and to rebut, if I can rebut, some of the accusations that have been levelled against my group by certain members in the House, and I am sure that you will do it.

I first of all follow the example of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, and not Lakehead, in a quotation -- (Interjection) -- yes, I'm smarter than my constituent, I'm a lot smarter I think than my constituent. But may I use the same book that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside used I believe this morning and use a quotation: "He who is without sin, let him cast the first stone." And there is to me, threaded in the debate that has taken place on this resolution, a lot of stone casting from those, in my opinion, who should not be casting stones.

I reject completely the accusation of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that our Party has, because we are socialists, evaded our responsibilities in the field of censorship. -- (Interjection) -- You didn't say it? I wonder if the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie would come over into his proper seat if he wishes to interfere with my remarks.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're not God here either.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I'm not God here, Mr. Speaker. I've never presumed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable gentleman if he has something to say to address the Chair, and from his own seat. I ask the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party to continue.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my honourable friend, the Member for St. Boniface, that contrary to his last remarks, I do not consider myself as being a god or God. I do consider myself to be a responsible individual within the community. I consider that all members of my Party are responsible individuals and I give them the right, as indeed I think everybody else should give them the right, to the freedom of the expression of their opinions, and as I listened to my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface he would deny them of that right because he doesn't agree with them.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is not true at all. I never stated that at all. It's the Honourable Member for St. John's that denied the right to my colleague, if anything.

MR. SPEAKER: We're in a considerable mix-up. I'll try and keep it straight to the best of my ability. With a view to concluding it at an early hour maybe the Leader of the New Democratic Party would continue without any interruption.

MR. PAULLEY: I imagine, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be rather difficult for you or for me at this stage in this afternoon's proceedings to restrain my honourable constituent, the Member for St. Boniface. I can appreciate your difficulty, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that you'll appreciate mine as well.

But I want to say to this House that if members of this particular group express their opinions on censorship, they are doing it as individuals, and for my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface to talk of our group or that group and associate all of the remarks regarding censorship with the political party that I happen to have the honour to lead is erroneous and it is not based on any fact or foundation.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, the other day we did have a bit of a discussion when we were considering estimates of one department on the question of censorship and I questioned whether or not the Censor Board of Manitoba were performing any useful function. Some other members of my group took part in it. The Honourable Member for Elmwood who was here disagreed with some of the contentions that were made by my other colleagues. I don't agree personally with the type of censorship that the Honourable Member for Brandon would impose on the community. I think that our students in our universities surely are intelligent enough to discern between what is right and what is wrong. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if as a result of their years in school and in university, they individually can't make up their own minds, why should we in this House impose censorship upon them? And what is censorship? And what is the relationship of morals to censorship? Would not my honourable friend the Member for Brandon agree with me, that the question of morals and what is moral and what is immoral has changed over the years?

I wonder if my honourable friend the Member for Brandon would go back a few years and consider what the thoughts would be at the time that he was in school if girls were running around in mini skirts like they do today? He would have said that that was immoral. Does he today? And I would suggest that he doesn't. So what is morality and what is censorship? There are some of our magistrates in our courts who today, because some individual wears his hair down to his shoulders think that he's immoral, that he's not a proper part of the community, and yet history shows that such is not the case, that Einstein, yes indeed Christ, had hair down to their shoulders. So I say to my honourable friend from Brandon, I say to my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, what is the basis of censorship and morality? And have not different people — (Interjection) — and the church, yes. And I might say seeing as my honourable friend has mentioned the church, I'm a staunch adherer to the principles of the Christian church and an active participant in it, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the church attempted to censor me as to what I can read and what I cannot read, I would have to take a second look as to whether or not I should continue. And when I say that I'm an active participant in my church, I am, and I adhere to the principles of my church, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in no instance, in any of the documents of my church, can I find the rules of censorship that have been suggested that we should adhere to in this House this afternoon. Yes, we have moral codes; yes we have an overall philosophy and policy, but, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to my honourable friends, and particularly my constituent from St. Boniface, that the church changes its approach just as we should change

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) our approaches, and if my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside finds disfavour with the Uniter, and I read the article too, and when I read it, I said "What a bunch of tripe and piffel" and threw it in the garbage can, where it should have been thrown. I don't think it's a big issue. I also read the articles that my honourable friend referred to in the Manitoban from back last November and I questioned it in my mind and I put it where I thought it deserved to go - into the garbage can. I think that one of the privileges that we have in a democracy, in a relative free society, is the opportunity of throwing in the garbage cans or other receptacles stuff that we don't want to read or what we don't want to look at.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I reject the contention first of all, of my friend from St. Boniface that because some of my colleagues have spoken the way they have, that this is essentially a political party approach, or a socialist approach. Lord there's more censorship coming at the present time from members opposite particularly in respect to the Manitoba Development Fund than we would have in other areas -- (Interjection) -- and my friend rejects that, rejects the censorship in that case.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface didn't mean what he said.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh I'm sure he did, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: So am I.

MR. PAULLEY: You see one thing I like about my honourable friend from St. Boniface, he sometimes - no I won't. He sometimes disagrees with me and -- (Interjection) -- pardon? No not really, Mr. Speaker. No I understand my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface. I think, Mr. Speaker, I give to him something possibly at times he may not give to me. I forgive him, for he knows not what he does. And if in that I am acting as one who is up in the clouds, I'm sure my honourable friend will forgive me.

But, again, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the debate this afternoon that has taken place has strayed far and wide from the proposition as to whether we should have a standing committee on education or not, but having had this discussion I think it is all to the well. I suggest that the Honourable Member for Lakeside had the right to stand up -- (Interjection) -- yes I'm learning. At least I think I know what constituencies my own members come from, without having been prompted by others.

MR. DESJARDINS: You haven't got too many, that might be why.

MR. PAULLEY: Well that could well be. And you may not have very many after the next general election yourself.

MR. DESJARDINS: Don't hold your breath; don't hold your breath.

MR. PAULLEY: Really, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for Lakeside introduced the subject matter this afternoon by reading the Uniter, by reading the Manitoban. I give him the right to do it and I suggest, I suggest that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface should give the rest of the Members of the House the right to do it without the political connotation that because some individual members speak this way, that it reflects completely and wholly on the political party of the representative.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I just want to correct my honourable friend that I did not read the articles from either of the papers of which I complained.

MR. PAULLEY: I accept the point raised by my honourable friend. He referred to articles that appeared in the Uniter and also the Manitoban.

MR. CAMPBELL: I didn't read them.

MR. PAULLEY: You didn't read them, no. I accept that from my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a lot this afternoon to the discussion of this particular resolution that is before us on setting up a committee under the Department of Education and I would have to endorse what some of the honourable members have said, especially the Member for Lakeside. I feel that there is too much trash coming out of our universities through these publications. And when the Leader of the New Democratic Party says to just throw it in the garbage can and that's it, I think it's not quite a simple matter as all that, because a lot of parents throughout the province have a great concern for the situation that we have today in Manitoba and hesitate to send their students to university when we have the things going on that are going on at the present time. And I want to

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) include myself in this group because I too have youngsters who are at the age where they are going to go to university and am I going to send them to the university and be subjected to all this that is going on there? Parents are very hesitant on this point and I think it would only be proper if we had such a committee that would question the commission that is being set up of the various universities as to what are we spending our money on, what is the money going for and what are we allowing to happen? I think these questions are important and that we should have a committee of this type, who would go into these matters and discuss the problems that are before us.

The question immediately arises; do you consider your own children to be brought up in such a way that they are weak and cannot withstand these problems? I for one feel that I have brought up my family in such a way that I think they can withstand these pressures and so on; but this doesn't mean that I want to subject them to this and I think here is the crux of the situation, that we have a lot of parents in Manitoba today who want to give their children an education; they want to give them a good and decent upbringing at the same time, but they hesitate to subject them to what is going on at their universities today when we hear through these publications about smoking pot and all the different things. So that, Mr. Speaker, we cannot treat this matter too lightly; this is something that we should take very serious and that we should express our concern and that I think can be done through the setting up of a committee and going into this more thoroughly.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the debate be adjourned.

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

I thank the House for having reached the stage of that particular resolution and would suggest that the tolerance shown today I would hope they would not consider a habit.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface; the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, may we allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from LaVerendrye

Whereas the constant increase in costs of government and the constant increase in taxes are of major concern to the people of Manitoba, and

Whereas every practical step possible must be taken by the Manitoba Government to ensure the maximum efficiency in government operations, and

Whereas the appointment of an independent Auditor-General in other jurisdictions has proven of great benefit in showing up waste and inefficiency in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer,

Therefore be it resolved that the Manitoba Government consider the advisability of establishing the office of an independent Auditor-General to be appointed by and responsible to the Manitoba Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that as a watchdog of Public Accounts, the Auditor-General could do a great service to the people of Manitoba and conceivably save them millions of dollars. Now I envision the job or the duties of an Auditor-General as a watchdog of Public Accounts. He would be accounting for all public money, he would confirm that money has been spent for the purpose for which it was appropriated by this Chamber and he would have, I think, one of the most important things that he would be able to do for us, would have access to the Manitoba Development Fund, and he would of course report annually to this Chamber.

Now I know that we have a Comptroller-General and I must say at this time that he is doing an excellent job, but I think that I should point out that he cannot point out any bad

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.) judgment on the part of the government. He is more like a chief accountant. I understand he audits the budget and he passes on all expenditures each day and of course he makes the payments -- and I guess when he makes the payments, it must be a hurried day-to-day process, because I am sure that he can't check everyone of them.

Now another thing that the - in comparing these two jobs - the Comptroller-General cannot audit his own forecast, nor does he prepare any analysis of his accounts. The only thing the Comptroller-General actually does is make sure that the government money is being spent in accordance with the budget. However, as I pointed out before, he cannot point out any bad judgment on the part of the government, nor is he involved presently in the Manitoba Development Fund. I know that in the past those on the other side will try and confuse the issue and say that it is not necessary to have an Auditor-General because the Comptroller-General is already doing the same job. But this is not true. As I pointed out earlier there is no duplication of the two jobs. Others will say, too, that it's like closing the barn door - I believe the Member for St. James said that last year - closing the barn door after the cow has gone out. Well, this is partly true; in many cases it is partly true, but spot checks are made after incidents do occur and I'm sure that the same mistakes are not made again, and in many cases recovery of funds can be made.

Now I think that there were a couple of examples pointed out here last year that the Auditor-General discovered in Ottawa, and to prove the point where recovery of funds can be made, I think I would like to mention them now. There was an army officer forcibly retired from the Armed Services when they had their integration program started, and he was awarded a \$964.00 a year pension. Now I imagine in the space of 40 years, if this man lived long enough, it would have amounted to in excess of \$40,000.00. Well, this mistake was spotted by the Auditor-General and of course the pension was cancelled.

Then there was another thing that happened in 1958. It was discovered that the 1957 federal election cost the taxpayers \$6,800,000, and in 1958 there was a change of government and there was another election. The cost of that election was \$8.7 million, and of course the Auditor-General had only completed 80 percent of his audit when he spotted this. One of the reasons for this large increase of over \$2 million in the elections between one year, was that someone got the bright idea to put policemen on every poll, and of course the Act reads that policemen cannot be used unless they're absolutely necessary or where there's a threat of violence for an election.

But I think one of the things that, in all the years that our party has broached the subject of an Auditor-General, there's one thing that has not been mentioned, and this is the fact that the Auditor-General would have access to the Manitoba Development Fund. He could inform this Chamber if there were some bad loans made, or dispel the rumours of bad loans, I should say, or bad judgment made in the Manitoba Development Fund. As everyone here knows, secrecy breeds rumours, because we know that if a group are trying to keep a secret everybody wants to know what's going on so they start stories about what's going on. And I think this is one of the bad features of the Manitoba Development Fund. I'm not suggesting for a minute there's anything wrong inside of it, but I am suggesting that if we had an Auditor-General he most certainly could assure this House that there wasn't anything wrong.

I think that the step that the Cabinet have taken in so much as they will be reviewing the Manitoba Development loans every so often is a step in the right direction, but to my mind it's a very, very small step and it's an improper step in so much as that if I have someone in my constituency that feels that they have had a bad deal from the Manitoba Development Fund, they have the right to come to me and I can take them to the Cabinet and we can have a review of the loan. Now right away the secrecy is gone. Now I know, too, that the government in the past has said that banks do not disclose the moneys that they lend to various people, but I think that I should point out that when I deposit my money in the bank I have the right to deposit it in whatever bank I want. If I don't want to put it in the bank that's fine, but in the case of the Manitoba Development Fund every taxpayer of Manitoba contributes to that Fund and he has the right to know what is going on, and I feel that the Auditor-General could help this.

I can only repeat that secrecy does breed rumours. Nova Scotia right now has the very same system as us and I think it's outlined very much the same as us, and they're under very heavy criticism for the very reason that our Manitoba Development Fund is under heavy

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.) criticism, because it's secret. There's no access to the files by the Members of the House or access to any of the information from it. Ontario has a fund very much like Manitoba's, or maybe I should say Manitoba has a fund very much like Ontario has, but the policy is open in the fund and there is very very little criticism about the Ontario Fund. Once again I repeat, if we had an Auditor-General he would have access to the Manitoba Development Fund and I'm sure that he would dispel all the rumours we hear. I'm sure that all the controversy about The Pas could have been avoided had we had somebody as an Auditor-General reporting to this House. He could have allayed our fears that there's nothing wrong. And I believe that if we're sincere about saving money, such as the new Premier has said, that he wants to cut taxes, save the Manitoba taxpayer dollars, cut expenditures etc. etc., that the Auditor-General could very well assist every Manitoban and assist the Premier in doing exactly what he says he wants to do. So I believe that if the Premier and the people on the other side are sincere, that they will adopt this resolution. And I want to repeat, I think one of the most important things about the Auditor-General for Manitoba would be the fact that he would have access to the Manitoba Development Fund and dispel the rumours of the Fund and all the bad criticisms that we hear in regard to the Manitoba Development Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the debate be now adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in light of the hour and because most of the resolution would have to be initiated, perhaps the House would be agreeable to calling it 5:30. If that is agreed, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.