

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, May 10th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motions

Introduction of Bills.

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 43 Grade 12 students from Rolla, North Dakota, a senior class under the direction of Mr. There are also 30 Grade 5 students from Polson School under the direction of Miss Edwards. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Kildonan; and some 25 Grade 8 students from Edmund Partridge School under the direction of Miss Murray. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all Members of this Legislative Assembly I welcome you.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House a copy of a study of hospital facilities and services for the chronically ill.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House Returns to Orders of the House Nos. 6 and 7 on the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before we get into the business of the day, I should like to inform the House that certain amendments are being prepared with respect to Bill 110, the bill on members' pensions which may render it a little more acceptable to some who have objected to the contents of the bill so far. Those amendments are not ready for distribution to the House at the present time. It will be a little while yet, so I think that we should take one of two courses. Perhaps if we go into the committee we could proceed with the other bills that are before the committee until the amendments are ready, or if that should not be deemed advisable then we can proceed with the other business on the Order Paper and get along with it. I'd just like to solicit the opinion of the House on this matter.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I think that insofar as our group is concerned, we would be prepared to go on with the other items of business if the government so wish, but on the clear understanding of course that we will be returning to Bill 110 and that it will be entitled to all the debate that will be required and that there will be no attempt whatever to invoke closure or to restrict the debate on Bill 110.

MR. ROBLIN: No, there's not going to be any attempt to invoke closure, Madam Speaker. Is my honourable friend willing to go into the committee and consider the other bills in the committee and leave 110 until we get our amendments?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, on the understanding that we'll come back to 110.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes. Fine. That's satisfactory?

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Orders of the Day though, I think there might be a further question, Madam Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. I asked him last week about the possibility of having another section added on to the Kelsey, that is another unit, and he took the question as notice. I wonder if he has anything further to report regarding the expansion of the Kelsey Station.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I just got the information this morning on it. The future planning committee of the Hydro is looking at all problems of expansion and in that plan they also include Kelsey, but at the moment there is nothing specific for any additional capacity being built at Kelsey.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Chairman, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer. Could he clarify the situation regarding tax on Indians. I've had some complaints from Indians in my constituency regarding the tax on Hydro and telephones. They feel that because they're treaty that they're exempted from paying a tax on the same basis that if they are employed on the reserve, they don't have to pay income tax. I'd just like the Minister to clarify that if he would.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I'd better take that question as notice, Madam Speaker, because there may be angles to it that I'm not acquainted with.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day. I would like to direct a question to someone who's responsible for the Order Paper. On the adjourned debate on Page 3, the second one there listed on the proposed resolution of Mr. Vielfaure, this has been standing in my name for about two or three weeks and now I see that there's no name after it. I refer you to the Order Paper of Thursday last. It was standing in my name at that date and I hope that it still remains adjourned in my name.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, I think perhaps I may reply to this. I, too, noticed this omission and we'll see that the honourable gentleman's name is reinstated in its proper place.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day if I may, I noticed that a large sheaf of papers has come on the desk of the Provincial Secretary. Would those be the amendments that we're waiting for.

MR. ROBLIN: Not yet.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I've been asked regarding the Racing Commission bill which has now passed. Is he ready to make an announcement who the members of the commission will be?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Not yet, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister, because there appeared to be a statement made the other day, not as I recall it officially, but unofficially here across the floor, that the Orders for Returns that are going in, if the answers are not ready by the end of this session that they will not be submitted to us either in between session or automatically at the next House and I would like to inquire if that is so.

MR. ROBLIN: Checking the rules on this point, Madam Speaker, and as far as I am able to ascertain that when the House dies the questions die too because the questions are really questions in the House rather than otherwise, so that technically speaking I think those questions are finished and should be asked again on the next occasion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the point is that at the last session, on the last day of the session, I had been expecting a certain debate to come up and the debate wasn't coming up, so I proceeded to ask a series of questions, 36 of them to be exact. That was on the Thursday I believe, 27th of August. This was an Order of the House for a Return and the Return was accepted. The House was adjourned or prorogued that night. The following morning the Premier was good enough to send me my reply to the questions by private mail, and I would think that having established this precedent that we would have the same thing in regards to any questions that will be outstanding at the end of this session.

MR. ROBLIN: My impression at the time is, Madam Speaker, that that was a special occasion because I think we were under the circumstances as my recollection is, that we undertook to give those answers regardless.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, on this point of order, the other day when the matter arose I suggested that as a matter of courtesy that this was done in the past. However, since that time I've had an opportunity of reading Beuchesne -- and I must confess, Madam Speaker, that I haven't once again got back to the section -- and discovered the section in Beuchesne which deals with this question as to Orders of Return and Papers that are requested and according to my reading of Beuchesne, Orders for Return and Address for Papers do not die on the adjournment of the House, but do carry forward to the next session, and in the precedents and annotations in the section with which I considered it even mentioned, Madam Speaker, that some Orders for Return or Address for Papers were not produced until some considerable number of years had passed by from the original time of asking, and I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that you may take a check through Beuchesne in this respect. Again I apologize because I have not the particular citation before me at the present time, but I think that if the Honourable the First Minister, Madam Speaker, and yourself would just take a look at Beuchesne, because we haven't any rule in our little red book covering this, you will find and he will find that there is reference to this that is contrary to the opinion that I had and that which has just been expressed by the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Madam Chairman, I think the point is well worth looking into. I believe that the point is covered in the Federal Legislature by a Standing Order. In other words, it is part of their rules definitely. Now whether under those circumstances it should be considered as a rule here or not is something which I'm in doubt about. If Madam Speaker would be willing I would suggest that we refer the problem to her and she could consider it and whatever advice she has to offer on the subject would certainly be agreeable to me and we can get the matter settled in that way. So, Madam Speaker, perhaps if you'd be kind enough to take this matter under consideration we could have the matter clarified in due course.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will take it under consideration and I will report to the House as soon as possible. The Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the - shall I read them - the bills standing on the Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may be granted the privilege on the question that was just before the House dealing with nullifying Orders for Return on prorogation, may I suggest to Madam Speaker on her way out and also the First Minister that they may take a look at Page 315 in the fourth edition of Beauchesne, being Chapter 14 which spells out the Standing Order on Orders for Return. It might assist in this matter.

Bill No. 93: Sections 1 and 2 were read and passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this bill, I did ask a question the other day of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Dealing with this bill, in view of the fact that there's no retroactivity apparently on this bill of assessments made previous to this bill, whether individuals concerned may have some recourse of appeal either to the Municipal Board or take civil action for recouping their expense. I wonder if the Honourable the Minister has any comment now to make on this bill.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, my understanding of this bill is that it would ratify everything that had been done by the City of Brandon up to and including the levy of taxes, and frontage tax particularly in this year. There would be no remedy left to anyone, if this bill is passed, to go back and open up this matter. As I explained to the House on previous occasions I think it would be an impossible thing to try and sort out, because some of these matters do go back 13 years and the persons who were owners of property 13 years ago no longer live in the City of Brandon, and in many cases we don't know where they are or where they might be found.

The amounts involved generally speaking are not large sums. They are quite small sums. In one or two cases the sums amounted to a substantial amount and those were the cases where appeals were made to the Court of Revision and where appeals have been made to the Court of Revision, usually they have been looked after, and in this particular instance arises out of the fact that an appeal was made to the Court of Revision by a man who was an engineer and who was able to point out to the city that their procedure in the past not only had been wrong, and the city didn't even recognize this at the Court of Revision, they still thought they were right, but he also pointed out to them that their procedure on certain by-laws had not been correct and this bill is intended to correct the errors of omission in the past. Also because of the notice that was given to us, by this engineer, the person who objected, we have gone back over their procedure and have shown to the city where they had been in error in the past and where they could evolve a much fairer system of assessing frontage tax in the future and this has been corrected.

I think the City of Brandon and the ratepayers of Brandon, certainly all those who own irregularly shaped properties, owe a debt to the gentleman who has raised this issue and we do here, because we are able to correct the situation which, if it had gone uncorrected and unchallenged, might have lasted in the City of Brandon for many more years to come. I think, however, it would be impossible for us to evolve a situation that would allow people to go back now and open up a situation that they couldn't ordinarily, assuming that the by-laws had gone

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd). through the proper formalities and been properly passed. If these people had made no objection to the Court of Revision, then they couldn't subsequently come back and object to the city and all we are doing now is saying that for the past errors we're not going to open that up, we're going to ratify the procedure on the by-laws which in some cases were incorrect. So they've all been listed, some twenty by-laws if memory serves correctly, and there will be no feature or no possibility now of people coming back to question a tax that was levied in the past and there will be no remedy for taxes that have already been paid.

MR. PAULLEY: I can appreciate this, as the Minister has outlined, of parcels of property for which no appeal had been entered into. Do I understand from my honourable friend, however, that irrespective of whether appeals had been made to the Municipal Board -- and of course I'm dealing with the same individual that my honourable friend spoke of -- that he too has no recourse to further appeal either in the courts in view of the fact that he did state his case before the appeal board.

MR. SMELLIE: I don't think that this bill is intended to affect any case that is already the subject of an appeal but anything that has not been appealed in the ordinary way could not be raised.

The remainder of Bill No. 93 and Bills Nos. 125, 126, 128, 129 and 131 were read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 132: Sections 1 to 10 were read and passed.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, in Section 11 there's a typographical error. In the first line the word "is" should be "it", so it would read "this Act comes into force on the date it receives Royal assent."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that the word "is" be replaced by the word "it" in the first line of new Section 11.

The remainder of Bill No. 132 and Bill No. 133 were read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 134: Sections 1 to 3(b) were read and passed.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, 3 - subsection 3. May I ask the sponsor of the bill, while this is incorporated, why the Lutheran World Relief which I think is a very fine good thing -- is that confined strictly to the Lutheran, or any other needy religion can participate? Can anybody answer please?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it's a little bit difficult for him to answer. But the purpose of this organization is to act as a charitable institution. And I believe that includes more than just Lutherans.

The remainder of Bill No. 134 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 135: Sections 1 to 15 were read and passed.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a general question to the powers that be. There were so many boards and commission - this question was addressed to me by my grandchildren - that they have not seen in the last 25 years, a single time that the Honourable Member of Inkster should write a name or mention or giving a chance to refuse, to act on any board, any commission, that had been appointed here in the last quarter of a century and there were very very many. Now am I an orphan, or am I illiterate or am I not acceptable by any imagination. I wouldn't like to mention it myself. But it seemed to me at this session and previous sessions, commissions and boards and everybody else are being appointed. And they asked me this and I couldn't answer it. I said, "I'll ask the Legislature and then I'll give you my answer."

The remainder of Bill No. 135 and Bills Nos. 136, 137, 138 and 139 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 141.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, we have now reached the stage where we're going to deal with what in my opinion is one of the most important bills to come before this committee or this Legislature for a number of years. That is the bill dealing with the question of shared services in the Province of Manitoba; that is, sharing as between the public school system and the private schools.

At the offset may I say, Mr. Chairman, the other day when the bill was before the House for second reading, after having made a contribution -- or I presume it might have been a contribution to the debate at that time -- I voted in favour of the bill going to second reading for the purposes of hearing representations by citizens of our province who may be concerned, and also because of the fact that during my remarks on second reading of Bill 141 I thought that I

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). had discovered in the legislation itself some weaknesses in the legislation as it was at that time which might be subject to widespread interpretation. I think, Mr. Chairman, that my contention insofar as the necessity of amendments has been substantiated in that in the Committee of Law Amendments changes were made in some of the clauses.

Aside from that, Mr. Chairman, by the virtue of the fact that I did vote for second reading, misconceptions have prevailed insofar as the eyes of the public is concerned, in that many people thought that I had changed from my previous position of being in opposition to legislation of this nature, to that of support. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, here and now, that such was not the case and that the only reason that I voted for Bill No. 141 going to Law Amendments Committee was to enable citizens interested to make their representations before the committee. And while I realize, Mr. Chairman, it might not be possible at this stage to have the same coverage given to my position as was given through the media of the press, radio and TV, which indicated that I had changed my opinion, I nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, want to establish insofar as the record of this committee is concerned, that my position was not altered and that I am still of the opinion that we in this House should not proceed with Bill No. 141. I take this position, Mr. Chairman, because I am convinced, notwithstanding comments of other honourable members including the First Minister of this House to the contrary, I am convinced that by the passing of this legislation we will be undermining the whole public school system in the Province of Manitoba.

I had the opportunity, along with eight other members of this Legislature, to hear representations over a period I believe extending beyond a year, of people interested in education. Also, Mr. Chairman, the other night, or Friday afternoon and Friday evening, we heard further representations and they did not alter my opinion one iota that nobody be they supporter of - they call it - the preservation of the public school system in Manitoba, or supporters of the private or parochial schools, will be satisfied with this legislation. And why? Those who are avid supporters, and I give them every right to be avid supporters, that the private schools should receive measures of public support, are not satisfied. They told us when they appeared before the committee, that is the committee considering shared services, that until such time as they have full public support for the parochial schools they will not be satisfied. We had those who are interested in what they call the preservation of the public school system tell us that this bill, in their opinion, undermines the public school system of the Province of Manitoba.

I made a suggestion a week ago or thereabouts that this legislation was ill-conceived, that this legislation was introduced into this House without proper consideration and only introduced at the tailend of the session. I must frankly confess, Mr. Chairman, that at that particular time when I was speaking we anticipated the session might have ended at the end of last week, but such is not the case. Because there has been a debate on another bill that, in the opinion of many, was likewise introduced into this House in the dying sittings of this session. But I say, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the other bill, this is particularly so insofar as Bill 141 is concerned. While I may be receiving some criticisms insofar as my stand on the other bill, I am prepared to accept them. I know that I will be criticized because of my stand on Bill 141 and am prepared to accept that criticism as well.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the government, despite the representations made to the committee during its hearings before the report was compiled by the government after the deliberations of that committee, that the government would be well advised not to proceed with Bill 141. In saying this, Mr. Chairman, I realize that the government is in a very peculiar, indeed may I say even a precarious situation respecting this bill for we on this side of the House, the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party, have had the opportunity as individual members of our respective caucuses of stating our individual positions. It is true and very evident that as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, that their caucus has been -- or maybe I shouldn't say caucus but their group in this House -- are split insofar as their opinions are concerned. It is equally true, Mr. Chairman, that insofar as my party is concerned we are not unanimous in our opinions but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that with the exception of two members who have always stated their particular individual position, that this same freedom of action has not prevailed insofar as the government is concerned.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, it would be in order for me to point to the individual members of the government and say, "Where standest thou?" I do however think, and I am of the opinion, that there are at least some members in the government caucus, if they had the same opportunity that members of my group have, and that members of the Liberal group have of voting for this bill on their individual personal principles or assessment of this bill, would

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)not be voting the way they are.

During the deliberations of Friday last members of the Winnipeg School Board, the Chairman of the Winnipeg School Board, appeared before the committee and after due questioning agreed that the contents of the bill passed the onus from this House, from this government onto them as to whether or not agreements would be entered into between the public school board and the private school boards. I think, Mr. Chairman, those members of this House that had the opportunity of listening on Friday could not be impressed otherwise than by this fact, and they agreed that this would be the case.

I want to ask the Honourable Minister of Education and also the First Minister, what sort of a position are you putting the School Board of Winnipeg into when you say to them in effect, as the bill now reads, "to enter into an agreement, subject to the approval of the Minister as to whether or not some system of shared services should be invoked." What is the position, Mr. Chairman, of the Winnipeg School Board going to be, because they cover so many students and have within the confines of their school districts so many different groups who are operating private schools. Mr. Chairman, imagine what the situation might be insofar as providing shared services in the City of Winnipeg will be if, say for instance, in some sections of Fort Rouge an agreement can be entered into between one private or parochial school because of the fact that in the public school system there is room for accommodation for some of the students on a shared services basis with the private school. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, what the situation would be in other areas of Winnipeg where the situation is not the same and that there are no facilities for the accommodation of these students. In one case, the Winnipeg School Board may say, well now we have some facilities here that we can share with the parochial or private school. So they enter into an agreement and Mr. Chairman, it's a fact that insofar as the private schools are concerned, by and large, they're each individual corporations, so an agreement can be entered into in one sector of Winnipeg for some pupils; in another sector of Winnipeg with like private schools the Winnipeg School Board may be in a position where they say we cannot enter into agreement because we can't accommodate you. What position, Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this bill, does this place the Winnipeg School Board in? So I say, that what is happening in this bill is the government of Manitoba, the supporters also outside of government of this bill, are shifting their responsibility to school boards, be they in the City of Winnipeg or anywhere else, and I say that this is not fair, even if one were to agree with the principle involved in this instance, which I do not agree with.

I say I do not agree, Mr. Chairman, not with any bigoted or biased approach but after due consideration of all the ramifications of the proposition that we have before us.

I appreciate very much that the Honourable the Minister of Education has spelled out to some degree in the amendments to the legislation, the possibility of misinterpretation that was in the original Act but the basic concept is still the same, Mr. Chairman. I say to the Government of Manitoba, it is not yet too late to accept the suggestion that I made earlier to withdraw this bill to consider the whole matter once again. One of my colleagues the other day, speaking in this bill, suggested that it might be acceptable if textbooks were offered, and possibly transportation, without the other aspects of the bill. This has never been considered in isolation by the government or this House. I suggested the other day that because of the growth of the ecumenical approach, which is apparent throughout the globe today, that maybe now is the time for Manitoba to take part in this ecumenical movement and endeavour to so form the base of our public school system that it might be acceptable to those who at the present time feel that within the confines of the public school that their children are not receiving the type of education that they are desirous of.

We know, Mr. Chairman, we know that only last fall or was it this year, that one of the separate schools in the City of St. Boniface, Precious Blood I believe it was, agreed to allow their school to come under the orbit of the public school system in Norwood. How much thought has the government given to expanding this approach between the separate schools and the public schools? None that I'm aware of, because this matter was never before the committee. So I say as far as the hearings of the committee were concerned, no one was satisfied. After a full day in the committee on Friday, no one is satisfied. I appreciate very much that on Friday evening the First Minister gave us a very impassioned appeal to "suffer little children to come unto us" or something of that nature. I say to my honourable friend, the First Minister, suffer us a little time to consider the full significance of this matter. I say to my honourable friend the First Minister that a previous government of Conservative

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). persuasion erected a monument in Manitoba in which we are seated at the present time; it has withstood time. It is still here because it was built on a firm foundation. I hesitate to say to my honourable friend that the builders of the public school system also thought that they were building it on a firm foundation, but by comparison of the former Conservative administration, building this building with a firm foundation, I say to the government of today that if they pursue this bill, if they continue with this bill, that firm foundation of the public school system that's a monument to the government of today, will be an edifice with its foundation crumbling as a result of this legislation.

We heard the other day an impassioned appeal from the Leader of the Opposition dealing with another bill. "Let's not be hasty," he said, "let's not ram it down the throats of members." I have stated I am not prepared to accept this bill. It is not too late to reconsider. "Let us," - in that debate the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said, "let us be sure that what we are doing is the right thing for Manitoba." I say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, his sentiments were correct. They're correct in this bill too, Mr. Chairman.

While it's not for me to criticise any individual as such, not many members of this House have taken part in this debate, only about 4 or 5 Liberals of 13, about 4 or 5 too of the New Democratic Party; only 5 members, if memory serves me correctly, of the government, two of whom have been in opposition. So I say to you members of this Assembly, this is not good enough. I'm informed that even as I am speaking now efforts are being made by some groups at least in Manitoba to band their forces together in an appeal even at this late stage, to the government, to the Legislature, not to proceed with this bill.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, many of the things that I have been saying here this afternoon I have said before but I want to reiterate my personal opinion insofar as this bill is concerned. I want to appeal to the First Minister and members of the government not to proceed with this bill, which satisfies no one. I have given due credit, in my other contributions to this debate, to the Honourable the First Minister, for his efforts for trying to resolve the problem that we have had here in Manitoba since 1890. Mr. Chairman, this problem cannot be resolved by the method that is being taken at the present time. This problem that has been with us for 75 years cannot be resolved in a week of discussion on a bill that has now been introduced by this government.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether it is in order for me to say to members of this House as individuals, be they supporters of the government or not, to stand up and to be counted on an individual basis of principle and not under the yoke or the whip. I do not think that anyone in this province would object if individual members did as I suggest. I appreciate the position of many members who have taken part in this debate. I appreciate the approach to this whole problem should be on an individual basis rather than a party basis and we have talked about this. We have talked, Mr. Chairman, in the past in informal discussions on this matter, that it should be beyond all political consideration but on the basis of the highest level of statesmanship. I have agreed with this all the way along the line, indeed, Mr. Chairman, at one stage I suggested that as far as an individual member of this House is concerned I was prepared to allow a Cabinet Minister of the government to introduce this resolution and if it were defeated, as I am sure that it would be on an individual basis, not to call for the resignation of the government. My suggestion, my plea, was not accepted. So I say, Mr. Chairman, even at this last stage the government should withdraw Bill 141. The individual members of this House, be they Liberal, Conservative, New Democrats or indeed Social Credit, should be given the opportunity of freedom of choice, which I suspect that they have not.

One other aspect of this bill, Mr. Chairman, no one to my knowledge has indicated anything dealing with cost factor; no one has indicated how exactly this will operate. The Honourable the Minister of Education, if I recall correctly on one occasion did say: well there's some money in the Department of Education estimates, we'll find some place where we'll find some money to start and then by way of supplemental estimates, we can get the balance of the money that we require. We do not know what we're voting on insofar as the financial aspects are concerned. We do, however, know, Mr. Chairman, at least some of us know, some of us are convinced that this vitally important matter has not been given the study, the consideration that it should have been given.

So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the position, which is indeed the same position that I have taken in this House throughout, that I cannot support Bill No. 141. And

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). if the torrents of scorn and disappointment fall upon me because of this stand, I take the consequences. If this be my last opportunity to be in this Assembly, because of the stand I take, I take it because I believe that I am doing the right thing so far as education is concerned in the Province of Manitoba. The decision is mine as an individual. I have explained to this House why my opinions on this bill are not necessarily those of my party. And if perchance, insofar as my position as Leader of the New Democratic Party is concerned, that my members in the party feel that the stand that I am taking today is incorrect I am prepared to accept their decision as indeed I am to accept the decision of the electorate.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I say the time is not yet, as far as education in Manitoba is concerned, for the adoption of Bill 141 and I appeal to all members of this Assembly to look once again, to think the matter through once again, and join me in having more consideration given to the subject matter of Bill 141.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think that I would like to say a word or two in addition to what has already been said by the honourable member who has just taken his seat.

First of all let me say that I fully respect his right to say what he has said, and to take the position that he has taken, and I think that other people besides me will also respect him for the purity of his intentions and the sincerity of the view that he puts forward. And I would not like to think that he is in any danger of being misunderstood by people inside this House or outside it, but that he should be given credit for an honest expression on his view, and I for one, certainly am willing to accord him with all willingness the credit for his sincerity of intention in all his contributions to this discussion. And I do not believe that people inside this House or outside this House will penalize him because he has the candor to state his view as he has done.

I shall not speak long because I doubt if there's much that can be added to the debate that has already taken place on this subject, because in this I do disagree with him. I think that there has been a very full debate on the whole of this topic, not just recently but in the past months and years. One point, however, I would still like to make and that is that I do not believe that this bill that is before the House now can be considered as a solution of the Manitoba school question. We have consistently taken the view that that is quite another problem than the one that we are discussing now. And, as far as I can see, that particular problem remains exactly where it has been and that is among those issues which we are not able to deal with in this province at the present time. Therefore I say that this measure should not be considered - and I think is not considered by anybody - as a solution to the Manitoba school question. It's quite another question; it's a much different question and it is not dealt with, in my view, in the measure that is before us. I merely repeat what I have said when I state that the intent of this measure is to open the door of the public school to those who do not use it now. That's all that it's intended to do, and that's all that I believe it does. And I think that on that basis it can be accepted by those who have diametrically opposing views in connection with the Manitoba school question. I do not believe that this does any harm to the position of the people who support private schools because their position remains unchanged. I do not think that it does harm to the position taken by those who support the public schools because I believe the public school system remains unchanged.

All that is happening here, if this bill is passed, is we allow these pupils that are outside the public school system to use part of the public school facilities, if they want to do so. So that my honourable friend and I are on different footing, so to speak, when we approach this problem because he obviously looks upon it as a measure intended to solve or to deal with the Manitoba school question and that it will please or displease people insofar as it deals with that problem, to their satisfaction or not; whereas I take the view that the Manitoba school question remains pretty well where it was - exactly where it was before - and this is a different measure and that it has for its purpose the making of the public school facilities available to those who are now in the private schools, to the extent that they care to use them.

This I think will be a very good thing to do because it may be a step to develop that rapprochement between that meeting of minds, between supporters of the public schools and supporters of the private schools, that my honourable friend I believe is earnestly seeking when he expresses his wish for development of the ecumenical spirit in this whole area. I too wish for the same development, and I think that the only contribution that this may make toward the Manitoba school question is if it does in some measure help to facilitate the development of that ecumenical spirit, that new approach to these vexatious problems that have been with us for so long.

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd).

With respect to the bill itself, there really are three parts to it as far as its practical implementation are concerned. One has to do with transportation; one has to do with books; and the other has to do with the rest of the school services. I do not think that any problems arise of an administrative nature or that impose undue burdens on the public school boards in connection with textbooks and transportation. It seems to me both those parts of the bill may be proceeded with in the expectation that they will readily lend themselves to implementation without placing any undue burden on anyone or without inducing any differences of opinion at the local level which might be thought to be harmful.

With respect to the more difficult part of this bill, namely, the paragraph that has to do with the other services that may be shared, I think that in that area we have to take a somewhat different approach to its implementation than we take with respect to textbooks and with respect to transportation. And the approach that I envisage as being one that will solve the problems that worry some people, is that before that particular section of the bill is proclaimed that there should be a meeting of minds; that there should be a master agreement drawn up between the private schools and the public school boards with respect to that section of the bill and it would be the intention of the government to take the initiative, to lend its services, to take part in the meetings that should be held between the parochial and private school people and the public school people, in order to hammer out an agreement that will be suitable under all the circumstances and which will avoid that danger of local differences of opinion on this subject, which worry and perplex some people who consider this plan.

It seems to me that if we take that practical work-a-day approach to the third portion of this problem, the question of sharing these other services, that we can with a little work and effort on the part of all concerned, bring about a master plan which will fit the circumstances and which will enable the public school boards to proceed in co-operation with the private school boards without entering into this area of friction and of difficulty of which a number have spoken.

I'd like to point out to the members of the committee what they already know, and that is that if the students in the parochial and private schools decided to come to the public school en masse for the services of the public school, the public school would provide it. We had that point made very clear in the evidence that was submitted on behalf of the Winnipeg School Board, which is the major board affected here, that they would be willing and able to provide that service if it were demanded of them. In fact they already do provide some shared services now. Those are two important points. They would provide the whole service any time they were asked to do so, which proves that it is certainly possible. And secondly, they do provide some of these services now on a mutually agreeable and satisfactory basis. I think that an extension of that same idea, that same course of development, to the problems of the other shared services beside textbooks and transportation, will lead us to a solution of this general question in a way that will prove to be satisfactory and workable to all concerned. That is the approach the government wishes to take. We want to take that approach because we believe that it is in line with our responsibilities in this question to take the lead in the matter and we believe that with the expressions of goodwill which we have had and I would not like members of the committee to forget about those expressions of goodwill or the opinions expressed by a good many - that with a reasonable and co-operative approach this matter can be dealt with. Let us not overlook that. It seems to me that if we take that approach to the difficult part of the problem we will be able to open the door of the public schools to those children in a way which will be to their benefit and which will not, at the same time, in any way hurt the public school system itself.

I have to admit that this is a matter of government policy. I think that is as it should be under the circumstances. We have to take the responsibility. We want the widest possible consensus that we can get of all concerned in this matter, particularly in this House. We have had some expression of the opinion of members by the way with which they have dealt with this matter, but just the same, the government cannot avoid the element of responsibility so far as it is concerned, and therefore it seems to me that this has to be a matter on which the government must make its position clear and state its view, and that we have done.

Now I don't really know what more I can say about this because, as I say, I'm merely repeating now the various arguments that have been presented several times in the course of debate on this matter. I respect very much what my honourable friend has said. I honour his view and I honour the views of others who take the same stand that he does, but I do believe,

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). just as sincerely as he does, that if we pass this bill we will take a step forward in closing the gap between different points of view in this province. We will not be solving the Manitoba school question, to be sure, but we will, I believe, be opening the door in a way that will reflect credit on all concerned to those private school children who can get some benefit or some use out of the public school system itself. And it seems to me that if we make the effort, as we intend to do, to work with the private schools and with the public schools in developing the plan under which the shared services operate apart from the textbooks and transportation item, that we'll be able to arrive at a solution to which we will look back in the future with some satisfaction.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister would just clarify one point for my edification - and sometimes, by jove, it really needs it. Do I understand, Sir, that it's the government's present intention to proclaim the bill, not holus-bolus, but in sections and from time to time?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, that would be our intention, to proclaim the first part dealing with textbooks and transportation, and withhold the proclamation on the other portion until we have reached a reasonable measure of agreement from the parties concerned as to how it should work out.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak on the bill at length at all. I think this bill will work as well as our school boards will want to make it work. It will depend so much on the school boards and the division boards as to how well the plan will work, and I think if our people back home, our constituents, our citizens from the province, feel that there is a need for this and they wish to take advantage of it through the private schools, that the public school boards will try and accommodate them as best as possible. I'd certainly feel that way.

When in Law Amendments Committee the other day, I proposed an amendment to Section 157 A, which would have provided for a change of the requirement to have 5,000 pupil enrolment in a school district or division before you could take advantage of shared services, that is, to new districts or future or new private schools, or future private schools. The amendment was not accepted but I thought I should really make one comment on it because I definitely feel that this is discriminative, this 5,000 requirement. The other three sections, (a), (b) and (c) are restrictive but at least you could work towards qualifying under those sections. Under this particular section you're completely barred before you attempt even to try.

My reason in speaking on it this afternoon is that I wonder whether the Minister of Education could supply us with a list of the student population for each division. I think this would be of value to us. In this way we could find out how many divisions in the province can take advantage of this legislation; that is, any future, any new private schools that may come up. I appreciate that the present private schools are all taken care of under Schedule C and I think these schools that I have in mind are secondary schools and no doubt they will try and take advantage of the legislation. But if the Minister can supply us with this list - probably he hasn't got it at the moment - but at some future date if he could supply us with it I would appreciate it. This is my only comment that I have. I think the bill is worthy of support. I think we should give it a try and see how it will work out. Maybe in a few years' time we can make further amendments to it if necessary.

MR. LEMUAL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, my Leader has given all the valid points to cover what I would say myself, but I am for the public school system, for this reason: I feel that our children in the public school system should come together as one. Don't segregate them, integrate them. You see what is happening in the United States today. Are we trying to go back to what they are trying to fight down in the States? I don't care for colour, creed or religion. We're all the same; we're all one under God. When I see these various things coming on -- the last speaker said, "There's various points that I don't like." We will always have various points because we don't come to one system; we don't -- I'm going to go along with this thing, yes; but do we go along with this thing? No, we don't go along with it. If this man is selfish, he says "I want my point or I'm going to destroy." If he's on the lake he's going to upset the boat. I say, let's get together. I know that this thing happened in my country years and years ago - in 1900 to be exact - not in the same manner. Our children, they worked in the coal mines, seven, eight years old; they were down there 11 and 12 hours a day. They were in positions where he couldn't speak to no one, and was there in the dark all day doing the various jobs that he had to do. These youngsters were asked: "What would you want to do?" "I would like to go to Sunday School," "I would like

(MR. HARRIS cont'd).to learn about God." "I would like to learn to speak English." Because he couldn't speak. And when I think of these things and see this thing before us today, it gets me down, because I say we have a system here today, the public school system. If you want anything different, go out and do so, but that system should be in there and your children should have everything that is in there, but if you want to be different, you want to make yourself different, be different, but don't come and say that I should support you in this very thing. Be Manitoban. Be a Canadian. Don't be either one thing or the other, but be one and one alone. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks with a few general observations, for I believe it is extremely important that my position is understood by both parties. I am not one that holds that this proposal is the "thin edge of the wedge," nor do I subscribe to the view that this is a recognition of an unequitable situation that has existed for many many years. I am particularly glad that the First Minister has pointed out that this bill is not intended to be a solution of the basic problem before us, and I honestly believe that he feels this may be so, but I am afraid the opinion is not shared elsewhere among Protestant and even Catholic circles. And if he is aware of the situation elsewhere, he will realize that the same feelings exist as they do in Manitoba. However, my argument is not of its moral value, although this is very important, but the dangers that may exist to the systems themselves be they private or public. And I hold the view that this plan is unworkable and could well jeopardize both educational systems without accomplishing what is claimed it will accomplish.

In the past, I have purposely stressed the Catholic viewpoint on shared services in the United States because I think it is very important. They are much closer to the experiments than we are; they have much more to gain if it is workable; and yet we find many prominent Catholic educators opposed to shared services. They reason that this plan will be the beginning of the end for their parochial schools. They believe that once the church stops teaching natural science, mathematics and foreign languages, other subjects may come next and if these can be taught in the public school, why not reading, composition and literature, and the rest?

Now I appreciate that some members might feel this would be a good thing but would it be such a good thing? Is this the way we want to go? The Associated Press reported in the Washington Post of March 12th, 1964, that the President of the Citizens for Educational Freedom - which is the American equivalent of the Manitoba Association for Equality in Education - said that shared time is unworkable in most school systems and he had a great deal of evidence to prove it. But if the evidence is strong that shared time or shared services can damage the private and parochial schools, the case is even stronger where the public school system is concerned, and we could relate the experience of the Netherlands as a good example.

Before tax funds were made available to the confessional or church schools in that country, only one out of every five Dutch boys and girls attended such a school. But as soon as monies were made available for the confessional schools the ratio was almost reversed. Now only one in four Dutch children attends a public school. The members could perhaps take this as a condemnation of the public school system, but I am not dealing with relative values at the moment. I am dealing with the proposal of shared services, and I maintain that a thoughtless shared services program could reduce the public school to the status of a service station, and according to America, a magazine that leans toward the Catholic point of view, the National Advisory Community Relations Council, a co-ordinating agent of six national Jewish organizations and 62 community councils, has rejected shared services, and I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman, with the opinion of those who are much closer to these experiments than we are.

I purposely asked some questions at the Law Amendments Committee on grants, but I actually did not receive any answers. One which I think is very important is whether this government will make grants to provide for facilities that may not be available at the present time, and we must realize that private and parochial schools are more inclined to take the very expensive courses in which complex and costly equipment is involved. If the representatives of a private and parochial school desire, even on a voluntary basis, to negotiate with a public school board for services that are not available for any reason, will public monies be made available to help provide for those courses? It is to be recognized, I think, that all

(MR. SEABORN cont'd). public schools may not be able to provide certain scientific or industrial courses, but I would be interested to learn if the Department of Education will assist in providing them if the demand presents itself.

Now one thing bothers me very much indeed, Mr. Chairman, and I say this, not because I fail to recognize the basic reasons for this proposal of shared services, but because I am rather disturbed at the fact that although they must know that this proposal of shared services is considered dangerous and could well reduce their schools into the same sort of secondary significance that other afternoon schools are placed, our local Catholic spokesmen, while pointing out the little or no assistance they will receive, nevertheless do not reveal the same caution or the same attitude as their counterparts in the United States, and I ask myself, could it be that this proposal before us is more than just a proposal of shared services? We have so many unanswered questions and, at the same time, such a determination to shove this bill through, that I must agree with one of the spokesmen who appeared the other day, who stated, if I remember correctly, that the very alacrity with which this matter is proceeded with makes the whole thing frightening. And there is no doubt in my mind that this bill is being left with wide openings at each end which could lead to a plan that we never anticipated in our wildest dreams.

I again say that I am not opposed to helping our private and parochial schools, but it must not be done out of the public treasury to which people of all denominations and faiths - and yes, even some without faith - have contributed. This is wrong and, besides the general consensus of opinion among leading educators both Protestant and Catholic, they believe that shared services can fragment both school systems, and I feel that there is no logical reason for proceeding with this proposal unless, of course, it has intentions that have not been revealed; and I share the concern of the local school boards having the difficult job of having to negotiate and carry through the very complex and almost insurmountable administrative problems which this plan entails, and I do not believe that scripture texts as worthy as this knowledge may be, makes this enterprise worthy or legitimate. I maintain and will continue to hold to my position that the Minister threatens our whole present educational system with this proposal, and I am positive that he has not examined the situation or analyzed it properly in the areas in which it is being tried, else he would not have brought such a plan into Manitoba.

Now I want to get back to my two main objections to this proposal for shared services. First of all I have the pastoral letter of Archbishop Hermaniuk who states: "His method" (and he is referring to the First Minister) "is totally strange to Canada, and it is contrary to the Manitoba Constitution Act of 1870 as well as to the School Acts of 1871 and 1881. It is not acceptable to those who seek public aid to private and parochial schools, and besides it is difficult and may be impossible to be implemented in a practical way."

Then I have the Sunday Herald of February 23, 1964 in which Archbishop Baudoux called the proposal "useless, dangerous and harmful." Brother J. H. Bruns, a man I admire tremendously and who is the superintendent of the St. Boniface School Division No. 4, asks an extremely important question. He asked: "The details are so far unknown. How will it work?" And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this bill gives no indication of the machinery upon which it will be implemented, nor does it give any indication of what is involved. Dr. Adam Geissinger calls the proposal for shared services a great disappointment. He stated: "His proposal doesn't begin to solve our problems. We need aid to keep our schools in operation, not just a few fringe benefits that the shared services plan can give us."

Now these are the views of the leading Catholic spokesmen and educators. We already know the views of those on the other side, so why are we proceeding with this bill? I would submit, and I feel that this is true, that there is a deeper intent underneath this piece of legislation that we have not been able so far to fathom. It is inconceivable that this government would go ahead, over the past year and a half, after all parties have expressed themselves as dubious if not outright opposed to the idea of shared services.

My second objection is the very probable segregation of children within the public school system, and we have had no assurance that this would be prevented. It is all very well to point to the relatively small experiments that have been in effect and say that this is not so, because the whole circumstances under which they came into being are entirely different. Now we have a definite piece of legislation which encourages and, I hate to say it, embarrasses local school boards to go into shared services agreements. I have here an article which deals in part with the shared services plan that has been in effect in Hartford for some 40 years, and right on the second page, Mr. Chairman, we have a class studying economics and industrial

(MR. SEABORN cont'd).....arts in a Hartford public school, and the whole class is dressed in the uniform of the parochial school. They are not integrated here and as far as I can ascertain they are not integrated in any other centre, and this to me is a real tragedy. In Pittsburgh, where the administrative difficulties create the same sort of segregation, Monsignor McDowell nevertheless has encouraged the Catholic youth into the public school system for part-time education, not because of the increased benefits that may accrue but because, and I shall use his words, "the Catholic schools could virtually double their enrolment if their students spent half of each day in public schools. I am convinced that it is better to have 2,000 students receiving a religiously oriented education in subjects directly concerned with value content and ideals than to have 1,000 taking all their courses in a Catholic school while the other 1,000 receive" (and I would ask you to note these words) "while the other 1,000 receive no Catholic education at all."

Now why did the Monsignor stress that it was a Catholic education that was being received in the parochial schools? Does the words "Catholic education" suggest permeation of the entire curriculum with Catholic dogma? I submit that it does, and while I have the utmost sympathy with all those who question the moral qualities of our public school system and desire more favourable educational facilities of their own, I again state that it is wrong to expect assistance from the tax funds, to which people of all faiths have contributed, to support the activities of another creed be they Nazarene, Mennonite, Salvation Army, Roman Catholic or what have you, in the propagation of their particular faith and beliefs. This is my quarrel. I think the principle of shared services is wrong, particularly when it involves grants from the public treasury, and in this case I think we have something that can, and will within a few years, be expanded to be almost full state aid of private and parochial schools of all denominations. If this were not so, we would have the actual services defined for us. As it stands the way is broad, and seeing the Premier and my friend from St. John's are very fond of quoting scripture, and usually quoting scripture completely out of context, I would like to quote one for you which I think is far more suitable, and it is this: "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction and many there be which go thereat." And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the destruction referred to in this case is the destruction of our public school system and our private and parochial schools.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, for five years I have, in my limited, scientific, academic knowledge, listened to many articles, lectures, discussions, and it was difficult for awhile to make up my mind what is the best; and as I mentioned once, I had to depend and umpire the fight that was going on between my thinking apparatus and my heart. I could better illustrate in a very very brief folk story. There were two people had an argument. There was no legislature in that part of the country, so they went to their religious leader, and after one told his story, the leader said "You are perfectly right." So the other man said, "Can I tell my story?" He said, "Yes," and when he told his story, he said, "Your're absolutely right." So the wife was sitting down there and she says, "Reverend gentleman, how can both be right?" He says, "You are right too." So this is exactly when listening to this. However I just want to make one declaration. I have opposed the first amendment because I felt it's not sufficient. I was -- and I admit and have admitted that I'm in favour of parochial schools, and I'm not going to hold a lecture why. But when the second amendment came in, like my Leader, we voted for a second reading, and I was very anxious to listen to the delegation who no doubt had more experience in education and who no doubt probably know more about what's best for the child. To be frank about it and honest, the delegation against this bill did not impress me at all. And with all due respect to my Leader and due respect to my colleagues who disagree with me, I have to depend on my heart. And my heart tells me: support it.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I feel I must get up and make a statement following the remarks of the Honourable Member from Wellington. I want to make it abundantly clear to the members of the committee in the House, that as the Minister, I don't intend to preside over the dissolution of the public school system in Manitoba. I want to make it abundantly clear that, as I understood him, there were implications that there were deeper sinister forces at work that brought about the shared services concept. That I reject and deny categorically. This has been an open approach to a problem that every single member - no matter what side of the fence he is on - says, "What can we do to bring our people together?" And for the Honourable Member of Wellington's information, I grew up not many hundred yards from St. Edwards Parochial School. I grew up in that constituency and went to public school. Those boys were my playmates and still my good friends.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) In all that time, the one divisive factor in our community was that they went their way and we went ours, and if you ever saw segregation, that was it. We had the Catholic boys' hockey team and the Protestants, on Alverstone Street, and we knocked the devil out of one another. And we didn't understand one another altogether. There was a divisiveness. Let's face it, there was a divisiveness.

Madam Speaker, I grew up in the public school system and it's not a godless system as has been implied previously in these debates by certain speakers. It's a good system. It's the best system in one of the best, if not the best, in Canada. The examinations from the Grade 12 system in this province will get you, in the matric course, into any university in the Western Hemisphere. And I know this government intends to maintain that. But we do want to make possible the excellent services of the public school system if it's possible, in a spirit of co-operation, understanding and goodwill. And school board after school board said, if the Legislature in their wisdom bring in shared services, don't do it by coercion; it has to be through goodwill and understanding and sitting down at a table and talking it out and working out our own particular problem, as to what we desire. And when I look at the requirements in education in this province over the next few years, I say, we've got to get together. What are we doing at the secondary -post-secondary level? We're knocking our heads together in a Council of Higher Learning. Why? Because we know that the various denominational educational institutions, we're going to have to get our heads together and decide not to teach Hellenistic Greek in four centres in the Province of Manitoba when we've got ten students to take it. We have simply got to get together.

Now, when I looked at myself in the mirror this morning shaving, as the Honourable Leader of the NDP, I said to myself, "What's wrong with giving a kid a textbook?" And I said to myself, "What's wrong with giving a kid a ride on a bus as long as it's on the public school route? No more, no less, than the child in attendance at public school." And so help me, I have to say I don't know why he shouldn't. I don't know. I honestly don't know. I conscientiously don't know. It isn't the same as one member in the committee said, "You might as well give them a million bucks as give them a textbook." We're not giving direct aid to private schools. This matter has been put far better by the Premier than I can ever put. But I do know one thing: When I played hockey for St. Paul's College - I didn't ever like to juvenile; it was the best team they ever had too - and I'll say one thing, that when I came to understand my friends who went to those St. Edward's and St. Paul's better, and came to know the fathers who taught us to play the game, there wasn't a finer bunch of fellows. We had the same Christian principles, the very - anyway it was one of the better experiences I had in my life. And I practised medicine for ten years in a Lutheran community with the Sisters of St. Benedict, and I came to understand that there isn't this divisiveness amongst our people. There is a divisiveness if we put ourselves into categories of religious denomination. All I am saying, in shared services, all that - - I've said it over and over again. I appreciate the low tone that this debate is being kept at - but for myself this afternoon - but I must say, in all seriousness, that shared services, I hope, may prove to be that instrument mentioned by so many as the method by which we explore the possibilities of making the excellent services available through our public school system, available to more and more of the boys and girls in our province.

I must say that in rural Manitoba, in my constituency for example, we don't have this problem. At this stage in the evolution of education in my constituency, the sisters who run schools, the King Edward schools in Camp Morton, are operated by the divisional board as it is in many of our areas throughout the province. And they're open to all. And there is more understanding through this approach.

Madam Speaker, I believe in the principles as enunciated by the First Minister last year. I believe, as Minister of the Department of Education, that this is not an untimely step at this stage in the evolution of the history of our province. And I would hope that the honourable members would see their way clear to supporting this bill. I can assure the honourable members there is nothing sinister, under the carpet, or in any way anything but above-board in the attitude and the policy of the government in bringing in this measure at this time.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Education a question. Has he or any of his experts in the department taken a first-hand look at any of these shared time plans that exist in the United States, and if he has, could he tell us something about whether they were entirely satisfactory or there were problems? I understand from the Honourable Member from Wellington that the plans that he has examined don't work too well.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I have read in the past year of most of those experiences, or those experiments referred to. In fact I have a great deal of material in the office. I would have had some of it reproduced, some of the material we got a hold of, but for the sheer volume of it. I would be glad to share any of it with any of the honourable members. But in each locale you have such different problems. I think we in Manitoba are - in looking at all the other areas and trying to compare them, it's very difficult because we have our own particular situation here. Our problem is more localized here. The concept or the philosophy is coming. It's interesting to note that in 22 states in the Union now, transportation is offered by the public school authority to children in attendance at private and parochial schools on their normal public bus routes. It's of course being debated in a completely different, in somewhat similar context down there, . . . the constitutional position of the parochial school authorities. But I really came to this conclusion, that this is Manitoba, as I said, trying to beg a Manitoba solution. And I really feel that we have to look at it in that light and in the light that we have accepted the concept that such services and aid should go through the local public school authority, so that the money is not directed to any particular church or group.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, we were told today and were told in the committee the other day, that shared services has nothing to do with the school question and nothing to do with the subject of aid to parochial schools. However, I think it's rather significant to note that no one is interpreting it in this way. The opponents of aid to parochial schools, or the opponents of this shared services plan, have said that this is the thin edge of the wedge. The advocates of private schools that will benefit to some degree from this scheme have described it as just a few crumbs, or a beginning, or a ray of hope, and it again is significant that none of them really approve of it, except for the very small benefits which they may receive from the textbooks and the transportation. They too, I believe, can see some problems in implementing the other part of the legislation. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that it's rather significant that we should go back to the time when the idea of shared services was first introduced into the House, and to see the reaction that the introduction of shared services at that time had amongst those who were advocating aid to parochial schools. And the Honourable Member from Wellington referred to this particular article and I'd like to quote from it just a little more than he did. It's in the Catholic weekly paper for Manitoba and the headline is: "Archbishop Baudoux Rejects Roblin Plan As Harmful - Acceptable In Rare Instances," and I just want to quote two little paragraphs in the article: "This is not what we have been asking for the past 70 years," the Archbishop said. "The Roblin statement has only one merit. It is that it recognizes the injustice being done to Catholics in Manitoba. The father of the people of Manitoba," he added, "to whom children plead for bread, are given stones. The proposal is useless, dangerous and harmful, as it leaves no other immediate alternative. Premier Roblin calls principles what is mere political expediency. His argumentation is invalid from every angle and is not acceptable to Catholics except in rare and individual instances." "

Now this, Mr. Chairman, was a very high personage in one of the churches in the province that supports parochial schools. It's rather significant, I think, in view of that statement, that the position that was taken by those witnesses who appeared before our committee saying something good about the Shared Services Plan that was outlined in our bill, that they also have now come around to the view - and these were the same people, I think, that at the time opposed this as harmful and perhaps detrimental to their school system - they have come around to the view that perhaps the shared services legislation is not all bad. They have come around to the view, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this is indeed a beginning and is some ray of hope and is the foot in the door or the thin edge of the wedge, and I can only quote from the letter that I received from the Presidents of St. Paul's High School, St. Mary's Academy, and from The Convent of the Sacred Heart, in which they say, "To indicate our concern regarding aid to private and parochial schools, we, the undersigned, respectfully urge you to support" - and I want to emphasize the next part of that sentence - "the shared services legislation as a first step towards equality in education for all."

There's no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation is a mistake, and I'm sorry to have to say that. Not only is this legislation, in my opinion, the thin edge of the wedge, as I thought that it would be, but the door is now halfway ajar, and it shall not be too long, in my opinion, before it is opened much wider. I can see no problems in the administering of this Act insofar as the textbooks are concerned. I can see many difficulties in interpretation insofar as the transportation aspect of it is concerned, and we had, I think, five or six problems with respect to transportation raised in the committee for which there was no immediate

(MR. GROVES cont'd) . . . answer, and I anticipate that in respect to transportation there will be many interpretations of the language of the statute.

With respect to the wording of the balance of the statute, the other services, I can see, depending on the district in the province where the problem arises, many and varied interpretations of the wording in this part of the Act, and what really worries me is: what happens if this scheme doesn't work? And I maintain that there are all kinds of factors, human and other, that at the moment point towards it not working. I ask each and every member of this House, if it happens that this plan doesn't work or that we run into real serious problems, can you see either this government or the following government or any future government withdrawing it? I say that this will not be done; that if we run into trouble with shared services, we will have no other alternative but to extend it, and extend it and keep extending it to the point where we are, in effect, giving direct aid to parochial schools. How could one possibly, when you can think of so many interpretations to the transportation aspect of it for example, say, "If we get into a real mess, this must be withdrawn and this service taken away from these children once they have received it." There is no other way to go, Mr. Chairman, but to extend this.

The other objectionable aspect of this, I think, was also mentioned in committee. There's no doubt in my mind that there are going to be pressures in our communities on the public school boards to enter into agreements with parochial school boards that are favourable to those parochial schools, and I don't criticize that. This is the natural thing for them to do. But there is going to be this pressure. Statements have been made to the effect that those organizations that support this are going to do so in a democratic manner and to me, Mr. Chairman, this leaves only one interpretation, and that is that if those who want agreements or want services extended to parochial schools in areas where the public school board is unwilling to go along, that they are going to run in the elections for school boards in those areas candidates who are going to support their point of view. And I think that it will be a tragic day in this province when we have candidates running for school boards on the basis of whether they support or whether they don't support legislation of this type. And I can see, Mr. Chairman, this being extended into our provincial elections, because as time goes by, and assuming again that shared services do not work, there is going to be a great deal of pressure -- and again I don't criticize those who would be wanting to put on the pressure to have the Act changed in order to have it more favourable to their point of view. And I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that if those who are directly concerned see that certain parties or certain candidates are not prepared to go along with their point of view, that they are going to, in future provincial elections, run candidates of their own. This I think, Mr. Chairman, is a very undesirable side effect that we may well be faced with once this legislation has passed and we are trying to make it work.

We have been asked what contribution this shared services makes towards the resolving of the Manicoba school question. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe, and I don't think anybody believes that it solves it, but in my opinion it certainly breaches the wall and it makes for steps being taken in the future, not for withdrawing the unworkable parts of it, but for the extending of it further and further. Maybe not, as I said before, by this government; maybe not by this Minister; but certainly there's no question about it that future governments and future Ministers of Education are going to be faced with very strong pressures to extend this legislation. They are going to be faced, in the event that portions of it don't work, with either withdrawing it or extending it, and there's no doubt in my mind now that when they are faced with this choice, there's no doubt about it that they're going to have to extend it, and we are therefore, in my opinion, passing something that may today look like rather innocuous legislation, but this certainly is legislation that in my opinion breaches the wall and leads the way to direct aid to private and parochial schools from the public treasury in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 -- passed.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I waited until you called Section 1 because I do not intend to enter into the debate on the general question. I had opportunity to speak on this matter at length last year. I heard the Premier speak on Friday as he spoke today, and I dealt on Friday with my reaction to what he said. I do not intend to repeat it today. I must comment just in passing, though, that when the Honourable Member for Wellington stated that the Premier and I are in the habit of quoting scriptures and usually quote them out of context, I will not speak for the Premier but rather for myself in saying that if I quote from scriptures I probably quote out of context because I'm probably not aware of the fact that I am quoting from scriptures. I don't think I do, and if I do then I consider it a compliment

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . that he thinks that.

I wanted to deal only with Section 1, Mr. Chairman, because I do not intend to deal with this bill item by item or in principle any more. As to Section 1, I stated before and I state again, that if this were all that were intended I wouldn't have bothered to address myself at all to the question of shared services. I do want to remind this committee, however, that the School Division of Winnipeg, represented by the Chairman, expressed concern as to the manner in which this procedure would be handled, and I am inclined to feel that this Session places a burden, an onerous burden on school divisions which they ought not to be burdened with. This is the only compulsory portion of the bill and it gives to the school divisions, school boards, a responsibility which I think can be better handled by the Department of Education because it is the Department's inspector who has a direct association with all of these schools, visits them frequently, knows the courses they offer, and knows the numbers of pupils and can therefore create a better liaison than can the boards. And although I wrote out an amendment, I don't see any particular purpose in submitting it as such, but I do want to urge the government to consider the feasibility of taking the responsibility away from the board and turning it over to the Department of Education so that the question of distribution of the books, and the question of review of the books after they are returned to ensure that they are returned in proper condition, will be that of the Department and not of the individual boards.

The amendment that I thought of moving would have been to delete the words "and the board of a school area or school division, or of a school district that is not within a school area or school division" and replace these words with the words "the Minister" so that the Minister would requisition the books and see to it that they are distributed, and if that were acceptable then I would have deleted the words "that is situated within the school area, school division or school district, as the case may be."

I'd like to urge strongly that the government do not impose a responsibility on the school boards which they cannot really carry out as effectively as can the Department of Education, and which I think is an additional burden to them. You'll recall that it was mentioned that the School Division No. 1 has its own repair depot and looks after the repair of its books to see to it that they are properly cared for. It was explained that this would be an onerous and difficult matter to handle. Rather than move an amendment that would have to be voted on, I appeal to the Minister to consider my suggestion and see whether or not this would not be a suitable suggestion for the purpose; that is, to delete the appropriate words that would put on him the responsibility of seeing to the distribution of the books rather than on the school boards.

MR. JOHNSON: the honourable member from St. John's that a great deal of thought has gone into this method by which the books would be issued, and I can assure the honourable member that the Department certainly give every assistance possible to the Winnipeg School Division, for example, as the books are requisitioned through that authority; but I think it is important too that all textbooks issued within a division should be issued equally under the same terms and conditions to students in both types of schools; and in administration, in the future, we have been now latterly giving some attention to further regulations governing textbooks that would be administratively -- I think we can work out an administrative arrangement with the division in this regard. At least that will be our intent in carrying forward this section.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I've been interested in this same point that the Honourable the Member for St. John's is speaking of, and I too was paying close attention to what the chairman of the Winnipeg School Board and others said in the Committee. I can see the Department's and the Minister's positions, in that they perhaps want, because of the attention that's been paid to the fact of the services being in the public school and matters of this kind, that they perhaps see difficulty in issuing the books to the private schools. I can understand that. But on the other hand, I can see the difficulty of the School Division Board, or District Board, making the requisition on behalf -- not that they perhaps have the same qualms of conscience about breaking any principle or anything of that kind, but the more practical effect that they simply don't know the books or are not so closely connected with the books that are going to be offered, going to be needed, so wouldn't it be possible, by the private schools placing before the Department of Education a list of the books required, that the Department of Education would take the responsibility of issuing those books then to the public school? Wouldn't that then cover the difficulties from both sides? Because I can see the point of the Department in order to try to stay strictly to the principle that

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd . . . it wants to endorse, and I think perhaps it could be met in this way.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, when we were in committee the other day, someone who was appearing before the committee said that it was all fine and dandy to give aid to schools at the University level and at the high school level, or something to that effect, but it wasn't all right to give them aid at the elementary level, and then suggested that presently all correspondence pupils in the province are receiving free textbooks and have been for years and years and years. Now for the information of the committee and for my information in particular, I would like to know if the statement made in committee is correct. Is it correct, No. 1: that all correspondence students in the province have been receiving free texts for many many years? And if not, for how many years have they been receiving free texts, regardless of their religious affiliations or background? And then, 2: I would like to know what assistance United College, St. Paul's College, and the other religious colleges receive in comparison to other institutions of this same kind. I think that it would be helpful to the committee to know some of these things, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the Honourable Member means by the last part of his question.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, is it a fact that provincial grants are presently paid to United College, St. Paul's College, St. Boniface College and so on; and if provincial assistance is paid to them, how does that differ to other public institutions dollarwise?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the latter part -- there is a statute The School Land Grants Fund - I forget now which way it's worded - where a few years ago the affiliated colleges at the post-secondary level receive 25 percent construction grants, capital grants, and receive the interest from this fund proportionately, and it works out, I believe it is 79 -- last year it worked out to around \$79.00 per student, to every child enrolled in the post-secondary grades. No schools under The School Attendance Act -- the only legislation governing the private schools now, comes through The School Attendance Act; and schools under The School Attendance Act, children attending such schools up until now have not received free textbooks.

BILL No. 141: The remainder of Bill No. 141 was read section by section and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the end of the Committee stage and what I would propose is that the committee rise and we'll deal with the Third Readings of these bills on the understanding - and I say this for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition because I think he would like to know - on the understanding that we will come back later on to deal with the bill that is still in committee, 110. So I move the Committee rise.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you leave your Chair, it was my understanding that there were amendments to be proposed to 110, I wonder if it might be possible, if they have now been printed, that they might be distributed so that we could consider them at some leisure, if not very much.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll do my very best to get them before the House rises at 5:30 and distribute them to the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills No. 93, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139 and 141, and with the exception of Bill 132, has passed all of these bills without amendment, and has passed Bill 132 with amendment. The Committee has directed me to report and begs leave to sit again.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: May we proceed with the third readings of those bills, except for 110.

BILLS No. 93, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136 and 137 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 138, an Act to incorporate The Manitoba Association of School Trustees, for third reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: I was not here this afternoon when this bill was discussed in committee. I am certainly not happy with the representation that our smaller schools will be getting both

(MR. FROESE cont'd) at local and at the annual conventions of this new organization. They are definitely a minority and will be outvoted. I therefore cannot support the bill and I oppose it.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILL No. 139 was read a third time and passed.

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 141, an Act to amend The Education Department Act and The Public Schools Act (2), for third reading.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the third reading of Bill No. 141.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Schreyer, Shewman, Smellie, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Groves, Harris, Johnston, Paulley, Seaborn, Smerchanski, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 36; Nays, 9.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains and had I voted, with grave reservations, I would have voted yes.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I did not vote. I was paired with the Honourable Member for Selkirk. Had I voted, I would have voted aye.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think we could now proceed then with the adjourned debate on the Committee of Ways and Means standing in the Honourable Member's name, the Honourable Member for Neepawa.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, it's such a long time since this debate has taken place that I hardly know where to begin. In fact I'll almost have to read the motion. The amended motion is that this House regrets that despite steady and alarming increases in debt and taxes, that this government has failed to promote adequate economic growth in Manitoba. Well now, Madam Speaker, I'm sure that everyone who is old enough to be paying taxes - and there are quite a few that are below voting age that pay taxes, I'm sorry to say, because there are a lot of under-aged people who smoke, and smoke quite heavily, and certainly they are caught with these new taxes if they buy tobacco or cigarettes or cigars - just everyone, every taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba I'm sure, can agree with the first part of the amendment that there has been steady and alarming increases in debt and taxes since this government took office, and we don't have to look very far for that. You will recall that about two months ago or thereabouts I read into the records a list of 29 parcels of land, and I compared the taxes, the taxes in 1957 and the taxes in 1964, and in keeping with the First Minister, I entitled that episode as "the changing face of Manitoba." And I tried to point up at that time that even with the \$50.00 rebate that we are going to get some day, that it will not be nearly enough to make up the difference in the increase in real property tax.

Now since that talk that I gave the other night, I totalled up the taxes on the 29 parcels of land in 1957, and in total they came to \$3,456.29; and the same parcels of land in 1964, the taxes on them amounted to \$5,641.82. So that you can see that there has been an increase of - oh, around \$2,200 on 29 parcels of land, which is considerably more than \$50.00 per parcel. And so I say once again that there has certainly been a change on the face of many Manitobans since 1958. And even my honourable friend the First Minister said just prior to this session: "There is a limit to the burden that we can ask our taxpayers to bear. And there are many who think that the overall tax levy in Canada may already be high enough," Premier Roblin said." He said that when he was in Ottawa trying to get some more money down there.

Now there are, as my honourable friend suggests, there are many people who think that it is high enough. I agree with my honourable friend on that score. There are many who think

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) that it is altogether too high. Now my honourable friend who has been taking full advantage of the free political time - and that's something that I certainly would do, being conservative in my habits, is take advantage of all the free things that are offered to me - he talks about this changing face of Manitoba, and recently there certainly has been a change in face all right, Madam Speaker. Recently he has one entitled "a proud record of getting things done". Well if it's loading on taxes, he's sure been getting things done. And I have before me just a little graph here to show the extent to which there has been, as the motion suggests, a steady and alarming - a steady and alarming increase in provincial taxes. And I refer you to the Free Press, Friday, March 5th - that's not very old - on the bottom of the editorial page, you will find that provincial government spending rose from 1957-58 from just over 80 million to just over 180 million this year. So that is roughly about 2 1/2 times, 2 1/2 times the spending.

Well there's nobody in Manitoba that doesn't know that every dollar that we spend here and every dollar we authorize here has to be raised in some form of taxation. So that if you say that spending has gone up by 2 1/2 times since 1957, you can also say the taxes have gone up accordingly; accordingly. And I have before me also, further statistics that were prepared by a chartered accountant, I do believe, that points up item by item the increase. And in 1958, Manitoba received under the Canada-Manitoba Tax Agreement, \$32,700,000 - and this year you will note by the estimates \$71,250,000, or just about 2 1/2 times as great - that we get from Ottawa. And just getting it from Ottawa, of course, doesn't mean that we get home free. We're still the same group of taxpayers.

The gasoline motive fuel tax, in 1958 the receipts 13,300,000; current year according to the estimates, 35,500,000 - over 2 1/2 times; in fact nearly three times. Liquor Control Commission, 1958, 10.5 million exactly, or very near exactly; the current year, 19,700,000 - nearly double. This doesn't mean, of course, Madam Speaker, that they're drinking twice as much because of the Conservative Government that we have here; no doubt they're drinking more. But it's a combination of being driven to drink by these taxes, I suppose, and an increase in the taxes. A combination of those two has resulted in revenues to the province of nearly double.

The Motor Vehicle and Driver's licenses - and incidentally, Madam Speaker, I suppose you got your application in the mail today; I got mine in the mail this morning. It was \$5.00 is what they want, and of course if there's four or five or six drivers in a family, that adds up to \$25.00 or \$30.00 for the family. Now in Motor Vehicle and Driver's licenses, the revenues in 1958 amounted to 6,600,000; the current year, 12,875,000 - just double. The Canada-Manitoba Unemployment Assistance Agreement, in 1958, it amounted to 2,200,000; this year, 5,850,000 - over double. Land titles fees, in 1958 is half a million; this year, 1,280,000 - 2 1/2 times up. Mining royalty tax - well we're not opposed to that - there's 303,000 in 1958; 2,906,000. Amusement tax 1958, 266,000; this year they're asking for 903,000. The normal and general school fees in 1958 totalled 330,000; this year, 486,000. The Department of Labour fees, licenses, permits, etc. - I see my honourable friend the Minister of Labour smiling over there because he knows they are 300 percent up - in 1958 they were 95,000; this year, 229,000. The county court fees in 1958 totalled \$73,000; and in this year, \$210,000.00.

And then of course, of course Madam Speaker, there has been a lot of new taxes, brand new, that have been imposed since 1958, some of which, some of which are the charges at provincial parks. There certainly were no charges to enter provincial parks in 1958 and they're now just a half a million they bring in in revenue. The tobacco tax; there was no provincial tobacco tax until just two or three or four years ago; certainly none in 1958. They expect, according to the estimates, to produce seven millions of dollars this year. Then the surtax on fuel, electricity and telephone, four million. The heat tax that probably - a lot of it will go for this new pension fund.

Now certainly and surely everyone will agree that we have had a steady and alarming increase in taxes. What about debt? Because the motion talks about debt. Well Madam Speaker, you will recall that back on March 8th, I believe it was, when my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside questioned the First Minister about the interest on the debt, and the Member for Lakeside asked the First Minister if he would agree, if he would agree that the interest on the debt was up 850 times what it was when he was in office and the Premier nodded in the affirmative to suggest that basically he was right. So if the interest on the debt is up 850 times since 1957, or 1958, well then surely that is an alarming increase and that's exactly

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) what we are saying in the amendment, that it's alarming. Surely you couldn't use any other word than "alarming" to describe an increase of that magnitude. I don't know just how these figures have changed since this article was put out, but this was dated March 3, 1964, and

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member will note that it is 5:30.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I would suggest the adjournment and then we can come back to Bill 110 tonight and get on with it. Then we can then ask my honourable friend to continue with his speech on the budget. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 Monday night.