

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, June 19, 1970

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to introduce our guests in the gallery. We have 10 Grade 8 and 9 students of the Edmund Partridge School under the direction of Mrs. Preyma. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. And 43 Grade 8 students of the Deloraine School under the direction of Mr. Fraser. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. And 40 Grade 7 and 8 students from Waskada School under the direction of Mrs. Gibson and Miss Billington, and this school is also located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can move to the Bills, with consent of the House, on Page 11 of the Order Paper. Also Mr. Speaker, I did indicate the other day that I was unaware of any more Bills that would be forthcoming. I now want to indicate that I didn't recall one and there is possibly another one that will be forthcoming, so perhaps members of the Conservative benches can communicate that to their Leader. One that I had forgotten about and another one which I have learned about.

MR. WATT: Could the Honourable House Leader indicate what the Bill pertains to?

MR. GREEN: Well, I think that the best procedure there is to see it on the Order Paper.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. Second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. Bill No. 87. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could I have a minute? Could you proceed with the next Bill so I can get my notes? I wasn't sure that...

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps somebody else would like to speak on this Manitoba Dental Services Corporation Act. I think there has been objection to passing a Bill by and then coming back to it. Maybe we could wait a few minutes so the member can get his notes.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): The Leader of the House might consider dealing with the next Bill and possibly come back, with leave of the House to...

MR. GREEN: ... objected to several times. I have no objection. I believe that 102 is going to stand in any event, which means that we go to 124.

MR. BOYCE presented Bill 124, An Act to Amend the Winnipeg Charter, 1956(2) for second reading. (Referred to Municipal Affairs Committee)

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, it's a minor amendment in my view. The particular section which is asked to be amended deals with special provisions pertaining to utilities and to include under the concept which already includes water, they would like it expanded to include electrical energy or steam. For those people who are unfamiliar with the particular section, perhaps it might be of some benefit to read it without the amendment: "Notwithstanding the provisions of anything contained in The Public Utility Board Act, the City may fix such price, rate or rent as the Council may deem expedient to fix for water and in fixing each rate may not make any application to or procure an order of or approval of the Public Utility Board, the intention being that the city may levy such rate or rent for the purpose of and as a means of securing revenue for the general purposes of the City and not for furnishing water and water service to the citizens at cost, provided that the revenue produced in any one year after providing the full cost of operation including contingent and depreciation reserves and carrying charges, shall not exceed one mill on the realty assessment of the City for the previous year." So this concept would just be expanded to include electrical energy or steam.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Rhineland still intends to speak on Bill No. 87?

MR. FROESE: Yes, I intend to.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, Bill No. 87. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us, Bill 87, has to do with the setting up of a dental services corporation and I was quite interested when the, I think it's the Member for Kildonan, introduced the Bill. I have certain misgivings about the Bill. It seems to me that it's actually a "closed corporation", if you could call it that. The Board of Directors that are named in the Bill, I don't know how they can ever be unseated; it'll be a continuing affair. Because if you take a closer look, there is no annual meeting of the members; the annual meeting will be of the Board of Directors only. They'll just be perpetuating themselves in office. All it requires is four members within the Board and they can control the outfit.

Then, too, I'm just wondering, I haven't seen the Bill in connection with the denturists and I'm wondering whether the denturists will not be compelled at a later date to work under this dental services bill. In my opinion this Bill is brought in to set up a corporation so that eventually they might qualify under Medicare and then in future the denturists of this province will be required to work under this very corporation, because the Bill provides for lay members. Then, too, under another portion of the Bill dealing with powers of the corporation, the Bill also provides for dental auxiliaries employed by dental practitioners and I would like to hear from the member just what do we mean by "dental auxiliaries" employed by dental practitioners. It is not an insurance bill as such. Another section claims the providing of care and treatment for subscribers and those other persons, but to me, and as is outlined in the Bill, this is certainly not an insurance or providing insurance for the members that they will get treatment.

I had some other points listed in my notes but I am unable to locate them at the present time; I didn't expect the Bill to come up the first thing this afternoon and as a result I cannot bring them out at the moment, but certainly I will be prepared to speak on it further when the Bill comes up for further consideration in committee, if it passes the House. I have very strong misgivings and I do not intend to vote for the Bill as a result. Perhaps my distrust or misgivings are not properly founded, but the way I read the Act, certainly it is one where the Board will be perpetuating itself and there is no provision for an annual meeting of the membership as such; it is strictly the Board that will have the annual meeting and I certainly can't subscribe to the principles that are contained within this Bill.

Then there is another section dealing with information and the information is to be provided to the Minister. But what about the Legislature? What about the members of this House? Are they not entitled to the information, the annual report and so on? I think if we are going to give powers of the type that are contained in this Bill to a closed group, I feel that we should be provided with more information. Personally I feel it should be much more open than it is according to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I'll be closing debate if I speak now. If anyone else wishes to go. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to enter debate but I'll ask a question and perhaps the member can answer it during the closing of debate. Is it the intention to have this Bill, because it deals with a professional group in the province, is it the intention to have this Bill referred to the committee studying professional services?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the debate be adjourned. If they have questions to answer I don't mind.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the House to deal with Bill 102?

MR. GREEN: No. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the matter is going to be stood, with the leave of the House. I believe the Member for Winnipeg Centre wants it stood.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

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

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I did introduce this resolution the last time we were dealing with Private Members' resolutions and have a few words to say about it. I think that most members of this Assembly are aware of the fact that families in which there is desertion, or separation of parents, constitute about 45 percent of the welfare

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.). . . . caseload in the municipalities. If a more constructive way could be developed to handle the problems of these people and to help them to be independent and live a better life, it deserves our attention and effort without any further delay. If it's possible to relieve this burden on the public purse to any degree I think our taxpayers deserve a break as well, and any effort to combat poverty, it's reasonable to give priority to the challenge which this group, the sole support mothers, represents.

At the present time a woman who's been deserted and left with children to raise may be awarded maintenance by the court. However, the father or responsible male may quite easily default on these payments and then the mother is forced to go on welfare. If she wishes to work or train herself for future employment there are not sufficient day nursery facilities to look after her children and certainly those that there are, are either beyond her means or of an inadequate calibre in the case of the less professional day nurseries, so in effect she becomes almost a prisoner in her own home.

There are many serious problems in the existing situation. An attempt is not made in every case to pursue the man in question in order to obtain some financial contribution from him and this is certainly the case in respect of a large number of unmarried mothers. The legal aid method of providing maintenance to the unmarried women or providing assistance to her in getting maintenance, is essentially inefficient in that the lawyers serve on a rotation basis and have no particular experience in this type of work and no particular desire to take up this cause. Now in those cases where the man in question is either on welfare or where he finds it more comfortable to go on welfare rather than work and make payments on account of his deserted woman's maintenance, society must bear the whole cost of supporting him, his deserted wife and children.

Often the man in question is not willing to comply with the Order to make payments on account of maintenance of his wife and child, but at the same time he's not willing to go on welfare. He decides instead to move outside the province where the order of the Provincial Court will not be effective. If he can be located there is no machinery by which the Order can be enforced in the province to which he has moved. The difficulty is that this man leaves no forwarding address and there is no other machinery available by which he can be located.

When an Order is obtained much energy is often expended in attempting to enforce payment through the usual several remedies when they return and does not justify the expenditure of time on the part of a lawyer. For instance, it might be necessary to garnish a man's wage at every pay period and if this is necessary the woman has to pay a \$25.00 fee on each occasion - this could be every two weeks. If this is necessary, the employer soon finds reason for terminating the man's employment. It's also interesting to learn that government cheques such as unemployment insurance, cannot be garnished, so again the woman is left without protection.

The deserted constitute a significant and separate social problem and accordingly an effort must be undertaken to minimize as much as possible the resulting cost to the taxpayer. I would, therefore, propose that welfare payments to the unmarried mother be coordinated through one agency and preferably under government administration. This proposed agency should have sufficient legal and other staff to act on behalf of a deserted woman in pursuing her remedy against the man in question. The agency would decide in which cases it would be worthwhile to bring a court action to enforce the woman's remedy and in this way all deserving cases would be carried to a conclusion. The agency could also recommend those cases in which criminal prosecution should be undertaken. Those men who refuse to recognize their responsibility to support a deserted woman and her children and who attempt to escape their responsibility by choosing to live on welfare rather than work, should be dealt with.

There's provision under both the Child Welfare Act and the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act to imprison such persons for failing to comply with the terms of an Order, but perhaps a better procedure would be to bring prosecution under Section 186 of the Canadian Criminal Code. The question that arises is whether the imprisonment of these persons will in any way alleviate what is a major social problem. Obviously it will prevent the culprit from engaging in any further illicit unions at least during the period of his imprisonment and there would be a sufficient deterrent factor to make the man reconsider his position.

Since the taxpayer is supporting this man while he lives on welfare, it's going to cost no more and perhaps less to support him while he is in prison. If figures could be obtained as to the amount spent by the public welfare agencies on account of these men and their deserted families I think any reluctance which the public might feel towards adopting such a harsh measure might be overcome. Legislation could be passed providing that the proposed agency be

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.). . . . subrogated to the rights of deserted women for maintenance payments and that all maintenance payments be made to the agency, which in turn would pay the money recovered to the welfare source or to the deserted woman in question. Under government administration of the fund I think the responsible male would be more hesitant to default to the government than he would to a fairly defenceless woman.

It should also be possible to pass legislation requiring that each employer obtain social security identification from his employees and that the social security numbers of such employees be reported to the proposed agency which with or without the use of computers could thereby keep track of the present employment of a man against whom an Order had been obtained. This should not be terribly expensive but of course would need the cooperation of the other provinces and the social security number system would work through the use of a central registry. With the cooperation of the federal government and through the use of the social security number system unemployment benefits could perhaps be subject to detachment in the same way as it's proposed that income from employment be attached.

The Family Arbitration Centre that I propose might counsel on the economics of marriage, prior to marriage and also prior to separation. I think with a better understanding of all the consequences of separation that there might well be second thought. The Ontario Law Reforms Commission is expected to complete a family law project sometime later this year which will be well worth our attention.

A review of the present legislation of all the pertinent statutes I think is timely, perhaps one should say overdue, and I would hope that the Law Reforms Commission that's being set up by the present government could be persuaded to give priority to a review of the Women's and Children's Maintenance Act and all other pertinent legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate briefly in discussion on this resolution. I think the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge is to be commended for introducing a resolution which does highlight a continuing problem in respect to an aspect of our society which hasn't received the serious attention sometimes that it ought. It's true that the whole matter of adjudication of family disputes and marital causes is one of continuing concern on the part of legislators everywhere. I'm aware of the fact through my personal experience as a barrister and solicitor, having appeared before family court judges, of the difficulties that do exist in respect to litigation in this area.

The honourable member really indicated much of, or in essence some of the things that I intended to say. There is a need for a very close scrutiny of the laws dealing with the whole aspect of domestic or marital causes. There have been substantial changes made but recently by the federal government in the area of divorce and the whole area of family law as it affects the individual provinces has received considerable criticism and as has been pointed out in Ontario it is the subject of the Law Reform commission study at the present time. It is certainly my expectation that one of the areas of concern for the Law Reform Commission to be established, hopefully, towards the end of this year, will be an examination of the whole field of domestic law as it applies under our jurisdiction, the principle set out in the private member's resolution. Some of them, however, I have very serious reservation about. The suggestion that a Maintenance Award Fund be set up is one that may sound very reasonable, yet in substance there may be very serious problems. After all, society owes to the applicant an obligation to endeavour to provide the applicant with redress, but I don't think it's possible to guarantee the same level of income to an applicant that they would have had if they were able to retain the status they had prior to the domestic breakdown. Simply put, a spouse who had an income from her husband of maybe two or three hundred dollars a month, or \$400 a month, for her own use, surely cannot be guaranteed by the province to continue to receive that for her own use, despite the fact that another lady whose husband has died and therefore is not a subject matter of a court order would get much less from a Workman's Compensation fund or any other source. So that the Maintenance Award Fund though it sounds like it may have some real substance, has to be looked at very carefully and I think in view of the problems that I indicate, I don't think it's a practical solution.

I can advise honourable members that since coming to office we discovered that the Family Court process had been transferred entirely under the previous reorganization of government into the Department of Health and Social Development, and as I indicated during the discussion on my estimates, that question or that problem had been recognized and transfer of Family Court staff had been returned to the Attorney-General's Department because it is a

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.), court function; and together with the return of staff, is the return of the office of Mr. Barrie Littlewood, who is engaged by the Family Court primarily to enforce Family Court Orders. Now we are currently making arrangements for some additional staff there to supplement the work of Mr. Littlewood, because there is no question but that there is a great deal of work that has to be done in respect to endeavours to secure payment of Family Court Orders where husbands have defaulted in payment.

The question of a central registry is something that has to be looked at very closely. There are working arrangements, as most of the honourable members know, with various provinces under the reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders. It's true that this is a very cumbersome and very slow process but it's something that requires intra-provincial co-operation on a very close level and it's something that isn't remedied overnight.

The third suggestion of a family arbitration centre to provide counselling actually touches at one of the very serious problems as to the manner of hearing Family Court disputes. There are some that have indicated a very great reservation to a continuance of the adversary system in marital disputes and the present counselling facilities that are available through the various family courts is an endeavour to prevent complete marriage breakdown, to provide counselling services that may rectify problems that exist in a marital union without the necessity of court proceedings. I have some reservations about the continuance of a system where the parties do, in order to establish the grounds for an Order, have to go through what is a very painful and pretty moral destroying process before a family court judge in weighing all the faults of each of the other to establish grounds primarily on the basis of persistent cruelty. It has a very serious effect; it prolongs litigation in some cases particularly when there is a very serious disagreement as to evidence. Under very careful and astute counsel these cases can drag on for a very, very considerable period of time and the stresses and the hurt that is felt by the family is a very serious problem and one questions whether or not this technique could not be revised to mitigate as much as possible the harm that comes about by the actual litigation itself, or the process of litigation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I indicate that I have a certain measure of sympathy with the principles that are enunciated in the resolution by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge but I have very serious reservations about some of the specifics indicated therein. I want to assure honourable members that my views in respect to the early consideration of this area of the law by the Law Reform Commission will be one which I hope that I will be able to make my views prevail on those who will be making the decisions in respect to the areas of immediate concern for the Law Reform Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short contribution to the resolution brought forth by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

The proposal to establish a maintenance award fund, a central registry and a family arbitration centre, are not, in my humble opinion, very practical. A review of the legislation may provide better ways of helping the deserted woman and her family. For example, we now have provision for assisting a deserted woman and her dependents through the Social Allowance Act. A review of this arrangement may provide evidence for changes in the Social Allowance Act.

Regarding the Central Registry to trace defaulting husbands with the use of the social security number, this is really not that very practical. Firstly, it does not deter a man from deserting; secondly, it is a violation of the civil rights of those men who comply fully with the terms of a separate maintenance order; thirdly, if information regarding the whereabouts of the spouse is available to the other it could perpetuate strife and possibly physical violence and negate the conditions that the legal separation is intended to relieve. Furthermore, I do not believe it is possible to use the social insurance number without the express approval of the Government of Canada. However, this might be obtained.

Regarding the establishment of a family arbitration centre to provide counselling prior to family breakdown, this is a very good idea and it is already available to a limited extent through the family counselling services of the Winnipeg and St. Boniface Family Courts; and on a limited basis through the family bureau; and equally on a limited basis through our regional offices. With additional staff and other resources this service could be, of course, expanded in the very near future.

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.)

Basically, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to say is that the resolution stay away from specific proposals because the proposals should emanate from a review of the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act and other pertinent legislation. I would therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Transportation that Resolution No. 26 be amended by striking out all words in the first paragraph after "the year 1954" in the second line, and adding the words "requires revision", and be further amended by striking out all words after the word "government" in the first line of the fourth paragraph and substituting "continue to give high priority to a review of the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, Revised Statutes of Manitoba 1954, and such other legislation as applies to the deserted woman and her family."

The resolution as amended would read: "Whereas the legislation in respect of the deserted woman and her family, the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, Revised Statute of Manitoba 1954 requires revision; and Whereas maintenance payments provided for by the courts are easily evaded by the father, the onus being on the woman who has few resources to collect on her own behalf; and Therefore be it resolved that the government continue to give high priority to a review of the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, Revised Statute of Manitoba 1954 and such other legislation as applies to the deserted woman and her family."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on the resolution. Primarily because it's probably the last chance we'll get to speak on Private Members' Resolutions; and secondly, to expose the phoneyess of the resolution itself. Let me read the resolution to indicate just why I call it a phoney resolution.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe we are now speaking on the amendment and not on the resolution.

MR. BOROWSKI: ... Mr. Speaker. The resolution before it was amended, and part of it incidently is still in the amendment, "Whereas the legislation in respect of a deserted woman and her family and the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act is unworkable, unenforceable and discriminatory. Mr. Speaker, this has been in effect for the 11 years the Conservatives have been in power and they're in fact admitting that they have been discriminating. That's a charge I could never make and if I did I would be asked to retract it - unenforceable. Now it's really very strange that they should pick on the resolution, that needs to be dealt with, but they should pick on it 11 years after they've been kicked out of office.

MR. GRAHAM: On a point of order. I believe we are talking on the amendment and not on the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: I would hope that the process of making whatever reference the honourable member is making to the original resolution that that is done with the intent of relating those comments to the amendment. The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm finished, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the amendment that has been proposed, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Minister of Health is in a very serious position. He is quite concerned about the establishment of any type of additional welfare course or arbitration centres or central registry or anything of that nature, because we have the news that was in today's paper and I would like to quote from today's Winnipeg Tribune where headlines state that "The Welfare Department faces mass resignation." Mr. Speaker, this is a pretty serious charge. If we are trying to be fair to those that are underprivileged, people we feel that are being subjected to unreasonable demands from society, and we find that the government is not providing necessary means -- (Interjection) -- Today's paper of the Winnipeg Tribune where it says, "the Welfare Department faces mass resignation."

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): ... read the rest of the article and find out, inform the House...

MR. GRAHAM: I would be glad to read, Mr. Speaker, the rest of the article. In fact I will read the whole article if the member so desires. And here I will now quote, Mr. Speaker, the entire article and it says: "Winnipeg Health and Welfare community has been told that welfare department employees are threatening mass resignation because of low morale, low morale and overwork. The work load is so heavy people are leaving, said Jack..." and I'm sorry I can't pronounce his last name Mr. Speaker, "of the Canadian Union of Public Employees

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.). . . . which represents the workers. Three people have already resigned and more are threatening to if the situation is not improved, he said, adding that because of staff shortages welfare recipients have to return to the department three or four times before being looked after. And the sickness rate of employees has also increased." I don't know whether welfare is a contagious disease or not, Mr. Speaker, but he says that the sickness rate of employees has also increased because of overwork. "In 1968 there were 2,139 hours of sickness and last year, 3,419. But for the first five months of this year the total has reached 2,481, I believe it is. Meanwhile, welfare director, Ron Hooper has also warned that because of unemployment, the City's welfare roles may soon swell drastically. This will be another burden existing staff will have to cope with unless about 11 more employees are hired, he says. He pleaded with the council or with the committee to allow the department five additional temporary welfare workers and six additional clerical staff. This would mean that additional appropriation of about \$5,159 a month, half of this would be absorbed by the province — half of it by the province.

"The number of people seeking welfare has risen to such an extent that extra office space is also needed said Mr. Hooper. Already City Hall's basement designed to house Vital Statistics and records is being used for recipients registering. The committee agreed to help and said it would advise the Committee on Public Works and Financing and initially the rehiring of staff. In the report Mr. Hooper said the department's staff of 79 has not increased since 1964 in spite of new rehabilitation programs and the caseload growth. Six welfare workers processing applications for assistance are averaging 70 to 75 interviews a day and cannot meet the daily demand, he says. The average field worker is carrying 40 percent more cases than the maximum allowed by senior staff. Employees attached to the Supplementation of Wages Program are responsible for two and a half times the recommended maximum" -- Do the members want me to continue with it? -- "warned one Mr. Hooper. The Social Service emphasis is by necessity becoming increasingly focused on crisis intervention at the expense of rehabilitation and support of service. A promised transfer of about 2,000 people to the Provincial Welfare Department would have eased the situation." And I want to repeat this, Mr. Speaker: "A promised transfer of about 2,000 people to the Provincial Welfare Department would have eased the situation, but unfortunately it has not begun. Nor has the city received any formal commitment from the Department of Health and Social Service." Nor has the committee received any formal commitment from the Department of Health and Social Services. "Pressure on the City Welfare Department has come from the steady influx of rural residents into the city and a progressive employer demand for higher education and formal trade schools, he said."

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is necessary to continue any further. You want me to read the whole thing? Very well I'll continue. "Nevertheless, the outstanding cause is undoubtedly related to an increase in unemployment, said the director. Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures show that 3.3 percent or 12,000 of the Manitoba labour force was unemployed on April 19th, last year. For the same period this year that figure has climbed to 4.6 or 17,000, an increase of 41 percent, an increase of 41 percent in one year's time. Premier Ed. Schreyer has put the figures much lower than that. About 8,000 unemployed for the same period. In the House in April, Social Services Minister Rene Toupin said the province has delayed taking over city welfare cases because of space shortages and staff problems."

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a resolution presented to this House, which in my opinion, was a genuine resolution dealing with genuine problems that exist today in the City of Winnipeg and probably in other parts of the province. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Metropolitan area, but I am a member of this House who is concerned about the welfare of the people of this province, and now we find the Minister of Health and Social Services or Social Development as he wishes to call it, trying in my opinion to gloss over the fact that the department is doing nothing. And Mr. Speaker, I object.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): . . . the Minister of Transportation will return. My intervention in the debate at this stage is prompted by the remarks that the Minister of Transportation saw fit to make in connection with this resolution. I have no objection to the Minister of Health and Social Development moving an amendment to the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that is -- I beg your pardon, Fort Rouge -- that is his prerogative and he explained his reasons for doing that. Also, the Attorney-General outlined some reservations that he felt were contained in the resolution. And I can only conclude that they're legitimate reservations that he expressed over the workability of the proposals

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) made by the Member for Fort Rouge. But I do, Sir, take serious objection to the constant interventions by the Minister of Transportation in referring to every motion, every suggestion made on this side of the House as being phoney or something of that nature. His contribution to debate at all times is nothing more than diatribe, personal invective. His objection to the introduction of this resolution was simply that the government that was in power before the present government took over had been in power 11 years and nothing was done about it.

Well Sir, the Member for Fort Rouge was elected on June 25th last and how she could have introduced a resolution of that nature prior to that time is something I would like to have him explain. In addition to that, Sir, what are the purpose of Private Members' Resolutions? It's to bring the thoughts of a member before the Chamber, to air them, to give them an opportunity to be debated, to find out if they're workable and perhaps to set the stage for public opinion to be generated in that direction. Private Members' Resolutions do serve a useful purpose in this Chamber and to have them treated in the cavalier way that the Minister of Transportation saw fit to treat it, shows his abysmal ignorance and his lack of knowledge of the purpose of this Chamber. I resent very much his attempting to relegate a motion or a resolution of this kind to the category of being phoney. Sir, if there's anything that's phoney in this Chamber, it's the Minister of Transportation. I can assure him that when his motion to deal with the motorcycle riders of this province comes before the committee he may find out what certain people think of him.

Sir, I rise only to raise these objections to the treatment of legitimate resolutions brought before this Chamber in an attempt to draw to the attention of the government problems that certain members see exist in current legislation. I know that the Member for Fort Rouge brought that matter to the attention of the House in the knowledge that there were problems in this direction. I want to say to the Minister of Health and Social Development that we appreciate his concern, and to the Attorney-General, for the courteous way in which they dealt with this resolution, which is more than I can say for the Minister of Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the Member for Morris. I don't rise to defend the Minister of Transportation; he doesn't need me to defend him, but perhaps we are losing sight of why the original motion was presented and the reason for it. I think I agree with the Member for Fort Rouge, and even in some ways I can understand the concern of the Member from Birtle-Russell for what's going on in some of the social services. But I just want to make an attempt to hang a couple of thoughts together without my speech writer.

This to me is but another manifestation of our propensity to look at the effect rather than the cause, and I have for a number of years have had cause for concern in this particular area, in marriage breakdowns and this sort of social illness, and perhaps the time has come for us to look at it in its broader sense. This is why I am rather enthused about the Minister's amendment, because while I agree in principle with what the Member from Fort Rouge was trying to accomplish, I think perhaps if we look at it in this narrow sense it won't accomplish what she wanted to accomplish in the first place.

I recall to mind - you know, our whole society has changed. For example, if you think of people working in places where the plumbing facilities consisted of a two-holer out in the back, that we have progressed to a point where you have a certain number of employees and we have to provide a certain facility to these people. Well, I'm not suggesting that the onus of provision of services in the area that I'm about to suggest should lay entirely on employers, perhaps it would be a good place to locate a facility which might be of benefit to people.

Now society has changed to the extent relative to marriage and the way people live. When our forefathers came to this particular part of the country they were so darned busy working and raising children that a lot of the social illnesses didn't occur to the degree that they occur today. They were just too busy, but as our society becomes more affluent, you get more things and people really haven't learned how to deal with leisure, how to put up with each other in close quarters and many other things.

What I'm really getting at is - I have somewhere around in all my junk here a proposal for a human development corporation. This isn't my Human Resource Research Council - I think I've alluded to it in the few words I had in another debate - that people have to, in my view, be helped to develop the capacity to deal with change itself; they have to be helped to develop the capacity to deal with the changing world around them.

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.)

One of the things which causes marriage breakdown is this urbanization of our society, and perhaps the time has come for us, through the Social Development Department or through business or through some other agency -- I think there is some work being done in the States of larger corporations employing clinical psychologists right in the business establishment so that some of these things can be prevented. There are a goodly number. I spent the last five years being a counsellor, and once word gets out that you are a counsellor, it's something like being a lawyer. Every time you bump into somebody, somebody always says - you know, oh I hear you are a lawyer; well I've got a case - can you help me solve it? They always talk about a hypothetical friend, but anyway a lot of the people, through social contacts and things, have asked me to be of some assistance in marital problems. In a good number of cases they can be prevented. By the time that you use the approach that is suggested in the original motion it's just too darned late, and this is why I support enthusiastically the amendment presented by our Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member from Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may just reply to some of the remarks before we close the debate. I would like to thank the Attorney-General - I don't see him at the moment - for his very thoughtful consideration of my suggestions and I must say that I agree completely with many of the things he had to say, and as the Member from Morris has said, the purpose of private members' resolutions is perhaps to generate discussion and certainly there was no resentment on my part if he didn't wholeheartedly adopt, as is, the suggestions that I had made.

The Minister of Health and Social Development, I have to take a little exception to his feeling that the use of the Social Security Number to trace the defaulting father -- I have to take exception to his saying that this would be a violation of a man's civil rights. I don't think that anywhere in our discussion or our lives or laws that there is any civil rights that a man can subscribe to that means that he can abandon his family. I think that members of the Attorney-General's Department have said that the use of the social security number would be relatively simple and that it would also be quite inexpensive.

Now I did mention these few things because I felt that I should make specific suggestions. I appreciate the Member from Winnipeg Centre's remarks that it was not comprehensive enough. There are a number of things that I could have added to this list, and in line with the thinking of the member from Winnipeg Centre I might suggest that extension of the Provincial Government Family Planning Centre would be probably the first and most effective way of dealing with these social problems. There is no doubt about it that the families in which breakdown occur simply aren't able to cope. Perhaps it's numbers of family or perhaps they are just mentally or physically or morally unable to stand the stress and strain of bringing up a family. I think that one can speak for a long time about the rather hideous effort that was outlined by this government in the discussion of estimates concerning family planning services.

I do appreciate the remarks that the gentlemen have made, including the members from my own side. I take some exception to having this resolution labelled as phoney because we didn't do it eleven years ago, and this just of course doesn't make any sense at all except in the light of the fact that the Minister of Highways is forever trying to push us into a box and hold down the lid as hard as he can. He just can't stand it if we come up with some new ideas and I think that it should be stressed loudly in this House that we are Progressive Conservatives.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, not having spoken either to the motion -- (Interjection) -- no it didn't, we are speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would have favoured the resolution as it was put because I know the need too for a fund like was suggested by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, because from time to time we as members all experience these difficulties, people come to you that are in distress because of certain situations and you would like to give them help, and I think one way of doing this would have been to create, set up such a maintenance fund. But since the government does not see fit to go along with it, I take it that the amendment will carry, but that doesn't mean that the problem is solved or that the problem is no longer there, but is still something that we as members and as the government will have to cope with.

I do feel that even though the resolution as originally worded does not carry, that they

June 19, 1970

(MR. FROESE Cont'd.). . . . pay particular attention to this request and that when they will in future review the situation that they honestly do give priority to the requests that are being made, because just to amend a resolution and then let it go at that, I don't think is sufficient. I think if the government brings in amendments of this type that they should mean it and that they should give priority to the matter as it's been suggested in the amendment.

The Central Registry to trace defaulting fathers might be a good thing. I don't know just how well it could be worked. The matter of social security numbers could be used in my opinion, but still I think this would still require quite an amount of work, although I don't know how numerous these cases are, and while it might have been said in debate earlier, at least I don't know at the moment. -- (Interjection) — Well, I imagine they are among them too. I know they are. I guess you have them in all different nationalities and ours certainly is no exception, because certain ones have been brought to my attention and where I have tried to assist people who were in trouble of this type. But I too just wanted to state that I would have supported the original resolution, and I do hope when the government forces its amendment through that they will give it priority as the amendment reads.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the motion as amended and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose, as amended. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. -- (Interjection) — The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing the debate if I speak at this time, if there are any other members who wish to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the resolution as amended although with great reservation, simply because I have no alternative at this point to either support it or oppose it. Other than that I would proceed, as I tried to do and put in an amendment, which I feel is a reasonable approach to the problem. I think the government here is stating a principle with which I agree, but that we really should be going beyond this and putting ourselves in the position of competing in this case with the other two provinces. Whether we like it or don't like it, we have to face the facts as they are, and the facts are that Alberta and Saskatchewan have moved in this direction and that in the light of that situation, the existing facts at the time, the Province of Manitoba equally should move and make the changes in the estate tax to put us in line with those two provinces.

The government says it will cost them money to do this. I think you can look at the situation in another way, that if we don't take this action we will lose more and more potential investments in Manitoba, we will find that people who are here, have money in this province, may in fact establish their headquarters in either Alberta or Saskatchewan to take advantage of the laws there and that the final loss to Manitoba in terms of the taxes themselves, which would not be collected here, as a loss in terms of employment, the loss in terms of taxes on the people who are employed here and on development, will I think far outweigh the loss that the government anticipates in the rebate as given by Saskatchewan and Alberta.

So I regret that the government is not prepared to move along in this direction. I agree that I would prefer to see one national tax in this area and the Federal Government responsible, but I still say that we have a responsibility in Manitoba to deal with the problems as they are now and that the government should be moving along in this direction. So I will support the resolution reluctantly because I don't think it deals with the problems of the moment. It's a good long-term proposition but the government is forgetting the immediate need for development in Manitoba, and I think it is placing the Minister of Industry and Commerce in a position where he can't do his job adequately.

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

MR. FROESE: For the point of record, I would like to have my vote recorded as opposed to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye as amended. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the amendment to this resolution was first introduced I had very serious reservations about commending the Minister of Agriculture.

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.). . . . However, Mr. Speaker, in the past few days we have had an opportunity, when the amendments to the Crop Insurance Act were introduced which allowed hail insurance to be a part of the crop insurance program, I feel that I must commend the Minister for his action on this particular subject.

The fact that crop insurance was always a voluntary scheme, a type of insurance that was provided for the farmers on a voluntary basis, they could accept or reject, and even though the Honourable Attorney-General stated that the vote on the establishment of the districts was compulsory, the principle of freedom of choice was always evident in the crop insurance program, and I have to commend the Minister of Agriculture for the continuation of the freedom of choice when he introduced the hail insurance policy under the crop insurance scheme. This allowed any farmer who had subscribed to the crop insurance plan to take out additional coverage for hail insurance, but only on the crops that were already covered under crop insurance. A farmer could not insure a crop that he did not have under the crop insurance scheme even though he was the participant of the crop insurance program, and I have no objection to that part of the clause. So, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of crop insurance I do find that I have one item that I can commend the Minister of Agriculture for his initiative, and this is what the resolution tells me I should do.

Mr. Speaker, there is another part of the resolution which I find the Minister has implemented, even though it has been omitted by the amendment, and this is the calling of the Agricultural Committee. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat pleased to find that a proposed resolution was introduced by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to call the Agricultural Committee to study one, or possibly two of the problems that face the agricultural area of Manitoba today.

However, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the Minister of Agriculture in my opinion will hamstring the committee that is set up. The resolution that is proposed by the Minister of Agriculture confines itself mainly to the field of an investigation into the area of farm machinery. Mr. Speaker, we have had the Barber Commission which sat for three years that investigated this field. I for one, Mr. Speaker, do not feel that it is essential that we re-open that entire field at this time. The report of the Barber Commission is extensive, it's covered almost every facet, and I do not see any worthwhile purpose served by a committee of this House studying the field of farm machinery.

There's another phase of the resolution which deals with an investigation into the recommendations of the Task Force on Agriculture which was set up by the Federal Government. Here again, Mr. Speaker, we have had extensive investigations done on the federal level, and now we want a committee of this House to study the recommendations - and I have no objection to that because we must, if the agricultural economy of Manitoba is to continue and to expand, we must study recommendations of the Federal Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have to go further than that, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the terms of reference as laid out by the Minister of Agriculture in his resolution do not go far enough. They are cultivating ploughed ground, and the unploughed ground that is still to be cultivated has not been covered by the resolution of the Minister of Agriculture. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you, my colleague. He may very well be summerfallowing. He may be taking advantage of the LIFT program because he quite obviously was in favour of it at the start and I hesitate to commend the Minister for his action at that time.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago we had a farm program here to provide assistance for the storage of farm grain, which I note that this Minister has not seen fit to implement again. While we recognize that the sales of grain will be minimal, this Minister has not seen fit to provide for assistance in the provision of additional storage space.

There are many other programs which this Minister has advocated in the past, Mr. Speaker, and Hansard will reveal them to you. I have investigated over the past year and a half, Mr. Speaker, some of the proposals that this Minister of Agriculture has advocated and I think on tabulation they numbered 17. Out of those 17, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen too much indication in the present legislation of this House which would indicate that this Minister has acted in a vigorous manner. Somehow, Mr. Speaker, I have reservations about a wholehearted commendation of the action of the Minister for his initiative, and while I realize that that initiative was more or less a self-imposed pat on the back - he voted for the amendment - Mr. Speaker, I would probably be more inclined to lower my sights and apply the pressure in a more vigorous manner because I feel that there is much that still has to be done in the field of agriculture in the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak at any length on this motion as amended, but I just want to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, how impossible it would be for us on this side of the House to vote in favour of such a resolution, a resolution that started out as a reasonable resolution and one that should have been accepted by the government, particularly by the Minister of Agriculture, and to make a speech on it today, Mr. Speaker, would simply be repetitious of what I have already said insofar as the competence of the Minister of Agriculture of the Province of Manitoba. If I could find one farmer who could come in and tell me that actually under the one year's administration of this government through the Minister of Agriculture that any direct advantage had come to the agricultural community, I would probably have some hesitation in getting up and recommending or supporting him in what he has done.

But I want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, in the one and the most important issue that has been before us in the past months is that of the relations between this province and the Federal Government, and I just want to say again before the Member for La Verendrye closes debate on this resolution that the Minister of Agriculture has utterly failed to represent the farmers of the Province of Manitoba insofar as his negotiations and relationship with the Federal Government are concerned. And I refer again, Mr. Speaker, briefly to the program that we have been stuck with known as Operation LIFT, and to say to the House, and to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba who find themselves in many areas in great difficulty right now because of the fact that on much of our land that no crop will be sowed this year and all that they have to fall back on is the program known as Operation LIFT and it offers little or nothing in relation to the costs of operation, to the costs of financing insofar as capital costs and interest are concerned, that \$6.00 an acre is a pittance and is in fact an insult to the industry in the Province of Manitoba.

Again I want to say to the Minister, who is trying not to listen, who dares not call the committee together to hear the farmers of the Province of Manitoba, who has not the guts to invite those organizations in here to discuss with him the problems that they confront now directly as a result of his negotiations or lack of negotiations with the Federal Government, leaves me to have no alternative, Mr. Speaker, but to vote against the resolution.

There are three "whereases" in the resolution that were introduced by the Member for La Verendrye that are whereases that no one can object to, but the fact that the balance of the resolution commends the Minister for what he has done in this area, is absolutely nothing, and in fact in his own words it will work out to no help to the majority of the farmers and in fact will do harm to some of the farmers in our province, so for this reason it is my intention to vote against this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be ajourned.

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

. continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing the debate on this resolution as well and I find myself in the same position as with the one I spoke to a few moments ago, although I cannot say that I have objections to the resolution as it is, the wording being exactly the same as the wording that I had in my original resolution. The only change has been that the amendment has removed reference to specific portions or specific taxes or proposals in the White Paper which seemed to me were explanatory and clearly laid out what my view and the view of the Liberal Party was, and I think in general, from the discussion I've heard in the House, the views of the members of this Legislature.

However, that is not major to the question. The real question here is that there should be a presentation by the Government of Manitoba on behalf of the people of Manitoba on this question and that the government presumably is agreeable to have the matter referred to the committee of the House. The committee then will be producing some kind of a report. Now I would hope that this would happen very soon, because although there are indications that the White Paper may not be acted upon as quickly as one originally was led to believe, nevertheless it is urgent that we put forward a Manitoba position.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are valid reasons for a specific Manitoba proposal in this area. The present state of economic development in Manitoba is far behind that of Ontario in particular, and to proceed to make changes in our tax laws that are applicable across the country without regional consideration, I submit could be very harmful to a province like our own which in certain area still requires some very massive development work. In the area for example of mining, it is true that we now have major mining operations in the north but there's still much more to be developed, and we don't want to be placed in the position where incentives to the development are going to put us behind, for example, the Province of Ontario, which was developed at a much earlier date.

I think that one of the things that Manitoba should be pushing for in the review of the tax structure is that the Federal Government could well consider a regional structure of taxation, not taking the tax across the country and saying we are going to apply them uniformly because this is the easiest way to do, but rather to look upon the country as it stands now, look upon the problems of the various regions and adapt the tax structure to fit those problems. I recognize the political difficulty in doing this but I think it is necessary if we are in fact going to have sound regional development in Canada. I submit that that is one of the essentials of Canadian unity, that unless the various regions in the country participate in the growth of the country, then in the long run the continuing arguments between one end of the country and the other, the talk about alienation and separatism and everything else that goes with it, will continue, and the way to correct this is to see that there is healthy economic growth in every part of Canada.

It seems to me that many of the problems of Quebec, while they may be related to other difficulties of language and race and so on, that basically much of it is economic, the feeling on the part of the people of Quebec that they have not shared in the economic development of the rest of Canada, and that feeling in my opinion exists here in the Province of Manitoba. Part of it is probably our own fault as Manitobans, but I think in many cases the federal laws do not take into proper consideration the need for regional development and I submit this is the case in the White Paper. The government of this province and the Economic Committee have a major responsibility to put forward the stand of Manitoba in a reasonable way, and to ensure that the Federal Government realizes that the conditions across the country are not identical and that a change of laws that is applied uniformly across Canada may be very detrimental to a province like our own which is in dire need of development.

So I urge the government to proceed with their presentation, and the Economic Committee of the House to meet as quickly as possible to deal with the White Paper.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the sub-amendment, I certainly have no objection to what is set forth there, and insofar as the amendment is concerned, I don't think I can vote for that anyway. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the contents of the main motion and in the interest of expediency, I am prepared to let that matter go forward to a vote, that is the sub-amendment, at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment? The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I rise to state more clearly my position on the sub-amendment and my position on the total issue of education in Manitoba. When this resolution as proposed by the Member from Rhineland was first introduced, I said then that it was a resolution that did promise to thrust rather deeply into the fabric of Manitoba's social and cultural life. I think in retrospect that perhaps the issue is not as salient today as it has been in the past. Certainly I have received from my own constituents very little negative comment on the resolution, on the amendment and on the sub-amendment.

Nonetheless, I think that it is incumbent on me and some other members to make clear whether they are talking about the past or talking about the future. The original resolution is one which I think looks at the past. It looks to that issue that has disturbed Manitoba politics, it looks to the possibility of righting what many people felt was a wrong. But I prefer to take this resolution as a vehicle for moving into the future, and I look upon the amendment that I proposed and the sub-amendment of the Member from Crescentwood as measures which would bring about some reform in our school system. That really is my position and I think others on the back bench here who are progressive and who got involved in politics in order to introduce to the best of their ability some reform in education, in the economic structure of the province and in other areas of concern to the Legislature and to the government.

There are many reasons for reform in our educational system. No system is perfect and I think that for many students in Manitoba the educational system has been for them a very imperfect system. And the imperfection of the educational system has become very clear in studies that have been made by the School Division No. 1, that is the Winnipeg School Division. In a published report they did indicate that about six percent of the school population in any grade level was likely to drop out of school. Now a dropout of course is not something that could easily be prevented by any mere change in the structure of the school system, but surely some of these dropouts might be kept in school if the school system was more responsive to their need. I think that many school divisions tend to be rather conservative, tend to be not too progressive in their attitudes towards educational reform, and tend to be a little frightened perhaps of introducing changes that might arouse some small criticism.

Now in the urban and suburban areas of Manitoba, in the Metro area, change has been introduced, but there are still large segments of the school population that the school system in its imperfections does not cater to. There are, for example, those that we might classify as the disadvantaged or the culturally deprived. These students have some difficulty coping with a school system which is certainly middle class, it's achievement oriented, and in the elementary grades and into the junior high is dominated by the female - a female-oriented middle-class institution - and a child who comes from a disadvantaged home is not able to cope with that kind of institution. Then, too, there are some students in the school system who have extremely high intelligence and find the school system not only imperfect, they find it a very sad institution, an institution which represses their originality, which represses their intellectual capability, which channels them into rather narrowly defined curriculum. These students too, I think, would benefit from some change in the school system. Finally, there are the students that I referred to earlier, the dropouts. Usually they drop out because of inability to perform academically.

Now these categories of students make up a minority in the school system, and the changes that I envisage from the suggestion contained in my amendment to this resolution and the intention contained in the sub-amendment, are not changes that would introduce a revolution in the school system, far from it. All that is suggested is a reform, and all reform is an incremental change, a change at the margin, if they can call it that. Today there is very little that can occur in the school system as it exists, and it would seem to me that there is some need for a system of financing schools, the public schools in particular and private schools, which would make it more feasible for school administrators and for teachers to innovate in the school system and to test out curriculum and methods which would meet the needs of the categories of

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.) students that I have already mentioned.

So what I'm looking to then is incremental change, a change that would be a supplement to the existing public school system, and what I'm suggesting and what I'm sure the sub-amendment is intended to suggest, is not a fragmentation of the public school system. The public school system serves a vast majority of students and I think it has served them very very well, but there are still those classes of students that I've mentioned at the periphery of the student body which need better service.

Let me turn from the student for a moment to the parent. There would seem, too, to be some need for giving the parents greater choice in what kind of education their children might acquire. What is the present choice that these parents have. Well, they can right now work for higher taxes. If they want a better school system they can move into the political arena, I suppose, or work in voluntary groups to get reforms introduced and to get the taxes raised so that a better school system can be provided for their children. Or, if they're dissatisfied with the schools in one area, they can move to a more expensive neighborhood where generally the schools are somewhat better and somewhat more responsive to the needs of the students. Finally, the choice of parents comes to paying all the tuition, the total cost for their child or children to go to a private school. These choices are not always that realistic for many parents, and I think there are some parents who would like to see their children experience a school system which would give them, in the parent's mind anyway, give the children a better education.

Now turning from the focus on the child and on the parents needs to some other benefit that I think might be derived from the changes envisaged by the amendment and the sub-amendment. There are benefits to any kind of reform. First of all, I think that the suggestion contained in these amendments would lead to the development of programs of education which could be more readily evaluated by the parents, by the teachers and by the students. I think you could find in a private school system, or a private school, a kind of feed-back which would let the administration know just how effective their school was. There could be evaluation of the kinds of school programs which produce a large earning capacity for example. What value is there in today's school of teaching ancient history for example. Is that something that is going to produce large earning capacities or not. How do you design a curriculum which does produce large earning capacity. I think a private school might lead to an evaluation of whether a large earning capacity is a criteria for a school system.

Secondly, I think that programs might be evaluated so that the effectiveness of those programs might be determined so that the different schools could be seen as areas, or schools rather than prepare students for life and work. There is a certain ivory tower aspect about schools. They are not an integral part of our community and their effectiveness in preparing students for life and for work might be looked at in a more objective fashion than is presently the case in our monolithic public school system.

Then, too, I think cost effective studies could be carried on in a private school system much more readily than they are carried on now. I'm not even sure that cost effective studies are carried on now in any particular school division. Cost effective studies I think need experimental schools of some kind because it's only in an experimental school that you can separate the ongoing administration and teaching that occurs in the school from the educational theories and the educational mechanism and the personalities of the the people that are presently in the various schools and school divisions. I think that there is need to try to determine just how effective any program is in terms of the cost input to it, and it's very difficult to do this in a public school. It's difficult because many parents of course get upset if there's any kind of evaluation or enquiry into what is happening to their child in their school. So the system continues without much evaluation.

Then, too, I think that a private school might introduce an atmosphere of freedom in which, what I call or what can be called the production function of education, could be examined. Again, you know, there's not very much that we know really about how productive a particular system of teaching could be or is.

Also, there is the necessity for introducing cost-benefit analysis in the school system. I think in the past the basic criteria that has been used in our schools is to increase the quantity; in crease to get more schools, more desks, more science equipment, bigger libraries, more books, more teachers, more special teachers, but somehow out of this moreness or greatness or greater increase in cost inputs, somehow you would get a better school and a better education

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.) for children. And of course I don't think that follows, just as if we introduced double the number of legislators, I don't think the Legislature would necessarily be a better place even though it costs people of Manitoba twice that it now costs them.

Well, I think that these benefits could accrue from the small reforms that the amendment and sub-amendment are intended to get at. The way of achieving these reforms I suppose are many. The resolution contains one but there are others, and the most common one that I hear of course is that the existing school system itself could be modified, could be changed, could be reformed. There's also the possibility of course of the Department of Education setting up or establishing a pool or task force of teachers, with perhaps the co-operation of the Manitoba Teachers Society, and these teachers could go out into particular schools to upgrade the school perhaps.

There is also the possibility of the Department of Education establishing its own publicly supported, totally publicly supported provincial ~~experimental~~ school. That, I think, is a rather intriguing possibility because, you know, if you approach any Department of Education in the province and suggest various innovations in school system, the immediate answer you get is - well, you know, the school division is autonomous and the Department of Education really has no business in the schools, in the ordinary schools, the academic schools, and therefore the Department of Education can do nothing. So that a provincial experimental school funded by the province, staffed I suppose by civil servants, would perhaps bring about some of the reforms that many people seem to think are necessary in our school system.

And finally, fourthly, there are the private schools which the resolution, the amendment and the sub-amendment could be the basis of establishing. These schools, private schools now, would develop their own curriculum and their own system of teaching, and then the sub-amendment points out the curriculum would be presented to the Department of Education and the officials of the department presumably would give their approval to that program, and then it would be instituted. If it was successful, one must assume that the parents would be willing to send their children there.

These changes then, Mr. Speaker, are really what I had hoped to see brought about by the House considering - or the government rather, considering the advisability of the resolution, its amendment and sub-amendment. But I think there is some need to focus on the future and the need for reform and not just to look to the past and the problems of the past, and surely if there's any change going to be introduced now which would right a wrong, which would bring equity to certain religious ethnic groups in the province, that that equity should not be denied to those parents who think that the present school system is inadequate but don't feel that they should send their children to a religious or a church school.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, what has to be kept in mind in considering these resolutions is both equity and reform, because if there isn't reform in our school system eventually, there is every possibility that we will see the same problems in our schools as some individuals have experienced in universities, particularly in the United States. So with these words, Mr. Speaker, I have to express that I feel I must support the sub-amendment because it would introduce a greater measure of reform in our school system.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment? The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I start agreeing with the Honourable Member for Osborne I think we've been sitting too long. The session has extended itself far beyond my capacity to stave off some of these, what we would call revolutionary ideas I suppose, two years ago. At one time, I can assure you, and I think as many others can assure you, that we would not have been standing to support such a resolution. I had a very closed mind on it, as the Minister of Transportation has today, but I can't say really that I have seen the light at all, except that I have seen that there is a place for religion in school and alternatives.

I think that if you were studying religion itself today you will find that religion in itself has said that we have got to stop turning within ourselves and turn out. In other words, they say that they cannot wait for religion to come to the church but they have got to go out; and if this is the case, then I think that perhaps, just perhaps, we should be able to on that point say to the public that if this is the case then maybe we can support religion in schools and schools that support a particular religion -- (Interjection) -- a comparative religion? Religion is

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) comparatively good in all cases.

So we would say that when they choose to go to a private or parochial school, they are choosing the school of their choice. I think it's difficult for the public school system to bring in religious teachings that would be acceptable to children or to the family because we are bigoted in many cases and it would be very, very difficult to bring in a course that would be acceptable to people of all religions, unfortunately, but this is the case.

I think that there is room now for both. I don't think we should have to go out and build a lot of schools around the country to support all the different religions that want to do their own thing, but there are schools now that are able to, and have proven that they are able to support students and there are more students wanting to get in apparently than there are schools available. I think that this has to be looked at carefully; probably there would have to be a freeze for awhile on private schools or the opening of new private schools, or the aid to new private schools, so that they could catch up with what is going on. But undoubtedly whatever you say, Mr. Speaker, whatever way you cut the cake, the private schools and the students that are going there, are taking a load off the taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba. I don't think that anyone can argue that. So consequently we are saving dollars. I don't know how much, but accountants could find out, they know how much it costs to teach a child in Manitoba and possibly from there they can get a formula.

I know that the formula used in the N. W. T. is something like \$425 a child up to Grade 6. I forget what it is from Grade 7 on but it is more, I think it is 500 and some odd dollars. But I don't feel that those who want to send their children to private schools would be able to say well we can do it at the cost of the public entirely. I think that the public purse has to be extended to some, but not the whole way, and I think that this would have to come about gradually.

I have had no pressure put on me by private schools or by my seat mate in fact, on this, but I think that perhaps it's the teachers that the problem has arisen at present, and if it is then there is no reason why some money couldn't be allocated to those teachers, because presumably if those teachers aren't teaching under a public school system then they are going to have to teach under a private school system, so it is not costing the government any money. How much would they pay? I don't know and I'm not going to get drawn into this type of a discussion, but I think that there could be a relief brought forward, because there are different costs even in the private school system which is very difficult to live with. If you want to send it to one private school the child may cost you \$60 a month; if you send it to another one it may cost you \$2,700 a year, and that is because one is supported within an organization, be it church, etc., by the use of bingos and such on.

If these people believe in their religion, in Christianity that much, that they are prepared as parents to go out and raise funds in this manner then I think that they should be given a certain amount of support, because they have in fact shown that they believe enough in religion today, and they believe enough in their ideal to not only pay for it, but to go out and work for it; to work for it not only for their own children but for others and I believe that we have to consider this when we are debating the fact of aid to both types of systems.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question at this point?

MR. BEARD: I suppose so.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member agree to provide public aid to a school that was dedicated to the teaching of Marxism?

MR. BEARD: I would have to study that to see whether it's a religion or not.

MR. GREEN: It's a non-religion.

MR. BEARD: I have only gone as far as religion, and in my terms I don't think that's religion. And I don't believe in atheists either.

MR. GREEN: Well would you agree to give public funds to a school that was dedicated to the teaching of atheism?

MR. BEARD: Atheism? I told you I don't believe in it.

MR. GREEN: You are saying that you will give money to schools that you believe in?

MR. BEARD: I believe in Christianity. I believe in religion and I don't believe in atheism, so the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knows how bigoted I am.

MR. GREEN: All I'm asking you - Mr. Chairman, may I ask the question again? The only thing - I'm not asking whether you'd be prepared to give money to schools that you believe in, because I don't think that's the problem, I'm asking you whether the Legislature would be

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) prepared to give money to schools, the teaching of which they don't believe in, because I believe that that is the real problem.

MR. BEARD: Then that is what this House is going to have to decide on what it believes in and what it does not believe in. As for myself, I do not believe in Communism, I do not believe in Marxism and I do not believe in that type of aid. If you want to be a Marx you can be a Marxist -- (interjection) -- But you said it I didn't.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just would like again to ask the honourable member not to interpret my question as expressing a belief. All I'm asking is whether he would be willing to give money to a school that taught, let us say, Fascism, that taught Communism, that taught Nazism, that taught atheism. I'd like to advise my honourable friend in continuing to ask the question, that there are schools in Manitoba that would have followed that program but would have taught, as an addition, Communism. Would the honourable member be prepared to give money to that type of school?

MR. BEARD: No, but I would be prepared to filibuster for a long time if the Legislature ever decides to try to support that type of program.

There are new approaches every day, Mr. Speaker, to education and we have found - and I'm speaking particularly in Northern Manitoba - we have found the public school system and the public school education has not been able to keep up with the changes or the demands that are required to bring a different group of Manitobans into the 1970th century. But I have found, Mr. Speaker, that fortunately in some case where I went to reservations and isolated communities in which they had in fact a private school system that was supported by the Federal Government on a reservation, that that school system had those children, as far as I was concerned, a great deal ahead in years than those that were outside of that type of system. It was possibly because of the dedication of the teachers; it was the fact that the people were up there and they had been there for many years and they had not come and gone as teachers quite often or mostly do in the north, but they were there year after year and there was continuity of teaching and the continuity of teachers themselves, so that they did provide for the north and for that particular part of the north a far better, a far far better system than was being provided unfortunately by our public school system.

I don't think our public school system is equal by any means. Just the same as the Member for Osborne said, in our sophisticated system today one can't compare a school system in one part of Manitoba with one in another because there are many areas that are falling further behind and there are many areas that cannot in fact offer the student the same quality of education, the same quality of teacher, or the same quality of extra curriculum that the City of Winnipeg is offering the children in this part of the province. So there is no security of equality just because you have a public school system controlling our education in Manitoba. There is no security whatsoever.

I think that public school systems often do not fit into the individual religious communities that the public school system is now serving. I think there are many areas in Manitoba which would possibly be better off under a private school system, and, Mr. Speaker, you know them as well as I do. There are different ones such as Hutterite colonies, which could have the assistance of public moneys and they could be under a private system, and I think that they would fall closer into line with what is needed in that particular area, in that particular area because it's important that we remember that we must fit education into the area into which it is supposed to support the requirements of the children coming from that area. And all parts of Manitoba are different. So I think that maybe in a way private school systems are more flexible. Certainly the curriculum has to be more flexible and this is what's necessary.

I would close on saying that as far as I am concerned the costs are not going to rise that much, I think the costs are only those that the public are hiding behind or away from today by the shield of the public school system and the care that religious groups have in saying we want to do it our way, and they have taken that burden of cost away from the public purse and they have done it themselves and they are going to continue apparently to do it themselves.

So let's start to recognize the fact that they are a service group to the community of Manitoba just the same as many other service groups that we in fact here in this Legislature offer money to every year. We give money to it, whether it be Ballet or whether it be the Winnipeg Symphony, whoever it may be, and we find all kinds of reasons to give it to those people. But I've never been to a symphony in my life and I've never gone to see - what do they call them? - the Galloping Gallots, and I never intend to see them, but part of the money is

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) allocated each year to these people. And what does it come under? Some form of education, an education for a small portion of the people that happen to want to go to see that, but not to everyone because we know that everybody couldn't go even if they wanted to.

So actually we have many cases in which education is being contributed to in many many forms under a private contribution or a contribution to a private company, and if that's all that's necessary then let the schools declare themselves private companies, charitable ones, and contribute to them. They're non-profit, but the children that go there are profiting and it allows the alternative for those children that cannot get along in the public school system, Mr. Speaker, believe me, I'm assured in my own mind when I say it, that there are thousands of children in the Province of Manitoba today that are in the private school system today because they couldn't hack under the public school system or they couldn't get along, or they're in the wrong crowd and they had to be moved out. This is not meant to be a derogative remark against the public school system, but it is a fact that we all, or many of us consider private schools for our children or our neighbours' children as an alternative, and if this is the case then I should think we should be a little more open-minded and say let's take a look at it. It's a hundred years and that's quite a long time and possibly the time for the change is now. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't intending to speak on this resolution at this stage but I feel I have to in all conscience now because of the amendment and the sub-amendment that have been moved to the resolution itself, and while I support the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland and intend to vote for it, I do not, Sir, support the amendment or the sub-amendment to the resolution for a number of reasons. I believe that the amended amendment opens up avenues of potential danger, opens up avenues where we enter into areas for which we haven't got the answers, and I think that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources a moment or two ago in challenging the position of the Member for Churchill was making reference to precisely some of the things that I have thought about and taken the position that I take, and I can tell him that if he had been asking me the questions that he was asking the Member for Churchill, my answer to those questions would have been "no", that I would not be prepared to expend public money to support an educational institution that taught Fascism or that taught Communism or that taught any creed that I consider, and that I think most legislators in this Chamber consider, hostile to our society, and to our system. But the original . . .

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit a question? Would he agree to pay public funds to a school that taught agnosticism?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I'll answer that question, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I see nothing to fear in agnosticism. I see nothing to fear in agnosticism. Agnosticism is a question that's related specifically to religion but not to political philosophy, and I would not object to support of a school that taught agnosticism.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member agree to support a school that taught atheism?

MR. SHERMAN: I think I would probably put atheism in that same category. I would probably put atheism in that same category. I would prefer to see - I would prefer to see that the institutions were not committed to that kind of clear-cut declamatory position on religion, but I would have to in conscience put atheism in the same category as agnosticism for the purposes under discussion, and I would have to say that I would not withhold my support of an educational institution purely on the grounds that it was in direction either agnostic or atheistic, but I would object to overt and obvious and declamatory, political, philosophical instruction of the kinds to which the Minister of Mines and Resources has also referred in his questioning.

I think that the danger in the amendment and in the amendment to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, lies in the generality of the language, the generality of the terms. The amendment refers, for example, to all educational institutions in the Province of Manitoba. Well, all educational institutions covers a pretty broad spectrum of possibilities. It poses the question, what constitutes an educational institution, what constitutes an educational institution in the future as compared to an educational institution of the present or of the past. What are the criteria by which "educational institutions" are measured, and I think the potential for exploitation and for danger is one that cannot be minimized. There is a possibility that specialized

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) educational institutions that we have not yet contemplated could develop over the next period of time ahead of us and that we might be confronted with a problem that we haven't anticipated or envisaged in the educational environment that we know today, and therein lies the danger to which I object.

I think that the term "a curriculum" is equally dangerous, because the term "a curriculum" is a generality. The term employed by my friend the Member for Rhineland, who proposed the original resolution, is "the" curriculum, not "a" curriculum but "the" curriculum prescribed by the Department of Education of the Province of Manitoba. I submit, Sir, without splitting hairs, that there is a profound difference between "a" curriculum prescribed by the Department of Education and "the" curriculum prescribed by the Department of Education, and I think that the possibility and the potential for exploitation again of a situation exists in just the precise use of that terminology. So I am opposed to that wording in the amendment.

I also take objection to the term "qualified" as applied to the word "teachers" in the amendment. Why does it have to be a kind of assistance provided for instruction that emanates from "qualified" teachers. There are of course situations in our school system as it exists at the present time where student teachers and substitute teachers, and others who have not achieved full qualifications, are required to offer and extend their services, and I think, that the terminology of "qualified" teachers imposes a limitation and a possible stricture there that would be harmful and dangerous and would, to a certain extent, limit the teaching facilities and the teaching personnel available to our schools and our students at the present time. In times of teacher shortages, a stricture that called for only "qualified" teachers might come back to haunt us and haunt the Department of Education and haunt the schools themselves.

I take objection also, Sir, to the word "approved" which is used in the sub-amendment and is proposed as a substitute for the word "prescribed" when related to the curriculum of the Department of Education. Once again I see a potential for exploitation and danger, a potential for possibilities that we can't at the moment anticipate or envisage. I see a deep difference between an "approved" curriculum and a "prescribed" curriculum. An "approved" curriculum could be one that was a limited curriculum, that was specifically devoted to a fairly narrow academic area, in fact it wouldn't even have to be an academic area, a fairly narrow and a specific area of instruction; whereas a curriculum that is "prescribed" by the Department of Education of the Province of Manitoba is obviously not one that lends itself to such possible abuse. A curriculum that's "prescribed" by the Department of Education for the Province of Manitoba is a broad and accepted spectrum of instructions, the contents of which are available to public scrutiny and which has had to stand the test of such observation and scrutiny.

So, on those grounds I must say that I reject the amendment and the sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I felt that I had to rise and state my position at this point because I do not oppose the original resolution. I support the original resolution and intend to vote for it, but the operative and the essential phrase in my view in that original resolution is the phrase "the curriculum prescribed" etc., etc. - the curriculum prescribed. That is a specific, broad, established curriculum that all of us know about, prescribed by the Department of Education for the Province of Manitoba, and we know there what we're dealing with. We're not asked to consider or to deal with or to consider legislation related to a field of instruction that at this point in time is unknown to us and which can be exploited by anyone who is inclined to take advantage of regulation and legislation that is general rather than specific.

As for the resolution itself and the original theme incorporated in the proposal of the Member for Rhineland, for the basic principle that we're considering here, Mr. Speaker, I say that I have no difficulty in subscribing to it or endorsing it because I believe that the contribution made by the private and parochial schools to our culture and to our society here in Manitoba can not be over-emphasized. I believe that they have made a massive and a lasting contribution. I believe further that if we really are sincere about the kind of mosaic we talk about and about the unity and diversity which we Manitobans have often raised, if not indeed flaunted as the virtual motto of our province, if we believe in it then we should be prepared, Sir, to stand by it in our approach to education and in our legislation. We should have the courage of our convictions, and I have no hesitation in saying that our greatest strength as Manitobans and Canadians reposes in that diversity.

I believe further, Sir, that there are strengths to be found in a diverse educational system that do not exist in a monolithic one. I have no hesitation in saying however at this point that my three children, all of them school age, go to public schools, public institutions in the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) City of Winnipeg school system, and I have been very pleased with the education and all forms of instruction that they have received. I think that Winnipeggers and Manitobans in general can take deep satisfaction in their public school system, but this doesn't say that I believe in the idea and the concept and the principle of monolithic educational systems. I happen to believe my children are getting a good education in the schools that they go to and I'd like to keep them there, but I don't believe in monolithic educational systems. I believe in fact the opposite, Sir, I believe that a monolithic educational system can be a very dangerous thing and it's in the diversity of our educational systems that our country's best hope for freedom reposes.

So I must reiterate that, despite what I've had to say about the amendment and the sub-amendment, I am fully in support of the concept of public financial assistance to private and parochial schools, but I can not accept a generality which raises possible avenues for abuse and exploitation such as is contained in the words of the amendment and the sub-amendment to the resolution, so when the time comes, Sir, I will have to vote against the amendment and the sub-amendment.

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

MR. SCHREYER: . . . of the last speaker. The question has to do with his very last statement. Did he indicate that he would be voting against the sub-amendment and the amendment as well, or just the sub-amendment?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Sir, I'll be voting against the sub-amendment and the amendment, and for the original resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was really very pleased when the Honourable Member for Rhineland brought this resolution before us and I will certainly give his original intention my wholehearted support. I feel that this province has lagged far behind the rest of Canada in recognizing that parents who are paying school taxes should have some choice in the school to which their children should go. I think there are very many valid reasons for sending one's children to private or parochial schools, and the parents generally make very great sacrifices in order to give their children this particular form of education.

Now, we've been reading and hearing about some of the parochial schools particularly which are facing the prospect of closing their doors. They have traditionally been schools of a fairly low tuition, but as they are raising their tuitions more of the families are finding that they can no longer afford to send their children, and without the clientele of course the schools are going to have to close their doors. I've received information just recently that two more are closing their doors at the end of this term, St. Benedict's Academy at Middlechurch and St. Charles Academy in St. Charles. I think that with the influx of students in to the public school system that will result from the closing of some of these private schools, that the government will find itself in a position of facing a very considerable expansion of the public school system next year. To me it's a little bit curious that public support has been forthcoming for hospitals, regardless of the fact that many of them are run by religious orders, and yet this reluctance persists to do the same for schools.

Now, it seems to me that a voucher system is an efficient and simple method to use in order to cover the cost of children's education. The parents should be able to apply this voucher at the school of their choice. This voucher doesn't have to be for the whole amount of the cost of the education, and it may be that in some instances his parents would be willing to pay that extra bit in order to go into a private school.

In an article in the New York Times on June 7, 1970, there is an article concerning the voucher system and debating whether this plan can work. There are a couple of ideas in it that I feel are worth passing on. They asked the question, what is the anticipated effect? Based on full disclosure of each school's programs and aims, parents would pick the school that seems best to them - progressive or traditional, public or private. Since the school that does not please a substantial clientele would cut itself from paying customers for schools, public as well as private would be squeezed out of the market. On the other hand, the competition it is hoped might encourage the schools to try new ideas.

Now they say that while a voucher might be for a certain amount, in those instances when a school is willing to take on a child with special problems, someone who is disadvantaged or perhaps has been in difficulties, that then an additional sum might be provided for this child. It's also suggested in this article that the money that is received from the public purse should

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) be kept from subsidizing actual religious instruction and should be applied to the general education of the child instead. While I think this voucher system might seem to be a bit threatening to the present system, in my opinion it would be worth trying.

Now there have been many arguments brought before the House in favour of aid to private and parochial schools and I won't attempt to reiterate them. However, I do hope that the government will give serious consideration to passing this resolution and giving some financial assistance in some way to private and parochial schools.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I don't rise at this time to make . . .

MR. BOYCE: I wonder if I could ask a question. I'm sorry, because of the noise of the rabble behind me I couldn't hear. Was the article the member was referring to, "School Vouchers - Can the Plan Work" from the New York Times?

MRS. TRUEMAN: Yes.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Do you want to ask a question?

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): No, I wanted to speak.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, so do I.

MR. GIRARD: Okay, go ahead.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I certainly don't intend to make a long speech or an emotional speech at this time. There is something though that kind of scared me. When the Honourable Member from Fort Garry spoke I found myself agreeing with him on most of what he said, but there is something that scares me when he said that he thought that he would vote against the sub-amendment and the amendment.

Now I would like to see of course -- Mr. Speaker, I don't think that anybody is waiting patiently to see which side I'm on, I think it's obvious that I'm in favour of some aid to private schools, separate schools, but I would like if it was possible, and of course this is not the way that things are done, I would have liked to have seen a very simple resolution asking -- especially now that every resolution starts with the Resolved that the government consider the advisability of granting some, and so on. I think that this should have been left fairly wide open, and I think that the only way in a private resolution if we want to try to indicate to the government that we are in favour of some principle, well then we should not try to tie down and to try to resolve everything in a resolution such as this.

I find myself now wanting to, and hoping that all the members if at all possible, or most of the members of this House, will vote in favour of this resolution but we find ourselves, we find ourselves in a position where the Honourable Member from Fort Garry has said, well I'm in favour of the main resolution but he can not vote for the amendment or the sub-amendment. In that way the people that are not -- let's say the way I understood the explanation of how the members of the government anyway were going to conduct themselves when it's time to vote on these private resolutions, I think that they were supposed to look at the resolution and say, well what would I do if this was a bill, what would I do on second reading of the bill. In other words, if I'm definitely against the principle I will vote against it. Now, if I'm not, if I'm for it or if I'm not sure even, I will vote in favour of it. This is the way, and I think this is a good way to do it, because then you're not just trying to embarrass the government, you're saying, well this is something that's good; and the government can say all right, if we're definitely against it we'll tell you right now, if not, we'll consider it.

So now we find ourselves -- and I would ask the Honourable Member from Fort Garry to think this thing over again. I think that it suffices in his speech to express his concern, I think that it suffices for the member to express his concern, but I think that all those that are not against this principle should stay united to show the government that we want them to bring in the resolution. This is why I say I would much sooner this thing would have been left as simple as possible, where you would say, well we want some kind of aid, we're either very much for the principle or at least we're not against it, we want it to be considered. Now we're in a position where we could lose my honourable friend from Fort Garry who seemed to be very much in favour of the principle.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) .

So I would ask him to think this thing over, and I think it's clear what he had in mind. I'm certainly ready to take allies wherever I can take them, wherever I can get them, because this is just an instruction now to the government to say, all right, study the advisability of bringing in some kind of help, because if we don't do that we can divide our forces into three or four and then we're going to lose out. The honourable friend might find himself waiting to vote in favour of the main resolution but it may be the main resolution as amended, so he'll vote against it, he won't have a chance, and that indeed would be unfortunate. And other people might say well, I only voted with this condition, so I think that's the reason for this private resolution here today.

I think that this is the way that we should be guided. If we are against the principle of any aid at all to separate schools then we have no alternative but to vote against it. Now, if we're not too sure, if we're ready to say, well let's see - and there's some that think that they might be against this principle but I think they should be open enough to say, well let's see if something good, if we can have some good bill, some good resolution that'll bring help. I think that then they could let this motion, they could direct the way they've done in other private motions and allow this to go to -- I would much sooner have my friend the assistant House Leader sit in there if he's going to yell because I want to talk back to him, not turn around.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said this - as I said I don't want to take part in the actual debate now, I'll have other opportunity - but before this gets carried too far I'd like my honourable friend from Fort Garry to reconsider what he has said, and I for one will note what he has said and I think the other members also. But let's stick together, and if we feel that we're for this principle then let's say to the government here, we favour some help, and then when the bill comes in if you're not interested in the bill, if and when it does come in, well then all the members of course are certainly entitled to either vote against or for it, the question of principle, or to make amendments. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I would like to try and get some of the opinions from the members of the government side on this particular resolution, because outside of the Minister of Transportation, not one of the Treasury bench over there has spoken one word on this resolution and I think that it's time that they did. This is the time that people should stand up and be counted on this particular resolution, but Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. GRAHAM: . . . I want to indicate to the First Minister now that I intend to support this resolution.

MR. SCHREYER: I was just going to ask a question. Because he was chastising us on the Treasury bench for not having spoken, I'd like to ask him if he is able to say whether in recent years there has been any government policy with respect to the particular resolution before us, whether there has been party policy by any of the parties.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in my short period in this House - and I defer to the First Minister, he's been here much longer than I have - but in my short period in this House this resolution I think is quite important and I stated before that I intend to support the principle of this resolution.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the member permit a question?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: I realize you didn't answer the First Minister's question but maybe you'll answer mine. Is he, in expressing his support of the resolution, speaking on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, when I vote in this House I vote as the Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit another question, and that is would he permit me to decide when I should vote as a Member for St. John's.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for St. John's assumes a role in this House, he has to speak on a ground far greater than that just as the Member for St. John's.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this, not in depth because I'm not prepared to do the topic justice right now. I think perhaps I'm in a position to talk at some length on this since I've been involved one way or another in this topic over quite a number of years, so

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) I'm going to speak only to the sub-amendment and I'm going to reserve my comments that I do want to make until another time.

Now with respect to the sub-amendment, what it does is correct an error in the amendment. The word "approved" is the actual case in the Department of Education now. There's nothing prohibiting a school board, or a group of teachers through their school board, to go to the Department of Education and have a particular course approved. And I might say that includes Marxism which the Honourable Member for Inkster is concerned about. If a school board wanted to have a course in Marxism taught and have it qualify for a social study course and it was deemed to be education, there's nothing to prevent that happening in the public school system at this moment. Now whether or not it would be approved or not is a point in theory, but since he was dealing in theory I think that we should point this out, that this can in fact happen.

I can tell you examples in the school system where a school board has wanted to have a course taught, and I could point out in the early days of PSSC Physics when this was brought into Canada that there were school divisions that wanted to get ahead with this, had the personnel to do it, went to the Department of Education, discussed it with them, and on the merits of their case had the course approved, and it was approved and the regular physics course was put aside and this new revolutionary course was brought in. So the word "approved" - and I think the Minister of Youth and Education would bear me out on this - is the actual case now, and the word "prescribed" that the Member for Osborne had in there probably is being corrected by the juxtaposition of the word "approved", so it's really no more than a technicality.

So on the basis of that, in terms of the sub-amendment, I have no hesitation in supporting it because it all actually says what we're doing now. -- (Interjection) -- I said that I would speak to that when we got to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I wonder if the former speaker would permit a question.

MR. CRAIK: Certainly.

MR. BOYCE: You raised the point of PSSC Physics, and the way you said it, from your knowledge as the former Minister of Education, is the implementation that PSSC Physics and Chem. studies in BPCS, how did it prove out in your knowledge? The implementation of it. You said that it was a -- it seemed implicit to me that it was a good thing that this was done. Was that the opinion you were expressing?

MR. CRAIK: No, I wasn't giving any subjective opinion. I'm just citing a case where a school board wanted to teach PSSC Physics and they took the initiative, went to the Department of Education, had it approved, taught it, although it was not approved in the general curriculum, so all I'm saying is that the word "approved" is correct because that's the case now.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment?

MR. TURNBULL: Would the honourable member permit a question? Is the member aware that the original amendment as proposed by me contained the word "approved" and was changed to "prescribed" while I was speaking at the instigation of the Minister?

MR. CRAIK: No, I wasn't aware of it. However, "approved" is really semantics.

. continued on next page.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to introduce our guests in the gallery - 44 Grade 5 students from Wawanesa under the direction of Mrs. Hunter, Mrs. Derkach and Miss Moir. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. On behalf of the honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS (cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that all will recognize the fact of your introducing our guests in the gallery - and I'm pleased that you do this on every occasion - it will not be construed as an interruption or an interjection between the previous speaker and the next proceeding insofar as the resolution is concerned, as it would of course be had it been a member on the lower floor here, but I would like to ask my honourable friend a question. Is it not a matter of semantics as to whether we use the word "prescribed" or "approved", but the main point is the principle of the bill itself. I would like, if it's at all possible, to extract from my honourable friend the Member for Riel, the former Minister of Education, whether he's in favour of the principle of the bill, irrespective of whether or not the word "approved" or "prescribed" is accepted. -- (Interjection) -- I see my friend from Churchill now has come out of his igloo and become the Speaker. I'm asking my honourable friend the former Minister of Education whether it's not just a question of semantics as to the use of the word "prescribed" or "approved", but the main matter under consideration is the principle of the bill irrespective of that.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, lest there be any doubt, I would like to tell the Minister of Labour that I've every intention of speaking on this issue and when I do speak on it I want to take some time. I think I, probably as I said, have as many battle scars in this particular area as anybody does in this House, even though I may be younger than the Minister of Finance, and when I do speak on it I want to have sufficient time to go at it. I don't know why we're concerned about the sub-amendment. I stated why I was voting the way I was on the sub-amendment. When the time comes, I'll make my case very clear and I would sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members on the front bench will do likewise.

MR. PAULLEY: The honourable member was concerned enough to speak on the sub-amendment. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate in this debate at this point. I'd like to, first of all, advise the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell who was anxious to hear the front bench speak, but apparently not so anxious that he would actually stay and listen to them speak, that the reason that I want to speak now is that it would appear that if House proceedings follow past history then there may not be a great opportunity to speak at a future time, but the mere fact that a person doesn't get up and speak at the outset of the debate doesn't mean one has no position and one doesn't intend to participate. I've been satisfied, and I think I've learnt a great deal about this resolution from listening to debates and much of what I have heard confirms previous positions, and really, Mr. Speaker, I find that the greatest difference of opinion that I have had, I have had with two speakers who spoke this afternoon, the Member for Churchill and the Member for Fort Garry.

These people, Mr. Speaker, have been, during the proceedings of the House - and I note that I am only going to have ten minutes and I will probably run out the clock and speak again next day if I get a chance - but these speakers have been, particularly the Member for Churchill and the Member for Fort Garry, have been very particular about preserving the question of what they call competition and the right of individual initiative in the area of economics, and I have indicated in many of the discussions that I have had that I don't think that economics lends itself to that kind of free competition initiative which they keep talking about as if it exists, and in many cases it doesn't exist. I have always felt that the public could involve itself in economics without doing a great harm, and as a matter of fact with doing a great deal of good to the democratic process, but, Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, I have always argued, and I hope I will always continue to argue, that the public has no right to interfere with the free competition in the area of thought and thinking and ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I have in this House defended on numerous occasions the right of people to

(MR. GREEN cont'd.). . . . say what they believe, regardless of what I think about it. When I got up and spoke on the right of a citizen to walk down the street carrying a sign, the example I used is that a citizen has a right to walk down the street carrying a sign saying "Down with Trade Unions", "Down with The New Democratic Party", or down with anything that I personally happen to believe in, but the Member for Fort Garry - and I'll let you ask a question in a moment - who says that he believes in free competition in the areas of economics, gets up and has the pomposity and the - not unctuousness, but the pomposity and the arbitrariness and the arrogance to say I will support this type of thought, I will pay for schools which will engage in teaching this type of thinking, thinking in which I believe, but I will not support or engage in giving public funds to teach things which I do not believe. Now, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister now permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: Does the Minister believe that public money should be expended to support for example a school teaching and preaching sedition?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if there was a school that spent its time in preaching the philosophy that sedition is a good thing, that sedition as a means of dealing with government is something that should be permitted, then I would say that if the honourable member is prepared to pay for any school which teaches any thought - and I'm not in agreement with that, you see I'm not in agreement with what you are saying - but I say that once you decide that the public is going to involve itself in the teaching of ideas, then one has to be very careful that one doesn't say these ideas are kosher and will be paid for and these ideas are non kosher and will not be paid for. But that's what the Member for Fort Garry said, because he said he would not give any money for the teaching of a Fascist school, he would not give any money for the teaching of a Communist school. . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that I would not grant any funds for the. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I don't believe the Honourable Member has a point of privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I'm being quoted.

MR. GREEN: Well, go ahead. Ask a question and get your point across.

MR. SHERMAN: I did not say that I would not give any money for teaching of a Fascist school as the Minister put it. I said I would not support, I would not expend public money to support a school dedicated to the teaching of Fascism, and there's a difference. There is a difference.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member has pointed out a difference I will accept it, and I say that my argument still is the same, that if the honourable member is prepared to say that he will not give money, public money to a school which is dedicated to the teaching of Fascism and he will not give monies to a school which is dedicated to the teaching of Communism and will not give monies to a school which is dedicated to the teaching of Socialism, then I say to the speaker that he cannot pick those schools, the thoughts which they are teaching he happens to approve of.

Mr. Speaker, if I thought, if I thought that this Legislature or that any Legislature - and that's why I have disagreed with the previous Legislature, with the previous government, who decided that they would spend money in what I thought was the propagandizing of their own program, their own political program, and I said that when we come to office I hope we will not do it, and if we do it I ask the honourable members to criticize us for it, because I -- (Interjection) -- well then I ask you to get up and criticize us for it. I suggest that we are not doing it, but if we are, then I ask the Member for Swan River to get up and criticize us for expending public money to sell the New Democratic Party program. If that's what we are doing we deserve to be censured, and I ask for your censure if that's what we're doing. I deny it, but if that's what we are doing, get up and say so.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that I in this Legislature have for years said that I believe in the freest competition in terms of ideas, but I don't think that the same applies in the area of economics and it has never happened, but honourable members, and the Member for Fort Garry in particular and the Member for Churchill even more definitely, have convinced me that for the public to involve itself in subsidizing areas of thought is in the last analysis for the public to involve itself in saying which thoughts it will subsidize and which thoughts it will not subsidize. It happens every time, and I'll tell my honourable friend that I know -- (Interjection) -- You say that all of these thoughts are available to the public school system. Then, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to my honourable friend, I believe that what he has just said is the great weakness of the position that I am going to take.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

And I recognize that weakness, I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is no such thing as a truly secular school system. I recognize that, and as much as I am going to argue in the next chance that I have an opportunity to do so that we should try and aim for a truly secular school system in which all thought is treated neutrally, and I know that this is a vain ideal which will never be achieved, but the fact that it will never be achieved doesn't mean that that's what we should not be striving for, because, Mr. Speaker, I see perfection as being impossible of achievement in every area of human affairs, but I don't mean - including economics, if my honourable friend will accept that. I have never said that we will reach perfection, but I say that we should take ideals and we should go and attempt to achieve them, and I say that the ideal of our society should be a separation of church and state, and the implication of that is that we should strive for what we hope to achieve as a truly secular school system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean - as a matter of fact that implies that we have a lot to do about the existing public school system. We have to make it as secular as possible; we have to take the area of thought or belief as much as we can out of that school system. If it's to be taught it has to be taught in a comparative way; it should not be taught in a way which attempts to influence the child to accept one form of thought or another form of thought. And I admit, Mr. Speaker, that what I seek for is an impossible achievement, but no more impossible than any other drive towards perfection, and I'd like to quote the words of Eugene Debs who always used to say in speaking of attempting to achieve any goal, that it is not for us to finish the job, but neither is it for us to stop trying.

I say that what do we want in a school system. We want a school system which does not indoctrinate our children to believe in one type of belief or another, and the system that is being advocated by the Member for Fort Garry, whether he likes it or not, is going to involve this Legislature in saying which thoughts, which thoughts have public approval and will be subsidized and which thoughts do not have public approval and will not be subsidized. Mr. Speaker, if we did that - (Interjection) -- let me just conclude. If we did that 25 years ago, then the thoughts that I am advancing in this Legislature today on all other matters would have been deemed to be not culture and would not have been publicly supported.

MR. SPEAKER: It is 5:30. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise that Law Amendments Committee on Monday meets at 9:30 and not at 10:00 o'clock, and I want to remind honourable members of that. I would like to now move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, that debate be now adjourned. -- (Interjection) -- That the House do now adjourn.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, can I ask a question regarding Private Members before we adjourn completely? Are we going to have an opportunity to speak on these resolutions again?

MR. GREEN: I suggest the practice of the House has been to complete the Order Paper.

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