

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, July 7, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance is in a position to indicate whether there was the formulation of any communique from yesterday's interprovincial, or Dominion-Provincial meeting of Finance Ministers, and if so, could he advise the House what consensus, if any, was arrived at.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition's question, there was not a formal communique put together by the meeting yesterday. The meeting really had two purposes; one was to look at the short and medium term economic picture that and performance of Canada's economy, and secondly, to do some preparatory work for the First Minister's Conference on the economy for this fall. The results of it were that there was a fairly extensive overview done, a presentation by the Federal Government, and then participation by the provinces, in reviewing the economic indicators for Canada, and comparing them in particular with those of the United States and the other OECD countries, which the Federal Government intends to use as a yardstick for comparison.

There were a number of other topics of course, that were dealt with that are of direct interest to the Province of Manitoba, or more specific interest, the question of the continuance of the sales tax was dealt with, and there was a . . . not a communique, but a statement by both the Federal Minister and by ourselves in that connection, which was done yesterday. I believe perhaps the House is maybe aware of it just from the media reports on it, but the really long and the short of it is that the evidence on the sales tax is still reasonably circumstantial, in that at this point in time, although there has been a very significant rise in retail sales across Canada, the rise in retail sales is — as I indicated earlier in the House on an earlier date we had predicted for an increase of somewhere in the order of 10 percent over 1977, and the increase is running between up to 20 percent, and in some commodities over that. But it's doing the same thing roughly, the initial indicators indicate that it's doing the same thing approximately in both Alberta and Quebec. Alberta, where there was no sales tax, and still has no sales tax, is running at some 18 percent. Quebec, which had only a partial reduction in sales tax, or a selective reduction, is still experiencing a much larger increase in retail sales than had been budgeted for. So, the evidence is not yet significant enough to indicate whether it's the result of the sales tax reduction, except in the larger items such as automobiles and fridges and stoves, where there is some pretty strong indication that there has been a net increase.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was the major issue. The position taken is that unless there are some iron-clad economic proof or indicators that the continuance of the sales tax reduction would be in the best economic interest, indicators other than that available at the present time, that there would not likely be extension for the support from the Federal Government, and that was generally supported by the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, other than that, there were specific things that were of specific interest to Manitoba. Mining taxation was put on track and I think the question of it will be effectively resolved by this fall when the First Ministers deal with it. And then, there was the question of the water . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I hope the Minister is not trying to make a speech.

**MR. CRAIK:** That's all I intended to say.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, at the risk, perhaps, of extending the reply further, I would like to ask the Minister, nevertheless, whether, even though no conclusions were reached, whether there was any consensus of opinion as to whether, in light of the analysis of concomitant variation, if the provinces that had no sales tax, are experiencing the same phenomenon with respect to incremental purchasing as those that did and who have reduced the sales tax? Was the conclusion or consensus of view that the sales tax reduction, the federal program of sales tax reduction, has had no significant bearing on the pattern of retail sales activity?

**MR. CRAIK:** No, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, but perhaps didn't emphasize, the evidence is not yet complete enough upon which to draw a conclusion one way or another. There is some conflicting evidence, but the problem is that it takes a . . . The main results are just coming in now and haven't been analyzed by any of the provinces. It's going to take another couple of months to get any sort of a firm reading on it.

**MR. SCHREYER:** On another matter to the same Minister, which he may wish to reply to now, or on Monday — I realize he hasn't had an opportunity in the last 24 hours, because of the Finance meeting — and that is to ask the Minister whether in light of the announcement by the Government of Canada of their \$400 million or \$380 million alternative energy developmental program, can the Minister say whether there was systematic consultation with this province just prior to the formulation of that policy, and also, does the Minister have any assurance that Manitoba will be involved or dealt into that program, at least approximately proportionate to population, which would then indicate something in the order of \$20 million that would be available for industry and governmental effort both, here in Manitoba?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I did have the questions that had been asked to the Minister of Industry and Commerce by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Fort Rouge, and the answer with regard to the question of consultation, there was very very little, if any, consultation on the matter. I had heard three weeks ago that consideration was being given to some further support by the Federal Government in the renewable energy field and particularly in solar energy, and I had written to the Federal Minister asking about support for a solar laboratory facility in Manitoba — and that's the only thread of communication that there was until I received a telex two or three days ago, the same day that the program was announced by the Federal Government outlining the \$380 million program. So I have no evidence on just how they intend to provide the financial support. I can only go by what he said that they intend to work with the provinces closely on this and directly, I presume, with industrial development in that field. Taking his telex at face value, then I gather that they now intend to work closely with the province. We certainly have a number of programs that we want to discuss with them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. .

**MR. SCHREYER:** I would like to ask the Minister if he will seek some more definitive assurance from the Minister, Mr. Gillespie, that with respect to Manitoba that there would be a commitment to provide at least proportionate to population, so that with respect to both solar and indirect solar, or biomass, that Manitoba industry and government would be able to formulate plans that would be proportionate to effort elsewhere in Canada in that respect.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, yes, we intend to follow it up immediately. The suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition sounds like a reasonable one and one that would be in Manitoba's best interest if we could at least get a per capita type of assurance that we would in general, I think, come out of the program very well from a provincial point of view.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader, the Minister without Portfolio. Can the House Leader confirm that this evening we will be dealing with five bills pertaining to Family Law and that we will not have the benefit of the Attorney-General who is responsible for the piloting of these bills through the Legislature?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, we will be dealing with the family law bills this evening. The Attorney-General is at a constitutional conference. He will be back for tomorrow's hearings and whatever hearings are held thereafter.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, would the House Leader not agree that a postponement until the Attorney-General's return would be a courtesy not only to him, but also to those that are presenting briefs this evening?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, the hearings were scheduled and since everyone is aware that the hearings are being held, we are going to continue with them tonight, tomorrow and whatever time it takes to complete them thereafter.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the House Leader if he was not aware that the Attorney-General would be absent this evening when this particular meeting was scheduled?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, the business was scheduled for early this week and I was not at that time aware that the Attorney-General was going to be away. As I say, he will be back tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance pertaining to his statements on the Federal Energy Program. When the Minister indicates that there was not discussion, would he not also confirm that there was a series of discussions between federal officials and Manitoba Government officials concerning that program and that in fact when the Manitoba Government officials did not proffer or put forward any specific arrangements for cost sharing on energy projects that would be funded immediately as part of the new energy package that was announced this week by Mr. Gillespie.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Member for Fort Rouge was here when I mentioned that I had written to the Federal Minister two or three weeks ago specifically about the solar energy laboratory facility that might be looked at for Manitoba. I haven't had any reply to that communication. The only reply has been a telex that dealt generally with the program. With regard to any further communication, I presume there has been some but not to my awareness has there been anything specific other than my communication with them on the solar energy facility.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, considering the Minister's lack of awareness of those consultations, I would ask him to consult with his own officials concerning those discussions to determine exactly what the nature of that consultation was and whether they in fact were pursuing the same proposals and lines of arguments the Minister seemed to be proposing. It was certainly my understanding that there was discussions between officials of the two levels of government concerning the details of the program.

I would also ask the Minister at the same time whether, under the terms of that new announcement or energy program, the \$115 million that is now made available for direct cost sharing of capital or experimental projects, whether the Province of Manitoba intends to submit specific proposals including the solar laboratory as part of the \$115 million which the Federal Government has already offered on a distributed basis without any necessity for further consultation. Do we have proposals ready to be proposed and could the Minister outline what kinds of proposals he would be putting forward at this time?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, now that we know what the proposals are, what the amount of the package is being proposed by the Federal Government, we'll put together our proposals. We have a number, one of which was included pre-October 11th last year in a major statement by the First Minister of the province at that time indicating a renewable energy package and that will be included as part of our consideration. It would be premature to indicate at this time what we were going to do, not knowing the level of support that might be available from the Federal Government. I don't go along with the suggestion that there has been adequate preparation for this or adequate

Friday, July 7, 1978

consultation. There has not been adequate consultation with the Federal Government preceding this announcement by them but now that we know what it is, I think it can be very helpful. I think it's going to be something that we can use now to get down to cases in some of these areas but we know the total parameters of it, we can now take the time and we won't be hasty about it and we will come up with a program that's in the best interests of Manitoba.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a supplementary, again I would ask the Minister to determine the extent of the consultations that did go on as it may be that things were discussed that he doesn't know about but I would also ask him that as he begins planning and preparing for the presentations from the Province of Manitoba, whether he intends to also undertake consultation with the universities and with private industry who are working in the field and with some of the special institutes like the Biomass Institute and solar energy groups to encourage them, and work with them, in developing joint programs so that the benefits of this program could be broadly shared with a number of organizations, and act as a stimulant to research and development in the province. And is he prepared to agree or accept that that kind of consultation will now be undertaken by the province with people in organizations within our own provincial boundaries?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** On the first question, Mr. Speaker, I'll check my sources against the Member for Fort Rouge any day of the week.

On the second part, there has been consultation proceeding, as recently as the day before yesterday at the University of Manitoba, on energy matters. That consultation will continue. It's a field that I have some personal interest in, and certainly don't intend to see it ignored in any way, shape, or form, particularly with this opportunity that is now available.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. KEN. MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question this morning by the Member for Rupertsland, in relationship to fishing, and problems that the fishermen might be having in the southern part of Lake Winnipeg. We have had one complaint, and that was possibly three to four weeks ago. Our biologists have looked at it, and found that it was a type of an algae that has, to the best of our knowledge, disappeared, but it was creating a slime effect on some of the nets, and had the fishermen concerned, and since then, we have had no complaints whatsoever from the fishermen.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.\$

**MR. PETER FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the First Minister, the question which I gave notice of earlier this morning. In view of the offer by striking construction tradesmen, to volunteer their services to the disaster stricken area of Aubigny, would the government consider and be prepared to arrange transportation for 25 to 30 workers starting next week to the site from Winnipeg?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge the courtesy of the Honourable Member for Kildonan for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question, a question which of course is more properly directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs who is in charge of EMO. I have communicated the information that he has alluded to in the House, to the departmental officials, and I daresay he will have some response from the Minister when the House next meets on Monday.

**MR. FOX:** Just in case there should be any answer sooner than Monday, would the Minister be prepared to transmit the name of Leo Desilets, the President of the Building Trades Council, to the parties who may be making the arrangements for transportation.

**MR. LYON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for passing along the name. I believe this offer was made in a public form, in a public way, about a week ago, so I judge the officials may well be aware of it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance, which I guess is supplementary to questions asked by the Member for Fort Rouge, with regard to possible Federal moneys for energy research. Is the Minister aware of a formal brief that was prepared at some considerable cost and involving considerable amount of time by a Manitoba group, for the government, outlining the possibility of a Canadian biomass centre, to be established in the Province of Manitoba, which was formally presented to the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the Federal Minister of Energy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the report. I haven't read it; there has been reference to it in the last few days in the media as well.

**MR. EVANS:** I Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would undertake to apprise himself of the contents and use that as one vehicle, as one instrument, to encourage the Federal Government to spend some moneys on energy research in the Province of Manitoba, because it is a very well documented brief for a series of biomass projects in the province.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I was incorrect in the first question. I wonder if the member was referring to the federal study that was published and distributed about a month ago.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, in that case my answer to the first question stands. The answer to the second question would be that we intend certainly now to put far more attention in this field because there is a potential of the federal support now coming.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you. I would like to ask the Minister another question in the area of finance then, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to thank him for his previous answer.

In view of the apparent lack of success of the reduction of the sale tax in stimulating the Manitoba economy, and in view of the unfortunate forecasts that are coming out that Manitoba and Quebec will have the weakest economies in the next year ahead, is the government now prepared to undertake new initiatives to stimulate the Manitoba economy or is it prepared to continue in its present course?

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, on the member's question, and his introduction to it, he indicated that we had stated or taken the position that the sales tax was ineffective. I didn't say that. I said that the evidence was so far incomplete, and that we're waiting on further evidence to come in over the next couple of months, after the results can be analyzed.

With regard to the performance of the economy, Manitoba's economy is performing certainly better and still performing better than many segments of the economies in Canada. It has some stiff competition to the West, there's no question about that, but in relation to the rest of Canada, Manitoba's economy is performing well, and as far as stimulative effects are concerned at this point in time, we haven't any policies to announce other than those policies that have been introduced since we came into office.

**MR. EVANS:** I thank the Minister for his optimistic outlook and statement. I would just ask him if he would care to look into reports that are being published by various research institutes, which state that this year and next year the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba are likely to be the weakest provinces in terms of economic performance. — if he would care to undertake to look into those studies, to satisfy himself that the forecasts are rather bleak for our province, unfortunately.

**MR. CIK:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Brandon East probably knows that Manitoba's economic picture is somewhat regional in nature. The slowdown of the Hydro projects in the north, and the current position of the mining industry alone, are having a very significant effect in those areas, and a spinoff effect in the southern part of the province, but apart from that, if Manitoba was in a position — on the Hydro, for instance — to be plowing in the sort of money that Quebec is continuing to plow into the James-Bay Project, it would make that difference, and you would probably find Manitoba in the position of having one of the strongest economies in Canada. If the Member for Brandon East is suggesting that we should do that, then, that's his position; our position has been that Manitoba's position is, at this time, that we cannot afford to do that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the fact that there is presently a nurses' strike in northern Manitoba, and at least two hospitals and at least five northern outpost nursing stations have been closed down as a result of the nursing strike; and apparently services are supposed to be covered from nearby centres — as a federal official is quoted in the press — can the Minister indicate what nearby centres will be providing these services to remote communities, and if his health officials have formed any contingency plans, or taken any action in regard to this strike and providing the necessary service on an ongoing and emergency basis to these communities?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I have asked for information as to which nearby or adjacent communities are supplying that kind of service for the particular communities in which outpost nursing stations have suffered an interruption in nursing service, and I will supply that to the honourable member and to the House as soon as I have it. I would say that in situations of this kind, under the federal contract prevailing, there is the contingency of the designated nurse who remains on duty and available in most federal hospitals and in most federally operated medical centres. For example, that's the situation at Deer Lodge, there are designated nurses remaining on duty. There's no question, however, that service is affected by this slowdown, and I've initiated inquiries to assure that there's no quality of patient care or of patient emergency being compromised.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister's answer that there is supposed to be a designated nurse left on duty, and in view of the fact that most of these outposts are one-nurse outposts, I wonder if he can determine which nurse is going to be designated to stay on, if the one nurse that's on duty walks out on strike. And further to that, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate if the Patient Air Transportation Program of the provincial government has been put on alert with respect to this situation, so that these communities can expect at least good service from the Patient Air Transportation Program in the event of an emergency or an accident in the community?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't indicate that that kind of step has been taken at this point. What I am doing, at this point, is simply familiarizing myself with the situation and with the measures that can be invoked to assure that patient care will not be compromised. But, as the honourable member well knows, we're talking here of a federal situation, federal nursing stations, federal hospitals, and federal nurses, and the main line of communication, and main access to redress in this instance lies with the federal authorities, and Manitoba's federal representatives in Parliament. However, I do want to be fully apprised of the situation to ensure that if there's anything we can do, it will be done, and I will give that undertaking to the honourable member.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister will do that I would just further ask him if these people in these communities are not citizens of Manitoba and therefore are the responsibility in the end of the Government of Manitoba — in this case particularly when the hospitals and nursing stations are being closed down and the federal are not able to deliver the service, if not the provincial government has the responsibility to provide the backup and the necessary service in the event that these people are not being serviced by the federal officials.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, there is a question of jurisdictional authority involved, as the honourable member well knows. I appreciate the moral question that he is raising, and I give him a commitment that I am morally concerned and will take what steps I can, but I cannot invade or intrude upon an area of jurisdictional authority that is not within the boundaries of provincial authority. I will pursue the questions that the honourable member has raised, and assure him that I will do all I can within the parameters of our authority to assure that patients are being cared for as needed and as necessary in those areas.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister to whom Government Air reports. I would ask the Minister if he is prepared to base the Government Air MU-2 in Thompson for the duration of this nurse employer-employee dispute, so it will be immediately available in cases that may require it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, we haven't given that immediate attention; it could certainly be reviewed. The service is available and ready and we foresee no additional problems to any others that we have had in serving the people throughout the province with that particular service.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address this question to the Minister of Labour. Yesterday the Minister undertook to contact Burns Limited in regard to alleged blacklisting of lockout employees of Canada Packers and Swifts strikers. Today she mentioned that she had been in contact with the head offices of the packing house companies; can she now indicate or inform the House as to the results of her investigation, or her attempts to clarify the situation in regard to that alleged blacklisting?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I didn't undertake to contact Burns, I undertook to contact the negotiators of the packing houses, which I did, and I answered to that this morning. With regard to Burns not hiring anybody, I have enquired and apparently they are within their rights to hire whoever they want.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would just direct the Minister to the unfair labour practice of blacklisting as outlined in the Labour Code. I would ask her also if she would at this time undertake to investigate alleged cases of blacklisting of Safeway strikers by Dominion and Loblaws companies in Winnipeg? Is the Minister prepared to exercise her ministerial responsibility and investigate what may very well be unfair labour practices under the Code?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I checked into it. The companies in question are not breaking any laws as far as unfair labour practices.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister apparently got her legal interpretation from the companies, would she consider acquiring from the Attorney —(Interjection)— would she consider —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, would she consider contacting the Attorney —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Inkster continue?

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I understood the Minister to say — and if I'm wrong, I will withdraw — that she contacted the companies who say that they are within their rights would she consider —(Interjection)— all right, if that is not correct, Mr. Speaker, would she consider contacting the Attorney-General's department to see whether this alleged practice is contrary to The Labour Relations Act?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, the information I got was not from the companies, but from my department.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister to find out from her department whether they received her advice with regard to this interpretation of The Labour Relations Act from the law officers of the Crown?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to — I don't know whether the Minister has received that question, or if she just chooses not to answer. Can the Minister advise the House whether the interpretation of her department is supported by the law officers of the Crown?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Inkster and his associates, I will contact the Attorney-General's department and find out for him.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege, and I want to know what the implication of the remark is, "his associates." I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Legislative Assembly, duly elected, the same as the Honourable Minister.

Friday, July 7, 1978

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour. .

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry; I meant colleagues.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, if the red-baiting is over, I'd like to ask a question. I would like to ask a question to the Minister of Tourism —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I wish all members would give the Member for Elmwood the courtesy of asking his question.

**MR. DOERN:** That's the best round of applause I've had in 12 years, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. In view of the substantial drop in American tourism, visitors to Manitoba in the first part of this year, would the Minister be willing to divert some of the \$600,000 that he has allocated for tourist promotion, to giving this money to Manitoba's cultural organizations to make it more attractive for people to come to the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, the figures released by Statistics Canada indicate there was a fair drop in the number of tourists entering not only Manitoba, but Canada, in the month of May. We are hopeful that that situation will turn around for the high tourist months of June, July and August, and we are monitoring it very closely at this time to make sure that we try and maximize the number of people that will come into our province. Unfortunately, we felt with the devaluation of the dollar, that we would be drawing more people, but that was not the case in May; hopefully, it will be in June, July and August.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, again, would the Minister be prepared to either divert some of the money that he has allocated for tourist promotion, or obtain additional funds for our cultural organizations? I am thinking now in terms of the fact that the Winnipeg Art Gallery has no evening hours for citizens or tourists; that the museum and other organizations have cut their hours, cut their budgets and cut their programs, so that even if people come to Manitoba and are attracted to Manitoba, they may find that the very cultural organizations which attracted them are not open to the public.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, there are several avenues that we are exploring. One of them is the number of campsites available in our provincial parks. We've been through that a number of times here. We haven't got enough provincial campsites. There are many things that we should be looking at. One of the largest tourist attractions in the province, namely the horse racing, is going to be having extended days this year and will be drawing very many people also.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the anti-cultural comments made in this House from time to time by members of the Conservative Party, can the Minister assure us that he will listen to the representatives of Manitoba cultural organizations and not the red-neck element in the P.C. caucus.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I told the Member for Transcona that I would get back to him today with his inquiry about Border Chemicals. I would like to advise the member that the plant has closed for a month. They are doing the necessary renovations and following up on the required changes as our department has asked them to do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for questioning having expired, we will proceed with Orders for the Day.



**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 57, please.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READINGS**

**BILL NO. 57 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 57, on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act — the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for my colleague, the Honourable Meer for Inkster.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, this bill to the same effect — and I want to emphasize that — to the same effect as a resolution that was presented to the House in 1972, comes before the Legislature in a much different atmosphere than it did arrive in 1972. Because, Mr. Speaker, in 1972, I believe that it was fairly clearly disseminated to the public of the Province of Manitoba that there was a profound debate with sincere and strongly held positions on either side and very well canvassed throughout the population for a period of, I would say not less than a year, as to whether or not public funds should be used to support or to give assistance to a separation of our school system on the basis of public moneys being used to maintain or give assistance to private schools which were separate from the public school system on several basis.

We have separate schools which are not part of the public school system on the basis of religion. Some people who adhere to a particular religion wish to have the atmosphere whereby that religion is taught within the ambience of a total full day school system.

We have separate schools in the Province of Manitoba that are based on ethnic grounds, meaning that certain of our private schools are based on the fact that the parents of the children concerned prefer to have their children educated within an ethnic ambience and we have separate schools from the public school system on different grounds, some based on the fact that some parents, as always, as has always been the case, feel that they would like a school system which is more suited to their own particular needs and, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be entirely fair, which they feel gives their child somewhat of an elevation from that of the ordinary public school children attendance. And that has always been the case, Mr. Speaker, and in that category — and I'm not a supporter of sending my child to such a school but I don't have any objection in principle to the people maintaining such schools — are schools such as St. Johns Ravenscourt, Balmoral Hall, the St. Johns School that was featured somewhat prominently and sadly in the news approximately a month ago. These types of schools have existed from time to time and I wish to emphasize that I have no objection whatsoever to the freedom of people to use such school systems, Mr. Speaker, just as I have no objection to any person in this Chamber, including the Member for River Heights and his parents for whatever resources they have, to decide that they would want their child to attend Harvard Law School in addition to the Manitoba Law School in order that they would have a more intensive education, or to any other school, Mr. Speaker, and there are some schools that are high-prestige schools that people wish to make use of and I say that they should have the freedom to do so.

Mr. Speaker, that is quite a different thing from saying — and but perhaps the Member for River Heights will not think that I am being sincere or serious, but I am — this is the right of a person to use their resources to improve, enhance or in any other way distinguish the education of their children is something which I have no objection to. The right of a person, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, to say that his taxation money, or part thereof, which would normally be used within the public school system should be, in some way, either refunded to him or deflected to make it more possible or easier to attend a private school, a private university, a private educational institution, is something which I totally object to, Mr. Speaker, is something the issue of which came prominently before this House in 1972 and which many people were led to believe, although I, at the time, said it would not settle the issue, many people were led to believe that the Legislature had spoken on the issue and that there appeared to be a clear indication — and I believe that it reflected the general population — that the public at large felt that whatever other educational system existed, all citizens would have to apply and pay equally to the support of the public school system and if they wished to use a private school, they could do so at their own expense.

Mr. Speaker, many people have done this over the years. There have always been private schools in the Province of Manitoba and as a matter of fact if one wants to look at the entire evolution, he will see that we have gone full circle. The first system was only private schools and largely ecclesiastical, Mr. Speaker. Many of these schools which were private were also ecclesiastical so we not only had private schools which nobody else except the purchasers of the educational system would go to, but they were generally religiously oriented. And the same people who are now fighting for public support to private schools — and I shouldn't say the same people, not the same persons — but the same element of society which is now fighting for the public to pay for the existence of private schools oppose public aid and the public establishment of a public school system. Because they said many things, Mr. Speaker. They said that this shouldn't be a charge on the taxpayer. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that they said, "This will interfere with the parent-teacher relationship. This will interfere with the standard of education, that we are going to have teachers leaving the province, that we are going to have a degradation of the standards of education." The public educational system was opposed by people who were purchasing private schools, purchasing private educational tuition and religious education for their children when the public school system started.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a development since that day. Universal public education came to be established, although the right to attend private schools was not questioned. But what happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the public educational system became much better than people suggested it was. There was no deterioration, although nothing is perfect — and I'm going to deal with how a deterioration has and will take place — and the public educational institution became something which everybody accepted, and the private system became more and more difficult to maintain. And that's a natural result, Mr. Speaker. The private school system became more and more difficult to maintain because the large resources of the community went into the public system. And as the private system became more and more difficult to maintain, the people who had previously said that we don't want the public paying for education, came and said, "Since our moneys are being used to pay for an educational system that we are not using, is it not fair that we be able to at least take the moneys from the educational system that we are not using, take them back and provide them, it's our moneys, it's not tax moneys" — Mr. Speaker, I hope that — and I have to say it — that Hansard will show I'm not saying this on my behalf, I'm using the argument of the others — "that these are not tax moneys, these are not public moneys, these are our moneys which we are not making use of. We don't get a chance at them; we should be able to designate them to our school system as a right of parental choice."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake about it, that is what we are debating in this bill. That is the issue. This bill is not a bill to clarify a problem — I'll deal with the problem in a few moments — this bill is a step along a path, an objective which is clearly defined and has been clearly outlined, on the part of people who wish to separate themselves from the public school system, to ultimately obtain whatever moneys are being used in the public school system, which comes from them through taxation. They wish to get the right to remove them from the public school system and designate them to their own system.

And Mr. Speaker, shared services was step No. 1 along that path in the Province of Manitoba, even though — and you have the similar refrain — Mr. Roblin got up in this House and said he is opposed to public aid to a private sector school system; that he was in direct opposition to it; that the shared services program was not public aid to private schools, because it merely permitted the children who were attending private schools to avail themselves, as every other citizen, of part of the public school program. And he specified, Mr. Speaker, he underlined, they cannot do that in a private school if they are to avail themselves of this service, they must do it in the public school system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just as Roblin's denial that this is a move towards the ultimate objective that I have referred to, so this bill, which is put forward as a clarification, is not a clarification. It is the next step — and I will say there was an intermediate step — an intermediate step that never really got canvassed in the Province of Manitoba, but developed through osmosis, and there are many people to blame for that, and I will not try to absolve myself, nor will I try to absolve any of the members in this Chamber who were around — and that includes governments of both parties — from the imperceptible changes that took place, while everybody thought that the principle that we were going no further than shared services, was clearly enshrined.

And that, Mr. Speaker, has made the atmosphere so different today, where the Minister can come in and he can do, Mr. Speaker, what we were taught to do as youngsters. Youngsters are generally mischievous, and there is a tendency for them to get into petty, mischievous trouble, and I remember there used to be a statement that we learned as kids, in the north end of Winnipeg, where I grew up, Mr. Speaker, that if a policeman grabs you, don't give your right name. Why we were told not to give our right name, I don't know, but it was "Don't give your right name." And what the Minister is doing, Mr. Speaker, is introducing the bill under the admonition "Don't give

your right name. Do not say what this bill is intended to do; give it a different name. Give it the name of a clarification."

But Mr. Speaker, we all know what this bill says. One of the amusing features of the bill is that there is a tendency upon some of our honourable members to feel that this is a brave departure from what occurred in the past. Mr. Speaker, if it was a brave departure, we would be giving our right name. We would be saying, and the Conservative Party would be saying, that we intend to move in the direction of the government seeing to it that there is "equal" public treatment — in quotation marks that "equal," because I will show you that it will not be equal — and if you want to make it equal, you will have a friend, but you will vote against it. And I will come to the proposition which I say you will vote against in a very short time.

Mr. Speaker, so the Conservative Party has said, "Let's present the bill. Don't give your right name. The atmosphere and the politics are such that nothing really is going to happen." And to a point, Mr. Speaker, they are right, because I deeply regret — and the Member for Lakeside was making some fun of it — that there is, at the present time, as the result of a political process that took over a period of seven years, ineffective opposition, the opposition to a departure for the state financing, the teaching of particular ideologies, for a state encouraging the separation of our school system on the basis of class. There was substantial opposition in this province. There was a substantial, to put it positively, group of people who were willing to protect the integrity of the public school system but that, Mr. Speaker, is not present in the Province of Manitoba at the present time, and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we are lucky that the Conservatives have decided to move in small stages. We are lucky, Mr. Speaker, because they may have got away with it today, if they had the guts to do it, to give their right names, and because there has been no mobilization of opinion, because they didn't say a word about it in the election campaign, because they have done it in what they consider a shrewd and what I consider a devious way, by the time that it comes to really move, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the people of the Province of Manitoba who are by and large, and a majority of them, are strongly in favour of protecting the integrity of the public school system, will have at least mobilized to deal with the question. That unfortunately doesn't exist at the present time but the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, have done them a favour because they have enacted this bill, or are enacting this bill, on the pretence that they are maintaining the status quo and nothing is changing.

How are they able, Mr. Speaker and by the way, it's a horrendous piece of legislation. No Conservative, no person on either side of this question, Mr. Speaker, would say that this is good legislation. There are saying that it is something that we can get by with now but nobody, Mr. Speaker, will say that the Winnipeg School Division should have the right to give money to a Catholic school and not to a Jewish school. Nobody would take the position, Mr. Speaker, that the Winnipeg School Division should give money to a private school such as St. Johns Ravenscourt and not give money to Ramah. Nobody, Mr. Speaker, would say that the educational policy in the Province of Manitoba should depend on the accident of which school division you happen to live in.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's what they are enacting. This bill says that a school division may enter into an agreement to give money to a private school. They don't have to and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that will not satisfy except that the adherents know that this is the process of osmosis. It will not satisfy anybody who believes that they have a right to their tax money going to the educational institution of their choice and that it is not a question of the accident of school trustee policy at the time or from time to time. Are the honourable members opposite saying that if in the Winnipeg School Division, which is the one that has largely held out, the accident of the next school trustee election, you elect five people who are against it, that all the money is cut off to the private school system. Is that what they believe in?

Mr. Speaker, it's laughable. And you know, the Member for St. Boniface is going to vote for this bill. It is laughable but the Member for St. Boniface will vote for this bill because he sees greater things in store. He sees a move in the direction . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm making a prediction. The member —(Interjection)— Yes, sure, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable First Minister of this province is enjoying this. He knows, and there is no doubt about it, that there will be great differences of opinion on this side of the House and that he hopes to sit over there watching the fight take place between myself and my leader, between the Member for St. Boniface and the Member for Elmwood, or any juxtaposition of people that you want to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this legislation has been introduced, if this legislation has been introduced to provide amusement for the First Minister, then it will succeed 100 percent. If this legislation is intended . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am not one to engage in nitpicking, but I want

to assure my honourable friend that the bill was not brought in in order that I could witness, as we are witnessing right now, the delight of a fight between him and not only the Member for St. Boniface but many other right-thinking people in this House; it was brought in because it was needed to remedy some of the mess that we took over after the last eight years.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like you to rule on that. I would like you to rule on that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like you to rule as to whether that was a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I point out that any member has the right to stand up and correct an erroneous interpretation of a statement. However, there is also a point of privilege that any member in doing that should confine himself purely to that subject matter and that subject matter only.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, now we have a colossal development of the Speaker's role in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. That is right, Mr. Speaker, now we will know just how we have to deal with this legislation. All semblance of suggestion that we are going to be ruling on the actual proceedings in the House will be dealt with by your ruling on this point of privilege and what you did this morning, Mr. Speaker, but I will continue despite those handicaps.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that as I was talking, the Honourable Minister, who now says what I would have respected, Mr. Speaker, because I was going to talk about that in my speech — if that was what the Minister of Education said, that we have to clear up a mess, I would have been, Mr. Speaker — as a matter of fact, I have it in my remarks — if they were looking for horror stories, Mr. Speaker, and wanted to expose them, and that's what they were doing, I was going to give them some credit. But, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is too late because, first of all, you look at the release that was issued by the Minister of Education and find one suggestion that there was criticism of what the previous government had done, or the previous Conservative Government had done. But let's put it on the record, Mr. Speaker. As I was speaking, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, will you tell him to shut up.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would suggest to all members of the Chamber — to all members — that when one member is speaking, the rest of the Chamber give him the courtesy of the floor.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, they are beginning to squirm because, Mr. Speaker, they thought that they were going to get away with something, and I say to you that the public of this province will not let them get away with it. Let's put it on the record, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, will you tell him to shut up again?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster may continue.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether, after you have made an admonition to the honourable member and within ten seconds of your having done so, he completely ignored it, whether . . . Now I know that I am to continue and to tolerate that kind of thing and that you are not going to do anything about it, and I will, and if we are in the alley, Mr. Speaker, which we are, then I can tell my honourable friend that I can fight in the alley and do it better than he can. If that's what you are making out of this House, so be it, Mr. Speaker. I'll accept my forum as you create it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** . . . have to take abuse continually today from the Honourable Member for Inkster, who is a particularly bad mood, for reasons that escape all of us, with respect to rulings that you make and so on. The business of heckling in parliament, and my honourable friend I think is aware of this but he chooses to forget it every once in a while, it's one of the great traditions of parliament. If he doesn't like the traditions of this parliament, there are other Legislatures that he can sit in perhaps in other countries where he would feel much more at home.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster may proceed.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I know what heckling is and I know what the use of my time has been as a result of this last ten minutes, and I can tell the honourable member that I have colleagues in this House; that he is not going to shut me up; that there will be motions made under which

I will be able to speak; that I know what heckling is and I know, Mr. Speaker, what is a concerted attempt to prevent a person from continuing with a speech. I have been able to take heckling with any other member and I give as much as I take, and I accept that. That is not what the honourable member is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that as I was talking about the disputes that are taking place, that he was motioning to the Member for St. Boniface and motioning to myself with his fingers crossing to each of us, sicem, sicem. And that is, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— No, I didn't even object to it, Mr. Speaker, I didn't object to it. . I said at that point, "Let's go retrace it." And the honourable member knows what he is doing and I will ask for leave to continue, and the honourable members if they refuse, I will get the leave in a different way. I know what the honourable member is doing. I mean he just doesn't want to hear what I have to say, nor does he want the plic to hear.

Mr. Speaker, at that point I said, "If the honourable member introduced this bill for the purpose of amusing himself by watching what is going on between members on this side of the House. If he did that he is going to be 100 percent successful." At that point, and I didn't object, the honourable member got up and raised a point of privilege, that that is not the reason that he introduced the bill, which was not a point of privilege. But I merely wish to retrace, Mr. Speaker, what has occurred.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have this bill. This horrendous piece of legislation, which would provide for the most inequitable circumstances, depending on how you use it. You know the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, he said, Mr. Speaker, "Farmer A earning half-a-million dollars; and Farmer B earning half-a-million dollars; and Farmer C earning \$10,000.00. Mr. Speaker, after it was all over, he said it was all fictional. Of course it was all fictional, because it was fiction, which is what the honourable member, my friend the Member for Lakeside, is so used to dealing in.

But let's use the same hypothesis. School Division A decides that it is going to give money to a Catholic School and it is going to refuse the Mennonite School School Division B is going to refuse all schools; School Division C is going to give money to a Hebrew School and is not going to give money to an elite school. That's legislation that is supposed to clear up a mess.

Mr. Speaker, that is the irony of it. The legislation confirms the mess. It enacts it into a statute law and gives me, Mr. Speaker, the first opportunity that I can really vote against it. Because in 1972, Mr. Speaker, and it is on the record, I got up and told the members of the Legislative Assely that despite the legislation, administrative acts are taking place which are making us irrelevant, and that no matter what we do these administrative acts could continue. The fact is they did continue. But if that's a mess, Mr. Speaker, then it's now being enshrined into statute, not for a long period of time because they will intend to change the statute, and, Mr. Speaker, that is the day that I am looking to.

Because all of those people, and there were many of them in the Province of Manitoba, who saw the necessity of maintaining the integrity of the public school system. This is the red flag, and, Mr. Speaker, I am happy I say — with some gratitude to the Conservative Government — that they have proceeded as they have proceeded. Because (1) they have not, Mr. Speaker, done anything except to pass a bill fortifying a situation which the member has described as a mess. So he has now enacted it into legislation, this mess. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, and more importantly, they have now given us an opportunity to once again have an effective opposition to this continuing, steady insidious and disastrous degrading of the Public School System, and Mr. Speaker, maybe we can win, because of this bill. —(Interjection)— The honourable member, Mr. Speaker, we will see how it comes out.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, in every way I will oppose this bill, and I tell the honourable members that I have now been given, other than the opportunity to speak on it, which I did as much as I could, as much as I reasonably thought I could, and I hope I am not rationalizing the fact that I wasn't 100 percent effective. I hope that I am not rationalizing, but I will do everything I can now to once again try to mobilize the people in the Province of Manitoba as to what is happening, and there is time. Because this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a horrendous piece of legislation that nobody will be able to live with. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, you know, if the honourable meer says that it is only the Member for St. Boniface that I have to mobilize, I tell the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that there are more Conservatives, people of normal Conservative backgrounds, sound Conservative backgrounds, who will leave the Conservative adherence on this bill than on anything else that they have brought into the Legislature. The only thing to do, Mr. Speaker, is to now mobilize it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable First Minister says that. . .

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAR:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

**MR. DOERN:** It may or may not be appropriate to heckle, but it certainly is not appropriate to heckle from outside of one's seat, so I think that if the First Minister is going to engage in a debate in any way, shape or form, he should at least take his place in the Chaer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to say what this fight is all about, and what will be the development of this bill, which is merely, not the thin edge of the wedge, but the middle edge of the wedge, to a complete deterioration of the Public School System. The end objective of the people who are pursuing this legislation and the principle of this bill is the following: That there will be a private school system, that that private school system will be available to anybody who can afford it, that the people who can afford it will be able to say to the Public School System a certain amount of our tax dollars have gone into your system. Those dollars we reserve the right to designate to the private school system. They will then be given the right as they have, Mr. Speaker, in other places, and as has existed in Ontario with respect to two school systems — with respect to the Catholic system — they will then have the right to designate their dollars plus their additional private support to the private system. A growing number of upper-middle class people will say that I am now going to send my children to the private school. The same people will stop their interest in the Public School, and when it comes to voting money for the Public Schools, Mr. Speaker, they will have no interest in it at all. They will say restraint.

And isn't it interesting, everything is being restrained, Mr. Speaker. Everything is being restrained. But we are introducing a bill, which the government knows will result in approximately over \$1,200,000 of public money being directed into the private school system in the years when sheets had to be stopped; in the years, Mr. Speaker, when at Shaughnessy School, a public school, which has an excellent day care program, when that program seems to be in the process of being discontinued and the money will be used to finance private schools; in the years when we have told the hospitals to cut their budgets, we have this additional going to the private school system.

Mr. Speaker, the most wonderful and wondrous feature of it is that you didn't hear a word about. There were no picketers, there was nothing in the election campaign, there were no appeals, there were no public meetings — people did not have to go anywhere, as a matter of fact, they were instructed not to. You know, I have been appearing with Mr. Svitkovich on several programs. Mr. Svitkovich is a fine gentleman in every sense of the word. We've appeared on several radio stations. But he told me an interesting thing, that he's to go because he will keep it cool, that the others are going to raise hell, and that they're going to make it difficult for the thing to be achieved, that things have to be kept quiet. And that's what's happened. You don't have Mr. Stangl, you don't hear from Stangl. Does anybody know the name Stangl? No, it's "keep it cool." The quieter we are, the more chance we will have of getting this forward. That's the principle of democracy under which these people are able to operate. I haven't seen anybody else able to operate it. I haven't seen the women being able to operate it.

But Mr. Speaker, what will happen is that you will have a series of private schools, attended and forced to be attended by people who would have wanted to send their children to public schools, but they will say that the public school system is so bad, the public is not doing anything for it, and we don't keep those people in the system, that they're going to send their child to a private school. Mr. Speaker, I would do it. I would not risk my children going to a second-rate school system if my only choice was to send them to a private school and I had the money to do it. - - - I confess, I would do it. I do not believe in principle so much in the public school system that I would have my children attend there no matter how bad it was — and it will get worse because this government, if this process continues, has no interest in anything which deals with the equality of people.mn

And what will be the result, Mr. Speaker? The result will be, you can throw your human rights' legislation out the window. You wouldn't have to ask people what religion they are, all you'd have to ask them would be what school they went to. The school tie, the school tie, Mr. Speaker, will be the entry, and you wouldn't have to worry about legislation. You know, the human rights' legislation is laughable when one looks at the kind of society that we would create by this type of bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is ten times, ten times, a hundred times, infinitely more significant than what is happening in Family Law in this province. One is completely irrelevant compared to the other, and it appears that the atmosphere is not available to effectively combat this bill. That's okay, Mr. Speaker, I mean you have to take your positions when they are most affected. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what I say to the Conservative Government.

You know, we were told about horror stories. What has happened, Mr. Speaker, that makes this bill so easy, is that Ministers have signed agreements, and I am advised they started under the Conservative administration, which they entered into with private schools, on the basis that for

certain portions of the day it will be a public school — and I am repeating now what I told this House in 1972, so I have no difficulty in that connection — that in effect, there has been a subterfuge to get around the Roblin legislation. And Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister had got up in this House and said that when there are horror stories about the previous administration — we heard so many terrible things about our government, well, alleged terrible things, actually the number of horror stories was largely diminished as the Session went on.

But Mr. Speaker, when we come to this administrative action whereby the public was financing separate religious ideologies, teaching catholicism and teaching Judaism, using the money of taxpayers who should never be required to teach any kind of "ism", what did the Conservatives say about that? They said, it's so wonderful, Mr. Speaker; this New Democratic Party was so wonderful, this government did such a great thing, that to make sure that there is no problem with it, not only are we going to continue it, but we're going to enshrine it in legislation. If they had said that this was a horror story, Mr. Speaker, I would have said, they got me, they found me out, it's a horror story, they finally found one. But Mr. Speaker, that's not what they're saying. I would have congratulated this government if they said, look, the previous government was being very lax about these agreements; we don't know that they're legal, we are going to clarify it, we are going to say, no more agreements until there is legislation. But no, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a bill, the Minister didn't criticize, previous Ministers didn't say they did anything wrong, and he still says they did nothing wrong. All he's doing is making sure, for those people at the City of Winnipeg School Board who appeared to be a bit squeamish, and appeared to have legal advice that makes it a bit of a problem, he's saying, don't worry about your problem, we have now passed legislation which will make it possible for you to take this money. That's what he is saying.

And Mr. Speaker, I will have to say, with regard to possibly not having done everything, although I thought that I was doing everything that was possible, that whatever criticism there is in holding up and being loyal, Mr. Speaker — and that's probably most important, there are people in this province who used to regard the New Democratic Party as being the party that really made it difficult for any other government to legislate with regard to public aid to private schools. The Conservative Government who had a feeling for it, but they knew that there would be strong opposition on this issue, there was a strong group in the Legislature and that group will oppose it. Mr. Speaker, the former Member for Transcona opposed it, the Member for St. Johns opposed it, the Member for Seven Oaks opposed it, the Member for Inkster opposed it, there were numerous New Democrats in opposition to this legislation, and they had the support of many, many people in the province of Manitoba behind him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. GREEN:** Now the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that because there was this, how would I put it, this schizophrenia on the issue within our organization — and you know, that happens — it is a fact that there is less of an effective opposition, and the Conservative Government is bringing in their legislation with, I repeat, the First Minister being very happy that he feels that there is no effective opposition and that he could be amused at the conflict that will take place between members on this side of the House. And I repeat, if that's the reason, they will be 100 percent successful.

But Mr. Speaker, they have been too timid. They could have gone further. At this particular time, they could have gone all the way. If they had the courage of their convictions, they could have gone all the way. But they didn't have the courage; they were timid — and they've given us, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity to mobilize on this question, and I say that the people of the province of Manitoba will mobilize on this question. —(Interjection)— The honourable member says, "no way;" that's fine. At least we will have the time to find out whether the people of this province will mobilize. Because the honourable member agrees with me. He knows that this is not the objective of this bill. He knows that the bill seeks to go much further and to deal with much more profound principles.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, seeks to create a class system of schools in the province of Manitoba. If the direction of this bill is successful, there will be a class system of schools in the province of Manitoba, and an ethnic division and religious division of our population, which will make any talk of human rights and equality completely ineffective. And that's Mr. Speaker, why I am going to oppose this bill. I thought when it was introduced that I might be self-conscious about what happened, but I believe now, Mr. Speaker, sincerely, that there was nothing that could have been done that wasn't done, and that it's the Conservative bill that will once again mobilize the people of the province of Manitoba so that when the time comes, there will be an issue.

So Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote against this bill. But while voting against it, I want to tell the honourable members that I am prepared that they consider certain very, very sound proposals to make sure that what I am predicting will not happen. I propose, Mr. Speaker, that the level of funding for the public school system be guaranteed at the same level as the most expensive private

school that is funded by the province on the principle of this bill; that if you will agree that when the private school system is established, which is being done with public funds, that the level of the public system and the measure of dollars that go to it will be the same as the private system, and all those people who hope to get their money out of the private system, will fail. And they will then talk about the equality of the school system.

I'm going to propose, Mr. Speaker, as well, that as this system develops, that private schools admit students on a first-come, first-served basis, and that there be no fee chargeable to the people attending those schools; that anybody can come, and that there is no tuition fee, because those schools are being maintained by the public, and if they want public money, they have to take any member of the public, and they should do so without fee, the same as is available in the public school system. Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that if the people who propose these measures hope to get their money out of the public school system and establish an elite and religious and ethnic private school system, that I want them, when they are doing it, to guarantee that the mass of people in the province of Manitoba will not suffer by this move, which they say in no way is intended to have any effect on the public school system. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

**HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments of the Honourable Member for Inkster. He followed the basic principle that those who practise law follow when they have a very weak case. They simply shout, they exaggerate, they threaten, and in effect, Mr. Speaker, they try to avoid the basic issue which is presented to them. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, it's not meant to be insulting. I want the Honourable Member for Inkster to understand that it's not meant to be insulting. He said this is a horrendous bill. He imputed motives to this side. He suggested this means something much more than it actually does, and he did this deliberately, because he wants to inflame the province and he wants to inflame a group so that he can win. Because I want to explain Mr. Speaker, again, what he said. He said, they have given us — well who's us? The members of the New Democratic Party? The Opposition? That we have given an issue, maybe we can win. Who's going to win? The New Democratic Party? The Opposition? No, Mr. Speaker. When the suggestion was made with respect to Tantalum Mine and the purchase by the Hudson Bay Mining Corporation of its interest, the Honourable Member for Inkster stood up and said, "When we become government, we're going to tell you what we're going to do. We're not going to allow that to go through, we're going to pay them exactly what they paid." Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, he couldn't say that now. He doesn't have the authority to say this just now. He doesn't have that kind of consensus. He's not speaking on behalf of a party.

So Mr. Speaker, what he has done, in presenting his own position because he has a problem, Mr. Speaker, he has a very severe problem, and I'm going to deal with that in a few moments — is that tempted by his theatrics here to try and suggest that (a) there was something more than what was presented; to try and indicate that this, in effect, is far greater than it actually is, and (b) in addition, to try and get himself out of the position that he's backed himself into by his own complicity, directly, in relation to the past practices of the administration of which he was a member, and of which he left, and of which he declared at the time that he left that the practices were in fact, not correct — then went back into the administration, Mr. Speaker, and became a party to additional agreements that were made during that administration, after he had left and come back.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know what the party position will be, and if the meer has given any indication, it would appear to me that we're not going to have a party position. What we're going to have is a fragmented position in which different members will present their own point of view. And that's interesting, Mr. Speaker, because I will be interested to hear how many of the former Ministers of the government will stand up now and say that they are not going to support this bill. Because, Mr. Speaker, they had the reins of power after 1972, after the issue was resolved in this House and after the Member for Inkster, who is the former Minister, left the government and came back; they had the power then to deal with it. And if, Mr. Speaker, they are against this bill then I have to ask him why did you allow it to continue and why did you allow additional agreements to be signed during that administration, if you are so against it now? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, nonsense about ministerial authority; it was done by the collective responsibility of the Premier and the Cabinet of the day.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem the Honourable Member for Inkster has. His problem, Mr. Speaker, is a very severe one. He asks us to undo it. He asks us to undo a problem that they had the power to undo for five years, and they didn't deal with it. And, Mr. Speaker, there is a good reason why they didn't deal with it. They were not prepared to deal with it because in fact there was no consensus among them.

But, Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is, having put himself into this position, how does the



Member for Inkster stand up and oppose the bill? How can he oppose this bill? This, in effect, is in fact putting in legal form the actual practice of the administration of which he was a part. And he says it's ministerial responsibility. —(Interjection)— Administrative responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we have already watched in this session the Honourable Member for Inkster suggest: Well, I wasn't party to this; I did not want the Information Service to operate, but it did. The Provincial Auditor made certain recommendations with respect to CFI and ManFor and we followed those recommendations but I wasn't really part of that and I really didn't agree to that. ' And, Mr. Speaker, there were certain practices with respect to shared services agreement which in fact allowed certain agreements to take place, which in effect may or may not have been legal, which we now are trying to legitimize, but at that time when I was part of the administration I was really not part of that and that was really a ministerial responsibility and not a collective responsibility of a government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster is a fraud — an absolute fraud — on this issue and he is not going to be able to get away with this and think that he can stand up here, go outside to the people and simply say, you know, "This is something far greater," when in effect, Mr. Speaker, this is in fact the actual practice which he allowed, which he sat through for five to six years in a Cabinet, knowing full well that there was a division but never once either objecting to it publicly after he went back in the Cabinet, or, Mr. Speaker, withdrawing from the Cabinet if he felt so firm about the principle.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of what the Honourable Member for Inkster says as if it's necessary, because he has a problem, to resolve it and the only way he can resolve it is by in fact the shouting and the exaggeration — "horrendous bill, oh horrendous." Mr. Speaker, for five years or for six years he was party to a government that allowed this horrendous thing to occur. Mr. Speaker, he didn't do a damn thing about it. —(Interjection)— Oh, he did? What did you do? —(Interjection)— Oh, you fought it; oh yes, you fought it but you allowed it to happen. As I say, we will be interested to see how many Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Speaker, fought it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** On a point of privilege, none of those agreements came to Cabinet. —(Interjections)— That is right; that is right.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Task Force.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, and I say this, and the honourable member has practised law long enough to know that he is absolutely estopped from making that declaration or trying to relieve himself of that responsibility. He would not win any court of law and he can't win in a court of public opinion.

The honourable member can cry and scream all he wants; he was part of the government. Now, I want to go, because I think it's very important because you know, Mr. Speaker, we almost have a repetition of the debate that occurred in 1972, and I had occasion to read the honourable member's statements then and I can anticipate what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface will say because I read his remarks again, and it's interesting because in effect the Honourable Member for Inkster is basically regurgitating some of the similar arguments advanced, particularly the reference to myself at Harvard; he did that in 1972. It was very apparent, Mr. Speaker, he knows what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface's position will be and he immediately indicated a position in the actual debate. He tried to lure him into the debate prior to the time that the honourable member was ready to debate the issue, and there were some very interesting tactics that were used then. I don't want to deal with that; I don't think that that's relevant but it's an interesting thing to watch —(Interjection)— Well, because there is a certain repetition, Mr. Speaker, to the pattern that occurred before.

But I think it's very important, Mr. Speaker, to try and put into context exactly what the Honourable Member for Inkster said at that time, because one has to understand the degree of complicity on his part with respect to what has happened in the past. Because if his recognition at that time of the procedures that were taking place, which I suggest, Mr. Speaker, does not give him one single bit of evidence to suggest that he can in any way, Mr. Speaker, be relieved of the responsibility that he held as a Minister, knowing full well that the procedures that were being followed were in fact accomplishing the very thing that he says today is a horrendous piece of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he said, and I want to quote from Hansard, and I quote his words, "In everything that was said at the time it was clearly indicated that there was not to be state aid for the maintenance of a private school system. That was the entire will of the Legislature and that was, in my view, the will of the people of the Province of Manitoba."

Later he said, Mr. Speaker, "And what has occurred is that the administration looked at a couple

of difficult situations." This was the previous administration, and I'm not going to blame because I think we share a complicity. And said, "We are willing to consider agreement. When we came to office one of the things that happened is that one of these agreements, which had already been previously negotiated, which was already operational, was put on the Minister of Education's desk for signature and since it was a commitment which had already been made was honoured and executed by the administration."

Mr. Speaker, and he said later, "I will accept the fact that perhaps on the first day that I knew that this kind of thing was happening that I should have got up and protested and maybe left the administration that was doing it. Perhaps this is my complicity. And if that is my complicity, I accept that. I plead guilty, and I lay myself down to my constituents to say, yes, I knew about it two years ago and I did take the position that nothing further could happen but I didn't cut back."

Now, Mr. Speaker, he said that when he had resigned from the Cabinet. Having said that, he goes right back into the Cabinet and he knows full well, Mr. Speaker, during that period of time that the Minister signed additional agreements. And, Mr. Speaker, he knew that; the other members here knew it and there is absolutely no way that they can stand up and try to weasel out, which is exactly what they are trying to do, out of their responsibility. And there is no way, Mr. Speaker, they can say that was something that happened that they were really not a part of, it was the other Minister who was doing it in an administrative way. We really didn't know about it. Because, Mr. Speaker, what they are really suggesting is when those things were discussed in the councils of the Executive Council and in the various sub-committees of their Cabinet, and of Management Committee when the Estimates had to come forward, Mr. Speaker, when the amounts had to be approved, they are basically saying that they all walked out and they didn't allow themselves to hear anything because they didn't want to hear anything, and they simply allowed —(Interjection)— Well, they, whoever were responsible.

I am still, Mr. Speaker, going to be interested to see how many former members of the Cabinet are prepared to stand up and take the same position as the Honourable Member for Inkster. I do not believe — and I have to tell him — I do not believe that he can say to me that he did not know about it. He knew about it, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** On a point of privilege. I never made any such statement. I said I accept that degree of complicity. I judged that I could not do anything about it at that stage. The opposition is giving me an opportunity to do something about it — the government has.

**MR. SPIVAK:** The honourable member could have done something about it. He could have resigned and he could have done the same thing he did before. Mr. Speaker, he could have challenged the previous administration. He could have taken the previous administration to the councils of the people and he could have talked the way he is going to talk now. He could have proposed all the various amendments that he is going to propose now, Mr. Speaker. He could have done all those things but he didn't because he didn't worry about it then. He is in opposition now, Mr. Speaker, and he is prepared now to reverse his position and do a somersault and in this respect, Mr. Speaker, he is a complete fraud. That's exactly what he is.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a clarification. The Honourable Member for Inkster suggests, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a clarification. He again imputes motives and he tries to suggest something that it isn't. And this will obviously be his position because, Mr. Speaker, without that he has no case.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think he has a case on that. Because in effect, Mr. Speaker, all we have attempted to do is to clarify in legal wording the actual administrative practices that have occurred in the past, and the honourable members opposite might as well accept that. And if in doing that we are creating a horrendous problem, then I think we then have to argue about the functions of government, the way in which it operates, and the degree of responsibility under our system that Ministers and Cabinets and caucuses must take.

Is anyone going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the former government in its caucuses did not deal with this matter, directly or indirectly? Is anyone going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they did not deal with it in Cabinet? One would have to be absolutely foolish, having gone throu the trauma that occurred with respect to the proposals of the First Minister made outside of this House in terms of the declarations of aid to private schools, which he made, then the following resolution and the debate that occurred, the resignation of the former member, who is a former Minister, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, I voted against that resolution and I am prepared to deal with that. That resolution accomplished nothing, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing, except to try and take the former First Minister out of the corner that he paited himself in which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, although it's a different corner is the same position that the Honourable Member for Inkster is in.

He has painted himself in a corner by the direct complicity and by the acquiescence and by his involvement in knowledge, Mr. Speaker, in what the administrative practices were.

So, Mr. Speaker, from my point of view and in listening to what he says, he is saying much to-do about nothing. He is exaggerating. He is imputing motives. He is threatening. He is trying to do everything to justify a position which is untenable from his point of view, but which he will not get away with either in this House or on the public platforms.

Mr. Speaker, he was a party to a government who carried on a procedure which is now in legal form being put forward by this Act. Mr. Speaker, he knew full well what was happening. If he felt so strongly as he has today about the principle, Mr. Speaker, and he felt that we must win and we have to — whoever we are, and that's an interesting thing — whoever we are, that he should have resigned. But having been part of that administration, Mr. Speaker, he cannot stand up. Because if he stands up, it is a false declaration on his part. He is stopped by his own conduct, Mr. Speaker, and, as I suggest, he is nothing but a fraud.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** I, too, would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister, one or two questions, Mr. Speaker.

Firstly, having listened to every word the Minister has said and found that I do not know what he believes in in regard to the principle of this bill, would he care to tell us whether he supports the principle or not?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Minister without Portfolio.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, the difference between the honourable member and myself is very simple. I am a member of the Executive Council. The Executive Council and the Cabinet have brought forward a bill, along with the caucus of the government, as a government bill, I stand behind the principles of the bill and I accept that.

Mr. Speaker, I take full responsibility for that. I hope the former member of the caucus and the former Minister of Finance, who is in fact a government that in fact allowed the procedures to follow as they have in the past, is prepared to take the same responsibility.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister has not indicated what he believes, in regard to the principle of this bill, but rather that he stands behind the solidarity of the caucus, which he himself did not attend for at least a year or two, may I now ask him, Mr. Speaker, if he is prepared to explain exactly how it is that he voted, along with all his colleagues, except Gabe Girard, against the attempt in 1972 to enlarge some aspect of aid to private schools?

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns doesn't know his facts. He made some statements with respect to the caucus which are false — (Interjection)— Yes, false, and the honourable member, again, should first of all get his facts straight.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, again I want to point out, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is present here now, the resolution we dealt with before set up a committee of study. If one is prepared to, and if the Honourable Member for St. Johns is prepared to, he can read the Hansard or, if he'd like, I am prepared to read the Hansard into the record today of what statement I made at that time. I indicated very directly my position with respect to aid to private schools. It's known and nothing has changed, Mr. Speaker. I support aid and I believe that the minority in this province had their rights taken away by the majority. I have said that publicly before and I'm prepared to say that again, however, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the resolution that was proposed, which would set up a committee to study it, would have accomplished anything, and I voted against it on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is known, the principle of this bill is to in fact put in legislative form the past practices that have in fact been operating, and to provide a means with which the question of legality will not be an issue as to the procedures that have been followed in the past. Mr. Speaker, on that there is no question with respect to the principle of the bill and as I say to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, and I want to be very clear, the Cabinet and the caucus have approved this, this is a government bill. I stand behind it, and we take full responsibility. I wonder whether he is going to be prepared and the others are going to be prepared to stand and take full responsibility for the administrative practices that they all knew were taking place then which in effect carried out the same principle that this bill has.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the member a question. It appears to us, on this side that — or to me, if you like — I still think of you as one of us. Mr. Speaker, it appears to those of us in the opposition, that the Conservative position is a reversal. I want to ask the Honourable Minister whether in fact he believes that he and his colleagues are being consistent at this time because to me, in particular, it appears that the Conservative Party is reversing itself.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I wonder if the honourable member would care to rephrase his question. Questions on a speech can only be for clarification of something that was said during the debate. The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, my answer is very simple. Consistency will simply mean that the members who are now in opposition will support this bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker —(applause)— applause is hardly necessary, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any long nor attempt a drama in my remarks. I merely want to say at the very outset that I intend to support the legislation, not because I regard it as being necessary but because I regard it as not being harmful in that it merely presumes to do that which has been done and carried out in the province for about one decade now.

I know very well that the issue of public support of separate schools, parochial schools, private schools, call them what you like or both, is one which has inflamed the passions in this province for a century, or almost that much, and that it has also been viewed with the context of much the same kind of difficulty in British Columbia, probably for about as long a period of time. In most, or not all of the rest of the provinces of Canada, various forms of support for separate schools have been a part of the Statute Law or practice or both of the province for most of the period of Confederation. Indeed, I must say in all candour that the type of arrangement that exists in provinces to the east of Manitoba, even though it provides financial support to separate schools is done in a form which, in my opinion, is less desirable than the manner in which the same is done, albeit to a lesser degree, in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

I think that those who have been in public life in this province for a period of time, whether it be five, ten years or more, realize full well that this question or problem has returned from time to time to bedevil successive administrations and it was in an effort to try and deal with some aspect, in a limited way, of this problem that prompted the administration back in the 1960s to introduce, I think it was in 1964 or thereabouts, the concept of shared services, and embody it in statute law.

About three or four years later, 1967 or 1968, to really telescope and summarize history now, the initial concept of shared services was extended somewhat — I guess most would say by administrative action and ministerial decision — to embody a form of shared services which some could argue, perhaps with validity, I would say with validity, was beyond that which was initially intended. Be that as it may, I say that looking at the actual evidence of performance and results of the past 10 years, that nothing harmful has ensued and that it is extremely unlikely that anything harmful will ensue with the passage of this bill.

I am going to avoid the temptation of harking back to 1971 or 1972, when there was a motion on the Order Paper which attempted to provide for analysis of shared services, both the short form, the longer form, or the initial form and the extended form, which extended form, as I already have said, Sir, was entered into about 1967 or 1968.

Certainly for the last two years of the Conservative administration and for the eight years of the New Democratic administration, shared services in both the more limited and in the more extended form were part of the reality of the functioning of schools in five or six divisions of this province. Indeed, I must say, just as a personal observation, that in two school divisions, namely Brandon and The Pas, the arrangement actually went, according to my interpretation and understanding, even beyond what I term the extended version of shared services. In those two divisions, The Pas and Brandon, a form of arrangement was entered into which was practically universal in terms of the extent to which there was public support for the schools which operated, however real or nominally as separate or private schools.

In the final analysis though, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is difficult to argue with the actual experience of 10 years and nothing, but absolutely nothing that I am aware of in the operations of those schools, in the five or six school divisions in this province that have been operating under shared services in the most extended form, has demonstrated itself to be in any way harmful or fractious within our society. Indeed, fractiousness is sometimes unavoidable. The elements of it

not to do really with the functioning of these schools, but rather having to do with the question of A or B-type curriculum in the schools, having to do with French language use, but that is a different issue almost, indeed entirely.

So, in light of these facts, which I believe to be self-evident, I would find it difficult, indeed impossible, to oppose the legislation. I do so in spite of the Member for River Heights because his attempt to justify whatever course of action he followed a few years ago is something that quite frankly he has to live with and justify to himself and I in no way feel compelled to try and elicit further reasoning and justification from him.

But, Sir, at the risk of being somewhat repetitive, I say that even if and when this legislation is passed, the issue in its larger dimension will not have disappeared because even if it works well, and I happen to believe that it will work well, it will still be based on the principle of local option, not that that's so terrible, but it is rather awkward, Sir, in the context of this issue and this problem, and therefore I suspect that this problem will come back from time to time as it has in the past.

The one virtue that I see in it and which prompts me to support it, there are two reasons fundamentally, and I'll restate them. One, it is merely clarifying that which has been the practice and a non-harmful practice at that. Secondly, I believe that there is justification in giving support to a measure which will enable schools to continue with less financial difficulty and yet at saving to the public purse, because I believe that in the event when certain of these schools do close down, and some of them have, that it then redounds at 100 cents on the dollar cost to the public purse. I don't get any particular satisfaction out of that and therefore, that is yet another reason.

My honourable friends opposite, I believe, have a right to be curious as to how it could be found necessary in 1978 to introduce legislation to merely confirm that which they did in full knowledge, and we did, for 10 years. Several divisions didn't find it necessary to obtain all kinds of precautionary legal opinions, and others apparently have found it necessary to ask for such even a decade after the fact. But there comes a point, Sir, when after years and years of practice, that custom and convention have the embodiment of clear and clearly understood lawful practice.

Be that as it may, it must be said, I feel I must say, that I really cannot view this legislation as having in it the portents of something dangerous to the public interest or harmful or capable of seeding dissension because the potential for that exists in many other factors of life and therefore, accordingly, I intend to support it. My honourable friends, however, would be not correct in assuming that this deals with the larger issue because it leads to local determination and in some localities, the determination may be one way and in others another way, insofar as the host division is concerned, in which case then there will be those involved in some of the schools and some parts of the province who will feel aggrieved and indeed, in all logic will have a right to feel aggrieved because they will be recipients of differentiating treatment and action.

Well, that wouldn't be the first dilemma that we've had to face, but in the meantime I prefer to support something which I believe will be somewhat clarifying of a practice already a decade old.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to take part in this debate at this time. First I want to put my position quite clear, I'm not going to support this legislation that is before the Chamber at this time. I must say that I would have had far more respect for the government if they hadn't had the lack of courage that they have evinced, to deal honestly with the problem that is before us. I listened to the Minister on TV when he was being interviewed. I thought he was quite candid. He said that he didn't prefer this system, he preferred a system of direct aid, but this is what the government evidently decided that they didn't have the courage to go to the people of the province of Manitoba with that type of legislation, and so there we have before the House the bill that we have here today, Bill No. 57.

It's true, as a member of the former government, I had to take some small responsibility that what was transpiring is something that I certainly do not uphold. I want to state quite clearly, quite unequivocally, I'm a strong supporter of the public school system, I always have been and I always will be. My first loyalty is not to any private or parochial school system, but it's to the public school system of Manitoba. I think that the public school system in Manitoba has served us well. I think if a poll was taken in the Chamber, you would find that at least 70 to 75 percent, or maybe even more, of the Members of this Assembly are all graduates of that public school system.

It has served the people of Manitoba well, because if you want an example of just how well it has been able to meld the people of our province, of many diverse backgrounds, religious, ethnic groups, go into Ward 3 of the old City of Winnipeg where you had a multicultural background of nationalities of people and I tell you, it still remains one of the most unique parts of the City of Winnipeg. People take great pride in saying that they are from the North End, and rightly so, because

those people were people who went there, went to the public school system of the City of Winnipeg and became Winnipeggers and part of the scene as we see it here in Manitoba, and have many made many contributions. I am talking about the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Germans, the Scandinavians, you name it. There were people of many many backgrounds, and even the North End Wasps were there too and they all became part of that scene, and that's a wonderful thing.

What is being proposed by this legislation is just to legalize something that, in my opinion, was being done under the table, and was being done under the table not only by the previous government, but by the government previous to that. I can say to the Meers of this Assembly that I was never a supporter of shared services. I wasn't a Member of this Assembly, but I was a member of the Winnipeg public school system at the time, and I certainly was never a supporter of the shared services.

I view this piece of legislation as one set of steps, many that will probably transpire over the years, to get complete aid for private and parochial schools. And for those who favour that system of public — Well, it becomes public education, as the Honourable Member for Inkster has stated — but for those who are adherents of the private and parochial school system, they will not be satisfied until they have destroyed the public school system as we know it today. —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend, the First Minister, says that's balderdash. That's his opinion, and he may have his opinions on this matter, and his feelings. I respect those and I respect those of the Member for St. Boniface and my Leader, and I respect any other member's, and I expect you to respect my feelings because I can assure you, my feelings on this matter are just as deep and deeply held with conviction as yours are. So don't try and pretend that your convictions are better than mine. —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind if the Honourable First Minister wishes to heckle or interrupt, that's his business. I realize that's part and parcel of parliament and the legislative system and to the yapping dog in the back there, well, I'll just ignore him.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, those who are the adherents of that, and that is my opinion and that is my conviction, that these people will not stop — they will not stop — until they destroy the public school system as we know it today, because as more and more money is funnelled into the private and parochial school system, it becomes an elitist system of education. For those who have extra money to spend on education dollars, it means that they can get the public purse to supplement and set up a school system that in many cases will become superior. Unfortunately, it will become superior to what the public school system is, and the public school system that we have today, I think is a wonderful system. It has done a good job and I've heard many people say, well, there's no discipline in the public school system. Well, you know, if you want discipline in the public school system, it is a very simple thing — very very simple. The people who send their children to the public school system, if they want their children to be disciplined, support the school administration and support the teachers. It's all very well and good to say that Johnny won't behave in the public school system so I'm going to send him to a parochial or private school system where they will discipline him. They'll send him there and they'll spend their tax dollars there. —(Interjections)— All right, I may not make any sense, as the Honourable Member for Emerson. . .

**MR. DRIEDGER:** You called me a dog.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, if you keep yapping, I'll call you a dog again. If you have anything to say, you can get up on your two hind legs and say it, after I am through —(Interjection)— and bark if you like. You know, there are dogs that run around on two feet.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the bill and to deal with the bill, as I was saying, if people want discipline within the public school system, it is there for them. People will send their children to a private school to have them disciplined. They say they can't get the discipline in the public school system. Well, that's very simple. You elect a board of trustees; the board of trustees will decide that they will discipline them.

When I was first elected to the Winnipeg School Division, corporal punishment was abolished, but we put it back in the public school system, we put it back in the Winnipeg School Division. —(Interjection)— No, five days a week, twice on Sundays. Unfortunately the people in latter years who were elected to the board, and that I must say must reflect the thoughts of the general public that the discipline was not to be maintained, so they decided they would do away with corporal punishment. So when I hear people on radio and people talking about the public school system because of its lack of discipline, and that the private and parochial school systems have much more

discipline, that's nonsense. If they want discipline within the public school system, it is very very simple to get.

You know, it is quite amusing to see the present government who, when my Leader, the Premier of the Province at that time, in 1972, introduced a resolution which would try to deal with this type of . . . and hold hearings, of the 22 or 23 members of the Conservative Party of that day, some skipped out of the House and didn't vote. They weren't here; they absented themselves and I think we can look at the journals and we will find out who they were; I'm not that interested. But of the 18 who were in the House at that time, 17 voted with members on our side to defeat that motion. I'm not sorry we defeated that motion. As I said before, my first loyalty, and it has always been and I have never hidden it at any election; I've told people exactly where I stand. I'm a supporter of the public school system; I'm not a supporter of the private or parochial school system. If you had any courage of your convictions, you would do the same thing. I have been returned to this House on three occasions, on four or five occasions to the Winnipeg School Division, and I always made my position clear. I never hid behind any bushes or under any stones. I told them exactly where I stood on this matter, absolutely where I stood, and I stand there and I will stand there until the day I leave this Assembly. I am here to protect the public school system first and foremost, because it melds together our young people. It makes them citizens of this country.

If you want to have a look at what the separation of people into different school systems will accomplish, go to Northern Ireland and see what they have there with a Protestant School System and a Catholic School System, where they are taught to hate each other. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not calling them second rate. I am saying that they are taught in those schools to hate each other. —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend says that's not true. Go and have a look and see what's happening in Northern Ireland. See what's happening in Northern Ireland. That's what is happening. —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says that he was a product of the private schools, I don't know. If that's the case, then I think he has proved the point. But if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek is an example of the private school system or parochial school system, I don't know which, he didn't say whether it was private or parochial.

**MR. DOERN:** Reform school.

**MR. JENKINS:** No, I don't think that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek — we may have our disagreements — but I would not agree with the Honourable Member for Elmwood and I disassociate myself from that remark altogether.

Mr. Speaker, you know, we could speak on this legislation for many many hours and I must say that I don't know how those people who are the adherents and who wish to see a private school system set up in this province would be happy with this legislation except, as I said before, it is one tiny step, one more chink, or maybe getting the foot a little further in the door, of opening the State aid. You know, the members opposite think that they are pulling off a cute one, you know, they are going to put us on the spot. I'm not embarrassed, I can assure you. If there is any blame and fault, and if I have any responsibility, what small responsibility I have had in the duplicity that was being used to get aid, I'll accept it and I'll take my lumps on it. I'm not ashamed of taking my lumps; I'm not proud of it but I'm afraid I can't say I want to absolve myself. I'll have to take the blame that is there. ut when you are trying to legalize something which the Member for Inkster said was a horrendous piece of legislation, a horrendous sort of thing that was being done, you're trying to enshrine it in law.

I will say for the Minister of Education, I think given his way, and perhaps he couldn't persuade his Cabinet colleagues and caucus members, but if I heard him correctly, and I watched him very closely on television, he said that he would much rather prefer to make the aid direct. . .

**MR. DOERN:** So did the Premier say that.

**MR.** but they lack the courage as a caucus and as a government. I would have had more admiration for you. I might not have agreed with you, but I would have had far more respect, because all you're doing is passing the buck down to the school boards. The school boards are the ones, and I think the Minister will agree with me, those are the people that are the lowest man on the totem pole in this whole scheme of government and you're passing the buck on to those people to make the decisions.

Now, the concept of shared services, as it first came in, was one that the public school boards would requisition books, textbooks, that was one thing. I didn't agree with that. I said that when I was on the Winnipeg School Board, that the government of the day if they'd had the courage of their convictions, they would have said, if you want school books, you apply to the Manitoba Text Book Bureau and we'll sign the cheque. The government of that day didn't have any more guts than they have today. You know, the Winnipeg School Division issued free textbooks before

the Province of Manitoba ever did, and we used to charge our children caution fees to keep those books in good repair when they were turned back in. I moved a motion, when shared services came in and we were still charging a caution fee, even though we were receiving free text books at the time, but when we were turning over books — in fact we never even saw them, they just came through as paper, a paper entry to the Winnipeg School Division — the people who were collecting books from the Winnipeg School Division under our setup, I moved that we abolish caution fees, because at least we had control over the ones within the public school system. We had no control over those in the private school system.

The same thing happened with the system of services when they were first set up, would be within the confines of the public school system, and the first Minister is right to some extent when he says that things have not changed. Sure they haven't changed. I know. I know the local option is there. I also know that the Winnipeg School Division, Public School Board today is dominated by people who are in favour of the shared services concept. I think it's pretty common knowledge that the wife of one Cabinet Minister and another lady that was elected to the Winnipeg School Division in Ward One are good strong adherents of the shared services concept in the private and parochial school system. I think it's very evident what's going to happen when this legislation goes through, that the largest school division in the province of Manitoba will sign an agreement, legalized by law, and they would have done so except that the board previously had voted to do this because other boards were doing so, but on the advice of the board solicitor, the then chairman — he's no longer the chairman of the Winnipeg School Division — refused to sign the agreement.

And there's no doubt about it that the Winnipeg School Division made representations to the then Minister of Education — he was our Minister of Education — whether this was legal or illegal, and the Minister refused to give a legal opinion. And that's perhaps one of the reasons that this type of legislation is here. But I would say that I would have respected you far more, far more as a government — in fact, the only one that I can say that I have any respect for over there is the Minister of Education himself, because he said, given his druthers, he would have given the money to them directly, out in the open, not under the table. But I can't say that for the rest of them. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, that yapping dog is at it again over there. I guess we just have to put up with barking dogs and ignore them. Perhaps they'll go away.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, to get back to briefly deal with this bill, I think that I have said just about my piece. It may not go down too well with the Honourable Member for Emerson, but then I'm not here to impress the Honourable Member for Emerson in one way, shape or form. I'm here to represent the people that elected me here, on the third occasion, and I can tell you we did a survey in 1971-72, whenever this issue was, and the majority of the people who replied to the survey were opposed to state aid for private and parochial schools. And I daresay a survey, if taken again today, would do the same thing. The issue, and there's no doubt about it, this is going to go through, but the next step, you may think you've got these people off your backs, but they'll be back, I can assure you. They'll be back again and again and again until they achieve their ends. And the Honourable Member for St. Boniface nods his head. And I don't disagree with him. I think that is absolutely his right, and it is my right to resist it. And I can assure him that any support that I can muster to see that this doesn't happen, I will do my utmost to do. I expect those who are the adherents to do the same. But when you come in here with a pussyfooting piece of legislation like this, under the table junk, and you pass it off on to the people down at the local school level because you haven't got the guts and the courage of your convictions to come out and say what you really believe, then I say, in no way am I going to support that kind of legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to simply indicate that I support the bill. I am pleased and delighted that I am part of a Cabinet and a Caucus that on an issue that may well have proven to be difficult, to say the least, that we have the capacity, as I think we are demonstrating to Manitobans every day in the last eight or nine months, that we have the ability, the discipline, to work well as a cohesive unit under our leader. I'm very pleased that I can associate myself with this bill that's being brought in by the Minister of Education, and I might also say that I am pleased to have this opportunity, this somewhat rare opportunity, to welcome and to be on side with the former Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the former Premier of this province, and that on these rare occasions that the former Premier, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and my leader the Premier of the province, myself, as the Minister of Highways, that we share and can take a commonsense approach to this question. I welcome that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that this bill presents and affords me to take that position and to make those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that it will be viewed much in that same way with that kind of



cross-party support. It will be interesting to note that while the Honourable Member for Inkster demonstrated this afternoon that he would like to bring the pitch of the debate up to an emotional level, back to the kind of emotional level that perhaps this issue raised in bygone years, but Mr. Speaker, I suspect that in this instance, as in other instances, the Member for Inkster will fail.

To those, who, particularly the last speaker, he bemoaned the immediate death of the public school system, or the death at any time of the public school system, I would have to intone the words, "Oh ye of little faith," express and demonstrate a little bit of faith in your own words about a system that is of primary importance to our whole society, that has demonstrated, and will continue to demonstrate its virtue. Don't suggest to us that for quite other reasons that we should hie off to Ireland to see the result of what we're doing in the passing of this bill. I think the Leader of the Opposition described the bill appropriately, that it is establishing, legalizing what is the case, and as such is in no way bringing on the kind of horrendous effects that the Member for Inkster sees in it, the Member for Logan portends it will bring about.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we stay far closer to home, that we go to our sister provinces. We recognize that we in Manitoba are the last province, to my understanding, that has recognized some rights of the minorities in this particular instance.

So Mr. Speaker, I really don't have a great deal more to say except to take this occasion

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Member for Lakeside will agree that Ontario does not give aid to private schools? It gives aid to catholic schools and the public schools.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, in the Member for Inkster's speech earlier on this afternoon, he was not that definitive in his concern for the difference. It was horrendous to give aid to a Hebrew school; it was horrendous to give aid to a Mennonite school; or it was horrendous to give aid in a sense that it could detract from the public school system.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I never said it was horrendous to give aid to any of these schools. I said it would be horrendous to give aid to one and not to the other, which is exactly what is occurring in the province of Ontario.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's description of the bill was "horrendous," and inasmuch as what the bill talks about is covering by statute, by law, the aid that he was, and his administration was part of in seeing it go to these schools, Mr. Speaker, there's reasonable licence for me to say that in his mind, and I know that I am true, despite the fact that he has said otherwise, I will not say that he said that but in his mind, because I know the Honourable Member for Inkster, I know that in his mind it is horrendous to give aid to private schools of any description, elitist schools, Mennonite schools, Jewish schools, Catholic schools, it is horrendous in his mind. And the Honourable Member for Inkster will not dispute that point. I will not say that he has said that in this debate.¢\$

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** On a point of privilege, because I do not wish to be misunderstood. I have said it would be horrendous for the State to choose which private schools it would give money to, it would have to give them to schools of every description, which I disagree with, but it would be horrendous to select as between. I didn't say it would be horrendous to give them to all.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the schools of note of course that he chose to mention, and that's why I know that not too far, right up in the front of his lobes here, this thought is. The schools that he mentioned, of course, was the St. Johns Ravenscourt school, the Balmoral School, did not talk about the parochial Catholic Schools in poor districts. —(Interjections)— No, not in the same context. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is getting me into a debate that I don't want to get into. What I would be interested in of course, and I would like to solicit this from the Honourable Member for Inkster, that perhaps on another occasion, at third reading or somewhere else in this case, I

would like to solicit from the Honourable Member for Inkster — you know, particularly after the speech that he made this afternoon — will dedicate his efforts to the withdrawal of any and all aid to these institutions in the same manner that he has demonstrated his dedication to chase out any insurance companies that should dare come from Toronto to Manitoba to participate perhaps in the insurance field, or the way he has made very clear to the Hudson Bay Mining Company that the day that the New Democrats return to power they will be confiscated of that 50 percent of the stock that the Minister of Mines and Resources or the Minister of Industry and Commerce allowed them to pick up. I would like to get that same dedication, those same comments, on the record, Sir, that when the New Democrats come back to power and the Member for Inkster is still. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. GREEN:** On a point of privilege. If the honourable member continues to say things that I didn't say, I am going have to continue to interrupt him. He said that I said we would confiscate Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting. I said we would buy back at the price they paid plus interest. That is very generous.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I accept that correction. The honourable member is perfectly right. I accept the correction. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't change what I was trying to say.

Now I want the Honourable Member for Inkster who has indicated that really this is the most dastardly thing that has come to this Legislature in this Session — he spoke very emotionally and very strongly. I happen to know that he feels very emotionally and very strongly about it — I want him to indicate to me and put on the public record that he will, as a front bencher of the New Democratic group, that he will as a former and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the next Leader of the New Democratic Party — I know that he has aspirations, has demonstrated those aspirations in two leadership contests before. I know that he still has an abundant supply of those green buttons without any wording on them, simply the green campaign button which I think were very effective, but obviously not effective enough when running against the present Leader of the New Democratic Party — Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of integrity to have the Member for Inkster clearly indicate that should the New Democratic Party gain power in 16 or 20 years that they will as their first and foremost action withdraw whatever level of support that at that particular time is being given to the private school sector. —(Interjection)— Oh, pardon me, , after they buy back the shares from Hudson Bay, after they have thrown out all the insurance companies and sent them packing back to Toronto, that he will then close down. . .

**MR. GEN:** I don't know what other crazy things you are going to do.

**MR. ENNS:** Well if I can accomplish that, Mr. Speaker, you know, then my few comments on this bill are worthwhile. As I indicated at the outset I have no desire to speak at length on this bill except to indicate that I am pleased that the measure is being introduced in the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise after the last speaker. He almost convinced me when he indicated the kind of company I would have to join to support this bill, that perhaps it would be better not to join it at all. As I had already cozied up to him once on the Cattle Producers Association, I thought that at least one session was more than enough, but it seems that, Mr. Speaker, we may have to join together on this. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could be fairly bumptious about it and say that I speak for my caucus, but I have been doing that a lot lately. I don't know if I can speak for my party on this. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that if past history shows correctly, that there are members of the Liberal Party in this province who have different opinions to the one I will express.

I want to express my support for this bill, I guess on two levels. One, because I was one of those who maybe only three or four years ago felt perhaps as strongly on the other side of the issue, as does the Member for Inkster and other members of this House, partly because of the conditioning, I guess, if you come out of a north-end United Church family you don't have any choice but to adhere to the notion of an absolute and complete commitment to the Public School System. But it in fact was that experience that I had in 1972, before I joined this Legislature, when I was asked by the United Church to sit on a special committee that they had established to look into the question of support for separate schools, when I think I began to change my mind. So I can say quite legitimately, I guess, working in the bosom of the devil, Mr. Speaker, that I began to go

through my own particular transformation and look at the question in several different ways, some different ways than have been looked at here, and also to offset to some of the arguments that have been looked at here.

I felt at that time, as other members have expressed, that somehow if there was to be any additional support for independent schools in this province that this would substantially hurt or erode the Public School System. I learned otherwise, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the evidence. It is as simple as that. In the different jurisdictions which that committee I belonged to had an opportunity to study and examine, I could see no evidence that in any way the Public School System was substantially eroded as a result of the kind of minimal aid that is presently provided to independent schools in this country, other than the separate school system, where you have them in Ontario and Newfoundland. There simply was not any evidence to show it. I couldn't find that somehow or other when a jurisdiction began to move to provide a proportion of aid, 10 percent, 20 percent, whatever it may be, that it was going to have any deleterious effect upon the Public School System.

The other side of the coin is that in looking at the general question of education, it began to appear to me that there was some advantage and positive reasons for having a greater degree of pluralism and diversity in the educational system. That not only was there not the same negative reasons that had been espoused by the Member for Logan that this will destroy the Public School System, but there were also increasing signs that the Public School System itself was in need of a greater degree of diversity and pluralism in its approach to education, and that there should be ways found to endorse and support that. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we have seen in the last three or four years a greater consumer demand, greater public demand, for more pluralism, for greater options, for alternative choices, in the style and the approach as to the education that is being offered.

I think it would be wrong to stand implacably on the idea that an administrative public system is the only way you deliver public education. I think it really begins to make the mistake of assuming that the delivery system, a monolithic delivery system, is the only way that the public sector can provide proper education. There are a nuer of opportunities and variances that are being used and experimented with in this country and others to have public support for varieties and choices in the educational system.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that those kinds of options, we haven't really looked at. If I had any major criticism about the approach taken — and it really isn't a criticism because I accept what the Leader of the Opposition said, this is really like a technical bill or almost a housecleaning of bringing something up to standard — my criticism would be that I think we are guilty of not taking some more fundamental looks at the nature of delivering education services in this province, and seeing how we can provide for greater degrees of options and choices, but still maintaining proper public accountability and control over curriculum, teaching certification, and other things. That we really are doing it in a fairly piecemeal fashion without getting into some more fundamental assessments of how we should be delivering education with the kind of public input that is required.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply want to say that as one who has changed his position over the past four or five years, I would support this bill obviously, because all it is doing, as other meers have pointed out, is simply clarifying a status that already exists. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would take the point opposite to the Meer for Inkster. I think it is in some ways eliminating or rectifying what is a present injustice in the system, where certain school divisions for legal reasons say they can't offer the same services as other school divisions are prepared to offer. So we have, what is it? Five or six school divisions: St. Vital, Norwood, St. Boniface, River East, Transcona, who do offer it because they don't feel quite the same inhibition as the Winnipeg School Division, because of a legal interpretation, and this is all this Act does, is simply clears up that interpretation and makes it correct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should be looking at things beyond that. I think that there are issues about the question of public support of independent schools that go much beyond this bill, and we are wasting an awful lot of indignation, righteous indignation, and a fair degree of acrimony, on perhaps a relatively small step. I don't believe in the Domino theory that has been proposed that somehow this step will lead to a sort of a following of all the other steps. I think that each of those steps has to be brought before this Legislature. It is going to have to be brought forward and go through the same kind of debate. I don't think it is an automatic, imperative, that simply by agreeing to this bill that all other things will follow. Mr. Speaker, the constraint is that any changes will have to be debated and legislated, and that is the proper degree of sanction and the proper degree of control.

I am surprised that the Member for Inkster , because he is the one that has argued against me on freedom of information, that this is the place where it happens, this is where the control takes place, this is the arena in which decisions will be made politically. So why all of a sudden

do we have this kind of an automatic thing that somehow one step will lead to another step automatically. No, it is going to come back into this House, it will be argued out here. The forces will be mobilized. That really is the issue. I don't see that necessarily there is going to be an automatic follow through.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, I think in the past there have been some mistakes made by Conservatives in this province in setting the wrong kind of climate about proper support for independent schools, and in this case I would point to the kind of arguments that were used a few years back by the now Minister of Consumer Affairs when we were debating the educational Estimates. I think he made a fundamental error at that time and I tried to point it out, of somehow saying that the private schools were superior to the public schools. He kept using statistics to say look, educational standards were better here than there, and I think that that was the thing that bothered me and has set in part a climate against this move, by trying to say that there was somehow an advantage or superiority to the private school system. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that bothered me at the time and it still bothers me that if that is the intent of what some members opposite are trying to do, that I would be opposed to them. Because I don't believe that there is necessarily anything elitist about this kind of legislation.

Certainly, and I think that perhaps the Minister of Consumer Affairs may regret having used that particular argument at that time, but it was an unfortunate use of that argument, and one I think, has set some people's teeth on edge. It certainly set mine at the time because I did think it was an unfortunate way of creating the distinction.

What we really are, in fact, arguing about — should be debating about — is whether this particular step will enable the independent schools to have minimal support. As I understand it, it will simply mean that you are talking about \$300 to \$350 a year per pupil, when in fact the total cost in the public school systems — the Minister of Education might correct me — is around \$1,700 in many instances. So it is not exactly as if there is a wholesale shovelling of money. It is simply providing almost minimal support.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary and needed at this time, because one thing is very pertinent and that is the cost of education, both for the public schools and independent schools, is going up in a geometric fashion. If there was not some degree of support in certain areas, public support, there would be many independent schools that would not be able to survive much longer. And if they were not able to survive then what the Leader of the Opposition pointed to would come true, that is, that all of a sudden those schools would fold and you would have large numbers — I believe there some 7,000 children registered in independent schools — back into the Public School System at substantial additional costs to the Public Treasury.

So it is not a matter of, if you want to use the economic argument, there is just a good, basic, pragmatic economic argument, that if you can leave for \$350 per pupil, a \$1,700 or \$2,000 per pupil education, then that's a pretty good cost argument to be used. It means that you are simply using some public funds. . . Well, it is a good view. I know we shouldn't be arguing economics; I know the Member for Inkster would like to argue theory and philosophy. I'm arguing economics in this case.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a necessary point. It is not a the point I would base my case on. —(Interjection)— Does the Member for Inkster want to interrupt?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** . . . talk about economics will answer the question of whether the cost of the marginal student is the average cost of schooling. The honourable member is talking as if the next student that enters the public school system costs \$1,750 which is the average cost. If he is arguing economics, he must recognize there is a difference between the average cost and the marginal cost, and the marginal cost would not be even be \$350.00.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Member for Inkster is right on those kind of equations, frankly. On the marginal cost of additional students coming into the system, if you are talking about an additional 7,000 students, if you start adding and start computing the cost of construction for additional school facilities or renovations, for teachers, I don't know if the Member for Inkster is aware of what the cost of school teachers' salaries are. I happen to know very closely, but the fact of the matter is that the margin is not as minimal as he points out. In fact, many of the special educational programs that are offered, would be higher than that \$1,700 cost. If he looks at many of the special, for example, the language programs and others, that you would have to work it out.

So what I am suggesting to him is that the additional increment that would come about would

have to be averaged out on a per pupil basis because at the same time . . . Well, I'm not going to get into the point where I'm going to sort of start in the Member for Inkster's favorite trick which is to nit pick away, you destroy your line of thought. Let's go back to the issue in fact.

There has been nothing shown so far in this debate; there has been no evidence produced and, Mr. Speaker, I would go back to my point. I looked at it very carefully when I was a member of the United Church Committee. There was no evidence that I could find within this country or in the American systems or the European systems to say that where cultural conditions themselves were based upon a fair degree of consensus that somehow you were going to fragment society, that it was going to be Northern Ireland all over again, or the public school system would be dangerously eroded as a result of that kind of support. No evidence whatsoever. If the conditions were already in existence, if Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland were already at each other's throats, of course it was going to be reflected in the school system. If there was already that kind of acrimony, of course it was going to be reflected, but it is also reflected in the workplace and in the Legislatures and every other institution. But the schools themselves were not the cause of it; they simply were a reflection of it, so that there is a basic fallacy in that kind of point.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, though, and I would base my own support of this bill on the principle that there is need, serious need in our schools, to look at the need for a pluralism of approach and diversity of approach in the way that we deal with education, and that we should be looking at alternative ways of offering it. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would treat this as an interim step, as a small step simply to clarify and clear up an anomaly that presently exists, but then go much further and perhaps the former First Minister was on the right track with his committee back in 1972 when he said there perhaps should have been a committee, not just simply looking at aid to separate schools, but looking at the notion of some fundamental reforms in the educational system generally. That's where we should have been headed and we might have had a better look at it now.

I would encourage the Minister of Education, as he is undertaking all those reviews and monitorings and reassessments that are going on, to begin looking up the way.

I just recall reading this last week records of the voucher system that is being used now in several states in the United States, where in fact what happens is the Federal and State Governments provide to the parents basically a certificate system that they then sort of cash in at different schools. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster might be interested in knowing, it has substantially improved the quality of education in the public schools. It has substantially improved the quality and offering of education. —(Interjection)— Well, it was proven in the United States and if the Member from Elmwood wants to see the study, I will provide it for him. It was contained in an educational supplement of The New York Times three weeks ago, if he wants to his own library references. —(Interjection)— Well, if he can't afford it, then I'll be quite prepared to Xerox a copy for him. —(Interjection)— And for the Member for . . . Well, remember, you guys have a caucus fund, I don't, okay. You'll have to pay for the Xeroxing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this bill really is a necessary bill to clarify the present situation that really exists in the Winnipeg School Division and to rectify what I consider to be a certain injustice because of the legal interpretation a school division applied. But I would go further and say that I think that the debate itself that has been generated on this bill does generate the need for further examination and investigation into some of the options that should be available and we should be looking at some of the other proposals that are being put forward in terms of the general issue of support for independent schools.

The other side of the coin is this, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make my position clear, I don't think that kind of support should be as loose and as unaccountable as it presently is. The thing that does disturb me, and I raised this issue with the Minister of Education much earlier on in Question Period, that if there is going to be a proliferation of independent schools that are going to be applying for aid, then there should be a greater degree of accountability from the Department of Education and from the school boards. I think there should be a probationary period before one is eligible for receipt of these kinds of funds to demonstrate one's worth. I think there must have to be much closer control over certification of teachers and certification of curriculum in the private or independent schools than presently exists, because if they are going to accept public money, they have to pay a price for it, you know, there is a *quid pro quo*. Rights mean that you will also accept obligations, and if you are going to accept public money, you should be accepting a greater degree of responsibility and I am concerned about some of the schools that have been set up in some of our school divisions where you don't know where the teachers come from or what's being taught. So if there is going to be public support, then there has to be an acceptance of a greater degree of public accountability and responsibility for the acceptance of that money. I think that that should be based upon the local school board option which I agree with.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that on behalf of myself, in this case, I support this bill but I would like to see us pursue this issue further and look more deeply into the question of how

Friday, July 7, 1978

we can improve generally the educational system, and part of that should be how we can pluralize it and generally work towards a proper degree of support for both the public and independent school systems, both of which I think are inadequate at the present time.

**MR. SPEAKER:**

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** There seems to be some inclination to call it 5:30. The Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will be meeting at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some changes again on the Statutory Regulations and Orders. This time it will be Mr. Sherman for Mr. Mercier, that would be for this evening only; Mr. Mercier will be back tomorrow; and Mr. Jorgenson for Mr. Gourlay.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Do those two changes meet with the agreement of the House?

The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Monday morning.