

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
1:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 8, 1974.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students, Grade 9 standing of the John Gunn School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ferman and Mr. Lefteruk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Minister of Labour. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

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. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster) introduced Bill No. 64, The Treasury Branches Act. (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet) on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Health introduced Bill No. 49, The Child Welfare Act; and Bill No. 60, The Social Services Act (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on the estimates of the Department of Education. The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Mr. Chairman, discussing the estimates for the Department of Education presents its problems. How does one steer clear between the banks of platitudes and the shoals of clichés, but I've come to the conclusion that it is a risky journey, but one that I'm glad and willing to undertake. Sometimes I think that everything that could be said about education has been said. Small wonder. Education is a crucial institution in our society. Education, or the lack of it, affects every member of society and sometimes I feel that every one of those whom it does affect has been to see me.

When I was reviewing the estimates for topics for discussion, I realized yet again how many and how diverse were the programs that have been undertaken and implemented. The wealth of material to which I will refer is due both to the size and nature of the department, as well as to the plentitude of programs undertaken. At the same time I'm keenly aware that not all of these programs have been greeted with salvos of joy. For every program which the government undertakes in education, and each one is given the most careful consideration, there are opponents; and opposition to the programs ranges from mild disagreement to rigorous disapproval. At this point too, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to make reference to my staff, all of whom I am extremely proud, and I think that particular mention should be made at this point in time to one who had given a number of years of service to the department as its deputy and who is presently deputy of Colleges and Universities Affairs, mainly, Dr. Lorimer. I think that during his years of service he had demonstrated outstanding abilities of leadership and guidance and this no doubt has left its mark on the department.

I would also like now to inform the House that government has some fairly explicit goals in education. They're not new perhaps, they've been our goals all along, but I would like to set them down once more for the record. As I set them out, and I make no excuse for the fact that they have not been attained in full. I make the assumption that all responsible people will recognize that the process of attainment of goals is the proper business of the department

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd). . . . and government. And the goals are these:

1. The quality of educational opportunity. The school system shall provide every Manitoban with the opportunity for achievement, the opportunity to develop distinctive and diverse talents and skills; equitable access to resources and to educational programs of varying levels is necessary to ensure equal participation regardless of race, sex, social economic background and geographic location.

2. A comprehensive system of education. The public system of education in Manitoba should provide a program to enrich individual life and contribute to the cohesion and vitality of a democratic and pluralistic society. Comprehensive planning will ensure the range of educational alternatives to meet the needs of those who wish to participate in the needs of the Manitoba community.

3. A system for the individual and society. We're committed to the development of a school system which will direct itself to the provision of educational alternatives which contribute to the fullest development of the individual and which meets the needs of our society.

4. A school system responsive to community needs. As the school interacts with and responds to the community in which it is located, programs will be developed which will serve both the students and the community members. It is recognized that individuals belong to many communities within the larger Manitoba community. Equality of educational opportunities sounds good. Nobody would oppose it. Everybody knows it costs money. Everybody also knows that inequities exist and continue to exist, and the problem is, how much money will it take? That we do not know.

But the problem that we are faced with now is how to reduce the inequity with the amount of money that can be made available, and that is a problem we must come to grips with at the present time. I believe that there is general recognition of this problem, and a recognition of the complexity of this problem.

There are probably two basic problems that create inequity. One is, how is the money raised; and the second is in how the money is distributed.

With reference to the first problem, the money which is needed for education is provided for by the people of Manitoba through taxation. One of the forms of this taxation has been a tax on real property. It has been a constant contention of this government that over-dependence on property tax has itself been an inequity which bears disproportionately upon those at the lower end of the economic scale, to whom a raise in property taxes or in rents to cover a raise in property taxes is a real burden.

With reference to the second problem, there is still another inequity. Because of geographical and historical factors there is a very uneven population spread across the province and this has greatly complicated the problem of equal opportunity at equal cost.

But I can say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that there is a degree of consensus at all levels on what governments should provide. Nobody argues against the principle that the government should provide capital costs for school buildings; neither is there much argument against the provision of grants for authorized teachers, for transportation, for text books, library books or any of these specific grants presently provided. But disagreement occurs as to the amount of these grants and what forms they should take.

Our government has for a long time been aware of these problems, inequities and differences of opinion. Upon assuming office we moved to modify the existing inequalities.

The first step was the introduction by my colleague the Honourable Saul Miller, the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, who at that time was Minister of Education, of a special block grant of \$18.00 per pupil, and this grant was paid to each division on the basis of student enrollment as an unconditional grant to be used as the division saw fit. Last year this unconditional grant was raised to \$50.00 per pupil, and still with no strings attached. We felt that by doing this we were to some extent freeing the hands of the local school authorities by giving them a sum of money which could be used as they thought best in their own area.

We have also introduced an equalization formula and this formula is intended to overcome in part the inequities caused by our uneven patterns of population. In very simple terms, the balanced assessments of all divisions are reviewed and a grant is made on a formula which gives the largest grant to the division with the lowest balanced assessment per pupil, and the smallest grant to the division with the largest balanced assessment per pupil. These

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) equalization grants were also, I might add, unconditional.

This year we have moved farther in the same direction. We have doubled the equalization grants and we have substantially increased certain specific grants, such as the grant for library materials and the maximum grant for the establishment of industrial arts and home economics courses in secondary schools.

Another problem to which this government has addressed itself is that of property taxes. We have said on numerous occasions that we regard excessive dependence upon property taxes for educational purposes as regressive, and we have taken steps to confirm this belief by introducing the residential property tax credit system. Keyed as it is now to income it gives the maximum amount of benefit to those at the lower end of the economic scale, where the need for benefit is greatest. This property tax credit originally had a maximum benefit of \$100.00, and this was later raised to \$200.00 and most recently to a maximum benefit of \$250.00, plus a minimum benefit to all.

When I made the announcements earlier this year of the doubling of the equalization grants and the increases in other grants, it was our expectation that as a result of these additional grants the rate of levy on farm and residential property would remain fairly constant. Now this has not proved to be the case, and it means that we must look deeper into the whole system on which our educational financing is based. Members are aware that the present foundation grant formula was devised and brought into operation in 1967, with alterations and amendments from time to time. It has remained the major funding mechanism for the public school system. The Foundation Grant System is based on a combination of provincial funds from consolidated revenues and local funds from local taxation revenues. Alterations since 1970 have brought the present provincial local division to 80 percent provincial and 20 percent local revenues. Foundation grants are calculated under formulae devised under this system and the grants are then paid to the school divisions in Manitoba through the agency of the Public Schools Finance Board.

At the local level the school board calculates its own needs and prepares a budget. Since the provincial Foundation Grants never quite covers the total budget, the difference is raised by special levy. This of course is raised by local municipalities from the source available to them, and that is primarily property taxes. This year much higher mill rate increases have been announced. Inflation, negotiated salary increases for both teachers and non teaching employees, cost of goods and services, have all contributed to the rise. It was in order to help control this last that the government injected an additional \$8 million into the property tax credit plan.

In summing up this part of my introduction, Mr. Chairman, I would repeat my earlier statement. There are inequities in the Foundation Program, both in the way the moneys are raised and the way in which the moneys are disbursed. We have moved to counterbalance this disparate distribution by providing equalization grants, by providing property tax relief, by increasing the provincial share of the Foundation Grant.

We have, however, increasingly become aware that the problem of financing education requires further review. The Premier has indicated that next year will see reform and revision in the Acts under which education in Manitoba is administered, and my staff is now engaged in working on this project. It is an undertaking of large proportion and one which will not be easily resolved but I trust that we will in due course come up with some answers.

Now I would like to make specific mention of some of the programs and of others as the debate continues. One that I wish to comment on at this time is our Planning and Research Branch. Honourable members will note that there's an increase of something in the order of a third of a million dollars from last year's estimates, and I draw this to your attention at this time. Now the history of this branch has been in my mind an exciting one, and I intend later in the debate to discuss some of the programs within planning and research that it's responsible for and which have been implemented and are being directed by this branch, but what I want to say at this point is that the increase in this branch of the third of a million dollars is due to the provision in the estimates of two new programs to redress some of the inequities in our system. One is the school milk program, and the second is the native education program. These two programs account for more than the increase for planning and research.

Now I would like to dwell on several other programs. The first relates to one of our

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) guidelines the Stay Option. Over the past decade the school system in its search for equalization of opportunity has moved steadily toward consolidation, towards building larger schools in rural areas which were equipped to offer options and resources which could not be offered in every small school. Now this resulted, Mr. Chairman, in school divisions increasing their use of transportation and thus tied in with that the steady elimination of small schools. As is always the case it looked good at the time, and it still looks good, but it had unanticipated problems. Many small towns found that the loss of a school meant the loss of a good part of the vitality of the town. Schools are often the focus of extra curricula activities which bring the parents, the community to the town for various events. The consequences are clear to us in retrospect. It became evident that there was a relationship between the rural urban shift and the slow demise of the small schools. At the same time research and education was providing increasing evidence that innovative alternatives in education could provide meaningful and quality education, that there were people who could understand that. For example, vocational education could take place in a small town, utilizing the classroom and the various trades and business premises that existed as an alternative to the beautifully equipped vocational classroom in the new regional vocational high school that existed anywhere from 15 to 30 miles away and required up to one hour on the bus to get there. Out of this the rural educational alternative program was developed and the objectives of this program, the REAP program are as follows:

(1) To show that the small schools can provide children with an excellent education because of their strong ties with their communities, which enables school and community to draw from each other; and

(2) To find alternatives to the present educational setup in small schools so as to enhance these schools instead of working to their disadvantage and involve everyone in a school division in devising innovative programs answering the needs and requirements of people in the division.

A quarter million dollars has been made available for schools qualifying for this program for this fiscal year, and contracts have been signed with eight school divisions to date, Tiger Hills, Turtle Mountain, Evergreen, Lakeshore, Midland, Morris MacDonald, Rhineland and White Horse Plains School Divisions. As many as 15 school divisions may eventually become involved in the REAP program over the next two years.

Another activity of our department relates to decentralization. Last fall we undertook to decentralize the department. We selected the south central region to set up a regional office. This action brought the accusation that we were centralizing because it was viewed as departmental personnel impinging on local autonomy, and this was not our intent, Mr. Chairman. After meetings with the School Trustees Association we undertook to offer decentralization in its most meaningful way. I sent the letter to every school board stating our intent, namely, that decentralization of the Department of Education was intended to offer assistance to all those who wished to avail themselves of that assistance. In that letter I invited the school boards to make their ideas of what they both wanted and needed from the department known to me, and I am waiting for comment from them. In the meantime I also informed them that there is an existing working group in my department developing an alternative plan for the implementation of our decentralization program under which it could be put into effect.

As you all may be aware, Mr. Chairman, the CORE Report was issued last year; the result of four years' work by a committee made up of representatives from our Department, concerned educators and members of the community. I recently announced the high school program for implementation September, 1974, or September, 1975 rather, 74 or 75 by whichever date the school division could implement it. We expect the high school program to provide a framework for change which should make the high schools more responsive to the needs of students, teachers, parents and community as discussed in the CORE report.

A uniform credit system will be established for Grades 10 to 12 as of September, 1974, as the high schools are prepared to undertake to do so, in September, 1975 for those who need the extra time. Grade barriers will be removed; a total of 20 credits will be required for high school graduation. Out of the total of 20, 10 will be compulsory, namely three in English, two in Social Studies, two in Science, two in Mathematics, and one in Physical Education. For any who have difficulty with this I would ask to think of credits as subjects so that by way of example where I listed as compulsory three credits in English, it is what has heretofore been referred to as three courses in English. Eleven credits can be chosen from a total range

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) of program options. Special student credits are a new component of the program options to be made available. A student may include among the three electives necessary for graduation up to three for programs or projects that he himself may initiate, and which the school within the parameters of the departmental guidelines is prepared to approve and supervise for credit. Student initiated credits will provide students with the opportunity of extending their learning environment by designing a course related to his or her interests.

Vocational Programs retain separate patterns for the present but are less restricted by reducing the shops' requirements from 12 to 10 credits.

We view this program as initiating steps and a continuing dialogue towards educational change between teachers, school divisions and the Department of Education. While the establishment of a credit system may facilitate diversification, school divisions will be required to examine their needs and resources. Department personnel are now working with the school divisions. The school divisions should be in the process of making decisions now so that implications for budgetary reallocation will be known to us for the next fiscal year estimates.

Of prime concern, Mr. Chairman, to myself, government, and department is the handicapped child. We have moved cautiously in this area, and I am all too aware of the growing frustration and anger of parents of children with disabilities. I will not at this juncture even attempt to dwell in detail on this problem except to indicate that the range of handicapped children is so broad that definitions have not been clearly worked out. In the past one branch was given a mandate to assist and work in this area. This was our Special Education Branch. Special educations provided assistance in the remedial field and in the institutions of our province which required an educational component.

It is examining the possibilities of even closer co-operation with child development services. More recently the Child Development Service Branch was established. Child Development Services since its inception has developed an excellent working relationship with the communities in the rural areas of Manitoba. Currently the co-ordinator is closely associated with parental groups and agencies in the south central region working toward the development of a further service related to the needs of the children in the community. Elements in Child Development Services and Special Education are highly similar and at the present moment we are attempting to combine to advantage the services provided by both.

Now all this, Mr. Chairman, is a preamble to a much larger question of the integration of the handicapped child into the public schools system, and I have made commitments to bring this about. Research in this area indicates there seems to be two large problems here. Estimates by experts of the cost of integrating the handicapped into the school system vary widely. This is not too surprising since we are dealing with something which is largely unknown. There is not much by way of precedent in existence. The other problem which of course is part of the first is a definition of the handicapped. When one considers for a moment that the term "handicap" now covers the spectrum of the emotional, mental and physical disabilities, I think you can appreciate the difficulties that we face; and this is further compounded by the fact that various experts are not in agreement amongst themselves as to definitions of mental and emotional disability. My department is looking at this problem at the present time. The estimates which I have received range anywhere from five to 20 million dollars. This does not mean that we'll not do it; it means that when we do it it'll probably have to be commenced on a pilot basis.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I have said enough at the moment to indicate the general thrust of the Department of Education. I have spoken about educational finance, the rural educational alternatives program, the high school program of studies, decentralization and the possibilities of integration of handicapped children. This is really a very short list, and as the debate continues, as I indicated earlier, no doubt we'll have opportunity to deal with those programs to which I may not have made reference in my opening comments. But with those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat and will certainly welcome the contributions to the debate that the honourable members of the opposition may have to offer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Minister try to take the chair of the Minister of Finance please. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank the Minister of Education for his explanations on the spending program of his department. It

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) is an experience that we were denied last year during the consideration of the estimates of the government, chiefly I think because of the fact that we used up the 90 hours that were allocated for debate of the estimates before we reached the Department of Education, and certainly not because it was not an important department. It is one of the major departments of government, one which has authority over a great deal of money, some \$140 millions. The estimates I believe for this year total \$145 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister covered in a broad sense many of the problems and the programs which relate to education in the Province of Manitoba. Before attempting to comment in any particular way I might note at the beginning one slight disappointment I had. I was rather hoping that the Minister would explain and perhaps announce some new direction in physical education in the schools. I know that he's publicly indicated some enthusiasm for a more regularized form of physical activity, and I would hope that he subscribes to the philosophy that education should really be physical as well as mental, and that it is important to provide regular physical activity in the primary and the secondary schools in the province. I know that that is being carried out in a manner at the present time but I think that much can still be done to make this a more meaningful, a more regular part of the total school program and I think this can probably be done without adding greatly to the financial burdens which the department already has, and the problems of making their budget stretch over the increasing cost, the rapidly increasing cost of provision of educational services as we now have them in the province.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of course began very early in his remarks to express his concern for his overriding problem, that of financing education. He explained that the Foundation Program as it was initiated in 1967 was able to provide for most of the costs in education, and that special levies as they were then used were used particularly for added local requirements, added local expenses, which the local divisions felt were necessary to enrich their educational programs. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course that has changed to the point where none of the divisions could continue to operate without the ever-increasing special levy dollars that are contributed by the local taxpayers.

This government began its authority as the Government of the Province of Manitoba with many brave statements of their intention to relieve the real property owner from the great burden of taxation. I recall very well in 1969 that many promises were made by the NDP Party that should they be elected that they would certainly take care of this major problem. This has not been done. The Minister is five years later saying, we recognize this as one of the inequities of the taxation system; we are considering it an urgent problem; we haven't the answers yet, but next year the Premier will announce important changes in this method of raising the necessary funds for the operation of governments. Well it's a next year country I suppose, Mr. Chairman. This prediction of relief is on the way, has been coming to us in one form or another, and from various Ministers, for the years in which this government has been charged with the responsibility of conducting the affairs of the province.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, it's not unexpected that there should be many problems in relation to education since no one I think has really been able to define its role in society. There has not been to my knowledge any clear definition of the subject of education, what it is intended to provide, and until we get some definition that is universally acceptable there will continue to be programs that will seem to go in a variety of directions, that will seem to add new directions in education but which do not always move in the same direction.

We have been through more than a decade of spending in education that began with the Roblin era, and it began I think with pretty general acceptance because it was conceived at that time that education would return all the benefits, and all of the amounts that were contributed by the taxpayers would eventually come back to the people of Manitoba not only in terms of individual benefits to those going through our educational system, but in economic terms as a result of the training and of the education that would be achieved by the young people in Manitoba. I think this has been to some extent achieved, but it has not always been acceptable to the purists in education who insist perhaps that there be more of a distinct division between training and vocational schools and pure education. And it seems to me that perhaps in one of the new programs which the Minister described, that is the program resulting from the recommendations of the CORE Committee in 1970, in one of these new programs I think we see more of support for those people who think that there should be an early opportunity for young

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(Mr. McGILL cont'd). . . . people to use their own initiatives in deciding what kind of educational experience they would be given.

Mr. Chairman, it's really in this area that I would like to talk for the next few minutes because it's not possible to discuss all of the new programs in education and one must establish which of the programs are likely to be the most far-reaching in their effects, and which of the programs we must discuss and we must contribute at least our ideas before the department, if it has not already done so, reaches the point of no return.

The Minister said, and rightly so, that we are anxiously trying to achieve a quality of educational opportunity, and he described the difficulties under the present taxation system of achieving this equality of opportunity for those areas in which population was less dense and where the assessment roll was considerably lower than in other areas of the province. He didn't I think mention the equally important topic of quality in education. I have read his previous remarks in this connection and I'm sure that he subscribes to the idea that quality of education depends without question on the quality of the teacher, and that if all of us were to think back in those years of our early education we would remember not the courses, not the subjects, but we would remember the enthusiasm, the ability to impart of certain teachers in our experience, and we would remember those teachers who, because they exuded a confidence, an enthusiasm for the subjects that they taught, that they encouraged questions, they invited communication between student and teacher. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is the quality in education that is so important in our school system and one that bears constant review and constant reflection.

The high school curriculum change, which the Minister has described as optional for Manitoba high schools in the fall of this year, and mandatory in the fall of 1975, is one that I feel we should all thoroughly understand and one that I feel comments should be encouraged. I am wondering if the Minister, before he made these announcements, gave all of the school divisions, all of the school superintendents, all of the trustees, if all of these various groups had an opportunity to fully participate in the discussions prior to the announcement of the change in the curriculum. There is going to be a credit system, and Grades 10, 11 and 12, as I understand them, now will disappear and there will be three years in which students at high school level will be required to achieve a total of 20 credits, 10 of which will be compulsory credits, two science credits, two social studies credits, two mathematics credits, and one compulsory credit in physical education.

Mr. Chairman, if I may just deviate for a moment, I don't think that this particularly enthuses me. I have indicated just a few minutes ago that I like the idea of regularized physical activity in the schools. I somewhat deplore the idea of making physical education a mandatory or compulsory credit. I think that that is somewhat at variance to my feelings in respect to this subject. Nevertheless, there are ten compulsory credits in the three years of high school training under this proposed system. The other ten credits which the students will be required to achieve, either are offered in the form of a variety of courses listed on the particular schools curriculum, or the student will have the opportunity to name his particular interest and an endeavour will be made by the school teaching staff to assist him in his attempt to achieve whatever passing grade is in the course of his choice.

Mr. Chairman, I have some very deep reservations about this whole direction in which the high school system is going in Manitoba, and I'm going to suggest that when the CORE Committee made these overriding decisions they were under the influence of a period in the student life in Manitoba, if you will, where there was popularity in dissent, student activism was at a peak, and there was a real demand on the part of those students at least we heard from publicly, to be taken into the decision-making process. If there was any peak in our society in what we describe now as a permissive system both in the home and in the school, it was perhaps at the time when the CORE Committee was meeting to make its over-all decisions as to the future. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the CORE Committee was somewhat intimidated by what turned out to be a passing phase in the student life of our province. I think the CORE Committee may have interpreted it to be a trend in our society.

So, Mr. Chairman, it may seem somewhat unusual, but I suggest that the CORE Committee Report is out of date as of this moment, and I suggest further that our society has almost come full circle from the period of the late '68, '69, '70s to the present time when I have the feeling that students are asking for more guidance, more direction, after having tested the area and

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) the times of student participation in determining the kind of education they should achieve.

It is my feeling that this kind of approach to education which the Minister now proposes was tried out in other parts of the continent - I'm sure the Minister has more information on this than I have - but I have the feeling that California may have been a state in which student options and general permissiveness in the education system was used to a large extent and found wanting, and I think they're on the circle back to a more guided system in their primary and secondary schools, and their secondary schools particularly, and they may have found that what the Minister is now proposing has been tried and doesn't work very well.

The Minister explained in his news release through the Provincial News Service, on the subject of student initiated options, an attempt is being made, an attempt to provide a mechanism for a school to help a student carry out studies in a field which particularly interests the students. And then he says, "The sharing of responsibility for educational achievement with the students." Well now, Mr. Chairman, when the people who are charged with the responsibility of providing a good education system for our students in this province want to share it with the students, they are then abdicating their responsibility.

SOME MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MCGILL: The students know, and most people know and agree that we hire the best kind of teachers, the best kind of administrative people we can find, and we place on their shoulders the responsibility for that educational system. Now it is simply, in my view, a cop-out of the responsibility of the Department when they say they want to share it with the students. I don't think this, Mr. Chairman, is keeping in step with our times today. I think it is an abdication of responsibility, and we had that happen at the peak of the permissive era in our society when parents were doing the same thing. They found that their children's problems were so complex in our society that they said, well, rather than try to force our opinions on them, we're not sure; we'll say, "Well, you make up your mind. You go your way and then, if things go wrong, we won't be responsible." Well I think parents are beginning to realize that was a cop-out, an abdication of responsibility, and I think they're coming back to some more guided environment in the home and I hope that the educational system is not going in the opposite direction.

Well, there are reservations, at least in my mind and I think in the minds of many of the people in this province, that we may be embarked upon a course that will be very difficult to change. It is going to become optional in many schools this fall. Many high schools, I know, are preparing now to make the credit system operative in Grades 10, 11 and 12. This presupposes, Mr. Chairman, that students at the Grade 9 level are able to accurately forecast what their principal interests will be in later life, and it seems to me that they are going to have to decide on certain course options that will have a great bearing upon their eligibility for higher education should they decide in three years' time that their main interest is to become a professional person or to go into some field of activity that requires certain background knowledge. So we're asking people at the tender age of 12 or 13 years to have some knowledge of what their goals in life will be. I think this is asking too much of people at the Grade 10 level in school.

Now if it's to be done at all, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the final year of high school might be early enough in which students are asked to determine their options in anticipation of proceeding to some form of post-secondary education. To ask them to do that in advance of the Grade 12 year is asking more, is expecting more of students. When I think back of my own experience again, and I would imagine that I was perhaps a middle of the class person of average ability in high school, I had no idea really what my interests would be until, I think, very late in my high school career. And, Mr. Chairman, I found out after having completed Grade 12, to my astonishment, that my standing was not good enough to enter post-secondary education in the field I had chosen. This was a great shock to me, because I had always assumed that the people who had guided me along the way to that time would have kept my options open and that I would have been able to rely on people to provide some kind of universal standard of entrance for post-secondary education, or to at least have counselled me in the final year that I would need this course and this course in order to go the way I had intended. No such information was given, and that was in a system which had all the options open, I think, till the final year of high school.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MCGILL cont'd)

Now we've come quite a distance since those days. That was just after Confederation, by the way, Mr. Chairman, when I went through that. We have many more counsellors, many more guidance people in the schools, but the same principles certainly do apply, in my view, that we are presuming too much determination on the part of the student as to his future role in life, his future activities. This little incident which I relate cost me a year in my educational process in order to pick up a modern language which I did not have at that time. But, Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be the basic weakness of the proposal which is now being placed before the high schools of Manitoba and which the Minister of Education is proposing and supporting.

I'd like to just refer briefly to a news report of yesterday in which there was a demonstration at the R.D. Parker Collegiate in Thompson. This was a demonstration by students who were complaining about certain things that were happening in that school, and these are their complaints. There was a lack of communication throughout the school. There was a non-existent school environment and a non-existent interest in student activities. Teacher attitudes that showed little appreciation for worthwhile accomplishments. A lack of control of students skipping classes, and when discipline is enforced students are threatened with expulsion rather than given guidance.

Now I have no firsthand knowledge of the activities of the Ralph Parker Collegiate in Thompson. I presume the Minister does have; he speaks from more background than I do. But this is an open area school in which there is a trimester system, which in my view perhaps somewhat approaches what he is proposing for the last three years of high school. And I wonder if this demonstration and this manifestation of unrest amongst the students and a request for more guidance, for more input by the teachers, for a more responsible role by teachers, is not an indicator in advance of what the Minister may get from the proposals which he is now about to implement. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister should look very carefully at this experience in Thompson.

What are the dangers, then; of the system which the Minister now proposes. And I don't think it's an over-statement, an exaggeration for me to say that there is a real danger, Mr. Chairman, that high schools in Manitoba will become teen-age drop-in centres; that they will be places where students come for entertainment, a sort of a fun place where if you don't like what's on the program, why, you name it - we'll dig it up for you. I think there is a danger, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister in presenting this program may be trivializing the educational system by introducing what may be an anachronism, a degree of greater permissiveness in our high school training program. I think it's fair to say that the average student is not ready, at Grade 9, to determine the options, to determine his long-term interests, and he is in very real danger of destroying his acceptance in any post-secondary education system which may appeal to him at a later date.

If we are to go to a credit system, then surely, Mr. Chairman, the final year of high school would be soon enough in which to give those optional courses and credits and to expect the student to exercise more mature judgment in his long-term ambitions.

I think the Minister will agree in principle that education was never intended as an entertainment for the students. It is and always will be a discipline, in my view, and I think that the option jungle which the Minister is now proposing will result in just further bewilderment for the emerging mind of the high school student.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Minister that the young people today - and I have a great deal of respect for the high school students - in the little experience that I have had in visiting high schools, I am really impressed with the serious approach and with the aims and objectives of these people. But I suggest that they're looking for answers and guidance, and I think they're looking for it from responsible, qualified teachers and from responsible parents. It's partly the parents fault that we went through that era of dissent and activism, or maybe it's just a part of the passing scene. It was a good experience for all of us, but it shouldn't have been one that was interpreted as a trend in our society by, I suggest, possibly the CORE Report, the CORE Committee. They may have been somewhat intimidated in their decisions by that passing phase. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would be right on wave length with the students today if he agreed that they don't want any more slick cop-outs by people who are trained to take responsibility for their education, and who now say they would like to share that

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) responsibility. This is another manifestation perhaps of the no-fault society in which we live, eh?

We would all like to go through society without having that emotional problem of having to face some blame for our activities. So the "blame game" is being played by everybody. We are all getting out of it and we say we'll share responsibility, which in effect means, nobody is responsible, and if you're in trouble, buster, I'm all right.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to attempt to deal with other programs which the Minister has mentioned. We will have an opportunity as we go through his estimates.

May I just conclude by saying I note the number of programs that have been evolved, and one which I thought was achieving some recognition, because it's only a few years old, was his OEC program, the Occupational Entrance Program. I suspect from what is happening in the division in which I am more familiar, that this program is finding itself immersed in the new credit system and I doubt whether this is going to be as beneficial for those with learning handicaps as the OEC program has been up to this point. I would regret the loss of the advances and of the progress that has been made in the OEC if this allowed to become immersed in the over-all credit system. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I intend to be fairly brief at this part of the debate, because I would merely like to direct a couple of enquiries to the Minister as to what progress is being made in two very significant areas in the high school and junior high school division of his responsibilities.

I first want to congratulate his deputy and his entire department, frankly, for the very efficient way in which the department is operated. It's one of the departments that we have the most spending in and yet probably the least contentiousness, and that must speak well for the Minister's handling of his department. But there are policy differences, if not administrative quarrels, we may have with the Minister, or differences of opinion that should be aired.

Mr. Chairman, in the last two years, and perhaps more so than I have ever in my life since I became involved in public affairs, I have been in a number of high schools and a number of junior high schools, and I discern a number of gaps that I would commend to the Minister to investigate and perhaps fill. I've spoken often about my concept of education in this House, but I would ask the Minister to comment in his response on his estimates where we stand on student travel, where we're going. The reason I raise it, Mr. Chairman, is, as I travel, and I know the Minister's background in life as a person is not dissimilar from my own, having lived and worked both rurally and in urban centres, that the students of our province, in their education - and that's the only place we can hope that they can achieve it in a formal way - do not know their province. And that's not their fault, but it's something that we can cure. When you speak as a politician, or as a person concerned about your fellow man, in Wabowden about the problems of urbanization, the problems of mass transport, the cost of a movie being \$3.00 or \$2.50, the student there has no appreciation for what the pressures and the problems and the tensions of his fellow Manitoban in Winnipeg. Similarly, when we speak in a Winnipeg high school, or talk to high school students, or junior high school students, about the sense of depression, the sense of hopelessness, that the students feel in the remote rural or northern areas, where the only access to the outside world is through airplanes and through radio, but not through communication through television, and they have no sense of what is the rural Manitoba student about or what is his fellow citizen about. Similarly, when we speak to the rural student who lives in an environment where his whole culture and his whole sense of values is tied to weather and crops and returns on natural resources, he has no empathy, he has no sympathy that we can touch for the student or the Manitoban generally who lives in a fishing village on South Indian Lake, or Leaf Rapids; or where he is in an environment economically, and that creates the social waves and back wash, where there is no living, there is no work, and people sit in despair and debilitate as human beings.

Those are part and parcel of living. They are the realities of Manitoba life: stay options, economic growth, what this province is all about, what makes us tick; this is not part of the educational course. I propose to the Minister that he embark very aggressively on a student exchange plan - and I know there is some experimentation going on at this time, but, Sir, not sufficient. We have devised and proposed on other occasions, a student travel plan which we apply intra-province, the student exchange plan, the plan we had proposed, and do

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. ASPER cont'd) again commend to the Minister, is one in which students would spend one month per year from grade nine through grade twelve, as is done in Australia, as is done in France, and I believe as is done in England, in some areas of England, travelling throughout their province, living in each region, getting to know their own fellow Manitobans. By the time they would have completed four years, grade nine to grade twelve, they would have spent four months travelling about in this province, continuing their education on the road, but getting that human education that they seem to be lacking in understanding and having some sense of touch with their fellow Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, through you we commend this to the Minister and ask that he consider it very aggressively and implement what was begun as an experiment in, I believe, the Department of Youth Secretariat a few years ago, where a few of these exchanges were arranged, and I know, Mr. Chairman, the salutary effect that that has had on those few students who have benefitted from it.

You take a young boy out of River Heights School, and you expose him to the rigours of going to the bathroom in Mafeking outside in 40 degree weather, Mr. Chairman, you do a very good thing for that young boy from River Heights junior high. You give him an education that no text can give him. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman. . .

A MEMBER: No wonder I'm so well educated.

MR. ASPER: . . . I know that the more of this we can do the better, and I urge the Minister not, not to let another generation go by that doesn't know what the junction of the Red and the Assiniboine looks like, where La Verendrye first declared that he would reach the West Coast; that our river banks consist of the Red and the Assiniboine and the Lagimodiere home, our own history, this they don't know. They have no sense of pride, or are lacking sense of pride in the grandness and the greatness of our province, because they don't - they've never been to Fort Prince of Wales. They don't in the north know what Lower Fort Garry is about. And these are the things that have made us. They have shaped our destiny. They have made our character as a province. They make us Westerners; they make us Prairie people. And we commend very strongly to the Minister the concept of student travel as a means of broadening that horizon and that education.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we discern a lack of learning for living in the courses taught in the junior and high school. There are some remarkable exceptions to this, Mr. Chairman. There's 301, 300, 201, 200, but Mr. Chairman, when I've spoken in over a hundred high schools and been questioned by the students, it's also been my experience that I then question the students, and I am unhappy with most of the responses that we get, and I'm sure you would too, Sir. Because our courses don't teach our kids what learning is about or what living is about. They don't adequately equip them to face the real world. They don't tell them what makes this province, what makes this country, what makes our hemisphere, what makes our world tick economically. They don't know what income is, They're not taught what, in sufficient degree, what economic opportunities await them when they leave the schools, what kind of career options they'll have, what kind of income opportunities they'll have, and what the price of income is, what lawyers earn, what MLAs earn, what teachers earn, and what options they may want to exercise themselves.

Mr. Chairman, we give the young Manitoban, as is certainly approved by the Liberal party, the vote at the age of eighteen, but nowhere in the educational process do we adequately - and it doesn't matter that we can point with some pride to some courses, because one merely need ask the students of the schools of Manitoba - nowhere do we adequately equip that student to exercise his vote well by the time he reaches the age of eighteen, which is the day he graduates. He comes out to vote. He doesn't understand the issues; he hasn't been taught them. He doesn't understand the framework in which he must judge Manitoba, or Canadian, or municipal affairs. So we would ask for a very substantial strengthening in the schools of the civics, the political institutions, the political science courses, as well as the political history.

At the same time, strengthening has got to be seen in the areas of what it is to be an adult, to be a consumer. By that I mean, Mr. Chairman, the student comes out of school and he goes to buy a car. He doesn't know what interest rate he should pay. Should he pay 14 percent at a bank; or does he even know he can borrow from banks? Should he go to a finance company and pay 22 percent?

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

A MEMBER: They know that, don't worry.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, the student is not taught his consumer rights. He is not taught his consumer protection. He's not taught his consumer options. How to buy a house; what he should look for when he buys a house. He may marry within two years. What's a lease? What's a mortgage? And these things he doesn't learn in school. He doesn't learn family law. He doesn't learn that if he happens to get married, what the rigors of divorce are, what the - he or she - he isn't aware of his rights or responsibilities as a parent - I'm talking about his legal responsibilities. We don't teach the student even the basic elements of how to fight City Hall. And most of our students have become, because of this, docile, passive, you can't fight City Hall, you can't fight government, you can't influence your environment. And Mr. Chairman, we've got to teach them how they do that. Education courses must do that. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: You want revolution.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Chairman, The Honourable Member from Swan River says I want revolution. I can assure him that compared to what he wants, I want revolution, yes.

Mr. Chairman, I speak of teaching students of their future options. I plead with the Minister to begin immediately the preparation of texts, and the teaching of texts, that will tell the students of Manitoba their history, to develop the greatness and the pride in this province and in this country that is missing. They learn about the French Revolution. They learn about the scaling of the walls in the battle of the Plains of Abraham, but they do not know our province. They don't know their cities. They don't know the history of why some issues are so strongly felt today because of things that happened 50 years ago in this province. We ask that the regional, the local history, be given at least as much attention in the current sense as ancient history and foreign history. We have got to develop a national identity; we've got to develop a sense of national purpose, a sense of national pride, and a pride in our own local region.

We have a brain drain, Mr. Chairman. Most of that brain drain is the young. The brain drain is running from this province this year one thousand people per month. Mr. Chairman, for - and I don't suggest that the only reason is that there is no feeling for the province. Part of it is economic, for which I obviously condemn the Ministry of Industry and Commerce. But, Mr. Chairman, part of the reason is there is no affiliation, there is no affection, and that can only come from knowing a sense of your history, and a sense of the values that make the province the great thing that we want it to be and know that it can be.

So, Mr. Chairman, without giving the full Liberal party response to the Minister's estimates, I would ask for his comments on the concept of greater student travel and greater practicality, greater learning for living in the courses in the junior and senior high schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, I want to take the opportunity at this time to make a few remarks on the Minister's estimates and, as the others have indicated, to bring up other remarks as we go through the items.

In preface to comments I want to agree with the Minister that a high degree of credit should go to his very capable staff he has working with him and having some firsthand knowledge of some of the people he's mentioned, I want to second his comments in that respect. I also want to say that it makes it somewhat difficult to stand here and - or at least makes me a little bit careful to stand here and tailor my comments in light of the honourable gentleman he has sitting immediately in front of him, and to make sure I recognize that the direction of education in Manitoba has been, to a very large extent had the influence of his hand on it, and I want to say that I don't think that there's a man who's been in the employ of the Provincial Government who holds more esteem of the elected members of this House, and has done so over a great many years.

I think that when one speaks about education, we always have to admit that we're victims of our own environment and I think I probably personally happen to be fortunate in that I have children sprinkled all through the education system from the low elementary grades up to the high school level.

Mr. Chairman, I think I'd have to say that like the Member for Brandon in his comments when he referred back to his earlier days in education, I think it's very natural for almost anyone to do this sort of thing, to use as a base his own experience, and to relate it to what he

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) interprets is going on in the school system. When I do that I find myself being pretty laudatory about what is happening to my own children in the education system, because although I do have disagreements with what's happening in many cases, I have to say that on the average as far as I can relate my own children are getting a very much higher degree of education in the straight academic sense than I received in going through the school system just after the Member for Brandon, who was just shortly after Confederation. So I would have to say that in that respect I can't stand and be very critical of the education system.

I can say that in the lower grades in the division in which I live, there is a great difference in the attitudes that are taken by the elementary and the secondary portions of the system. In the primary grades the attitude, which is highly influenced by the attitude of the teachers in the particular school or schools, is one where they tend to be inclined more towards the attitude and philosophy of the CORE Report which provides a looseness as far as grading is concerned, and I use that term "looseness" because generally it is the parents by and large who are opposed to this type of a system, and the parents do remain highly concerned about the fact that a lack of a grading system appears to be there in the sense that it does not provide the absolute measuring stick that the parents themselves were exposed to in their own processing, through their education system. So as a result of this you find a high degree of concern in the primary grades in that particular division because of the fact that the parents cannot tell how their children are doing in school, by and large they are quite concerned that they are unable to plug in to the system and be able to tell exactly how their children are doing. There's a natural instinct on the part of parents I think to want to judge how their children are doing in relation to somebody else's children, and are more inclined to hold in respect the competitive system of grading.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we all look at this and live with it, and we find that in the secondary education portion of our system there is a system in employ that is closer to the traditional system, and has been kept that way in spite of the fact that the teachers themselves do experiment with all the new systems that come along, that the grading system and the guidance system through the different years is pretty well controlled. As a result of this the parents have a much higher degree of confidence in what is happening in the secondary portion of the system than they do in the primary system. I think that this is primarily just a characteristic of the division, and every division probably varies considerably, and that you may find in another school division that the secondary portion, the high school grades, take a much different attitude, and in fact are allowing the pupils to go through much more on the basis of their own ability, and to progress at their own abilities' level. As a result of that they have to do their sorting out when they come to the post-secondary decision.

So I must say that as an observer, as a parent observer, I have to come down on the side in favour of the process whereby there is a degree of control, a fairly well worked out set of examination procedures that are still employed, rather than taking the what has heretofore been considered the more progressive attitude of allowing the students to go through entirely at their own speed and at their own ability level. They are being put through the sieves, so that when they get to the end of their Grade 12 they pretty well know on the basis of a fairly rigorous set of tests exactly what their own capabilities are, and where they should be headed for to maximize or optimize the use of their capabilities in the academic sense and in their personality trait sense.

So, Mr. Chairman, in round terms I think I'd have to say that again, repeat, we're all victims of our own environment and we tend to voice our own experiences in these matters.

I would tend to agree with the comments of the Member for Brandon. I think that education does go through its swings from one direction to the other. I was part of the swing that was very much in favour of the open classroom system. I have found from experience that some children are adapted to it and others are not adapted to it. There are no pat answers to whether the classroom system or the open system is the better system. I think probably to classify in a mildly derogatory fashion the definition of the open system - it used to be referred to in this House by the former Member for Rhineland as the "loose housing system" in education. That was his attitude towards it, and he reflected it entirely in one phrase. On the other hand I think it is adapted to the abilities of the children to concentrate and to get along in the different physical environments they're in in the schools. I don't think that there

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) are any pat answers. But what happens is that education, probably more than any other endeavour, goes through the swings of experiments. I think the answer is that if you have a willing student and a teacher, and a teaching system, that feels it is progressing and to some extent experimenting and discovering, they will provide a motivating atmosphere, and between those two things you're likely to get a pretty good education system come out of it.

So if you try and put education in one straightjacket, one plan system, and govern it to that, I think you'd have great difficulty in this day and age in doing it. I suspect that we'll probably swing away from the open system and probably tend to drift back towards more the standard classroom system. But that's something that's going to have to work itself out, and I don't think there's any pat answers to it. But like all things it has to go through an experimental stage and find itself.

I want to among other things mention the fact that I was pleased to see that the department was able to build in more support for the Children with Learning Disabilities Program that was announced earlier in the year. I think this is something that was always a desired end and a little further move has been made towards providing assistance to children with learning disabilities. It's a matter of budget I know as to when you can afford most of these things. I am pleased to see that you are able this year to shoehorn in a few more dollars for this type of a program.

Again I set out to endorse the comments of the Member for Brandon with regards to his comments on the CORE Report. I have a feeling that probably we've gone about as far as we can go in terms of not providing some sort of a rigorous system of grading from the high school system, because if we go very much further in this way I think we're going to experience severe difficulties at the post-secondary level. I would be somewhat reserved about endorsing any greater move in the direction of doing away with the exams.

As you know, the system of college entrance exams that was evolved several years ago to try and take the place of the traditional departmental exams in providing the universities with some measure of student ability were a dismal failure and came to an end only a matter of two or three years of experimentation, and it leaves us with nothing really in its place to provide the student, as well as the administrators and the teachers at the university level, it leaves them nothing very solid to go on in terms of measuring ability, prior to sorting them out in the actual classroom when they reach that stage at the post-secondary level. So I would again underline that I think that I would certainly have reservations in any further moves to try and remove all these tests and gradings and so-called crudely, the sieve, that students one way or another finally have to measure up to somewhere along - if not in the secondary system, they have to do it in the post secondary.

I think it was noteworthy that about two months ago it was reported that in Ontario that a large number of students had taken a petition up and presented it to the government, asking them to reinstitute a form of examinations because they found themselves at post-secondary level of being woefully inept of combatting with the system; and, Mr. Chairman, I would go further and say that even if they didn't run into it at the post-secondary education level, they're going to run into it in their job setting because sooner or later everybody has to measure up to some sort of performance guidelines. I would say that it's not in the best interests of education to attempt to go too far in eliminating the performance measures that have to be brought in to the system at some point or other.

On the negative side, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the efforts of the Minister's Planning and Research Branch have certainly not won any support in the school system, and in the divisions of the Province of Manitoba. I don't think it's because it's a conflict of empires that's brought about that comment, I think that it's simply because there are certain things that divisions can do, and do best, and that the Planning and Research Branch can not do. For instance, I think that you have imposed requirements on the divisions for the filling in of standard forms with regard to experience in the division, teacher qualifications, student cross section analysis or whatever it might be and that - Is that for me, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The member will have 15 minutes. The hour being 3:00 o'clock, Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, has directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

. continued on next page

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Question Period. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It relates to the new marking prices for fish that have been issued by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation for Lake Winnipeg. I wonder if he can indicate whether his department has had an opportunity to examine it, and to determine whether they are going to act on behalf of the fishermen of Manitoba to try and accomplish a result which will put the new price to be offered by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation in line with the increased costs that the fishermen must have to pay now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are meetings being held as between the prairie provinces and Ontario which is involved in the area of jurisdiction of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. The meetings are somewhat broader in their considerations than that just mentioned by the honourable member, but I think that they encompass that. However, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to indicate anything which would cause some people to gauge their activities on some type of assured subsidy on fish prices. The Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation operates on the basis that the costs of operation are deducted and the balance goes to the fishermen. This is a much better situation than prevailed in the past, and at no time in Manitoba were fishermen more assured as to a price for their fish than they are at the present time.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. Is it the intention of the government to consult the fishermen to determine whether they really want to remain within the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, based on the price lists that are being offered and the margin of profit that they have available to themselves today.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, despite some degree of complaint which exists with any organization, including the Canadian Wheat Board, my assessment of the matter up until now, and everything I have heard up until now, is that the fishermen of Manitoba are much more satisfied with the arrangement that they have now than the one that they had previously.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can inform the House whether the government has received a telegram from the Lake Winnipeg Fishermen's Association indicating that unless an investigation is undertaken by the government with respect to pricing, they believe they will be forced to opt out of the marketing board.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Lake Winnipeg Fishermen's Association or any other fishermen are not at liberty to ignore the marketing regulations and marketing setup which exists in the Province of Manitoba. I could advise the honourable member that from time to time one does get representations from people indicating courses of action that will be taken when we set up the quotas. It was indicated, Mr. Speaker, that people wouldn't fish for those quotas. The fact is that we had many more people applying for licences than we had fishermen, many more people applying for licences than we had licences to give. So no government can, without minimizing the effect of any complaint, no government can act in such a way as to respond merely because somebody says that they will do something if the government doesn't behave in the way they suggest the government should behave.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Co-operative Development. I wonder if he can indicate to the House now with the new price list for fish for northern Manitoba whether it will be possible for any of the co-operatives to be able to make a profit as a result of increased costs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Asking for an opinion.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then - I'll phrase it another way, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. SPIVAK: Has his department prepared for the contingency of loss to be absorbed by the co-operatives as a result of the price list . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's hypothetical.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll frame it another way.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. SPIVAK: What contingencies are the government undertaking with respect to the northern co-operatives and the increased cost that they will be absorbing and the new price

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) list that has been given and undertaken by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation? What contingencies will his department be undertaking?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines did indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that we have been involved in discussions, and are continuing those discussions with the federal authorities, and indeed with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, to arrive at some improvement in the situation with respect to northern Manitoba. After those discussions are concluded is the time that we may have to consider things that we might do as government if we feel that those particular resolutions do not appear to meet the need. But I think it's premature at this time to indicate what our role, if any, would be at this point in time until those discussions are concluded.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether those discussions are likely to be concluded after the fishing season or before the fishing season?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we have had recent meetings and there are meetings planned in the next week or ten days. It's my hope that before the season starts we will have a definitive position with respect to how, or conditions under which the fishermen are going to have to fish this year.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Would he confirm to this House that Chemalloy Minerals, the Government of Manitoba's partner in Tantalum Mining Corporation, has sold 25 percent of the stock of Tantalum to Kawecki Berylco Industries Limited of New York.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I thank the Honourable Member for Radisson for his assistance. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that an announcement was made to that effect some months ago. The sale also went hand in hand with an agreement by the purchaser relative to firm purchases of Tantalum at prices which would advance from time to time. But there was a public announcement made to that effect, either by the Chemalloy firm, or by Tantalum, or by the MDC, I cannot recall it.

MR. ASPER: Would the Minister indicate what price the shares, 25 percent of the share of Tantalum were sold for?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the price was identical, or slightly more, than that paid by the Province of Manitoba. I also indicate that the price also--consideration in the purchase was the purchase contract made by the purchaser relative to Tantalum.

Mr. Speaker, unless the honourable member has a supplementary, I have another . . .

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Was the Government of Manitoba given the right of first refusal to buy the shares that were sold to the American company, or do we have any such rights in our relationship with Chemalloy?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the sale by Chemalloy was made--this is a question of commercial opinion which is sometimes dangerous, but I believe it was made in order to avoid the Province of Manitoba being able to own the entire mine by paying the 2 million guarantee that Chemalloy had with respect to one of its creditors. The province was involved in the discussions, the MDC was involved in the discussions and I think had to in some way facilitate the discussions, but I do not believe we had a right of first refusal.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has another . . .

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

MR. ASPER: Yes, I have a final supplementary. Does the Provincial Government intend to take any action in view of the fact that the sale has not closed yet, to take any action under the federal foreign takeovers review jurisdiction to protest the sale of a Manitoba natural resource company to a non resident of Canada?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to answer my honourable friend who two weeks ago said that we are involved in a bad thing. If it's a bad thing, I would think that he would want it to be owned by foreigners. We, Mr. Speaker, had a particular position with respect to the mine where we were guaranteeing a debt of \$2 million. If that debt had not been paid, we would have had to pay it in return for which we would have had ownership of the mines subject to an equity of redemption by Chemalloy. But I, Mr. Speaker, am sometimes in partnership with Canadians that I don't like, and I find it no difficulty in being in partnership with Americans.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) I've always indicated, Mr. Speaker, that if it is not owned in the public sector then I have no choice as between Mr. Asper or Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to a question that I promised to answer for the Honourable Member from Morris yesterday, and I said that I would have the answer today relative to the Shellmouth Dam, the present outflow from the Shellmouth Reservoir is 2,000 cubic feet per second and barring excessive precipitation over the next three weeks, the outflow will be reduced in the last week of May. Flood flows from the Lumsden area on the Qu'Appelle River are not expected to reach the Assiniboine River in Manitoba until early June. These increased flows on the Qu'Appelle River will coincide with the reduced flows from the Shellmouth Reservoir, and hence should not present a problem. It is not anticipated that the release of 2,000 cubic feet per second from the Shellmouth Reservoir will cause flooding along the Assiniboine River. Should conditions change over the next few weeks operations of the Shellmouth Reservoir will be modified in keeping with the objective of achieving optimum flood control benefits. And I tell my honourable friend that all of the observations which I am reporting on, are based on, hopefully, conditions reflecting these answers - one can never say.

I tell the Honourable Member for Wolseley in addition to the previous answer, that the American company that we're involved is also a purchaser of the Tantalum which is - I suppose, one hopes that somebody will buy your product, even a foreigner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the answer just given by the Minister and ask him if it is true then to assume that the water flowing out of the Shellmouth Reservoir is equal to or in excess of that which is flowing into the Shellmouth Reservoir, and that there's still capacity to control the amount of water flowing out without spilling over the spillway, and if it starts to do that of course there is no control.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll look into the honourable member's question further. In the meantime I'll send him the written answer so that he can see whether he can make more intelligence out of it than he has from my verbal answer.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister then for his answer.

I'd like to ask, direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him that in the light of the decision made today of the Winnipeg District Milk Producers Association if he will call a meeting of the various groups involved, the Milk Producers, the Marketing Board and the dairies to attempt to work out some workable solution to the cooling of milk, which obviously is not going to be supported by the milk producers today according to the release that was issued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the subject matter that my honourable friend introduces to the House in that I have not read the media of today, so I'm unable to answer that question at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thanks, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Is the Minister using his office to urge railway companies to repair bridges in rural areas which were washed out in the spring flooding so farmers will be assured the opportunity of marketing their grain in the 1973-74 crop year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is not a matter that is under my jurisdiction, the railways come under another ministry. I've not had any situation brought to my attention which would want to involve my department.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the First Minister. Is the government considering the possibility of purchasing the Winnipeg Public Safety Building to house the Magistrates' Court Services in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had many discussions with the City of Winnipeg with respect to a number of matters; that particular proposal I'm not aware of.

MR. MARION: A second question to the same Minister, and perhaps it would serve as

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MARION cont'd) clarification. Is it not possible that this could be used as a decentralization point for the Provincial Judges Court Services inasmuch as this is now under the aegis of the Attorney . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is improper. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I direct this either to the First Minister or a responsible Minister. Can the Minister advise what effect on provincial policy and revenues there might be if the Federal Government is dissolved prior to passing a two-price oil legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question's hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the First Minister. Would the First Minister indicate to the House if any commitment or proposals that the government has agreed now to make to retain the Winnipeg Jets in Winnipeg, to the business community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, a meeting did take place yesterday afternoon, at which time I indicated to the group the reasons why we felt it was inappropriate for the province, for the Crown in the right of the Province of Manitoba to become involved financially in the operations of a commercial professional sport.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Has the government indicated to the group, of any assistance through, say, the lottery system or any other form. Would the government be agreeable to that?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion as to the extent to which it was open, and it is open, to the interested persons, a group such as the Jets Booster Club, which I believe exists, to apply for a licence from the Manitoba Lotteries Licencing Board; and also it is open to the same group to operate as an agency for the sale of any lottery sweepstakes that might take place within Manitoba and with respect to the Canada West Lottery Foundation as well. Based on experience on the part of those agencies who have already been involved, there could be significant amounts of revenues available for private non profit community groups in that fashion, including this particular group.

MR. PATRICK: A final supplementary. Is the government itself prepared to do anything to retain the Jets in Winnipeg, aside from the lottery that may be . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is meant "prepared to do anything". I believe one of the things that has already been done is the indication that as of the end of this year there will be the discontinuation of the Amusements Tax, which has a value of perhaps a \$100,000 roughly per year, to the operation of that particular hockey club.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. In the absence of the Attorney-General, could the First Minister indicate why the Attorney-General's Department did not call as a witness to the preliminary hearing affecting the case of one Gilbert Barkman, who is charged in the case of the fire, the investigator from the Fire Commissioner's office who had prepared a report relating to that fire, and particularly relating to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question's asking for a legal expression. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. AXWORTHY: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. AXWORTHY: Not in a legal way, but would the Minister indicate why the Attorney-General's Department is now investigating why the report of that Fire Investigator was suppressed, and not prepared and presented to the hearing on the case relating to Mr. Barkman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well clearly, Mr. Speaker, I would have to take the question as notice. I have no awareness at all of the particular case or reference that my honourable friend is making. So I will take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BOSTROM cont'd) Minister of Highways. Considering the fact that Provincial Road 304 has been washed out effectively cutting off four communities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, what action is the Department of Highways taking to provide a bridging of the flooded portion of the road in order to reopen it for these communities use.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, we had some questions, or a question on it yesterday. We had tried to make sure that supplies that are needed would be delivered, and this was being done. However, because of the two rivers, Manigotagan, and I believe it's Duncan, I'm not sure, both overflowing and the water has really gouged out the road, which cannot be repaired immediately because it is flowing quite freely and has gouged the road that deep, that it will take some time before the waters will recede, and because of the urgency of the matter in the usual manner that the Highways Department acts quickly on these things, I might point out that the Bailey Bridge from Thompson that was sitting there for some time is now in the process of being moved into this area, and we hope that it will be erected for passage by traffic on that road by no later than Saturday morning. I might also point out that we have asked the Hydro engineer who has the know-how of assembling these bridges, he has agreed to come to work and make sure that the bridge is assembled as quickly as possible. As I said, hopefully it will be done by Saturday morning if all goes well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Assiniboia asked me a question yesterday pertaining to CAE. The number of employees at CAE Aircraft in Winnipeg are presently 230 in the factory, plus another 150 office personnel.

A second question was asked. How long is the Federal Government committed to support CAE? Specifically no time limit was agreed upon in the letter which was given to CAE in 1969, that is the letter from the Federal Government to CAE. It did provide assurance however that the Federal Government had an objective to maintain the current level of employment at CAE Aircraft operation until the company had achieved a viable level of operation and the level of employment at that time was 600. The letter also indicated that 700,000 hours per annum would be required to make the operation viable. It specifically committed the Department of Supply and Services to supply from between 40,000 to 50,000 man-hours annually until the end of 1976. It further indicated that the Government of Canada would employ their best efforts to obtain other Federal Government contracts to make up the difference between 50,000 hours per year and 700,000 hours per year.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, the company CAE Aircraft has indicated that it feels that the Federal Government has a continuing commitment to support this operation because they did state in their letter that they had an objective to support it until it had become viable and continuing, and this status in the opinion of the company has not been achieved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for giving me the answers to that question but there was one more that he did not answer. I wonder if I can pose it to him again or if he has any information. Did he have any indication from the officials of CAE or any report that the present CAE base has the capacity, the facilities and the personnel to do the overhaul job on the 707s that has been ordered by Air Canada?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the information that I had received previously was that there would have to be - and this is a bit dated perhaps but I think the situation has not changed - there would have to be some modifications in the plant facility, but I believe the company feels that they can cope with the challenge posed by this particular overhaul work that is being talked of today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce further to his statement. Is it not the position of the Manitoba Government that in effect there is a commitment by the federal government to CAE to provide sufficient man-hours to in fact see that the industry that they took over is maintained on a viable basis. Does not the Manitoba Government feel that that commitment was made to CAE at the time the overhaul base negotiations were completed?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, yes, we've indicated that and this has been our position for some years and we still maintain that position and we've indicated this to the responsible authorities on a number of occasions.

MR. SPIVAK: To the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Regardless of what may happen to a new Air Canada overhaul base for the 707s to be provided in Winnipeg, would it not be the position of the government to see to it that the Federal Government lives up to the commitment given to CAE that sufficient man-hours of work would be provided to allow that industry to be maintained as a viable industry?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a particular position. Our main concern of course is employment of Manitobans and maintenance of activity in the area of aerospace industry. We were not party to the agreement, it was an agreement between essentially the Federal Government, its agencies and CAE, but we have in the past and we haven't moved away from this position that there is a commitment and of course the commitment is in writing.

MR. SPIVAK: I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce or to the First Minister. Will not Manitoba take the position that the commitment given to CAE at the time that the negotiations were completed for Air Canada in which the government was not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is stating an argument. Would he kindly state his question?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll frame it in another way if I can and I'm not in any way stating an argument. I would like to really, and I think I have a right to ask, to understand correctly, whether the government intends to stand up for CAE with respect to its rights under the contract with the Federal Government, to see to it that there's sufficient man-hours provided to allow it to maintain a viable industry here regardless of the other situation dealing with the Air Canada overhaul base and the potential of a new base and new activity in aerospace industry. One is not going to be sacrificed for the other I would hope.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has already indicated that our position is based on our understanding that the Government of Canada did give a commitment to CAE to maintain a given level of activity at the facility here in Winnipeg. And during the course of the time span since that undertaking or commitment was given there has been a diminution of activity at CAE as a result of the Government of Canada being unable, for reasons best known to them, to live up to their commitment.

We have indicated our position. CAE has not to the best of my knowledge in recent months requested the Province of Manitoba to make additional representations on its behalf, although if they did we would certainly consider it proper to do so. But in the final analysis it is up to the Government of Canada by introspection to decide whether or not they believe that they have lived up to their agreement. It is up to CAE to take whatever follow-up action they believe is appropriate in the circumstances and we are prepared to support because of our understanding of a prior commitment.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the First Minister as Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government has completed or is now in the process of completing a major urban transportation study for the City of Winnipeg dealing as well with the problems of railway relocation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding jointly with the City of Winnipeg; I'm not aware that we are conducting any study for the City of Winnipeg. They are quite capable of conducting studies such as they deem appropriate and they are also of course free to work jointly with the province, and we do have a joint effort under way in certain respects.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'd like to ask the First Minister another question. Is the government on its own, independent of the City of Winnipeg, now in the process of completing or have completed an urban study of transportation for Winnipeg including railway relocation, independent of any joint venture with the city?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we have certain studies under way. I would not want to exaggerate the magnitude of those studies. We have an urban transportation task force. A good deal of work involves a joint activity in consultation with the city. We do not propose to undertake any grandiose study that would preempt responsibility from the City of Winnipeg to carry this out.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether it's the government's position that they are at this present time against any proposal dealing with the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the province's position up to this point in time is that until there is further definition as to the probability of rail relocation that the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass would be a classic example of putting the cart before the horse. And that opinion and view is shared by quite a number within the City of Winnipeg itself.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate at what point the government arrived at that position, or was this always the position in the past two years, year and a half?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that has been our position all along, particularly when there was on again off again indication with respect to the possibility of a significant or major rail relocation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister responsible for communications whether in view of the impending CRTC hearings relating to communications in Manitoba whether he is now prepared to table the position paper that he had promised the House, immediately, so that we may have an opportunity to discuss it and comment upon it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the discussion paper will be tabled. I'm sure the member can appreciate that getting it ready and getting it printed and getting it into the House takes time. But certainly I will make every effort and my staff will make every effort to have the discussion paper tabled in the House before it's made public.

MR. AXWORTHY: May I ask the Minister or perhaps the House Leader whether through Estimates or through some other opportunity this House will have an opportunity to debate and discuss that paper prior to its being presented to the CRTC hearings?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I assume that if my Estimates are under review that the Member for Fort Rouge can debate any item that is covered in the Estimates.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well may I ask the question of the House Leader then. Is he prepared to bring these Estimates to the House prior to those CRTC hearings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would expect that the Minister's Estimates will be forthcoming but I do think that I should point out that the brief presented by the Provincial Government relative to provincial positions at various times and at various places, there is no undertaking that a debate will take place before these positions are taken. Frequently the Ministers attend Federal-Provincial Conferences relative to energy, relative to mining policy, relative to other policies in which the provincial government takes positions. Those positions should and I believe do reflect continued discussion of public policy, but there is no undertaking for legislative debate with respect to those government positions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Going along with the question previously asked by the honourable colleague of mine from Morris in regard to the new regulations of the Milk Marketing Board, I wonder if the Minister could tell the House as to whether or not he has received a petition from the Milk Producers Association of the Swan River Valley in regard to the pressing problem detrimental freight rates that have been developed through the change in the new regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker. There may be something in the mail, however, which I'm not aware of but to date I've not had a communication from Swan River in particular although we have had a lot of discussion with the producer associations. I might add that members opposite appear to me to be completely confused as to the regulatory changes that have taken place in that the questions they are asking are of no relevance in many instances to the changes that had been brought into being.

MR. BILTON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Whether they have any relevance or not I have a problem, and I wonder when the Honourable Minister receives the petition if he would be good enough to invite that association in and discuss the matter which is very serious to them?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I always communicate with people that want to communicate with my department. There is no reason why anyone wanting to bring their views to my office would not be able to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister responsible for the operations of the McKenzie Seed Company. I wonder if he could indicate if the financial statements of the A. E. McKenzie Seed Company will be available to the members of the Economic Development Committee when they meet on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I undertook to give the highlights of the finances of the company to the honourable member or to the members of the House. I have communicated that request to the management. As soon as I obtain the information I will be providing it to the House.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister then be able to indicate whether or not the financial report will be presented to a Standing Committee of the House and will the House then through the committee have an opportunity to review the operations?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier it was not my intention to table the complete financial statement of the company but to give the financial highlights plus other information pertaining to the progress of the company to the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose a question to the House Leader. Can he give us some indication what will be the order of the Estimates after Education so that we know - I know that we'll perhaps not finish all the Estimates in this Session but at least we should know what order they'll come in so we can prepare.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been in the habit of doing it. I just confirmed yesterday that following the Minister of Industry and Commerce who follows the Minister of Education, after that Minister deals with both Education and Colleges and Universities, that is followed by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, followed by the Minister of Tourism, followed by the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources is in relation to a statement he made yesterday regarding Lake Winnipeg levels. Can he indicate whether the destruction that he indicated had been placed in the outflow of Lake Winnipeg has been entirely removed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in the House that it had been removed. The department tells me that the removal might not have been as complete as possible and that's why I also indicated that of the high levels which would be at 717-plus, that perhaps three inches maximum would be attributable to that particular problem. I also indicated that if the two channels were completed, Mr. Speaker, we would be in the process of having some two feet off those high levels, but that has not yet been completed.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Minister's statement regarding the channels, can he indicate when the channels are likely to be in operation?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd prefer to answer that tomorrow. I should know it but I want to give him a precise estimate if those terms do not contradict one another. I'll get it for him tomorrow.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister might indicate whether the control that was put in turned out to be necessary and what the costs were of installing the obstruction?

MR. GREEN: I can check that, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the judgment at the time was that it was necessary. There was danger of the waters falling to levels of 712 and 711. Of course no one knew at that time that the precipitation would change significantly as well. The judgment at the time, Mr. Speaker, was certainly that they were necessary and they did as indicated by the Premier I believe in the fall, protect us from having power shortages during last winter.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, my question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Honourable the First Minister. I would like to ask him in connection with the A. E. McKenzie Seed Company which is 100 percent controlled and operated by the government, why his government is not prepared to submit a report of these operations to the Legislature for review?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the company in question is not 100 percent owned by the Crown, although I don't think that matters much because the percentage is admittedly close to that, it's probably in the order of 90 percent; and I would think Sir, that we would be prepared to provide the same kind of information as we have in the past. It's an easy matter to deal with inasmuch as the operation has been relatively in the same status for approximately 20 years. I should think that we can provide the usual kind of information.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please proceed to the second reading debates.

BILL NO. 43

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 43 has been perused by several members on this side of the Chamber. I'm sure that there'll be more members yet who will want to enter into debate on the bill we have at the present time to amend the Farm Machinery and Equipment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to confine my remarks today to just one small portion of that bill because I'm sure that other sections have been covered or will be covered by other members. I want to deal with that section of the bill, Mr. Speaker, which establishes a fund, and apparently if this bill is approved by the Legislature the Province of Manitoba from the Consolidated Fund will establish a special fund namely, the Farm Machinery and Equipment Act Fund with \$300,000 out of the Consolidated Revenue, and this fund is to be administered and used by the board for the payment of claims made to the board by such persons and in such amounts as may be provided by the regulations. Mr. Speaker, we haven't seen the regulations and until the Act is passed and proclaimed and the regulations drafted, we really have no way of knowing just how the payout procedure is going to be. We have no way of knowing whether the payout as suggested by this section of the Act will be made just by persons submitting claims, says nothing about whether the claims have to be valid or not, but it says "for payment of claims made to the board by such persons and in such amounts as may be provided by the regulations." So we know that it's only going to be in the regulations that we will find out exactly what the intent of this fund is going to be. It could be that a farmer could make a claim because his crop didn't yield as well as he expected last year. I would be very surprised if that was one of the criteria that was used.

It could be that this \$300,000 fund could in fact be a slush fund of the government for campaigning in the next provincial election. We haven't seen the regulations so we don't know whether that is the intent of the Act or not. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it is possible, I would hope that it is highly improbable, that I can visualize in the next provincial election, Mr. Speaker, the possibility of candidates running for the government party going around talking to farmers, saying are you satisfied with everything that's going on. If you're not, I'll look after your claim for you if you will support me in this coming election. I would hope that that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, but it's entirely possible. We haven't seen the regulations--(Interjection)--well if the Minister of Agriculture says that's Conservative tradition, he must have run as a Conservative member at some time or another. Or maybe he is very familiar with that pattern and is trying to put a Conservative tag on it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that those good farmers in the Province of Manitoba would want such a thing to happen. To my knowledge, I don't believe that most of the farmers in the Province of Manitoba even want such a fund. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that most of the farmers in the Province of Manitoba don't even want this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Minister of Agriculture speaking from his seat and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the last remark of the Minister is probably one of the most

BILL 43

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) positive contributions he has made.--(Interjection)--When the Minister suggests that maybe we should repeal the entire Act, then maybe he is talking sense.

Mr. Speaker, I want to carry out another line of thought in respect to the repeal of this bill and what the effect would be on the farmers of Manitoba. At the present time we know that in the Province of Manitoba the suppliers and manufacturers of farm equipment have some apprehension about making sales in this province. When there is a market which is a sellers market and which we have in Western Canada at the present time, Mr. Speaker, the manufacturers of farm machinery cannot begin to meet the demand that is placed on their facilities. Under such circumstances I suggest to you, Sir, if you were a manufacturer of equipment and you had ready markets in practically every section of the country and there were some areas of the country that was more difficult to deal in than others, would you apportion your product equally to all segments of the country, or would you make your sales in the markets where there is the greatest freedom? I think it is a logical question to pose and I think that the effect is being felt in the Province of Manitoba today.

I was in a farm machinery dealer's place just last weekend, Mr. Speaker, and a salesman there talking to a customer said in maybe a bantering way and maybe in a sincere way, we'll never know, he said, what do you want to buy? He said, we have it here. He said we have harrow bars without any hubs; he said, we have cultivators without any shanks; we have drills without any discs. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Act does nothing to guarantee the supply of equipment to dealers but it does something to manufacturers of equipment to make them somewhat reluctant to deal in the Province of Manitoba. And if that is the case then perhaps the remarks the Minister of Agriculture made from his seat when he suggests that maybe we should withdraw the entire Act, may in fact be a very true statement and one that is worthy of considerable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know when the original Act was implemented or brought into this Legislature, what segments of the farming industry the Minister of Agriculture was talking to, how many people made submissions to him to bring in this type of legislation, because it is my considered opinion, Mr. Speaker, that since the implementation of the Farm Machinery Act of two years ago that it has not benefitted the farmer; in fact it is my opinion, Sir, that it has hurt him. When the legislators attempt to spell out in legislation that service must be provided in a certain specified length of time, that compensation must be paid for failure to deliver, that they are doing nothing to assist the goodwill that has existed for years between the farm machinery dealer and his customers. Confidence in the utilization of farm machinery, Mr. Speaker, has been built up through the goodwill of those that sell and service farm machinery. It cannot be legislated, it is a confidence that only time and good service will build in legislation of this nature. It does not improve it nor does it assist the farmer in his problems.

A second section of the bill that is in front of us, Mr. Speaker, deals with the maintenance of this Farm Machinery and Equipment Act fund. The 300,000 originally put up by the Consolidated Fund will be maintained from year to year under the proposed amendments by levies which will be assessed on vendors and dealers in such amounts as may be set out in the regulations and as may be required to maintain the fund.

Mr. Speaker, the activities of the members of the board who administer the fund can greatly affect the financial position of those that sell and service equipment. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that in his farming operation he is the man that knows how much it's going to cost him to operate his business, he is the man that is supplying the financial capital to operate it. I want to ask him one question. Would he like to have a third party involved in his financial affairs that can come in at any time, any time they wish, and take a \$100 out of his operating account or take \$500 out of his operating account without any right of appeal? I don't believe the Minister would appreciate that type of interference in his personal operations, and yet he is proposing legislation that would do that to someone else. If this Act is implemented the way it is drafted, the board that is charged with the responsibility for the Farm Machinery and Equipment Act fund can levy at any time amounts as may be set out in the regulations. Not only that but it can also levy amounts as may be required to maintain the fund at a level of \$300,000. I don't know if the equipment dealers and vendors will have any representation on that board. I don't know whether the Minister is contemplating any further section which would give the dealer the right of appeal against the levy; at the present time there's nothing. It places the Farm Machinery dealer and the vendor entirely at the mercy of the board

BILL 43

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) that is administering that fund. We don't know the purpose of that fund. As far as we know any person can make a claim valid or invalid and the board under the provisions of the regulations, which we haven't seen, will make payments out of that fund.

We have a form of appeal written into the legislation which is there for the user of farm equipment, but I don't believe there is any appeal for the vendor or the dealer.

I would think, Sir, that if there is a form of appeal for one party there should also be a form of appeal for the other party.

A MEMBER: It's only fair.

MR. GRAHAM: But we see nothing in here to that effect. And I would hope that when this bill goes to Committee that these matters will be corrected. I would hope the Minister will entertain amendments to that nature, so that if there are inequities being proposed, rather than having to come back a year or two from now that they be corrected now. It's far easier to do it now, Sir, than it is later.

Mr. Speaker, when I rose to enter into this debate I wanted to confine my remarks just to that particular section and I think that I have made any contribution I wanted to make on that section, and I would hope that other members would make their contributions on other sections of the Act, or even give me their interpretation of how they read this particular section.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Souris-Killarney that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 46

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a few comments at this time in regards to Bill No. 46 and much of my comments will relate to personal experience of operating under the present act which governs the City of Winnipeg operation. I, like the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, had the opportunity of sitting on the new City of Winnipeg Council for two years and to operate in a position which had an opportunity to more or less experience the full operation of the City of Winnipeg Act and we personally also had an opportunity to operate under a former city or municipality prior to the City of Winnipeg. I would like to comment that at the time the act was being proposed in the House back in, I believe it was 1971, that I was an opponent to the act for various reasons but I don't believe that any justification would be done at this time to go back into debate on something where a decision had already been made. But I can honestly say that even though I was an opponent to the act prior to its passing that once it had been passed and I had personally become a member of the new City Council that I worked as hard as I could along with my then colleague, the Member from St. Boniface, to make sure that the act would work. And I can say that in most cases, and I believe the majority of cases, that all councillors that did either oppose the act originally and were fortunate to be elected as a representative for their ward and on the new City Council were the strongest workers to make this act work and I believe from what has happened to date that my remarks would be borne out.

I was kind of bemused to some extent by the Honourable Minister of Public Works in his comments of asking for fresh ideas from the Opposition. I sometimes wonder what happened to the suggestions from the Opposition when the original bill was being discussed and debated. As my honourable colleague from Brandon West would say, it sounded like it was a St. John shift. I think that's play No. 3 in the government's play book in the football arena where if the particular decision or policy doesn't work blame the Opposition. I would suggest that the ideas that were presented before, many of them were sound by the Opposition but were not acceptable to the government. And I suggest that if you have resulted from your decision in somewhat of a mess then it's your responsibility to accept this and also to stew in it.

I would like to compliment the City of Winnipeg administrators for the job that they have done through the past two to three years in making that transition from a multitude of cities and municipalities to one city overnight. Because without their dedication, and I'm sure the Honourable Member from St. Boniface would confirm this statement, that without their sincere dedication and their many long hours in meetings and at work this, what would appear to be a smooth changeover would not have occurred.

BILL 46

(MR. MINAKER cont'd)

I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would not have occurred if the elected councillors had not also been as dedicated and put in as many long hours because there was virtually many many hours of meetings with the administration and also with the political council to make basic decisions. Because, Mr. Speaker, one could liken it to 13 corporations being amalgamated overnight with a new set of rules, also with a new Board of Directors, 50 in number, many of which had not sat on a public council before, and as such they also had employed in this new corporation some 7,000 people who were concerned about this all of a sudden overnight change, and further had a budget to establish and to approve within a three month period, of some \$80 million plus. I believe it would only be right to suggest that because of the efforts of the administration and the dedicated civic employees that this transition was made possible. I question whether such a transition could have been as smooth if it had been say a conglomeration of corporations. I believe that no one in this room that's resided in the City of Winnipeg could suggest that on January 1st, 1972 that there were any problems that they could arrive at with regard to snow removal or fire protection, police protection and so on. And I have to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it was the efforts of the elected body and the civic administration and the employees that made this possible.

I might comment that we did receive task force reports that I personally found little value to and I don't recall that our administrators made any strong comments that they were of great assistance, so that a lot of this work was achieved in a three month period primarily by the employees of the city as well as the elected officials.

I was somewhat disappointed in the Honourable Minister of Public Works in his comments with regards to the City of Winnipeg Official Delegation, and particularly when he described the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg as an amateur. I'm quite concerned when a Minister of the Crown calls the Mayor of Winnipeg an amateur because my own personal opinion is, well, 1) it doesn't create a good atmosphere in discussions with the City of Winnipeg when the Government and it's Minister describes such a respected individual in these tones. I personally consider the Mayor a very professional politician, probably one of the most professional in the Province of Manitoba and also in the Canadian and North American continent. But I can understand the Honourable Minister, he's probably still smarting from his confrontation with the amateur over the washroom. But it's surprising, at most of the meetings that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and myself attended and I believe it was the majority of them, we didn't see the Honourable Minister of Public Works there that often anyway, so one can only assume that he probably was down in his washroom practicing professional politics. I wonder if the messenger could come here, I have a card that describes another politician practicing his professional politics that I'd like the Honourable Member from Elmwood to have a glance at. It belongs to a friend of mine, I'd like to get it back.

The other concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is that why did there have to be rivalry with the official city delegation because the Minister of Finance during his debate, the Honourable Member from St. John indicated in Hansard when he was debating the merits of this City of Winnipeg Act back in 1970 when he said it related to the Urban Affairs Department. And we are also at the same time studying how we can organize within government this information gathering process so that it can become a decision-making process. Because, and I underline this, because we don't want to build a Department of Urban Affairs as a line department delivering services. We want it to be a co-ordinating body. So why did there have to be rivalry? I know as a member in the official delegation and my colleagues when we came to meet with the government it was in good faith and we were trying to achieve a common goal, it was my understanding to make this City of Winnipeg Act operate and function in the most efficient fashion. But one can almost get that feeling from time to time that there was rivalry there, as the Honourable Minister of Public Works described it as a poker game.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as one of the members of the official delegation of the city at that time, and I'm sure my honourable friend from St. Boniface would agree with me, we didn't come there to play poker. We came there representing the City of Winnipeg and its people with an interest of making this thing work, and it was unfortunate that possibly some of the members at that time were busy scanning the opposite side of the table and saying, "Uh huh that guy's an amateur, Uh huh that guy's an amateur." Because that's not why we were there.

BILL 46

(MR. MINAKER cont'd)

By the way in regards to the poker game, when one considers professionals or whatever you want to consider them I didn't really consider it a poker game when the government had the card game rules controlled, they had the House rules, they controlled the deck, they controlled the bank and also they had six croupiers I think over a period of two years in there as Urban Affairs Ministers, I don't know whether they were in there as relief pitchers or whether they were not interested or what. But I can tell you that the official delegation at that time was not going there to play cards. They were going there in the concern of the City of Winnipeg and its people.

Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity because I was not present when the original debate was on to read parts of Hansard and also to read the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources comments most recently on this present bill and the actual original bill, what the objectives of the government were. And we all know they were to equalize the tax base or unify the financial tax base of the City of Winnipeg and surrounding areas and as the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources commented on or stated, to operate within a development plan. These were his two main objectives.

And the Honourable Minister of Finance at that time, it appeared that his main objective, in witnessing him at a couple of meetings when they introduced the White Paper his main objective was to have local participation along with these other two objectives. And with regards to the equalization of the financial base and the disparities that existed prior to the Unicity, there still exists disparities, even though we have the common tax base. I particularly refer to the educational costs and there we have an experience where the greatest increase of cost in education within the City of Winnipeg has occurred in the past year in this Budget, in what was known as the former suburbs or in the younger communities of our city. And this is understandable in my opinion in that you have on the outer stretches of your city a young community. They're obviously going to have young families, they're going to need school facilities and they are probably going to when they get the new school facilities get the present day thinking on education and the level of education required. So as a result a good number of the communities in the City of Winnipeg have been increased or their cost for education has increased in the order of - well in the example of my own community of St. James-Assiniboia, this year 34.7 percent. This is the mill rate cost for education or school taxes. Similarly, we have here in Fort Garry 27.3 percent the increase. In St. Vital 24.4. In River East 40.1 percent. So there still is disparities in our tax base in the City of Winnipeg. We have not eliminated this problem. And in fact in St. James-Assiniboia this year they have experienced an increase in educational costs somewhere - I'm sorry, the increase of 30 percent has been this year in the actual share of costs. One of the highest in the areas.

Also when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was indicating in his comments the other day on this bill he almost implied that there wasn't really any sharing of costs towards the metropolitan services that were being provided back in 1971 prior to Unicity coming about. This was not true. I know that in the instance of the community of St. James the Metro levy represented some 53 percent of the municipal costs in that community. It also represented of the overall budget - correction - the overall budget some 53 percent for municipal costs; where in the former City of Winnipeg the Metro levy at that time, I think it was somewhere in the order of 14-1/2 mills, it only represented one-third of the municipal cost for the city of Winnipeg; so that there was a sharing of costs at that time for the Metro levy services. One also watched the debate and there seems to be a bitter feeling at times about Metro, and really, what's wrong with Metro? That's a very fine Ukrainian name and I don't know why many of the opposition on the other side are so opposed to the name Metro. But one looks at, what was the price tag of this unification, these objectives that the government wanted to put through. What were the price tags? Well, the total expenditure and I think Mr. Bole at that time indicated that there would be a fantastic rise in service costs for the one-city concept, and what was this price tag that the City of Winnipeg and its populace and citizens have paid for these objectives that the government has passed? Well, back in 1971 - and these figures are taken right from the budget figures of the City of Winnipeg - when we dealt with the budget back in '72 - the total actual expenditure for all municipal services in the City of Winnipeg when they totalled in the various municipalities, in 1971 was 88.3 million dollars. In the 1974 estimates for the same services - we are talking about municipal services now - the total

BILL 46

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) expenditure that's estimated for this year is 127.3 million. That's an increase of 45 percent in three years. It's costing the people of Winnipeg 145 percent more than what it did three years ago. And in this year from 1973 to 1974 there is an eighteen percent increase. That's what it's cost us, Mr. Speaker, for this unification. And it is obvious, Mr. Speaker - I've commented on this several times in the House, and many of my colleagues have, and I know the Honourable Member from St. Boniface has commented on it - that we must have a new financial and fiscal policy between the province and urban centres, because if we do not we will slowly choke off our major urban centre with an opportunity of rounding itself out, it's in its infant stages and we have an opportunity to try and make this thing more of a success than it presently is, but it will need financial assistance, it will need a share of those growth taxes, we can only go so many more years before major repairs will have to be made in the City of Winnipeg, and I would imagine in other urban centres; and we can only go so far trying to keep the level of service at the rate it was in 1971, or possibly in some areas now it's probably a less level of service, and I think the area that I'm referring to would be the police protection area in the City of Winnipeg which has been kept to a limited growth because of the price tags that are involved with the operation of our new city and the main objective effort of our councillors in the City of Winnipeg is one to try and provide an efficient type of operation without driving our people out of their homes, whether they be old age people or young people.

That was one of the main fallacies that the City of Winnipeg operates under, was to take a look at any major decision changes so that we wouldn't handcuff the people of Winnipeg and the people of Manitoba with some costly mistake. And as a result the basic policy in the city for the first two years was one to review any proposal changes with regards to police and fire and other major services, have a proper study before proceeding with a change that would effect the lives of thousands of people possibly, or cost moneys that could not be recouped or could not be changed after a policy-decision was made.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is the city cannot continue to operate on a year by year grant system, particularly with the attitude the present government has that every time it puts out a grant it wants to gain more control over a service that the municipal or the urban government, prior to the offer of the grant, had control of. This seems to be the attitude of the present government and I don't believe it is an attitude which creates a strong urban government and provincial government relationship, and it definitely does not provide an opportunity for the urban government to become stronger, or to maintain its strength. And I'm not talking about political strength, I'm talking about the strength in terms of the ability to provide services, the ability to make a basic decision relating to services and so forth. Because I can only see the present policy and attitude towards urban governments that the present government has lead to where the urban government will become a puppet of the provincial government's Urban Affairs Department, and I think this would be grossly wrong. I believe that we need strong urban governments and municipal governments because they have an area to play in our particular field of politics and services provided to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one has to look at what the role of a municipal or urban government is in today's way of life, and how the municipal government originated originally some years back. I think one of the basic responsibilities that urban government has and will continue to have, and it's most logical to have, is the providing of maintenance services. This is basically my opinion in how the original municipal governments were born, in that as a community grew they found they could get the streets clean but then all of a sudden they also needed to put out fires and they had to do other services, which one individual wouldn't provide, but by going together they could get the work done. And then as the community grew in size, it took on greater responsibility such as welfare and health and so forth. I think you have a blend of both of these in your urban centres but there is a need for both. There's what one would call a local government representative that looks after those local needs, and there is also a need for the regional responsibility or the regional type of government decisions which relate to the more broad effect of planning decisions, social decisions, and so forth. Particularly those decisions which create a large economic commitment on to a community, and so forth. I think that if we lose that local responsibility, or that local - well basically the local responsibility, that we will become a very bland type of community, that there will be no input from our local people, there will be no decision making or no opportunity to have a say in where a community club goes, or what type of park we have, and so forth.

BILL 46

(MR. MINAKER cont'd)

I think that the original intent of the White Paper strongly indicated that there would be this local input, the importance of it. In fact I have a copy of it here, and when I listened to the Minister, well the Honourable Member from St. John's when he presented the White Paper in our area, he stressed the importance of the grass roots representation and he said, or at least the White Paper said that they stressed this grass roots type of participation. And then they dealt with the new concept, and it related to community committee and citizen involvement and says, "The absolute imperative. We wish to make it completely clear, however, that it is the absolute conviction of the government that no attempt at urban reform can succeed unless it succeeds in strengthening the sense of identification and intensify the communication between the citizen and local government." I will get back to that later on in my comments in regards to the amendments that are being put forward at this time.

It also went on to say with regards to strengthening community identities, and it dealt at length in saying, "the object of this adherence to the familiar is obvious. Obviously to strengthen local character and identity, rather than to have them obliterated in the process of unification." These were what were put forward to the citizens of Winnipeg back in 1971, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that when the government passed the legislation originally in 1972, that this thinking still survives. There is obviously a difference of opinion between, I would suggest between the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, whose main objective would appear to be to equalize finances and to have a broad planning to operate under.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 4:30 we are now into Private Members' Hour. The honourable member will have fifteen minutes the next time we get to this topic.

First item, Private Members' Hour. Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Can we have this stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 50. The Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 51. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 51 for second reading.

MOTION presented.

BILL NO. 51

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the Whips of both opposition parties, that this was a simple amendment to an Act of 1964 which incorporated Investors Syndicate which will allow for the increase in capital in keeping with, you know, the present day reality.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 53. The Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 23, also the Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 31. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood. (Stand) Bill No. 47. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that Bill No. 47, An Act to Amend the Financial Administration Act be now read a second time.

MOTION presented.

BILL NO. 47

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is a very straight forward and simple one. It's intention is to restore to the Act the intent and meaning of that particular section of the Act, and to return to the Legislative Assembly the right to examine and to control expenditures, which is a function of this Legislature, to check the excesses and the arrogance of government. I don't say that in any partisan sense because it is generally known that governments after being in power for some time tend to want to take the shortcuts that prevent them from the kind of scrutiny and the kind of examination that should take place in the Legislatures and in the Parliament of Canada. But to do also, Sir, what the government admits

BILL 47

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) that it is incapable of doing, by virtue of some of the statements that have been made by honourable gentlemen opposite, that is to abide by the spirit and the intent of the law, now beginning to realize what the Premier meant when he said that we're going to cast aside some of those old traditions and practices that in his view has outlived their usefulness. And we are beginning to wonder if the proper examination of government expenditures by this Legislature is one of those practices and traditions that this government intends to discard.

Sir, what is the purpose of Parliament and this Legislature. It's only function, or at least its primary function is to control expenditures, to consider the estimates and to give the government the authority to spend, if it has passed that kind of examination. In other words, to enable the people of this country through Her Majesty's loyal opposition, to exercise some control over spending. It's well known what has happened in Ottawa when the control over spending was removed from Parliament; spending gone wild, an increase in the Federal budget in the short space of ten years from six billion to 22 billion dollars and perhaps more. Sir, when governments have the right to spend money without the right being examined by the parliament, there is a tendency to excesses.

Sir, ten years ago Bernard Crick, who was a lecturer at the London School of Economics wrote an interesting book called A Reform of Parliament, and he had this to say in his comments on parliamentary government, said "Control means influence, not direct power. And it has never been the intention of the opposition to assume that power. It is the intention of the opposition to exert some influence and to examine. It means advice not command. It means criticism not obstruction, scrutiny not initiation, and publicity, not secrecy."

Sir, what has happened is history, and I am going to refer for a moment to the Premier's statement in response to a question by the Member for Portage-Neepawa, or Portage, when he said that the legislation was drafted, was drafted by the previous administration and was just carried forward. And that, Sir, nobody is going to deny. But what interests me is the recommendation for the change in the drafting, because that particular section of the Act was lifted almost word for word from the Treasury Act in Ottawa, and the only portion of that entire section that was omitted were the words that are now included in the amendment that is before the House. Why was that left out? Well, Sir, in my examination of the events leading up to the time that that legislation was drafted, it was left out on the advice of some bureaucrats in Ottawa which was accepted by some bureaucrats in Manitoba, because as they said, it's difficult to get money sometimes. And supposing you had an emergency. I said, well what kind of an emergency. Well, let's supposing there was a flood and you required 100,000 sandbags or something like that and you needed the money to pay for them. I said, do you mean to tell me that an Opposition would be so obstructed, and not only obstructed but so crassly stupid that they would refuse consent of that nature if the government wanted to bring in such a bill and the spending and authority, in 15 minutes it would be passed and everybody knows that. These are the emergencies and I look over the list of special warrants that were passed in this last year, and admittedly some of them may fall under the category of emergencies.

For example, the first one says, Emergency Hay Replacement. Well that perhaps could be classed as an emergency and it's no problem because the House wasn't sitting at that time. But to suggest that salaries and increases in salaries augmenting existing appropriations and things of the like - road construction, driver registration - these things are emergencies? It seems unlikely that they're emergencies when the House is in session. Surely those things can be brought forward for examination through the proper course of events, through the consideration of Estimates. The suggestion that the government must have this authority, that the governments have this authority during the course of a session, I don't believe came from the politicians. I don't believe it came from either the politicians in Ottawa or the politicians here, those who finally had the responsibility of introducing the legislation or even speaking on it when it was passed, and I am frank to admit that the bill passed without my grasping the significance of it until it was finally used.

Sir, if we are to do the kind of examination, if we are to execute our responsibilities in this Chamber then surely that kind of an examination can only be done if the Opposition, which is their right, has the right to refuse a granting of Supply if they feel that the government have not acted in a manner that they believe was a proper one. It is one of the very few weapons that an Opposition has in a parliamentary democracy. To take that away from the Opposition

BILL 47

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) is to take away the very purpose for which this place sits. Sir, I urge the government to show their good faith and to indicate that they as well as those of us on this side of the House are not in agreement with what happened and that remedial measures should be taken, and they can be taken by the passage of this amendment. Well, government persists in playing the numbers game. The Minister of Finance who exhibited some of his capacity to shift around a little bit during the course of the debate on the Mineral Acreage Tax Act suggests that since there was nothing written down it was legal. Sir, if we are to take that at its face value it means that so much of the constitution of this country and indeed the British Constitution which we follow so closely is worthless, because most of it is unwritten. It means that the government has unlimited powers and I would not like to see the situation exist where it is necessary to write into the Constitution and write into every act what is a moral and ethical attitude on the part of the government. Surely the government themselves should observe those rules without having some written authority in front of them.

Now the Minister of Labour who - I don't want to repeat the speech that he made in this Chamber on the bill on Interim Supply because the Minister of Labour is one of those that is not given to stating things in concise and brief terms - I'll simply paraphrase what took him 20 minutes to say, in one sentence. He said, "What more does the Opposition want. We gave them the right to speak on the Throne Speech Debate and we gave them the right to speak on the Budget. Now surely after having done that and the votes having gone in favour of the government, that now gives us unlimited authority to do as we please." That was really the message that the Minister of Labour gave to the House when he spoke on Bill 34. Well we've seen how much the government really wants to live by their own laws. We've seen that example in the Elections Act that was passed in this House, an amendment to the Elections Act, moved in this House and passed by the present government. And the support of that Act was to limit expenditures of candidates in election campaigns. Sir, there were so many flagrant violations of the provisions of that Act by the government that one wonders what its real purpose was. Well, Sir, we find ourselves in a rather . . .

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Name one.

MR. JORGENSEN: Name one, he said. The Member for Radisson asked me to name one, Sir; that is not very difficult to do. The truckloads of signs that came in from Regina, the government knew when they were going to call the election so they very conveniently ordered and paid for all their signs prior to the date of the calling of the election. That, Sir, is a violation of the Act.

Now, Sir, we're caught in a rather interesting situation in this Chamber, according to the honourable gentlemen opposite if we debate at length, we're called obstructive and irresponsible. If we co-operate on certain measures, as we did on the Mineral Acreate Tax Act, ah, then we're to take the blame if the legislation turns out to be bad. If we have members on this side of the House who very infrequently participate in debates, then during the course of the election campaign we find honourable gentlemen opposite will be loudly proclaiming in that particular constituency that that member is useless to them because he never gets up in the House and speaks. So, Sir, government persists in having all of these things their own way and we simply wonder just what the attitude of the government is.

Now the Member for Birtle-Russell yesterday spoke of the inversion of our traditional concept of justice that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty and he demonstrated, and even to the satisfaction of the Attorney-General who agreed with him, that somehow or other that traditional concept of justice is being by-passed, and we now have an inversion of that in that you're guilty until proven innocent. And we'll carry that even further. That if you are lucky enough to get convicted then the red carpet is thrown out for you and those that are within the penal institutions perhaps are treated better than those who stand outside of them.

Well now what is the extent of the moral and political inversion in today's prevalent view of government? Constitutions, Sir, were designed to impose limitations on government. Never were they designed to impose limitations on the individuals. But that's not what's happening today. Governments and constitutions were designed to protect man's rights and we find that the government is man's worst violator of those rights. Governments are designed and constitutions are designed to protect freedoms. It's the government that takes away most of the freedoms of the individuals. Constitutions are designed to protect the citizens from the initiators of physical force and coercion, and yet we find that governments are the greatest violators

BILL 47

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) of that concept. And instead of serving as an instrument of objectivity in human relationships we find that the government is creating a reign of uncertainty, and indeed fear, by means of non-objective laws and random bureaucrats who interpret those laws. Instead of protecting men from injury from whim, the government is arrogating to itself the power of unlimited whim.

Sir, the ultimate inversion in moral concepts of government is not that far away if we continue on the path that we seem to have started. I suggest, Sir, that we take stock of to what extent that parliament has been degraded and denied its rightful place in our society, its right to control the excesses of government, its right to examine, and indeed its right to withhold the authority for spending; bearing in mind, Sir, that there is always the right of the government to exercise its authority through the use of closure if it chooses. That right is always there and I do not deny the right to the government. The government has that right and they know it. Now I've seen it used in two ways; once during the pipeline debate and once during the flag debate. In one case it was wrong and I think in the other case it was justified, in fact I don't only think it was justified, I know it was justified in the second instance. Government makes that decision, and that's what the government is for in order to make decisions. But if an Opposition feels that it's right to withhold Supply then there comes a test between whether the Opposition will exercise that kind of influence on the government to make them change their ways or that the government will exercise its authority to impose closure and finish debate. That's their right, nobody denies that. But, Sir, to avoid the responsibility and to avoid the examination in this House by means of the issuing of Special Warrants when the House is in session is a denial of the rights of the members of the Opposition and abuse of the powers of government. I trust, Sir, that this government will accept this resolution, or this amendment to the Bill, in the spirit in which it is presented, and that is to restore to this legislature the right that is traditionally the right of parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of Bill 47 is admittedly important. The Honourable Member for Morris has made a very articulate presentation of the arguments that surround the substance of this bill and while I will not attempt today to indicate the specific government response to Bill No. 47, nevertheless I would like to take this opportunity to comment on some of the major points raised by the honourable member.

I would begin by agreeing with him of course that government as it has evolved in the British Parliamentary system, which we adhere to in very large measure, has evolved in a way that is based on continued respect for the rule of law and restraint by constitutional law of government actions. And I know there are those who argue that with each passing year in the 20th century that we have tended to allow the enlargement of government and of government powers and that this is militating to the danger of individual freedoms. And I have no doubt, Sir, that to a degree one can find substance and specific evidence that this is so. At the same time we know, Sir, that governments in this generation over the years have moved, at the expense of enlargement of bureaucracy admittedly, but they have moved to bring about more programs, more equality of the human condition, more opportunity for those who in years gone by, in the case of their forebears, could only hope and in most cases couldn't even hope but could only look forward to continued despair. Like so many things in life, it is a case of balancing off negative and positive features of developments in government and government programs as we go along through the years.

I am one of those who while regretting to some extent the increase of the volume of legislation, increase of numbers of politicians and public servants, nevertheless find some considerable consolation in the fact that there is more equality, with a capital E, I feel this with a passion, that there is more fairness in our society today for more people than was the case in the past. Maybe we are coming to a point in history when we hit the phenomenon or encounter the phenomenon of diminishing returns. And that is, I believe that it's possible theoretically for us to arrive at such a phenomenon in civil government as well as it is in economics a fact or a law.

But to come back to the situation or the circumstance which my honourable friend the Member for Morris complains most about, and which I suppose prompted him to introduce Bill 47 and to prepare his interesting discourse on government and constitutional restraint, I would point out to him that he is correct when he states that the advice that was received here

BILL 47

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) in Manitoba some time in 1968 or 1969 was received, at least to some extent advice with respect to the Financial Administration Act in this respect was received from Ottawa. That doesn't mean that therefore we were entitled to implement it, to legislate and implement it. And I'm not going to make much of the fact, but it is a fact, Sir, that the Act in question which he is now objecting to, and the section he is objecting to, was drafted by his colleagues when they were the government and not by us when we formed the administration. We took an Act that was fully prepared, and drafted it and re-introduced it into this Assembly, and it passed. It became Statute Law; it became part of and constituted the Financial Administration Act.

Now, the Member for Morris thinks he has a point when he argues that governments must not be allowed to encroach on the rights and privileges of the Opposition. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, that is true. But this is to some extent a non-productive argument, because the corollary certainly applies as well, should Opposition be allowed to frustrate and thwart indefinitely the responsibilities of government and the ability of government to exercise and carry out those responsibilities? So that is a circular non-productive argument. Both sides of the argument are correct and neither is correct. It gets you nowhere.

. . . . continued on next page

BILL 47

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would permit a question. I do not disagree with the point he's just made, but does not the government, by virtue of its majority, have the right to stop the Opposition when they feel that they have reached the point where debate becomes repetitive and where they feel that it should not go any further? You have that tool in the closure motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was working my way towards that very observation, and since my honourable friend the Member for Morris interjects it into the debate now, I will seize upon it and say this to you, Sir, and to this House: that is there really that much difference between a government that is prepared to invoke closure within the rules, that has been longstanding, long provided for under our system of parliamentary government, is there that much difference between that, or proceeding to do what it has to do providing it is willing to come back to Parliament and the Assembly within all due dispatch, a matter of hours, or at most a few days, in order to face the House with a motion of confidence on that Act which it has carried out? In the ultimate analysis, Mr. Speaker, there is only one ultimate test whether or not a particular group have the right to carry out the affairs and responsibilities of government, and that is whether that group has the confidence of the majority that constitute this Assembly, that constitute a parliament. After all the words and all the reams of written pages of analysis, constitutional law, and government and political science, that is what the ultimate test is: whether or not it has the confidence of a majority in the Assembly or in parliament, and if it does not, it falls, and then the people decide who shall succeed them. That's really what the end result and net effect of this is.

I don't disagree with the mood and the spirit of what the Honourable Member for Morris said. So much of it I could only say "Me too." That I agree. But the Honourable Member for Morris should be aware that this particular legislation, which provided for the drawing up special warrants in times of emergency or in times when fundamental financial obligations had to be met and could not be met under normal procedures, that it was pursuant to the Act as drafted in late 1968 or early 1969, introduced by my honourable friends when they were the government, re-introduced by us for final passage. The whole point of it was to enable government to carry out its financing, either of emergencies or of fundamental obligations and responsibilities.

Now I know that it can always be argued we could have invoked closure. The invoking of closure, Mr. Speaker, will never, I'm sure, take place without the Opposition -- I'm not now talking about the government or opposition of the day, the present day; I'm talking in a generic or general sense. There will be complaint and bitter complaint, as I imagine there is in the case of this special warrant. Does the honourable member try to draw an artificial distinction between what he calls an emergency, some unforeseen disaster which requires the expenditure of money by the Crown in order to meet the costs of meeting that disaster, coping with it?

I say to him that emergency should also be interpreted to connote a circumstance or condition in which debate has gone on for days, liberal degree and amount of debate, and in which a fiscal deadline is to be faced, if not already passed by, and there is no authority of funds for the carrying out of the most basic costs of civil government, which includes wages of those who are in the public service, which includes the many hundreds of different items that can only be described as of a fundamental, routine, financial, administrative nature. And if the Crown is not in a position to meet those fundamental financial requirements and expenditures, then it is truly a crisis, it is truly an emergency, and at that point government must be prepared to do one of two things. It must be prepared to invoke closure, and that will not sweeten the circumstances for the Opposition, because clearly the Opposition has been engaging in protracted debate - and again I'm thinking generally outside the context of the case in point of this Session. Opposition must have felt strongly and therefore that is why there was protracted debate, and therefore they are not happy about any course of action that will enable a decision to be taken. But my honourable friend agrees; he admits that it is possible, and in fact must be possible under the rules of parliamentary government, for closure to be invoked. That's one alternative and, as I say, it's not going to find much favour when all is said and done.

There's an alternative, and that is that if we invoke a section of the Financial Administration Act, which my honourable friend has criticized so roundly, then it seems to

BILL 47

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) me that it should not be allowed to stop there, but that there is an obligation for follow-up; that government must, if it has proceeded in that kind of circumstance, in that manner, invoking that section of the Act, it must be prepared, it ought to be prepared although it's not required to now, but it ought to be prepared to bring that measure which it has by special warrant effected, ought to bring it back to this assembly for the Assembly's disposition. In other words, we should devise a rule of procedure in which it would be brought before the House by way of special motion, debated, and voted within a given amount of time. It seems to me that we have innovated with parliamentary rules and procedures here, to some significant degree, with the concurrence of both sides of the House, and we have experimented in parliament in Ottawa certainly. My honourable friend is personally aware of that. There's been a good deal of rule change, both sides of the House being willing to discuss innovations in the rules, and in fact estimates of spending in the House of Commons are no longer dealt with in the way in which we have long been dealing with them here. There is no full Assembly debate of estimates of spending. Now the estimates in the House of Commons are merely assigned or allocated to the various departmental standing committees to take up the departmental estimates. So changes are always taking place in the rules, Sir.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I hate to intrude on the First Minister's speech but I would like him now to answer this question. The removal of the estimates from the consideration of the House and the publicity that is attached to the debate on the estimates, is largely, would he not consider that that very course of action is largely responsible for the phenomenal increase in the federal budgets from 6 billion to 22 billion dollars? Because they're not being examined, and there's no attention being focused on the spendthrift habits of the Federal Government.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to comment or attempt to answer that question. I fully realize that there has been a very substantial increase in the Federal Government budgeting and expenditures, and yet I cannot bring myself to agree that it is as the result of a new method of dealing with estimates by removing them from the Whole House into various select standing committees, because I look around the free world and I see that the amount of expenditure in all countries of the free world has been -- I would be surprised if it wasn't in very similar proportion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've just a few minutes left. I merely want to express my agreement and pleasure with the one reference made by the Honourable Member for Morris, and that is the recognition, the realistic recognition, and if he had not said it I would have - and I suppose vice versa - that there do arise occasions under parliamentary government when the use of closure in debate is not only justifiable but necessary, and therefore justifiable. And that the reason there's this great amount of public misunderstanding about the use of closure is because it was once used in 1956 in a way, which I agree again was completely wrong, completely erroneous, and that is that closure was invoked even before debate on the measure had commenced. Clearly that's wrong. But if there has been debate that has gone on for days and weeks and months, then clearly there comes a point when closure is completely - but completely - justifiable.

But closure is not the only basis or means for dealing with problems of this kind where deadlines have to be met so that fundamental emergency and fundamental administrative and financial responsibilities can be carried out. Closure, if closure is acceptable, then it should be equally acceptable, if not more acceptable, to have a procedural means whereby any emergency action that is taken pursuant to the Act it brought back to the Assembly by way of requirement for ratification, debate, and a vote on the action. And if the action was wrong and deemed so by the House, then clearly that is a straightforward lack of confidence, in which case the course of action to be followed then it well-known under our system of government.

So I welcome the fact that this subject matter is being debated but I cannot agree that we are locked into only one specific course of action in cases where debate has gone on for so long as to take government beyond, or up to or beyond deadline dates required for the carrying out of its financial obligations.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt . . . ? The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition wish to speak to the . . . ?

BILL 47

MR. SPIVAK: I gather the honourable member is intending to adjourn debate. I wonder if he would allow me to say a few words and take the adjournment at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I was absent when the honourable member presented the bill. I know his views though. It's been expressed to me privately and it's been expressed in our caucus, and I daresay it really has been expressed in the House already. I was not present when the First Minister made his presentation but I have already spoken on this issue when we debated the issue of Interim Supply, and I think that it's necessary to, without being involved in the recitation of the chronology of what happened, to basically point out that the bill would correct what I think has been an error of judgment on the part of the government.

Now I think that it's very hard for any government to admit at any given time that they've acted incorrectly. I think that it's probably a sign of the maturity of a government to acknowledge that in the heat of debate or in the handling of the procedures that are within their control, errors in judgment can occur. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest to the honourable members opposite that we have reached really a period of time where that acknowledgment should take place, because what really is involved here is a fundamental principle that is sort of basic to the whole history of parliamentary democracy and responsible government, one which the honourable members opposite I think are prepared to acknowledge as being the case, and who in the objectivity that I think they can bring to bear on this matter, from several weeks away from the actual incident, will acknowledge that in the haste they undertook something that was incorrect.

I indicated at the time of the debate on Interim Supply that what had to be applied in this particular situation was a test of reasonableness, a test of reasonableness under the circumstances, and I do not believe that the government could pass that test. I believe that they can argue, and they will if they want to, that they had passed that test of reasonableness, but I don't think that any objective appraisal of the situation could have justified the kind of actions that were undertaken. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that my evaluation is wrong, but even if my evaluation is wrong, I then would say to the other members, there should not be that opportunity for government to act as they did in this particular situation and the honourable member for Morris has brought to the attention of the House a way in which to correct this, and if we do correct this, Mr. Speaker, we have not closed off all the options that government would have open to it, but what we have done is applied by the amendment that's proposed to the existing act, and we applied the basic tradition which really has formed the parliamentary heritage that is ours in this Chamber.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in asking the government to consider this favourably, and in suggesting to them that it would be a sign of maturity on their part and a sign of recognition that governments in the future should not follow that example - and this I admit, Mr. Speaker, is very difficult for any government, for any Minister to admit - but I think, Mr. Speaker, if I'm correct, from the remarks that were expressed in the House during the time of Interim Supply Estimates, there was even a dispute among themselves as to the course of action, and I'm not trying to delve into that because Cabinets and governments will always have difference of opinion and then they resolve it and arrive at a consensus. That I recognize. But the fact is that if there was some concern, that concern surely must weight very heavily because again in the perspective of an examination several weeks after the event, one has to say, what is the purpose of this Legislature, what is the purpose of the House of Commons, what is the purpose of the whole check and balance of the spending of government. Now they have the majority, they are quite capable of exercising that majority and ultimately when the procedures are followed, they will in turn accomplish their result.

We go to a committee system, Mr. Speaker, we know in the committee they have a majority, and we know invariably that when issues come up and the government makes a determination it is only the odd time, and that will be if someone breaks caucus ranks, that anything will happen that will prevent them from accomplishing results. So the whole procedure is based on a check and balance which gives us an opportunity to be able to examine, to question and in turn be able to draw out over a period of time answers and to be able to test the arguments to support the position of the government. And, Mr. Speaker, we should not be prevented from exercising all of those procedures, nor should we be prevented from following the tradition which would give us a check and balance with respect to the way in

BILL 47

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) which government operates.

Mr. Speaker, if one examines the financial position of government one knows that Orders-in-Councils up to 30 - 35 million dollars appear to be the annual figure that governments have spent in the last few years -- or Special Warrants at least of \$30 million. I may be wrong, it may be 28 million, may be 26, but my recollection is that they're around \$30 million and have been for the last period of time. That's a substantial amount of money that is dealt with by the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, that really is not dealt with by the House, and that's dealt in between the periods, between sessions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we are in this position, we are in this position, Mr. Speaker, I think that we reach a trend, and I think this is what our concern would be, we reach a trend which basically says that we as a government, we really are working for the interest of the people, we know that what we are doing is best, we know we have the majority, we know we have the right, so we'll exercise it. And, Mr. Speaker, when a government takes that position then the question has to be asked what's the purpose of Opposition, what's the purpose of the Legislature, what's the purpose of the legislative function. And the tradition that has been followed is a very simple one. It was the way in which, the only way in which the control of taxation and spending could be handled so that the King was not in a position to tax without explanation and to be able to levy and to spend without approval. And, Mr. Speaker, what really happened in this particular situation is that we violated that tradition.

So, I suggest to the honourable members opposite, the ball is in their court, they have three alternatives, Mr. Speaker. They can reject this, and if they do I would suggest that that is a black mark on their record. They can accept that, in which case if they do accept it, there will be an acknowledgment that there could have been an error, there may have been an error by the recognition that they should not be put in any position nor should any other government be put in a position that this should happen again. And if the amendment's accepted, it would not.

Thirdly, they can try and rationalize the position, and in the course of rationalizing the position basically say that there should be something else but not **what** the Honourable Member for Morris is proposing. If they do that, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that's a sign of immaturity on their part. Yes, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is a sign that they are not prepared. --(Interjection)-- No. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I have stood up and heard him say time and time and time again ad nauseam of the fact that we are the people's representatives, of the fact that this is the form in which the people of Manitoba are represented, of the fact that this is the place where the people of Manitoba will have decisions made. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the honourable member he can continue to talk like this all he wants. When faced with a situation that a breach occurs of a basic tradition that has existed in the House of Commons, existed in every provincial legislature and the government says that, well you know, we can rationalize this, we don't have to take your advice, we're not concerned. Mr. Speaker, then I say to him, what he really means when he talks about the people is that he is the people, they are the people, they are the government, they know what to do, we have no function whatsoever to perform. And, Mr. Speaker, I again apply the test of reasonableness at this time. I just simply ask the honourable members opposite, how can they justify their action on any basis of reasonableness. They can't. They can argue it. I'm not suggesting that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can't apply his ingenuity and his debating skills to try to argue a position, but I want to tell you that I don't think that he really believes that he can justify his position; he can argue it, he maybe able to win a debating point, but he can't justify it. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was on this side and we were on the other side and we attempted to do what they did, he would be on his feet screaming and pounding his desk and demanding the change; and as a matter of fact he would introduce the same amendments that the Honourable Member from Morris did. And I think everyone in this House knows that to be the case.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, to the government, and I say this to them in all sincerity, the decision will be theirs because they have a majority in this House. It is really a question of whether they intend to act like a mature government or not. And it really will be a reflection on them as to how they deal with what I think is a reasonable presentation and a reasonable amendment under the circumstances. And, Mr. Speaker, I will await, as well the members

BILL 47

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) opposite here, to hear what their response will be and to witness the vote that will take place, and the people will judge, Mr. Speaker, and the people will judge how reasonable they are, and the people will judge. And if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources believes in his heart that the course of action that they took - took is correct - then I must say, Mr. Speaker, it simply means that some of the opinion or part of the opinion of integrity that I sort of felt for the Honourable Minister will have altered. Because I cannot in all conscience believe that he as the one who considers himself the supreme parliamentarian on the other side can in all honesty justify in his own mind a decision to do something which is contrary to tradition. Now we recognize that rules are to be altered, we recognize that we are in a changing society, but this is pretty basic, Mr. Speaker, because you know it can happen in that situation, and so long as the power is there it can happen in other situations, and so long as the power is there it can happen in things that could be held in secret but within the Cabinet, and as a matter of fact the Order-in-Council could be signed and it could be given to the Lieutenant-Governor and it may not be produced in the regular office for several days. And it can be held back.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that government with respect to financial matters when the House is sitting should be acting this way. I don't think they believe themselves that they should be acting this way. So again I say on the issue itself, the issue is really a question of a test of reasonableness, whether the government acted reasonable under the circumstances, whether the authority was there or not. --(Interjection)-- Yes the test is reasonable. And there's no way, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no way that the First Minister can argue that that test of reasonableness has been met by the government. --(Interjection)-- Well, I, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Honourable First Minister there's absolutely no way that you could justify it. Absolutely no way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: There is nothing, there is no way, Mr. Speaker -- you can politically stand up and you can debate it as the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would, or as the First Minister would, and you can try and present the best presentation and the best position but, Mr. Speaker, there's no way they can. They know, they know damn well, Mr. Speaker, that what they've done has been unparliamentary. --(Interjection)-- Yes, oh yes they know, they know damn well, Mr. Speaker, that they've breached a tradition. And Mr. Speaker, they are upset by it. But the problem at this point, the problem, Mr. Speaker, -- well the Honourable Member for Radisson may not be upset with it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just have a note and I guess I can depart from my speech to indicate that the Government has been defeated. The Federal Government has been defeated. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what day the election is nor do I know what the Prime Minister will be doing. Where was I?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes left.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I think that the defeat of the Federal Government is important. The Honourable Member for Radisson was you know following his usual procedure of saying something from his seat and - well mumbling from his seat and sort of bellowing. You know I don't know how much concern he has for what took place. I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the honourable members opposite, that as a caucus ever discussed this, I wonder if they, you know, at any point asked the government, you know, are you not breaching tradition. I wondered if there was a consensus among all of them that what the government was doing was correct. I wonder if they even knew about it before it happened. --(Interjection)-- Well the First Minister acknowledges that they did know, and I assume that they knew in advance of what was happening.

A MEMBER: . . . so that we could pay the bills, we wanted . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the bills did not have to be paid for a week from the time that that was passed. And yes, Mr. Speaker, the bills did not have to be paid before that. The bills had three, four days to be paid. We were conscious . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I must say that we on this side were as conscious as the government as to when the bills had to be paid. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, we were aware when the bills had to be paid. We knew what the rules . . .

BILL 47

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am going to suggest if the honourable members want to have a conversation I can leave. Now we have two more minutes to go.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite may or may not be unaware but we determine the exact time, the exact moment when in fact would be the last moment before action would have to be undertaken by government. We're satisfied that the test of reasonableness if applied in this situation would not have justified the actions of the government. But government was angry, the government was angry at the members opposite and so what they did is they breached a parliamentary tradition. And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, you know is that reasonable, is that reasonable, is that reasonable because we exercise our prerogative under the rules. Really, Mr. Speaker, the government when it's had a majority has abused the committee system. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has acted almost in a dictatorial manner in certain occasions. Not only this year but in other years, he has exercised the authority that is his, they have used the majority when it satisfied them, they have altered and changed the rules and broken the traditions of the past. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the honourable members opposite can stand there and accuse me, accuse us falsely, particularly when the very reason that other governments have not used this, Mr. Speaker, is because of the fact that there has to be --(Interjection)-- The law did not prevent it.

A MEMBER: Your law.

MR. SPIVAK: Our law did not prevent it. You know we find this situation again. The Minister continually keeps blaming us for everything that they do. You know we're going to go through this over and over again. We're going to be blamed for this, Mr. Speaker, we're going to be blamed because the government had to act. I say the government acted because they're out of control, Mr. Speaker, because they couldn't discipline themselves and because of this they were getting sick and tired of hearing the complaints of the Opposition. Well that's our function, Mr. Speaker, to be able to present an opposition point of view.

And, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of what took place with respect to this particular matter, on the basis on which we handle ourselves, on the basis of the way the government handles itself I ask, apply the text of reasonableness and you'll find that we were correct and they were very wrong and we'll see how mature they are and whether they accept this amendment or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Radisson, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, the debate be adjourned. So ordered.

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday).