

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, July 11, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs could make some comment now with respect to the rather serious contention contained in the statement which I forwarded to him this morning contending that Telephone System was proceeding to attempt to confiscate, or I should say expropriate without compensation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity yet to read the whole of the document that was presented. I noted that statement in particular. I see no justification at all, Mr. Speaker, for the writers having taken that view or having given that indication that the Manitoba Telephone System intended to expropriate properties belonging to the Winnipeg licensees. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the statement is quite incorrect.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the larger question then of the entire text of the statement which runs to some 30 pages, approximately, issued by someone on behalf of the cablevision operators, can the Minister indicate whether he will be proceeding to the issuing of a statement which will attempt to deal with each of the particulars contained in that rather lengthy statement of accusation or contention?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I will ask for detailed comments from officials of my department and from the Crown corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the report of continuing unemployment in the Province of Manitoba, particularly among young people, I wonder if the Minister of Labour has examined whether there is still applications being made by agricultural firms and farmers in the province to import workers from out of the country, particularly from Mexico, during the summer growing season and whether that particular practice should be altered in view of the numbers of people in the province who are available for employment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. While the Minister is taking that question for notice, could she provide information as to whether there have already been applications made for working visas for agricultural workers in the province and also determine whether there is availability within these regions of people in the province, Manitobans, who would be available for that kind of work.

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

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that he is in present process of preparing amendments to the family law legislation that is before committee?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that asking for questions dealing with legislation is clearly not in order as is contained in Citation 171 of Beauchesne.
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance tell the House whether he has made any progress with the Federal Government with regard to the Federal Government assuming it's proper share of expenses concerning services to treaty Indians in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the meeting last night that completed with the Federal Minister of Indian Affairs and the President of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood and Manitoba Government, resulted in Mr. Faulkner, the Federal Minister of Indian Affairs, undertaking to prepare a formula by this fall which would take into account the costs that are being borne, or appear to be borne, by the Province of Manitoba and a formula which would also apparently contain a commitment by the Federal Government for development undertakings on the reserves. What the formula might contain is open to speculation at this time. It appears to be a step towards a recognition by the Federal Government that they do have obligations in this connection although they did not accept the full value of \$35 million that was estimated by the Provincial Government as being the cost of the services being provided by the province.

What the formula comes up with, I don't know. It will be open to discussion at that time and at least it appears to be moving in the direction of at least knowing what their position is as opposed to the former position where it was difficult to tell what their position was at all.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the same type of development has taken place over a period of perhaps some 15 years, with a continual erosion of federal fiscal responsibility for treaty Indians in the Province of Manitoba, would the Minister consider proposing to the Federal Government that the Province of Manitoba act as agent for the Federal Government for delivery of all services to Indian people within this province on the same basis as to other Manitobans and that there be a fiscal equivalent made available to the province to provide these services so that there would be no further erosion of federal responsibility for provision of finances for treaty Indians in this province?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, effectively that's what was said to the federal people that the Province of Manitoba did not object to delivering the services through the education and health facilities and other facilities of the province, provided that the Federal Government did recognize its responsibility under The Indian Act, I think it's Section 88 of The Indian Act, that it was their responsibility and that the province was reimbursed, that we were prepared to deliver the services provided that they were prepared to meet the financial obligations incurred.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Speaking to your ruling that my question was not in order, I would wish to refer you, Mr. Speaker, to a recollection which I have from last June, 1977, certainly not reflecting upon the then Speaker, the present Member for Kildonan, but I seem to recall that you, I believe, Mr. Speaker, or a colleague of yours, while you were sitting as the Member for Birtle-Russell, asking myself a question pertaining to amendments, whether they were being prepared for submission to the committee that was then sitting on family law and whether those amendments were in fact being reviewed by attorneys outside the department. I believe I responded to the question at that time, Mr. Speaker, so that I would simply ask that you take that under review, examine Hansard as to whether or not that very same form of question was not dealt with last June of 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WAER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on that particular point of order, I just simply want to comment, Sir, that my honourable friend, the Member for Kildonan, was very meticulous

about the kind of questions that he permitted during the course of the Question Period. I don't want to reflect on anything that he may have done, but the ruling is very very clear in Beauchesne which simply says, and I again refer my honourable friend to Citation 171, subsection H(h), which lists a number of questions which are forbidden during the daily Question Period and one of them is: "to seek information about proceedings in a committee which has not yet made its report to the House." I think my honourable friend's question falls squarely within the rule that forbids this kind of question to be asked at this time of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, over the past week or so, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has been asking a number of questions concerning an alleged type of pollution in Lake Winnipeg and I'm happy to report that my departmental people were in the area last Friday to investigate that particular problem. They report that the difficulty is as a result of an unusually early growth of filamentous algae and mucous from Chironomidae eggs, commonly known as midges. They consider this as a result of warm weather. This sort of occurrence usually happens later in July. They do not consider it to be connected with any particular point source of pollution. I think my honourable colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs, may have something to add with respect to the possible impact this would have on fisheries. .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the Attorney-General. My question is whether or not he is correctly reported in today's newspapers to the effect that amendments will be prepared pertaining to the committee hearings dealing with family law?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I refer the honourable member to Citation 171(e) where it says that it is clearly improper to inquire whether statements made in a newspaper are true.

Orders of the Day — the Honourable Meer for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Environment or perhaps his colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Can either Minister give an indication as to whether or not the particular substance that has been discovered in the waters of Lake Winnipeg has had any bearing on the drastic reduction in catch of the fishermen in the south basin this spring?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, our department has again gone through the same routine that we did about a week ago, and we have not located fishermen who are complaining as such about the algae. We do have some who are saying that the catch is somewhat less this year than last year, but it is a matter of record that last year was a record year in that particular fishing part of the province, and this year the counts that we have indicate that part of the time throughout the fishing season, that if the catch was to increase accordingly and double, that it would end up being very similar to previous year's catch. The algae itself is not as bad as it was in 1976 when they were told to pull their nets and move to another particular area, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister and his staff not aware that the fishing season on the south basin is now completed, and many of the fishermen on the south basin had to pull up their nets early because they just weren't catching the fish. Mr. Speaker, I believe they are very concerned, they believe that there is some connection between the material that is found in the water and the drastic reduction in their catch, and I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs and his colleague, the Minister responsible for the Environment, could look at this situation very carefully to see if there is definitely a connection between the two, and what can be done in the future to alleviate this problem?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day — the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, we have found nothing unusual that would relate to the catch, so I really can't say that we can do any more than we have particularly done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question flows from a Canadian Press report from Ottawa this morning. Can the First Minister indicate whether he has received an invitation with a specific date or dates from the Prime Minister relative to the convening of a First Ministers' Conference September 13th - 15th inclusive, and if so, can the First Minister indicate here whether he intends that a paper really indicating Manitoba's position relative to the constitutional proposals would be made public or available some week or weeks in advance of September 13th?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, we did receive this week a communication from the Prime Minister's office suggesting tentatively a conference of First Ministers for the week, I believe it is of September 11th, with a further suggestion that it might be the 13th to the 15th. We're in communication with his office as I imagine other premiers are with respect to perhaps an earlier date that week but some time centering around that time, I expect that the meeting will take place.

With respect to the second portion of his question as to when a position paper will be put forward, having regard to the position of Manitoba on the draft bill, I can't really give him a firm date on that. To some extent, we will be wanting to complete the series of meetings which have already begun. My colleague, the Attorney-General, attended a meeting in Saskatoon last week with the Attorneys-General first of all of Western Canada and then of the Ministers responsible for the Constitution from all of the other provinces. A distillation of that opinion will be of help to us in ascertaining some of the viewpoints that we will want to put forward in the Manitoba brief.

Further to that, of course, the premiers will be meeting the 9th to the 12th, I believe it is, of August in Regina and following upon that meeting, when we have the opportunity for formal and informal discussion, that will have a bearing as well upon some of the attitudes that are already being formulated. In the meantime, the staff are working on the draft proposals that the Prime Minister has laid before the House of Commons, the Joint Committee of the Federal House, of the Senate and the House of Commons, has been established, and with the input that will be available from all of these sources, we will then be in a better position to be formulating a position for the government and the people of Manitoba. But as to when that final position paper will be available, I can't really tell him at this moment.

MR. SCHREYER: Could the Premier indicate, based either on what he feels to be certain knowledge or impression, whether the meeting on the constitutional proposals will be on the constitutional proposals generally and in their total spectrum, or whether they will be dealing principally, if not exclusively, with the question of the so-called House of Federation, the expanded Supreme Court and the entrenchment of language rights through a Bill of Rights.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without having the communication in front of me from the Prime Minister's office, I would hesitate to answer my honourable friend's question definitively. However, what I will do is obtain that and subject to the usual requirements of approval, I'd be happy to table it, let my honourable friend see the most recent correspondence or Telex on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I assured the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that I would advise him as to what measures are being undertaken by my department to look after patients in hospitals that were affected by the federal nursing slowdown. The two hospitals were Norway House and Percy Moore Hospital in Hodgson. I can report to the honourable member, Sir, that Norway House Hospital is down to six patients now and Percy Moore Hospital in Hodgson down to two, the reason being that the patient loads in both those hospitals have been transferred, some to the personal care home in Norway House and the rest to hospitals in Teulon, Gimli, Arborg, Eriksdale and the Children's Centre in Winnipeg.

In the two hospitals still operating with six and two patients respectively, each has three designated nurses on duty plus three alternates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate if there will be medical staff available for emergency service at these hospital locations and/or will the Provincial Government be providing an emergency service through the Patient Air Transportation Program to these communities, particularly the community of Norway House which is rather remote, as well as the

communities served by remote nursing stations?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the designated nurses and the alternates that I mentioned in those two hospitals there are also LPNs on duty and directors of nursing in each hospital. In the main, emergency cases have been removed from those two hospitals and transferred by the Northern Air Patient Transportation Service or other reasonable means to the hospitals that I had mentioned.

In the five nursing stations, which are also , affected, there is one designated nurse on duty at each one of those stations assigned to looking after emergencies. Now some of those emergencies have been sent home or sent to the nearest hospital but where they can be attended by the designated nurse they are being treated in those nursing stations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, the First Minister accepted as notice a question as to whether the Provincial Government would be supplying transportation to the construction workers who had volunteered their time to assist in the rebuilding program at Aubigny. Mr. Speaker, I can report that the Emergency Measures Organization, through the Rural Municipality, has made arrangements for a bus this morning to transport workers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: I want to thank the Honourable Attorney-General for the information. Can he indicate whether the bus will be going all week or just for today?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can't indicate the exact extent of the transportation assistance. I assume that it will be carried on for as long as the workers wish to volunteer their efforts in the rebuilding program.\$

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had lost too much weight that you couldn't see me. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that the session is now sitting, is it the intention, and for the information and clarification of the member, is it the intention of the Attorney-General to repeat the statement that he has made outside the House, that is, that his government is preparing amendments to the marital bills?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that matter will be discussed in the very thorough and exhaustive committee meetings that we are presently holding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance in regard to the federal responsibility for services to treaty Indians. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House whether there is still a continuing committee of officials from the Provincial Government and the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood that are preparing and dealing with the factual information on this and some preliminary discussion between the province and the MIB in regard to this matter. Is there still such a continuing committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, after the preparation of the formula that has been suggested by the Federal Government, the committee of officials is to again go at working on the formula, and presumably it is going to take most of the rest of 1978 before we come to anything final, if in fact we reach some sort of final agreement.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether or not there was a joint approach, whether there was agreement between the province and the MIB as to what position would be put forward to the Federal Minister. Was there a basic agreement on that matter for the meeting yesterday?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, it would depend on specifically what item is being referred to. If it's with regard to the final formula, there's agreement by Manitoba and by the MIB that the Alberta formula will not apply in Manitoba, will not work in Manitoba, so it has to be something different than that.

On the question of the size of the amount of cost being borne by the province, namely the \$35 million figure, the MIB president has questioned that amount although his staff worked with the staff of the Manitoba and the Federal Government in developing that figure but there appears to be some question on their part as to the actual amount.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate, of the \$35 million that the province feels that the Federal Government has neglected to live up to its responsibility for, I wonder if the Federal Minister indicated how many million dollars he did see as his responsibility and whether or not it is still the position of the province that if the province in fact recovers some of this \$35 million that has been lost over the years, whether or not some of that money will be used for economic development on the reserves in Manitoba.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is part of the proposal that the Federal Government is wanting to integrate into its proposed formula but the exact nature of the proportioning of the amount that goes into a development on the reserves is still open to question and would likely come up for discussion at the time of the production of the formula.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Over two months ago the Minister undertook to determine whether in fact government departments, agencies or Crown corporations had received identical bids for cement. Can the Minister now inform the members of the House if he has got an answer to that matter that I raised two months ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the collection and relating of the statistics required by the question from the Member for Transcona is still going on. I am getting responses from various departments of government. There are a considerable number of requests for information still outstanding but I assure the member that the preparation of the answer to his question is underway and that it will be announced as quickly as it is available.

Mr. Speaker, while I have this opportunity, I could respond to a question from the Member for Transcona of, I believe Thursday, July 6th, when he asked a question and a supplementary question which flowed from a recent decision of the Supreme Court denying the appeal of a landlord in Winnipeg in respect to the repayment of rents which had been collected and that were considered to be above the guidelines.

I can tell the member, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of the landlord involved, the Rent Review Agency will be requesting from the landlord a list of all rebates owed to the tenants and to the former tenants. The list will indicate which rebates have not been paid and why, and where the rebate has not been paid because the tenant has moved and cannot be located the landlord will have to satisfy the agency that he has made every reasonable attempt to locate the individual. The rebate will remain unsatisfied and should the person eventually approach the agency about non-payment by the landlord, the landlord will be advised and if necessary enforcement action will be taken.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that all rebates are calculated correctly, the agency will request from the landlord copies of his records which will be checked for accuracy. If the landlord does not comply with the rebate orders or rebates are not being made properly, a rent review officer will investigate and issue appropriate orders for rent refunds and adjustments.

There was also, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question relating to the total amount of rebates that were outstanding and I can tell the member that it has been the practice of the agency to follow up on their orders on a test basis and to receive complaints from tenants where the refunds have not been made. Through this activity the agency is aware of orders respecting 1,891 units for a total refund value of \$318,314.01. This is the amount that has not been complied with. In each instance, legal action has either commenced or is in the process of being started to assure satisfaction of the orders.

Of the total number of orders quoted, 1,849 relate to two landlords who are responsible for payments totaling \$311,184.00. In these two cases, a method of repayment has been arranged and tenants will begin receiving their refunds shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister for his information. As a supplementary, I was wondering if he would be willing to consider the advisability of having the rent rebate due to tenants who have moved and presently can't be located, held in trust by the Rentalsman rather than held by the landlord, and if in fact the tenant can't be located that the money should remain in trust with the tenant, because frankly according to the guidelines of the Rent Review Agency that certainly isn't the property of the landlord. It is the property of the tenant and if they can't find the tenant, couldn't it be held in trust in the rentalsman office and after some time used for some purpose, possibly funding the Tenants Associations.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, we will certainly consider that suggestion from the Member for Transcona.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. I asked him a question the other day concerning the possibility of additional funding for Manitoba's cultural organizations, which seem to be in some difficulty, and the Minister replied about more campsites and more horse racing. Could the Minister comment on the narrower question of funding for cultural organizations and indicate whether he sees any possibility that the Art Gallery, the Museum, etc., might be given greater support from the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned several days ago when I was asked some questions by members opposite with regards to the funding of cultural groups and cultural organizations, I said that my office doors were open. I was willing to meet with any one of them. However, I must point out that because of certain restraints put on not only cultural groups, on different departments of government and different agencies of government, and in order to effect a little belt tightening and a little bit of economy we have treated the arts groups in a very similar and fair manner related to what the policies of the government are.

MR. DOERN: Then I would ask the Minister whether in his \$600,000 advertising campaign in the United States, whether he is featuring these same cultural organizations and using it as a basis of attracting tourists to Manitoba?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the \$600,000 figure and it is a rounded-off figure, represents the tourist promotion and the different things involved with festival funding and other things, so if the member is trying to say that is exclusively the amount that we are spending in the United States for advertising, that is indeed not a fact, because there is other tourist promotions that are involved in that. But with regard to advertising Winnipe as a place to come for arts and that, yes, we are including that in there, we have a very fine Museum, we have a very fine Art Gallery, and we have some other things happening such as last weekend out at the Festivals Manitoba we gave the Folk Festival in Birds Hill a small grant from the province. I understand there were very many people from outside of the province, so those functions are continuing and continuing to draw tourists to the province.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, again I would ask the Minister whether in view of the obvious promotional benefits of featuring our cultural organizations, whether he doesn't find it contradictory that while on one hand he is trumpeting their benefits, which all of us agree with; on the other hand their programs are being cut and their hours are restricted so that they are not fully available to either the local citizens or to American tourists?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the deficit which was announced by the Finance Minister the other day, in light of the restricted amount of funds that are available for the running of different — whether it be government agencies or external agencies — we feel that we have treated them fairly and we hope that within the guidelines of the finances that we have given them, they can carry on the duties which they wish to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

Tuesday, July 11, 1978

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister to whom Government Air reports. On Friday last the Minister indicated that his department could review the possibility of basing the MU2 in Thompson for the duration of the nursing employee-employer dispute, so that it would be immediately available to those communities with reduced nursing staff. Can the Minister now indicate as to what that decision, whether it has been made and if it has been made, as to what it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: No decision has been made, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Last week the Minister undertook to contact the Attorney-General's Department to ascertain whether her department's interpretation of cases of alleged blacklisting by Winnipeg employers was supported by the Attorney-General's Department. Can the Minister indicate now to the House the result of her efforts in that regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I did contact the Attorney-General's Office and I am just awaiting his reply. I should have it by tomorrow.

MR. COWAN: Thank you. A supplementary to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister report to the House as to the number of labour and management disputes that are currently involved with the Conciliation Services of the Department of Labour?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the number of work stoppages and amount of people out of work was all in the paper on Monday, I believe it was, or Saturday. I could get a copy of it for you if you would like.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question to the Minister was not the number of work stoppages, but as to how many of those work stoppages are currently and actively involved with the Conciliation Services of her department.

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. In view of the fact that he has ceased publication of Manitoba Moods could he advise those subscribers holding unexpired portions of subscriptions to the magazine as to their status, particularly with respect to refund or whatever plans the Minister may have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the staff is now in the process of refunding the unused portion of those particular subscriptions.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, could the Honourable Minister advise the House as to the future of Manitoba Moods. I believe that he had indicated that he is negotiating with private publishers for the continuation of it.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we are negotiating with some private publishers who have showed some interest in maybe printing The Manitoba Moods. It would of course be in a different form. because they would not be able to subsidize it to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars over three years, but we are negotiating. In the meantime it has been a decision to reimburse the people who have unused parts of subscriptions and those refunds will be out in the mail very shortly.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Whatever negotiations it is that the Minister is engaged in, is he also negotiating or attempting to negotiate the sale of the subscription list to the magazine?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I know there are certain negotiations going on with regard to some people who are interested in it. At this point in time, I can't give an answer on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can the Honourable Minister inform us of the current wage disputes, how many of these wage disputes between management and labour are utilizing the Conciliation Services of her department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I had misunderstood the Member for Churchill. I have three going on right now; the Trades, the Brewery, and the Safeway, the Retail Clerks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, in view of the allegations or the suggestions of a great reduction in the Civil Service, could the Minister of Labour explain information obtained from Statistics Canada, Provincial Government Employment, Public Finance Division Section, which states that as at March, 1978, the number of civil servants, and that includes everybody I am advised, in the Province of Manitoba, is 14,192, whereas at March, 1977, the number of civil servants was 14,090, an increase of 102 civil servants from March 1977, to March 1978.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, not having read the paper that the Member is referring to, I'll have to read it and I'll take it as notice.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was quoting from Statistics Canada, M.C. Roberts, Provincial Government Employment. The figures that I give do not appear on the paper; the figures that I gave were telephoned to our caucus research director by the person named in the Statistics Canada paper. So I am giving you the source; you can check it. It shows 100 civil servants more under the Conservative administration as at March 1977, as against March 1978. Now I say that they were —(Interjection)— Yes, a big farce, the pink slips, that's right. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please.

The time for questioning having expired, we'll proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a change on Statutory Regulations and Orders. The Member for Transcona to be replaced by the Member for Churchill; Mr. Parasiuk for Mr. Cowan —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that the Member for Transcona be replaced by the Member for Churchill. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Call Bill No. 57, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 57. The Honourable Member for St. Johns. The honourable member has 29 minutes.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I spoke for the ten minutes that I did at the end of this morning's session, I reviewed my own position, which in some cases was contradictory because of my background and my interests and concerns. I also questioned the attitude of the the Conservatives, in that in 1972 they voted against an effort to review and research and study the entire question. I suggested that it was of value so to do. I say that in 1972, the Conservatives acted as if this were a political issue, they made it a political issue. They were

to attempt to create dissention in the NDP, and there was disagreement in the NDP. They appeared to be one solid force, one solid group with one belief, and they weren't, Mr. Speaker.

This year the Minister of Education has presented his bill as if to make it appear that the members of the Conservative caucus are in agreement, Mr. Speaker, I am sure they are not. They are certainly in agreement with this bill, which according to their own words, does nothing, because all this bill does is to legalize what they say has been done up to now and therefore they are making no real change in what has been, and saying what will be. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative caucus is not in agreement on the question of shared services; there is not the slightest doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that there is disagreement in the Conservative caucus as between the extent of and the principle of support of private and parochial schools.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that at least amongst the NDP, when we disagree, it shows up very quickly, but when the Conservatives are working, it gives an impression that they are all solid and in agreement on the principles of shared services and on the principles of aid to private schools. —(Interjection)— For example, Mr. Speaker, as usual the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is making speeches from his seat. I will venture, Mr. Speaker, without having discussed it with him, to indicate I believe that he is not in favor of aid to private schools. —(Interjection)— Now, he doesn't care what I believe, he said, Mr. Speaker. Well, having quoted him to that respect and knowing very well that he has never really cared very much what some of us think, I really shouldn't spend any time on him, and I won't, Mr. Speaker. I will really spend time on my own concerns and ignore that of members opposite having already voiced my impression that they are not in agreement on the question of aid to private schools, and that this bill to them is meaningless, because it doesn't really make any changes. That is the picture —(Interjection)—

It is suggested that the former Member for Charleswood, Mr. Moug, is the one who is the most concerned on behalf of private schools. I don't really remember that that's the case, but so be it. Mr. Speaker, this is too serious a subject for me to be distracted or to jest about it. I do want to deal with my concern about it.

I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to refer to the speech I made back in 1964, something over 13 years ago, 14 years ago, and I spoke then about the importance of what has been termed the cultural mosaic in Canada, it has been termed as a tapestry within Canada, it has been termed in many ways to describe the multicultural background of the peoples of Canada. I indicated that I believe that the only hope for survival in the world as civilized beings lies in the education and the mutual understanding of peoples of a community, of a province, of a country, and of a world, and that we must concern ourselves with the manner in which our children will be educated and the nature of their learning process.

Because I indicated that since I believe that our youth is the most important natural resource of our country, that we must recognize that the problem of its education must be dealt with by a united community consisting of people of goodwill whose major objective is to bring about in our children a recognition of the important values and truths of communal life and to recreate an even more strongly united community.

And I suggested that the greatest contribution that any citizen can make to his fellow citizen is to bring to them a full knowledge, a pride and respect for those factors — the culture, the language, the traditions of his forefathers — which have made the man what he is today. I said that the future of Manitoba and of Canada lies in our ability to become aware of each other's contribution to our society, and thus to be united in mutual respect and understanding.

As I've already indicated, the people of this province have brought to it diverse and exciting cultures, beautiful traditions and proud and respectful history, and these ethnic identifications must not be forgotten by their descendants. I believe that strongly, Mr. Speaker.

The knowledge, the respect, the love of each for his own background, is of little use, however, if he cannot share it with his neighbors, and I did not believe in 1964, I do not believe now that we have yet accomplished that purpose, and that we are not yet a community of mutual interests, of mutual understanding and mutual respect. I indicated this morning that I believe that many of the biases and prejudices that we had 20, 30, 40 years ago we still have and I don't think we have been successful in melding together the peoples of our province to understand and to respect each other because of our differences in cultural, educational and historic and religious background. I believe that is a very serious thing. I felt that we had a long way to go; I believe we have not gone very far since the time I spoke about it.

We talked about the public school system; we talked about the values of the separate and the private schools; and I said then that I hoped that we will never have to choose between the potential extreme of one lukewarm, unimaginative, colourless but united people in this province, and colourful, educated, ghettoized groups who have learned to look on each other as strangers whose ways are foreign to them, and whose backgrounds are unacceptable and suspicious. And I suggested that

the ideal public school system is potentially the only educational system which can be developed to offer to the children of this province those values of understanding and of mutual respect which permit freedom of association, freedom of belief, freedom of speech and freedom of religion in a manner which can unite all of our children of all backgrounds, faiths, colours, accents, inflections and gestures, into that symphony or that tapestry made up of citizens who will work together to build our country and to make a contribution to a healthier society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at that time, 1964, after Duff Roblin had introduced the subject of shared services, I said that I had no particular faith in the feasibility of a shared services program, which was offered in Duff Roblin's resolution. I believe that it was only a compromise to appease the conscience of those who think that minorities are being discriminated against, and a compromise to appease the demands of those who claim discrimination.

However, I did state that I believe that the statements enunciated as the three general principles in the resolution — which I have already referred to this morning — the separation of church and state; the provision of taxpayers' money for the Public School System; and the right of people to attend the school of their choosing at their expense, if not that of the Public School, that these are morally correct.

I felt, Mr. Speaker, that the public school system was the most important educational instrument in Manitoba, and was vital for the continuation of it. I pointed out that the contradictions in my own mind which exist today, and I suppose will stay with me for the rest of my life, are there, but that in discussing what we do about it I had to reconcile what I believed about the positive values of the private school with what I had to say about the need for the paramount recognition of the public school system. I didn't find it easy, I don't find it easy, and I don't think there's an easy answer. But I believe that both are very important, and that they are no more in contradiction than is our life in our civilization today, and of the lives of all people who reject the status quo in the hope and the expectation that they can work and build together for the improvements in the attitude of peoples to each other.

And, Mr. Speaker, to me that carries forward in almost every phase of our life and in almost every part of the work we do in this Legislature. There are many of us who are not satisfied with the status quo in our society, in our economic life, in many aspects of life in Manitoba and in the world, and we must always, if we don't accept the status quo, recognize what is the status quo, attempt to improve on it without destroying what we have built that is of value, and the same is what I believe in regard to the public school system.

Mr. Speaker, at that time, 1964, I sort of envisioned what might be the dream, the dream ideal, and I said that I would like to think that our educational system could be improved to the extent where, within the public school system itself, it could provide its pupils not only with the attitude, the truth, and the knowledge which it is today imparting, but in addition give to the children an understanding of, and respect for, the religions of all the peoples that make up our society, and an understanding of, and respect for, the cultural, historical, and traditional backgrounds of these same people. I said then, and I say now, that I'd like to think that it were possible that our public school system would provide facilities, after regular school hours, for private ancillary schools to teach the students the languages of their own forefathers, and even more important than the languages, the history, the tradition and the culture of their own people.

And yet, if the public school facilities are used in this way, all students are still members of the same public school, and meet together during the school day in the common interest of furthering their education. I said then, "This may be a dream, but it is one for which I would like to feel that I would have company in attempting to make of it a reality." And I said, that to the extent that a shared-services program will not be a thin edge for the wedge of anyone who wishes aid to private schools, it occurred to me that it may yet prove to be the thin edge for the wedge of an expanded program of our public educational institution, which will give full recognition to the value of our pluralistic society, and for that reason, in 1964, I voted for the resolution.

Some years later, in 1972, there was a great deal of discussion and demand that there be further recognition to the private school system in terms of aid. In the interval I found that the NDP government, of which I was a member, had inherited an agreement which seemed not to be in accord with Duff Roblin's principles. Where Duff Roblin had said that the education had to be within the public school when he said that it was not to aid private schools but rather to provide a facility to the students of the private schools to come into the public school, that through a legal interpretation we found that there were private schools that for part of the day became a public school, according to the law, and thus became entitled to aid. Now although I must admit I was not happy, at the same time I accepted that legal interpretation.

But in 1972 all of that was discussed in this Chamber and there was an effort made that the whole question be studied and reviewed. I was sorry that it didn't pass. I voted that it should, not that I wanted aid to private schools but I wanted discussion, I would have wanted discussion today around the table hearing delegations discussing with people. But that was denied us by some

on our side and by the vast majority on the Conservative side and that didn't happen. So what went on was what had gone on and it appears that it was a legalistic interpretation that made that possible and I, for one, did not fight it too strongly.

Mr. Speaker, I had started out hoping, but not convinced, but hoping that Duff Roblin's shared services concept would somehow bring students together, would make it more possible for them to work together, to come into the same school environment, to work side by side at those subjects that were not peculiar to a private school or religious school atmosphere, and would thus start to impart more of each other's background to each other so that there would be this kind of realization of the dream I described. I also hoped that our whole public school system, led by our Department of Education, would adapt to that need in a pluralistic society such as we have and start working towards a greater understanding. Mr. Speaker, I came to the reluctant conclusion very very slowly — and I don't like the word conclusion because I still have hope — that it was not progressing to any great extent.

Earlier in this session, just after the T.V. shows dealing with the Holocaust where so many Jews and non-Jews were slaughtered by a planned, deliberate act of government in Europe, I questioned as to what was being taught about that, and the Minister said, "Oh, yes, it's part of a course." Mr. Speaker, since then I have tried to find out how much a part of a course it was and, Mr. Speaker, it's really meaningless if one would recognize the importance of that kind of teaching that ought to go on being taught amongst children of school age in a public school environment where they have to know more about each other's problems and background.

I think it's kind of sad that the Jewish school, where the people still remember the impact of the Holocaust on themselves, teaches a great deal about it and they really don't need to know that much about it to understand themselves or their neighbours, but the non-Jewish schools don't really have very much of that aspect. Saying that, I recognize that one of the members here mentioned something about Northern Ireland and the struggles that have been going on there for years and I have to tell you I don't believe that in the Jewish schools they teach very much about the history and the problems that have occurred in the religious wars that took place in Northern Ireland. And I think that's sad and I think the public school systems are failures in that respect and are not doing a proper job.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I have, again, that ambivalence of feeling well, maybe we need the private schools to at least give each of the children an understanding for himself for his own self-respect and for his own knowledge, that which they are not getting in the public schools. So I must admit, Mr. Speaker, I've gone through a disappointing period of time reviewing this.

At the same time, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that within the Jewish community, which I know best, there are two types of schools. There is the religious school and there is the non-religious secular school. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Jewish community and in my time a leader in the Jewish community, I tried very hard to bring those two schools together, to see to it that when they taught subjects of common interest, English, Arithmetic, Geography, whatever other subjects there were on the public school curriculum that were taught in those two schools, that they at least combined for those purposes so that their kids will sit together in the same classroom, will learn together in the same classroom and when one wanted to teach something about the religious aspects that the other was not involved in that they would separate during those hours of the day and have alternate classes.

It never worked, Mr. Speaker. You know, it broke down on one occasion because the religious school would not agree that their children who were required to wear the skull cap should not sit in the same classroom with children who were not required to wear a skull cap, because they said that that would do some irreparable damage to the children who saw that one was required to wear what another wasn't. To me that was ludicrous but the fact is that, to my knowledge, there is still no intention of those two school systems working together in those areas where they could work together and in spite of the fact that they are undergoing tremendous financial hardship, and they are, Mr. Speaker. They are suffering and they are the ones who no doubt would appear before a committee dealing with this shared services and say, "We need the money; we want the money; we're entitled to the money; we are taxpayers." They will use all those arguments and there is no question about it they are short of money, but when it comes to the savings of money that would have been possible had they worked together in certain common interests they didn't do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I don't find it amongst the members of the Jewish community themselves maybe I'm naive to expect to see it within the public school system, and amongst the people of Manitoba generally, to try and get the children to sit together and work together in those subjects where there is no conflict of their interests.

So, Mr. Speaker, my dream has not been realized and it may yet, although I'm much more cynical now than I was then. On the other hand, I don't want to exaggerate the harm and the danger of the growth of the private and public school system. I think it's unfortunate. I think that the public school system must be paramount but I recognize that there are other provinces in Canada, I think

almost every other province in Canada has a much greater assistance to private and parochial schools, and I don't think that their graduates are that much worse than we are. Of course, they must be worse than we are, but they can't be that much worse than we are here. I don't think that it's the end of the world. I don't think this bill before us is the end of the world. What I do feel is that we're not getting the full picture because we know the Minister of Education is in favour of aid to private schools, the Minister of Highways is in favour of aid to private schools, the Minister without Portfolio, no longer responsible for the Task Force, for the non-existing Task Force, is in favour of aid to private schools, or says he is, but I accept that he says he is, so he is.

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't know about the rest of the Conservative caucus, but it may well be that this is indeed — as the member for Inkster has said and the Meer for Logan — maybe this is a further driving of the wedge and I, for one, want to continue my efforts, which have not been very successful, of trying to see improvement in the public school system.

Mr. Speaker, I must not complete my talk without recognizing that I think we have had tremendous improvement in our public school system in other respects. I think our program in the community, Community Schools Program; I think our program amongst the native children, amongst children who are newcomers to the country, has been extremely good. I think that our school system has improved tremendously, but not in respect to the aspects that I have been describing today. And for that I am indeed sorry, seriously sorry. I can only look forward to more discussion and that is discussion I would like to have seen as I did want to in 1972.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared just to accept the fact that we are now being told that what was done up to now is not legal, so we are going to make it legal. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. If it was legal as I assumed it was, then it was happening in accordance with the law. If it was not legal, Mr. Speaker, then I wouldn't make it legal just to appease the minds of anybody who are concerned as to the legality of it. I want to see a positive reason and that positive reason has not been forthcoming, except from those who want aid to private schools. Well, Mr. Speaker, I knew in advance once they said they wanted aid to private schools, that anything they do to make legal the giving is obvious. That doesn't satisfy me, Mr. Speaker. I want to hear from people who are not in favour of aid to private schools, who are in favour of the Duff Roblin theory, where he espoused these principles, who believe in those, and who say that I am in favour of that bill. Because then I will hear some rationale between what I consider is a break away from the Roblin principles as enunciated by Roblin in 1964 and preceded the enactment of our present legislation, a complete break away from that and still the support for this bill. Because this bill indeed does contradict what Duff Roblin said, and if it does that without a proper review, with a proper consideration — and I would think so important a matter that it really ought to be a matter, I suppose, for an inter-sessional committee to discuss this openly and broadly — then let's know what we are doing. Let's not be dragged in or pushed in to a change, a radical change, from the legislation that was enacted under the pretense that we are only making legal what was not legal before.

I am not even sure that it wasn't legal before. I have a feeling that The Public Schools Act said that a school division may rent premises from another organization for part or all of a day or a year, and it thus becomes a public school. I am not sure that these agreements are not legal. I never looked at it in great depth, but I suspect that they were legal. But now we are being told they weren't legal, so let's make it legal. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Highways called out a moment ago and said, "You won't hear people agreeing with Duff Roblin, supporting this bill and justifying their support, and explaining the contradiction between their agreement with Duff Roblin and their support of a bill which clearly recognizes a break from the principles established by Duff Roblin." Mr. Speaker, until that happens, I will remain unsatisfied. If it happens I don't know that I will be particularly happy, because nobody can be happy about the problems that are so vexatious and the entire question of the separation of teaching facilities based on the separation of our children because of religion, ethnic origin, or whatever separates them. Or elitism as does occur in the case of some of the schools that have no real difference from the public school except they claim the quality of their teaching is greater, but don't have any particular ethnic, cultural or religious difference or special interest.

So it is not a very happy situation and it is one which I don't like to see slide through as it is about to slide through, because the Conservative caucus has probably threatened the whole thing out and know where they are going. So I am not happy with that and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to support them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: I wondered if the honourable member would accept a question. The speech will come. Was the honourable member a member of Cabinet when the previous government approved shared services agreements for services outside the public school system? Perhaps the member

dealt with it before 12:30, when I wasn't here.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I dealt with it after 2:30. I dealt with it while the member was sitting there. I said that I was aware that these agreements which were inherited from the Roblin or the Weir, whatever it is, administration, were continued by the present government. But unlike some of the Ministers opposite, I will not discuss what went on in Cabinet. Although there are Ministers opposite who are prepared to discuss what went on in our Cabinet, I am not prepared to do that. Does that answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate clearly and unequivocally that I support the principle contained in this legislation and that is financial assistance to private schools for services rendered outside of the public school system.

I don't believe it is perhaps that necessary to even state the principle at this particular point in time, because as has been indicated it is a clarification and legalization of what in fact has been taking place for a number of years. But the issue has been raised by members opposite, Mr. Speaker' and I think it perhaps appropriate to briefly explain my view for the record.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is in the present day perhaps the same religious issue that it has been in past years, that we are talking now about private schools, organized and operated by many religious groups and many other groups.

Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a great fear in the minds of many people about giving any support to the private school system. It seems to me that private schools are operating in virtually every other province in Canada and I am not aware of any great harm, or any harm at all, that has been caused by that system in any of these other provinces.

The Member for Inkster when he spoke last Friday and unfortunately I was not present, but looking at Hansard I note that he refers to St. Johns-Ravenscourt, Balmoral Hall, as two of the particular schools. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that I hope that wasn't an attempt to refer to the public school system or the private school system as being schools that I think are recognized in the public mind as schools — richer schools as some people would. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. The honourable member. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member was referring to my remarks and pleading with me that I am not referring to rich schools. If he will look at the remarks in full, I mentioned Ramah, I mentioned the Mennonite School, I mentioned the Roman Catholic Schools, I mentioned that there are all kinds — some based on elite systems, and some based on ethnic or religious grounds — so why does the honourable member pick out two schools, and then suggest that I am making an inference.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm very glad to hear that from the Member for Inkster, because I'm looking at Page 4899 of Hansard, I'm looking at approximately the middle of the page, and he refers to schools such as St. Johns Ravenscourt, Balmoral Hall, and St. Johns School. Now, I'm suggesting that there was a reference there to schools that are considered probably by many people in the community to be elite schools. Perhaps he did mention others, and I'm glad he recognizes and goes on the record, because I'm just making the suggestion that we should . . . I want to point out for the record as he apparently agrees, those are not the only private schools we have operating at the present time in the Province of Manitoba. We have some very small, very small private schools operating in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad that that has been clarified for the record.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 4901, the Honourable Member for Inkster, referred to the wording of the bill in which it says that a school division may enter into an agreement to give money to a private school, and suggests that this may result in some discrimination within one school division. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing in this bill is confirming the situation that is presently going on. I am not aware of any instance where a school board has discriminated in any one school division at the present time under the existing legislation, but Mr. Speaker, we are presuming that the principle embodied in the legislation will be followed by the school division. If there are cases of discrimination,

I am prepared personally to make recommendations with respect to that matter in the future.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 4903, the Honourable Meer for Inkster refers to the continuing, steady, insidious and disastrous degrading of the public school system. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it was the, I guess next to last, and we're the last one to perhaps deal with this matter. B.C. within the recent year, I believe, approved aid to private schools in the amount of \$500 per pupil. Under this particular formula in the The Public Schools Act, my understanding is that the maximum amount of assistance that could be received by the private school would be \$365 per pupil, which is only a small proportion of the actual cost and of the amounts received by school boards in the operation of public schools. Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe that virtually every province in Canada has a private school system, and I'm not aware of any harm that it has caused to any other community in any other province in Canada.

There is, I would point out, if it's any reassurance to the Member for Inkster, that the grant — according to my understanding, that could be clarified by the Honourable Minister later — does not allow money for capital costs. We are talking about operating costs, and in these days of such high construction costs, Mr. Speaker, it seems unlikely to me that individual citizens will be able to actually construct new private schools.

On Page 4905 in Hansard, the Honourable Member for Inkster referred to the fact that the government was using the money of taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, this was referred to by the Member for Fort Rouge, I believe, in his remarks, and I agree with his remarks from a purely economical point of view. There are obviously savings to the taxpayer in Manitoba for every child that attends a private school, when one compares the maximum grant of \$365 per pupil to the amount that is paid to a public school board for the operation of that system. From a purely economical point of view, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the Member for Fort Rouge that the operation of the private school system is, in fact, an economic advantage to the taxpayer of Manitoba.

Aside from that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that people should have the opportunity to send their children to a private school if they wish. The bill clearly provides for the establishment of standards of education that must be received and the quality of education in those schools. What we are doing here, Mr. Speaker, is recognizing the principle that has been going on for the past last number of years of providing aid to those private schools, just as takes place right across Canada, Mr. Speaker. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is much advantage in a system in which there is a choice, in which there can be some form of competition between the public school system and the private school system. I don't believe we're going to see a great private school system mushroom in Manitoba, but this bill is simply a means of confirming the aid to the present private school system that has been going on for quite some time; aid, which in many cases, is urgently required to continue to operate the schools, and which is to the economic advantage of the taxpayers of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I find it disappointing to begin my remarks with the Minister of Education absent, and I think it's disappointing that when we're dealing with bills in terms of public hearings or legislative debate that the Ministers don't even have the courtesy to stand and hear the debate on the very matters for which they are responsible. —(Interjection)— Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, I would correct myself and say that I'm glad the Minister did appear, however he is late, and as a teacher I'd expect that he would be prompt and on time. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, it's difficult also to begin when the government is in such a jocular mood, because obviously they think this whole thing is a colossal joke, and I do not believe that there was, in fact, a full discussion of this bill in the Tory Caucus, or in the Tory Cabinet. I believe that from the looks of things, that what has happened in effect is that the Minister and the First Minister smooth talked the members of the P.C. Caucus, and some of them are not fully aware of the implications and the ramifications on this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill in no way is a bill on shared services. It is a misnomer to call this something to do with shared services. This legislation is, in fact, a transition from shared services to direct aid to private and parochial schools. It is not a clarification but it is a substantive legislative change.

In 1965, the Roblin Government did, in fact, introduce a shared-services concept, and I know that the Minister, in particular, is fully aware of what that legislation was intended to do, and how it was intended to operate, but if that was shared services in 1965, then in 1978 we have a Conservative introduction here of direct aid. This marks the end of shared services, marks the end of sharing public school facilities, and it marks the beginning or the accentuation of the church and state school, of a separate and apart educational system, of a system of elite and mass — or the elite on one hand, and masses on the other. It marks the introduction of more dollars for private schools, more dollars for parochial schools, and my greatest concern, probably less dollars

for the public schools.

Mr. Speaker, we know, because the government has reminded us continually, that from the time of introduction to the present, that there were some extensions made in violation of the shared-services concept, but that left the government with three options: they could have continued that kind of a pattern; they could have stopped that whole system and rolled back what was done; or they could extend and legitimize what has been done, and that is the route that they have taken. But they did not have one option, they were not forced by logic or compelled by public opinion to only go one way. This is what they would have us believe, that they had no choice. There wasn't only one alternative, and there wasn't only one course of action.

But the Minister, who I think is a very capable teacher, but he is finessing this Legislature in this legislation, and I hope that he is fully cognizant as well of what he is doing, because, Mr. Speaker, he's taking an attitude and indicating to all of us something along the lines of, this hurts me more than it hurts you, and I'm doing it for your benefit, and I know this medicine is bitter but it's for your benefit, and so on — doing us a favour. The government is telling the opposition that it's doing us a favour, and that they are going to do something for our benefit that they don't necessarily believe in, but given the situation, they were forced into a course of action.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear more. I think there is some explaining to do on this side. —(Interjection)— The members are right, there is some explaining to do on this side, but there is some explaining to do on that side. I think that the members on that side are going to have to explain to the people in this province and in their ridings and in this Legislature and to myself as well, how it is that they were able to six years ago oppose what looked like a modest measure, what looked like a study introduced in this House by my Leader on the basis of a study to explore the possibility of extending aid to private and parochial schools. No more than a study, but to a man — with one exception — on a 17 to 1 vote, the former Meer for Emerson, Gabe Girard, they voted against it, Mr. Speaker, and you will remember the debate well. I would like to know how it was different, I would like the members who voted "Nay", because I was one of them. I opposed that resolution and I spoke against it, and I voted against it, and I stand here today voting and speaking against this measure, which I believe is an extension of aid to parochial schools. So if I was with them on that measure six years ago, how come they're deserting me today? That's what I would like to know. .

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the Conservative vote at that time. Some of those members are no longer present, but I would like to read the Conservative vote, because there was only one in favour, but these are the people who, I think, have some explanation to offer to us.

A MEMBER: You read it this morning.

MR. DOERN: Well, I'd like to read it again. Bilton, Blake. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that repetition in debates serves no useful purpose. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will desist, but most of the members, or at least half of the members present voted against, 17 to 1, voted against —(Interjection)— Well, you know, you may say it was a setting up of a committee, but I read it slightly differently. I believe that that measure would in fact lead to an extension of aid to private and parochial schools. That's how I saw it, and I think a lot of you saw it exactly the same way, that you believe that that was a step in that direction and then you decided that you were therefore not going for the study which was a one step, and then a second step, and then a third step. And I say, some of you, some of you, I would like to hear why you are reversing yourself.

I have to direct my remarks to an old friend sitting there, the Member for Rock Lake. You know, he's a man of principle; he took a position on that bill and now he's reversing himself, and I am curious as to how someone like him who would be really typical, average, a good example of a Progressive Conservative in Manitoba, how he can suddenly reverse himself on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that concerns me is this, some of the members want to know why some of us are opposing this bill. What concerns me is what will happen over the long run, and it's this point, will more money for private and parochial schools mean less money for the public school system? Because you know, we're hearing a lot of talk about restraint, and we know that in effect, this money is going to come out of the same pie; it's going to come out of the wedge allocated towards education in Manitoba. And if there is going to be a relative increase in aid to private and parochial schools it strikes me that that will mean that there will be a relative decrease in regard to aid for public schools.

Mr. Speaker, I said to the Minister of Education one day here, in Question Period, "Are you going to give more money to the Winnipeg School Division for some of their special inner city programs?" They have programs which no other division has; they have responsibilities that no other division has; they have a mix that no other school division in Manitoba has. Then he answered that they were getting a million dollars, just a million, only a million; what's a million, they're just getting a million. Well, I recognize what tongue in cheek means so I know the Minister was only joking. But, what he was saying was, in effect, they are getting a million dollars, but it also was the same million dollars as was given by our government. So another way, another way of putting it, Mr. Speaker, was that there was going to be no increase, that the grant would be frozen at its present level and there would be a zero increase between last year, when our government made the grant, and this year, when their government made the grant.

And the Adult Education Centre, which has students from all over Winnipeg and so on, which needs something like \$30,000 to allow people from all over Greater Winnipeg to attend it, a measly \$30,000 on a budget of 300 and something million dollars, cannot come up with that kind of money, Mr. Speaker. The Minister cannot come up with that kind of money because he doesn't have any money. He doesn't have another penny; he can't give any more money for special programs.

Yesterday, in the Free Press, and I believe, the Tribune, there was an article about Isabel Sudol, and she said that they had to take money from the Winnipeg taxpayers and renovate some of the larger high schools in this city, and maybe build some new schools out of their own funds, because they were turned down by the Public Schools Finance Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. There are no new schools being built anywhere in the province using School Board funds. I would like to add that correction. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. May I suggest to honourable meers, perhaps I should read to them Citation 126 from Beauchesne: "If a member desires to ask a question during debate he should first obtain the consent of the member who is speaking. If the latter ignores the request the former cannot insist even if he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech but he must wait until the member has resumed his seat, and then he may ask leave to make a statement or he must wait until his turn comes to address the House."

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I just say to my honourable friend, please don't let it happen again.

But I do stand corrected if that's so, but I notice that the amount of money was sizable, renovations. Well, it struck me, if I recall correctly, it sounded like it was a million and a half, or was a substantial amount of money that was going to be spent on I believe Daniel Mac, and also

Elmwood High School was also one of the schools being considered. But it was a sizable block of money that the Winnipeg taxpayer has to come up with because the public schools Finance Board was turning them down. So, Mr. Speaker, on one hand some of the school divisions are being told to tighten their belts, they are being told they have no money for capital construction or renovations, they are being told they have no money for new programs, and they are being told to tighten their belt in regard to existing programs.

At the very same time the Minister comes along and announces that a program which costs \$517,000 a year ago is going to cost \$1.2 million this year, and he has come up with an additional \$700,000.00. He has been able to find that money somewhere in this pile of money, or whatever, that he has been able to find for the private and parochial schools. He is not able to do very much for the Winnipeg School Division, or for some of the public schools, but he has suddenly found money for this new program, this extension of a program. And, Mr. Speaker, let me be quick to add that I don't believe for a moment, that that is the amount of money that is going to be spent. I believe that that is no more than a guesstimate on the part of the honourable member, and when we look at a list of private schools in Manitoba, some with 300 students, and 200 students, and 270, and 390, and 130, and all kinds, with a dozen, or a couple of dozen, and all these little schools springing up all over the province, and particularly dotting the countryside, when they see what is happening and they start asking for aid, then I think that \$1.2 million is going to be completely inadequate, that we're going to be talking a lot more money. I would like the Minister to explain on what basis he put together that figure, because I believe it is not, it is not an accurate figure.

And, Mr. Speaker, when Duff Roblin introduced this legislation in 1965, it was my last full year as a teacher in the public school system in Transcona-Springfield, and I was on a group, I headed a team in the division to study the shared services concept, so I was somewhat familiar with it at that point in time. And I remember very clearly, very clearly, what Premier Roblin said, and I have here again the copy of his remarks that he made in 1964 when he was introducing the legislation or a study that led to the introduction of shared services. And he said, Number one, "it would be offered by the public school system and in, in the public school." Number two, he said, "That any service would be available and the private pupil would be entitled to any one or more of the services he would get if he were enrolled at the public school." And third, how would they obtain these services? "Private schools would affiliate with a Public School Division or District and receive the service under Public School Regulations at the Public School."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is crystal clear what shared services meant. It meant that the parochial and private school students would physically go to the public school and in so appearing they had the right to accept any portion whatsoever of the services in the public school. And I believe that, at that time I was a little hesitant about the shared services concept, I thought there were problems associated with it, but I bought, I bought the concept.

MR. ENNS: That was in the 60's, and now we're in the 70's., we move on.

MR. DOERN: Right. Well, you know, my friend the Minister of Public Works and Highways, he says we have to move on. Well, let me tell you, that your government is way behind the Roblin Government. It's going to take you another 10 or 20 years to get up to the progressive level of that government, because they have slipped back, Mr. Speaker. The days of Duff Roblin look like the good times in Manitoba; the days of the Schreyer government, they look like the good times, but we're going back to the Campbell, the Campbell, Lyon, Weir era, that's another time, that's another attitude, and I don't regard that as going forward; I regard that as going backward.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clear, it is clear what shared services is, and it is clear that this is not shared services. This is using the name of shared services, but this is direct aid. No more will the students be asked to go physically into the public schools and accept the services of the public schools. They will be sent money; they will be given money; they will find funds where before they were simply given an open invitation to come and participate and share in the public schools

programs. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is monkey business, and the bending of rules, and false interpretation and a distortion of shared services.

And I would give two examples of what has been going on in the past ten years or so. One way around the former agreement, one way around, was the notion of selling your school to the public school system for a dollar, and allowing a public school to, in effect, operate what was formally a private or parochial school. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, if in so doing that school then became part of the public school system, and had programs and students from all over, then in effect it would be a public school. But I am told that what has happened, in the example in Norwood — and I would like to hear a further comment on this — was that in effect you had the same staff, and the same programs, and the same parochial instruction that was there before, so that in effect, if that's true, that was a ruse; it was not really a change or an evolution from a parochial to a public school, but it was in fact the same school, with the same programs, only they were paid for out of the public purse. So if that can be done, you know, the people who support private and parochial schools, they have a right to fight for their position. Mr. Speaker, I respect their position, but it is not my position, but they have a right to do whatever they can to get the most money that they can from the government. I give them that right; I recognize their right, and if there is any movement in that direction, then they will be very quick to follow that up, to piggyback that move, to extend it in any way that they can. So if it's possible, if it was possible, if it is possible now, to build a school, turn it over for \$1.00, have the same kind of programs, have exactly what you want, the difference being that the public school system picks up 100 percent of the cost, then that is the way to go. And the people who went that way, they were smart; they were ahead of their times. And I'm told that that has been done.

That only would leave one step ' Mr. Speaker, one step and that would be to obtain capital funding, that would be the final step in the journey from no aid to shared services to direct aid that is now going to be offered to 100 percent of the way. Because we are going in that direction and this government is taking us a quantum leap from shared services to 100 percent funding. —(Interjection)— Well, I find it hard to accept the Domino theory. I rejected that in Viet Nam and I reject the Member for St. Matthews as well. He's likable but politically naive, so this is what concerns me.

MR. DOMINO: Russell, that's the nicest thing you've said about me.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the second point is that it is possible under this legislation to obtain money for what are so-called public programs in private and parochial schools without the former student movement. Now I would like to read a couple of examples, if I can locate them here, of what would have been a correct agreement between a parochial school and a public school. That was between St. Emile's School and the St. Vital School Division where they made an arrangement, correctly, legally, to have 16 boys take Industrial Arts, 16 girls to take Home Ec., and 43 pupils for transportation. That strikes me as an agreement that would meet all the features of the shared services concept. Then you got other agreements in which you moved from that kind of an agreement, which I think most of us thought or all of us thought or some of us thought, was being carried out where you had agreements signed, for example, in the St. Alphonsus School in River East, my old division, or the Seven Oaks Division with the Peretz School. There what you had was you had a formula in which the following subjects were taken as being public subjects, taught in the school and money sent over for these because they were public subjects. These were the subjects that the students were supposed to take in the public school but the money instead was sent to them for taking Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Physical Education, Art and Music, and French. And varying amounts of money were sent over as a result of that kind of an agreement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not a lawyer so I have to leave it up to three or four of my colleagues to comment on the law but it's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that those agreements, those agreements were not proper agreements and that they were in fact in violation of the legislation, the intent of the legislation and the correct interpretation of the legislation.

I think it's true . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether the member would accept a question at

this point. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the member indicate, as a member of Cabinet, did he approve or his government approve or the Minister of Education approve those agreements and pay out moneys which he alleges to be illegal agreements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that those agreements were approved by our Ministers of Education, yes, but I also do not recall participating in any debate or discussion on them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in terms of this arrangement which went on between private and parochial schools and the obtaining of money from the Department of Education, that there was in fact some understanding between the Department, or people in the Department, and certain school boards. As I said, the concern that I have is that when you go this far under the proposed legislation, when you go that far, it isn't much farther to go to give 100 percent of the operations and maintenance. If all parochial schools can come forth and say, we are teaching 90 percent, 90 percent of our program, or they can define it, define it as 90 percent of their program is public, even if it's 70 or 80 or whatever it is, if they can say 90 percent and get 90 percent of the funds, then all that they have to do is pay a small portion of their costs in terms of the pure teaching of religion or theology in their schools. So the difference between that and 100 percent isn't very far. Once the government moves that far, it's only a short step to 100 percent and then it's only a short step to 100 percent of capital grants.

So that is where my honourable friends are going. Mr. Speaker. They should know that they're going there and they should not take the position that they are simply legitimizing previous actions of a previous government. That would be, I believe, misleading, and I also think it would in effect dishonest. If the government wants to move to direct aid to private and parochial schools, let them say so, let them take that stand and let them vote to a man to back it up. but I don't think they should come before this House and this province and say, well, all they're doing is they're making legal what was illegal; they're simply correcting a defect in the legal or legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, the one point I want to make . . . I assume I have about 10 minutes left. One point I wanted to make is that I believe there is a very serious danger, a very serious danger in terms of a proliferation or an explosion of private and parochial schools in this province, small ones, really small ones. I think most members in this Chamber who are from the rural areas are familiar with a sudden flowering of little schools throughout the province and now, these schools are going to have a vehicle to obtain money from the Provincial Government that they never had before and they will all come, there will be a long line outside the door of the Minister of Education, these people will come with three students and eight students and twelve students and 20 students and 30 students and they will ask for funding and they will get in terms of their main costs, 90 percent, 90 percent of their costs are going to be paid for by the Minister of Education. So there will be a proliferation of these little schools throughout the province. It's going to have a devastating iact on the public school system, Mr. Speaker, because at the very time when the public school system is suffering declining enrollments all across the board, there are schools being closed up, there are empty classrooms, there is a surplus of teachers, there is an obvious decline in the birth rate, there is a change in the lifestyle and so on, the '50 baby boom is over and gone, there are people leaving the province because there's no employment opportunities, they are looking for employment elsewhere and, Mr. Speaker, the result is that there is a decline in the population of the public school system, No. 1.

And No. 2, at that very moment my honourable friend is introducing legislation to encourage people to establish and expand private and parochial schools. There is going to be a double effect and I say that it will be a negative effect on the public school system and that will be felt in the next few years.

Because I know this legislation is going through, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Tories will vote to a man, the Tories will vote to a man. —(Interjection)— I think we'll see what happens on this side but I believe on this side that it's a free vote and that those of us who wish to support the legislation will and that half will and half won't, whatever the breakdown will be. But the Tories, they will give us either the old government vote, Mr. Speaker, 33-0, or since you cannot vote, 32-0, or they'll say it's a free vote. We all know what the free vote is. It means it's 31-1. That's what a Conservative free vote is because we've seen two of them before. It means one guy votes against the rest and they say therefore there was a split, there was a split. So what's the difference whether you all vote 32-0 or whether it's 31-1; it's the same thing. We don't really care.

But I want to give the Honourable Minister an example and I read from somebody that I find it peculiar to read from because he certainly wasn't one of my supporters. He certainly didn't think the way I thought. He was a classic, classic right-wing Conservative.

MR. ENNS: Fine fellow .

MR. DOERN: Richard Seabourne, Richard Seabourne.

MR. AXWORTHY: Richard Seabourne, the violinist.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Yes, yes.

MR. ENNS: A fine fellow, a real fine and outstanding fellow.

MR. DOERN: Now, Mr. Seabourne, in 1965, pointed out the following which I think some members are not aware of because I was not familiar with this instance. I tried to check it out. I wasn't able to get ahold of certain people that I know to confirm this or not, but here's what he said in a debate

MR. ENNS: On the subject matter of coloured margarine?

MR. DOERN: . . . in 1965. I'm afraid to retort to that, there's too many good quips that I could think of.

MR. AXWORTHY: No, purple gas.

MR. DOERN: Let us not introduce racism into this debate. Mr. Speaker, he said as follows, I'll just read a paragraph from his speech in May, 1965, from Hansard. He said, "But if the evidence is strong that shared time or shared services can damage the private and parochial schools, the case is even stronger where the public school system is concerned and we could relate the experience of the Netherlands as a good example." I found this fascinating. He said, "Before tax funds were made available to the confessional or church schools in that country, only one out of every five Dutch boys and girls attended such a school. But as soon as moneys were made available for the confessional schools, the ratio was almost reversed. Now, only one in four attends a public school."

Mr. Speaker, this is an example, this is an example of what happened in another country where you went from a public school system to a funding of a parochial school system in this instance. And, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be aware of the possibility of this happening in this particular province.

Mr. Speaker, one of the proponents of aid to private and parochial schools and a former president of the Manitoba Liberal Party, Mr. Joe Stangl, apparently a couple of years ago was quoted in the Altona paper under the old system, under the old system, as saying to the local school board, what they should do in effect is sily approve a program for one of the schools in the area and they should simply stamp it and then transfer the cheque right over, never mind anything, no sweat, no concern, no interference, that this was what could be done under the old legislation and what should be done under the old legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that board, I think, acted in a manner which was ethical and refused, refused to confirm that procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I have more to say, but I think I am running out of time. I simply say this, that this bill should be withdrawn, that no public moneys should flow from the public purse to private and parochial schools as is proposed by this legislation and that the shared services concept, which was introduced in this House in 1965, should continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Member for Elmwood carry on as he usually does, but he is trying to do what some of the other honourable members over there have been doing, is try to cloud the issue and make it look as if this hasn't been going on, you know. We'll hide everything, sweep it under the table, we will cloud the issue by saying the Conservatives are split. We will cloud the issue by saying that they planned to do the whole thing anyway, so this is just going a little bit of the way this time.

Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say to you is that I have never heard anything to preposterous in my life. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Elmwood talks about how we voted in 1972 and we voted for a resolution for more study. We stood up in this House and we said if the government hasn't got the guts to come in with legislation about what they plan to do with shared services or private schools, we don't intend to vote for it, but give us something to vote for, give us legislation

to vote for, and we'll give you our opinion. We will vote. That is what most of us said. We will vote on legislation, not more study. Many of us on our side said there is no legislation here. We have studied this for a hundred years, let's have the government have some internal fortitude and come out with legislation.

The reason why more study was wanted, Mr. Speaker, is fairly obvious today from what we know now. According to what we know now, I should say. If it had of gone through, we could have been coming forward and saying, "How come this money for shared services is being paid out illegally?" They would have said, "Well, we are allowing it to carry on while we are studying." Now that is an assumption, Mr. Speaker, but it is pretty obvious that they had to have some reason to keep paying out this money. —(Interjection)—

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member was in the Chamber in 1972 when I indicated clearly to the House that agreements of this kind were being signed, when the First Minister clearly indicated that agreements of this kind were being signed, and there was no subterfuge whatsoever with respect to the payment of money out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he is not at liberty to interrupt a member to make a statement. He should wait until his speech is over and then rise and make his statement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will refer you to the rule that if a member permits himself to be interrupted, he can be interrupted. I have operated under this rule for 13 years. I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to stop because you have devised a new rule. If the member said he doesn't wish to be interrupted, I would have had to sit down, but the Member for Sturgeon Creek has always given me the courtesy to ask a question, which he did on this occasion, and which he is permitted to do without interference from yourself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I won't doubt the honourable member, but I will not tell him that I remember exactly what he said that night without going back and reading it. I remember the night very clearly. He stood in his place with all his references and made his speech. I will not doubt him. But I did say, Mr. Speaker, that it is fairly obvious, and I still believe this, that one of the reasons for wanting to have the resolution for more study was a good reason for saying that we should carry on with this, and that is an assumption, as I said earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan, I feel rather sorry for him when he steps up and he said that he had some responsibility for the paying out of moneys to shared services as we have said we believe is illegal, and it was carrying on. I feel sorry for him in this respect, in that he was a member of the Winnipeg School Board and a trustee. I note that since 1966 when the shared services started, in Winnipeg they received in 1966, \$5,881 for shared services, and Mr. Speaker, in 1976 they received \$14,882 and \$12,000 in 1977. They jumped into the \$14,000 figure about 1968 and it remained pretty constant through that area.

The City of Winnipeg School Board obeyed the rules right to the letter. They now come along and they say, you know, what is happening? All of these moneys are being paid out to other school districts. You know, in 1971 we jumped from \$1,000 in St. Vital to \$28,000.00. In 1972 it went to \$71,000, and you know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Logan is very sincere in his statement, he said, "had some responsibility." I don't think he had any responsibility. I don't think he even knew because when the Member for Inkster sits in his chair and says it was never brought to Cabinet, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it was never discussed in caucus.

Mr. Speaker, in 1976 there was a total of \$339,746 paid out. There was another statement made by the Member for St. Johns. He says, "inherited." Yes, you inherited it. It was there but you didn't inherit any moneys to Fliin Flon. You didn't inherit any moneys to Seven Oaks. Yet in 1971 they started paying Seven Oaks. In 1970 they started paying Fliin Flon. All of these new agreements came up. The Honourable Member for Inkster can say he knew it was going on in 1972, but new agreements came forward. The St. Boniface School Division just took the private schools right into their bosom and took care of them. It went on continually. The honourable members opposite seemed to have some sort of mechanism within their minds to say that they weren't responsible for paying this money out. For some reason or other they seem to think that they weren't doing anything that shouldn't have been done. The Honourable Member for St. Johns believes it may have been legal. Well, my goodness, he could have taken a look at the Auditor's Reports that questioned the practice continually. He could have done that. He could have read the bill that has a distinction between

Tuesday, July 11, 1978

whether they have got public schools teachers doing it, etc. It is there. But there are legal opinions that what has been happening has been illegal. —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, in 1969 when the government came to power, they didn't stop it. It had jumped from \$13,000 in 1966 to \$34,000 in 1967. In 1968 it was \$70,000.00. In 1969, it was \$75,000.00. In 1970, it was \$130,000.00. They didn't take it out. No, they didn't take it out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's just really take a look at that situation. Here we have Ministers of Education who weren't coming to Cabinet and saying that this is going on. Now they absolutely — and nobody can kid any of us on this side, they all have a look at the Estimates, they all have a look at the moneys that are being spent, and all of a sudden — it didn't come to Cabinet was the statement from the Member for Inkster. The Ministers of Finance just went ahead and signed it. They sent it through, as I might say a couple of our Ministers of Education did.

But, Mr. Speaker, a new government arrived in this province in 1977, and the Minister of Education had all of these things on his desk and he came forward to his Cabinet. He came forward to his Cabinet and gentlemen, I am not going to discuss what went on in Cabinet, but I will say this. My colleague presented to this caucus, every one of us here, the problem that he was faced with, and he could have said, "We could just sign it again. But, no, we are a new government, I am a new Minister, there must be a decision made whether we stop it or legalize it." And it came in front of every one of us in this room. That never happened on the other side obviously. That never happened on the other side.

Now as I said the other day — thank heavens for this Minister of Education that takes the responsibility of bringing things before this group on this side. And you all buried your heads in the sand on the other side and you wouldn't even look at it.

Mr. Speaker, it was never caucused. It was never caucused and I must say, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is probably very glad it didn't. But the reason that this was happening and the arguments the members from the other side are putting up to defend themselves at the present time is just plain ridiculous.

I did not canvass for aid to private schools and you don't see anything which says, "We will legalize what has been happening." Do honourable members want to be blind, do you want to be blinded by the fact that you spent \$339,000 last year and what the requests are this year. You are talking about a half a million dollars and you are not going to do it legally. This is the type of thing that got us into the financial problems and that's pretty obvious. Nobody brought it to Cabinet. —(Interjection)— Stop it. No, the decision on this side has been to legalize it. Now the honourable member can accept that or not. He doesn't, but that is our decision, which you did not take the time to do. You didn't stop it and you didn't legalize it. You did nothing, absolutely nothing, except increase every year the amounts of money that were going.

And the Honourable Member for Logan and I bring him up again, who sincerely believes in his convictions on this subject, who was from the Winnipeg Wasn't that a sin? Wasn't that a sin, that one private school should play football against another. I played football against Kelvin and that wasn't a private school. I played football in a league that had many public and private schools in the same league. Was that really what you call integrating them? Never played against St. Mary's. Often went to dances at Rupertsland though, that was quite common in those days.³⁵

So, Mr. Speaker, all the talk about we're going to ruin the school system all of a sudden and you know the fact is that it isn't happening in other areas. The fact is it is not happening in Alberta; the fact is it is not happening in Ontario where they have a different system. Everybody seems to have a different system. But what is our system now? Our system is "may," the school board may consider it, and the school board are elected people, and they have to take the responsibility if they are going to be elected people. Don't let the school trustees say to you that we've put the onus on them. Look, I was an alderman for a long time and we put a lot of onus on them. They are the ones that made the decisions, how much money was spent in the school system. We automatically collected it because they were elected people. The same as the Member for Logan was, and I'm sure many other members in this room were members of school boards or school trustees. These gentlemen will have to make the decision, they will have to look at it from their point of view.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood's statement about the little schools that are starting up around the country. They will not receive any help, they will not qualify for any help unless they have —(Interjection)— Well, they won't unless they have certified teachers and have an equivalent curriculum to the provincial curriculum or they won't receive any help. There's nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Speaker, another interesting statistic that in 1965 there were 9,000 children in Manitoba going to private schools. Do you know how many there were in 1977? 8,000, 8,000. And from 1965 to 1977, our costs went from \$13,000 to \$500,000.00. And you say that that shouldn't be made legal? You say that that amount of money doesn't come to Cabinet?

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster got a little bit of a spanking from the Member

for River Heights the other night — I don't like to put it that way — and he deserved every bit of it. He stepped out of that Cabinet, and I don't want to dwell on it, because it was said, and I respected him for doing so because he had his convictions. He debated in this House his convictions and he felt so strongly on them, he left the Cabinet, and moved back in, and the money was still being spent. After 1972 it was increased and some were taken on after 1972. The Member for Inkster knows full well that the decision had to be made and we were a new government looking at an awful lot of money that either was going to be spent legally or illegally and we have a Minister of Education who walked in to all of his colleagues and said, "This is my problem. I don't sign them if it's illegal," was what he said to me, sitting in his office. "I don't sign them if they're not legal. So the decision has to be made. We're a new government; I'm a new Minister. If I sign them this year, it will have to go on forever; it will have to go on," he says, "I will have to keep signing it because this government has now decided to sign something illegally." He said, "It's got to be either legal or stopped," and we made a decision. And that's the decision, gentlemen. I didn't canvass nor do I know of one of my colleagues that canvassed on aid to private schools.

MR. DOERN: But you're doing it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Oh, Mr. Speaker, here comes that nut again who's been out for a while and doesn't know what he's talking about. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this very simply, I can tell you very simply, that we did not campaign for aid to private schools. What happened was a Minister of Education presented a situation to us that had to have a decision made on it and this government had the guts to prepare the bill, put it before you, our decision is made and you vote on it. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to prolong the debate over any great period of time but I do feel that I would like to say a few words with respect to this bill.

First, I do not want to enter into an argument as to who is wrong or who is right in a partisan sense insofar as the situation which has led up to the present. I think that previous government handled this in the wrong way, or it was handled in the wrong way, and I do not intend to attempt to justify red what has occur, not only during the previous eight years but I gather also during the period 1969 just prior to the election of the Schreyer government when the practice first started. So I do not intend to engage in some sort of anatomy as to what went wrong.

I do want to express some reservations which I have with respect to the this direction and the direction as is envisioned in the bill before us and I want to also indicate, Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to be that much of an authority when it comes to the question of aid to private schools and I'm sure that my remarks may very well display the fact that I haven't researched this matter, I haven't delved into this matter as well as some other meers have in this House.

But I do concern myself about what I do feel to be the worst of the alternatives that is proposed by way of this bill. The emphasis seems to be the provision of aid through the local school division and I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that that possibly is the worst of all alternatives before us. I principally support local autonomy insofar as most areas of government activity but in the area of aid to private schools, it concerns me when it is a matter which is dealt with as a result of the discretion of the local school board. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the potential is too great, too great for one group to be served in a different manner than another group; that a religious group, which has a larger proportion of the population or support base within a school division, will receive benefits which smaller or more minority groups within that school division would not receive the benefit of. So I express concern about the potential and what I fear will be an inequitable dealing with this matter at the local level in the way that it is being proposed by way of this bill.

Secondly, of course, dealing through the system of a local autonomy, we have to also accept the fact that unfortunately still, some school divisions are able to afford some programs that other school divisions are not able to afford. So unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there will be a discrepancy insofar as one part of the province to another part.

Mr. Speaker, in basic essence, I feel that there is nothing wrong with having private schools within our society, but I believe that those private schools should be self-financing, ought not to be financed from the public purse. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that the development of a publicly aided or assisted private school system at the local level or at the provincial level will lead — I'm not sure as to the extent and therefore I cannot claim to be as great an authority as some that have already spoken — but I fear that it will lead to some weakening or some diminishing of the public school system within our midst.

And I want to say, insofar as the comments by the Member for Fort Rouge, that it may be that our public school system does suffer from some deficiencies. It may be that there is need for greater

plurality, diversity within our public school system, but if that be the case, I think that can be better remedied and cured by the improvement of the existing public school system rather than introducing a form of publicly aided private schools. Let's put our shoulder to the improvement of the existing public school system, rather than lend ourselves to what could be some fragmentation, some development, insofar as two different types of schools within our society, within our provincial community.

I do fear, Mr. Speaker, that the gradual and possible evolution of this development could be two groups of schools: Group A schools in which, because of better financing, better support, will tend to provide a series of courses and services that will be superior to those that are provided by Class B form of schools, publicly aided. So that I fear the evolution or the development that the planting of these seeds could create for the future.

I fear also, Mr. Speaker, that we are turning back the cycle. Our forefathers, 125, 150 years ago, struggled and fought in order to develop the public school system that we could all receive the benefits of — rich or poor, urban or rural, whatever part of the country that we resided in and whatever our convictions were.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I fear that there is more that is negative about the bill proposed. I do not criticize the Minister for bringing this to the Chamber because I believe he's done the right thing. I believe it was important that this matter be dealt with in this House one way or the other and I do believe that the Minister has done the right thing in what he has done and I'm not going to criticize him for that. At least we're able to express our view, place our view on the record. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I will be compelled to vote against the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for River Heights has a question.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: I wonder if the honourable member will permit a question. I wonder if he can indicate whether he does not consider his position to be a reversal of the position he took while a member of the Executive Council, in which he allowed the administrative procedures to be such, and approved the Estimates of expenditure which in fact provided the same thing that the legislation will provide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to attempt, as I indicated at the very beginning, to justify the actions of myself or the previous government. I feel that some criticism is deserving, as I believe that there was criticism deserving of the Weir government as well. So it may be that the honourable member interprets it as some sort of reversal. I think it's more important that we honestly reflect in our views now. If we have erred in the past, I think it is better that we acknowledge that error. I think it could have been handled differently in the past, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Is the honourable member saying to the members on this side at this time that he, as a member of the Executive Council, erred in the past?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is debating at this point in time. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, will not speak at great length in this debate, but I believe I should place my views on the record as well in terms of some of the comments that have been made by honourable members opposite and members on this side of the House. I wish to indicate at the outset that I will be, and am, opposing this measure that is being brought forward by the Minister of Education. I would like to indicate as well that I wish it to be known that I am not opposing the concept of the private school issue. I am opposing the method of funding of the private school issue. I do not oppose those residents of this province who wish to set up and operate their school systems. I would hope, and I have yet to hear, and I hope the Minister of Education will comment upon the suggestion made by my colleague, the Member for Inkster, if we are to provide funding for the private schools, as to how the pupils or the students will be accepted into those schools, whether that is acceptable to the government, whether these schools will be open to all rather than having some special type of requirement, of entrance requirement, as that local board might dictate. If that is acceptable to the government, one of those conditions, and as well the other condition about the funding, so that the public school system will be funded to the same extent as a private school system. For we here in Manitoba, as an example, in the Health Care Institutions over the years, the provincial institutions which were provincially funded, suffered over the years because of governments holding together, while on the other hand

have been hit over the head by the private institution saying, "We demand more money." And who got the money? The private institutions were the ones that received the funding while the provincial institutions were left just held tight as budgets could, and they were held in a very tight administrative way.

So I see a possibility of a similar move being made by this present legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I want to indicate that I too, I don't want to indicate that although I have been a member of the Executive Council previously, that because this was done, that because we did it then that you should be doing it. I give you credit for making a collective decision and moving in the way that you, as a group, have felt right. I don't deny you that at all, I think it is a move of the government, but I certainly don't agree that now, just because this side of the House did it and we are somehow waffling, well, Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the Conservative Party voted against a similar resolution to provide the same measures, similar move, and now they have reversed their position in the same way of arguing that we have reversed our position. I don't accept that kind of a position that members on this side have somehow reverted their positions, I, individually as a member of my area . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. USKI: Certainly.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to ask this one question, and I will ask every honourable member on the other side if you'll accept the question. Were we voting for a resolution to study or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, at that time when the resolution was brought forward this matter was hoped to have been dealt with in one way or another, in order that some relief could have been brought to those schools, because that was perceived as a very legitimate problem of the day, and it was a very legitimate problem of the day. —(Interjection) That the people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. URUSKI: Could I finish answering it, and then I'll let you ask the questions. I'll give you my viewpoint as I perceived the problem.

It was viewed as a particular problem of the day, that financial aid was requested for the private school system, and in order that this —(Interjection)— Yes, the Member for Inkster mentions it to me that the agreements that were signed previously to us coming into office, were mentioned in that resolution, so that, you know, there was only one conclusion that really you could come to, is to find a way of financing the private schools of this province. There was only one way. If there was not going to be any funding or any assistance to the private school system, what need was there of a resolution. You say, "No," and that is it. You don't do anything, there is just no way around it. —(Interjection)—

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't think the honourable member should be disturbed any more than he has to be, but the one question is, will the honourable member explain to me how a resolution in this House will supply money to anything, other than the advisability of . . .?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, when the resolution is brought forward as a government resolution there is only one conclusion, unless the Minister without Portfolio cannot see beyond the words in that resolution. If you are intending to look at a particular problem surely you are intending to do something about it, and if you are going to look at it, and you are going to do something about it, it can only mean one thing, that you are going to provide some of the assistance that has been requested. There is only one thing that you can do, either you close your eyes and say well the resolution is only words . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I hope that those that want to carry on their own little private conversation will calm them down a little bit and allow the Member for St. George to complete his speech.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable members, very shortly if they so desire, can go back to whatever discussions they have had because I will not continue very long.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I am opposing the measures brought forward by the Minister

Tuesday, July 11, 1978

of Education and the present government, and I believe that, as has been indicated, the way to indicate in the most strenuous way that I oppose this measure is to move a motion, Mr. Speaker.

I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" in the first line, and substituting the following:

"That Bill No. 57, An Act to Amend the Public Schools Act be not now read a second time, but be read this day six months hence."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 62 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE RENT STABILIZATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I started on this yesterday or the day before. As I indicated in my opening comments my concern about this bill was that it really wasn't bill to amend the Act to make it more workable, but rather it was a bill to bring about the demise of rent control, and that basically is what it is, it sets a target for the end of rent control unless the government and the Legislature reintroduce it. And this, of course, is what concerns me. I would like to point out that the problem of supply, on the one hand, and adequate income on the part of people to find adequate housing or lodging, is the problem before us. Supply can only come about if the private sector is assured that they are going to have a fair, in their opinion, a good return on their investment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he has 20 minutes left.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, I won't need twenty.

Mr. Speaker, the private sector, whether they are going to build or not, really depends, and they look to the investment factor and whether or not it pays them to invest in this kind of venture rather than just in other ventures or simply investing in bonds and other very safe and, in this day and age, a very good return. So the private sector is not going to invest unless they know that the rents are going to be adequate to cover their costs, their financing, and give them a profit.

The government, unfortunately, is backing away from participation in owning facilities, they pretty well announced that as far as construction is concerned they're not going to be using the private sector to construct for MHRC, and to be owned by RC, much more in the way of public housing or elderly person housing. And so you have a situation where there is not much construction going on, it's not very high right now, and I can't see that it's going to get better, because unless the private sector knows that the moneys they can demand and get from the marketplace are high enough to cover all their costs, the higher costs of construction which you e face today, they are not going to build. It is as simple as that. Now, sure we can give them incentives, but despite those incentives — and there have been incentives in the past few years, the assisted rent program, the MURB program, the Federal Government's, — these are all programs that were there, and the fact that MHRC was prepared to take up 25 percent of any of the units built in a private apartment block and put in people and subsidize their rent, none of these were able to really make a much of a difference in the rental field.

There is still a shortage, we know the vacancy rate is going down instead of up, and it's in the area for the moderate income earner, the lower income owner where the pressure is really intense. As I've indicated, I have no concern about people who are paying \$500 or \$600 a month rent, or can afford to, because there are vacancies in that level. But in the \$200 to \$300 a month level the pressure is intense, the alternatives are not there, and this is what is wrong with bringing in a bill which deals with one facet of the problem, the problem being decontrol.

As I indicated, we know that rent control is not a long long term answer. You cannot sit on this kind of pressure indefinitely, but we also know that you cannot simply deal with decontrol by simply bringing in a bill to end controls. It has to be part of an overall strategy. There has got

to be a strategy to create, both through the private sector and through the public sector, more units. If there are more units then maybe the vacancy rate will rise, and then people will have alternatives, right now they don't. Right now, if they don't like the rent they are paying, there is not much they can do about it. There's really not much except try to cut their lifestyle somehow or other, to save on something else, penny pinch on something else so they can continue to live where they are, because they don't have much choice.

So, it's this lack of strategy which I'm critical of with the government, and for which reason I'm having difficulty in looking kindly at this bill, although as I said before, I know the Minister is very sincere in what he's trying to do here, and I'm not critical of the Minister. I'm critical of his Cabinet colleagues, of his government as a whole, for just looking at one side of the coin and ignoring the full scope of the problem, that in fact there is a supply problem, and there's an income problem, and they are ignoring it. They are simply saying we'll decontrol certain units, we'll continue to control others. But even the ones that they are continuing to control there's a kicker in there. You know, every year, about 18 to 20 percent, there's an 18 to 20 percent turnover in accommodation. People move for many reasons, many legitimate reasons; new family formations, a change of a job in location, just a reduction in the family size, or an increase in the family size. All of these things affect the decisions to vacate, and when you have an 18 to 20 percent voluntary vacancy rate, then by 1980, or by 1979, you're going to have a great many of those that are supposedly controlled now, are going to be decontrolled, and the pressure for the remainder is going to become more and more intense, and the battle will develop as inevitably it will with the landlord who says, "I want out," and he can achieve it. He'll achieve it by not repairing, not maintaining, and hoping that the tenant will walk out of it, and then it will be voluntary.

There is a problem of landlords who will say, well, I'd like to, I want really to repair this building and upgrade it, and renovate it, but to do it effectively at a reasonable cost, I'm going to have to give my tenants notice that they vacate, so I have two or three months in which I can renovate my building, and that will probably be considered voluntarily giving up the apartment block, or at least being forced to move out for a good cause, because the landlord can make a case that he wants to repair, and he can't do it if people are living there.

So all of these are, I say problems, which this bill does not address, and simply to say, well there's a Rent Review Board, it will still be functioning, and people can appeal. Mr. Speaker, there's going to be hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of appeals. They're not going to be able to cope with it. The appeals are going to come pouring in, as landlords are going to try to get as much as they can out of the marketplace, and they're in business. They will do what any other person in business will do. If he has the commodity which is in demand, he will try to keep charging, raising the rate on it, until the demand eases off. That's the old marketplace at work. If I have a commodity that everyone wants, then I will increase its price until my production and demand are equal, and that I know that if I then keep pushing up the price, I'll lose sales.

So it's not as simple a matter as saying, well, you can't live off rent controls forever, we have to start sometimes; let's start now. A start can be made, Mr. Speaker, if this government was prepared to undertake and pledge that they would undertake a massive construction program, through the private sector, as the MHRC always does because they don't build anything, but finance the construction of apartment blocks for the elderly, or for people on low incomes, to take at least the pressure of them off the market. Instead, we have a sort of perverse situation. That government brought in legislation which gives to people on pension, irrespective of income, an additional hundred dollars so that they can pay their income tax. So that you have a perverse situation, whereas instead of encouraging people who no longer need the four-bedroom, or the five-bedroom home, or even the three-bedroom home, that could move into an apartment block, they are discouraged from doing that now, because they are encouraged to stay in their home that's too big for them now, and discouraged from moving into an apartment block because the Property Tax Credit was frozen insofar as rental accommodation is concerned, and for everyone, except for pensioners, pensioners whose income may be very, very high, but who will now be receiving an extra hundred dollars, and that as I say is perverse. It's acting against the normal marketplace and certainly is not acting to encourage people to give up premises, large premises which they no longer need, and move into apartment blocks. And frankly, anyone now thinking in that way, if they are moving into something that's built before 1973, or even after 1973, is now moving into a decontrolled accommodation, because he'll be moving into an apartment block. If it's an old one which has been voluntarily vacated, and there is no limit on what the landlord will try to charge, and if he moves into a newer apartment block, they're not controlled anyways, because anything built after 1973, where a permit has been issued, I think it's after October, 1973, is decontrolled.

So what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is really a situation which is asking for trouble, it's asking for chaos insofar as the renter is concerned. He is going to be faced with pressure from his landlord to get out, because he wants that suite in order to raise the rent beyond six percent. Many are now, in any case, even though when they're not maybe pressuring their tenants, are now asking

the tenants to sign agreements calling for 15 and 25, 30 percent increases. Now they may be rolled back, maybe. But I suspect that the way this Rent Review Board and its offices are going to be administered now, I suspect that there is going to be far more increases beyond the guidelines than has been allowed in the past, because the attitude is that more things should be taken into account in determining whether an allowance beyond the six percent or five and a half percent is permitted, and I think the interpretation of the regulations is going to be somewhat more lenient, if I may use that word, than has been in the past.

So you have a situation where the tenant, the renter, is caught between the devil and the deep. There is very little new accommodation coming onstream. There won't be much new accommodation coming onstream, because the cost of land and construction today is so high that the builder legitimately has to charge a high rent in order to recover, to pay off his mortgage; it's quite legitimate.

The government has stepped back and away from its contribution to the housing market for the 1,000 or 1,500 units that are put on the marketplace annually; it's backing away from that. They did recently announce, the Minister responsible for Housing announced that they have acquired some units from CMHC, but that's simply the acquisition from CMHC of existing units. It's musical chairs. They're not adding one unit to the housing stock, they're simply taking the ownership from CMHC and transferring to MHRC, which doesn't mean much, or doesn't mean anything, insofar as new accommodation is concerned, or greater accommodation is concerned.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact is, although because of the announcement by the Minister that the increases of 5, 5-½, or 6, there is an impression around that somehow this is part of the bill. That these rent increases, the ceilings that were announced are part of the bill; it's not the case. Those guidelines have nothing to do with this bill at all. This bill basically calls for the end of rent control; that's basically what it does. The guidelines are ' part of the legislation which exists now, which has been existing for some time, and annually, the Minister, through the department, issues the guidelines and the new levels to which rents can be raised, that is to the maximum, but it has nothing to do with this bill. This bill is a departure from the old bill. In my opinion, the old bill was better than this bill, because it did maintain a better control, because it recognized that so long as there is the kind of marketplace you have, and the low vacancy rate you have, you cannot hope to introduce rent controls effectively without hurting an awful lot of people, and a lot of people are going to be hurt. A lot of people on not just low income, I'm not talking about the poor, I want to get away from the idea that it's only the poor, I'm talking about people who are earning moderate and middle incomes who are going to be faced, and are now faced, with increasing rents, which are going to make it difficult for them to maintain their units but they haven't got a choice, so they're going to maintain them, but they're going to have to sacrifice something else.

And, Mr. Speaker, without some strategy to build up this supply, until we have about a 4 or 5 percent vacancy rate, when that happens, sure, you can remove rent controls, but unless you have that kind of strategy to build up enough units so people have a choice and an alternative. So the landlord says, I want to go from \$275 rent to \$325, they can say thank you very much, I can't afford it, I'll go elsewhere, and the landlord knows they can go elsewhere. But in today's market that's a dream, it can't be done, and therefore, what you are doing to people today is locking them in, putting them in a position where they — I was going to say at the mercy of — but it implies that somehow the landlord is a dirty guy; he's not, he's in business. He's out to maximize his profit, and you're putting people in an impossible position, where they are going to be faced with having to pay higher rents than they have been paying, rents that they can ill afford, and they don't have any alternative except to know that 18 months from now, or 20 months from now, rent control will be completely ended, and the sky is the limit at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs will be closing debate.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable, the House Leader, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I should like to announce that it is the intention for the House to meet tomorrow morning for the regular session from 10:00 to 12:30,

Tuesday, July 11, 1978

and then it is hoped that the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will meet for the afternoon and evening sessions, and the Committee on Agriculture will meet for the evening session. In other words, the House will not be sitting tomorrow afternoon. Now that's the present intention and unless there is some reason why that cannot be done, I would like to hear from my honourable friends.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Wednesday)