



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVI No. 91

10:00 a.m. Friday, July 14, 1978

Manitoba Legislative Assembly

Thirty-First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

<i>Name</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Political Affiliation</i>
ADAM, A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Robert (Bob)	Springfield	P.C.
AXWORTHY, Lloyd	Fort Rouge	Lib.
BANMAN, Robert, Hon.	La Verendrye	P.C.
BARROW, Thomas A.	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David R.	Minnedosa	P.C.
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J.R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	P.C.
CHERNIACK, Saul M., Q.C.	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Keith A., Hon.	Gimli	P.C.
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Donald W., Hon.	Riel	P.C.
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell J.	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	P.C.
DOWNEY, James E., Hon.	Arthur	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	P.C.
EINARSON, Henry	Rock Lake	P.C.
ENNS, Harry J., Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	P.C.
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, James	Dauphin	P.C.
GOURLAY, Douglas	Swan River	P.C.
GRAHAM, Harry E., Hon.	Birtle-Russell	P.C.
GREEN, Sidney, Q.C.	Inkster	NDP
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
JENKINS, William W.	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, J. Frank, Hon.	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
JORGENSEN, Warner H., Hon.	Morris	P.C.
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	P.C.
LYON, Sterling R., Q.C., Hon.	Charleswood	P.C.
MacMASTER, Ken, Hon.	Thompson	P.C.
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Edward R., Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	P.C.
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	P.C.
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
MERCIER, Gerald W.J., Q.C., Hon.	Osborne	P.C.
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, George	St. James	P.C.
ORCHARD, Donald W.	Pembina	P.C.
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Howard, Q.C.	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Norma Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
RANSOM, Brian, Hon.	Souris-Killarney	P.C.
SCHREYER, Edward R.	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Louis R., Hon. (Bud)	Fort Garry	P.C.
SPIVAK, Sidney, Q.C., Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	P.C.
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	P.C.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, July 14, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.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

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris) on behalf of the Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 71, The Statute Law Amendment Act (1978). (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba.)

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he can indicate as to an amount something in excess of \$1 million that is being requested of this House relative to the Northern Flood Agreement. Can the Minister say whether this amount relates to the compensatory features of that agreement, or to the general economic development provisions of that agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, it is for the obligations contained in the agreement itself.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I realize it is pursuant to the agreement but basically there are two aspects to the agreement. One is relating to compensatory requirements and one is deemed to be unrelated to compensatory obligations but is rather of a broad economic development thrust. I'm asking the Minister — perhaps he would like to take it as notice — as to which of these two aspects of the agreement that particular request relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I understand that we will be into Supp. Supply and it is in the Supplementary Bill; it's the second next item up on Supplementary Supply which we will be into presumably some time today and we'll go into it in detail. The Minister of Northern Affairs is here as well to give you the details on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, without asking the Government House Leader to indicate to the hour, could he indicate whether it is intended to bring forward Supp. Supply for further consideration this morning or this afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to bring it in this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question to the Honourable the House Leader. Is the Honourable the House Leader intending to bring in any more bills in the middle of the session, where we are now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my honourable friend wasn't listening to me when I said to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Services, that if a Minister brings in another bill I'd shoot him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was inquiring about recent correspondence with the Prime Minister's office relative to the constitutional proposals and I undertook at that time to obtain the necessary clearances for the tabling of the documents in question. I now understand that the Prime Minister has tabled in the House of Commons the correspondence with the various Premiers and I wish to lay on the table of the House his telex to me of July 10, 1978, relative to the constitution, and an earlier telex of June 12th, which I really think is necessary in order to make sense of the second one, which is also being tabled for the information of honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, apropos of the documents just tabled and the subject matter of the constitution, I recall from the Premier's previous reply some few days ago that it was not likely that there would be a position paper prepared by the Province of Manitoba in advance of the upcoming September conference. Can the Premier confirm whether it is intended to have such a position paper and, if so, would it be necessarily in advance of the September conference?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition's impression of what I said the other day is correct. I can't give any firm commitment as to when the full and comprehensive position paper relative to all of the constitutional proposals of the Prime Minister, and indeed of the Province of Ontario and other jurisdictions, when a full position paper relative to Manitoba's position on these will be put forward. It's likely that we will be dealing primarily with the Prime Minister's proposals at upcoming conferences, but we should not lose sight of the other matters that are being laid on the table by other jurisdictions. And having regard to what I have previously described as this plethora of material, it's difficult, if not impossible at this stage, to say when a comprehensive distilled final position paper on behalf of Manitoba would be presented.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the First Minister the opportunity to hold forth on the relative merits and necessity of having an Upper House in the Canadian Parliament. Perhaps the First Minister would like to resist that temptation, but nevertheless, I ask the First Minister whether he can say whether the Province of Manitoba generally favours the proposed reform of the Senate to restyle it into a House of the provinces or a House of the Federation, with the members, however, still not elected but rather appointed. Does the First Minister have any irresistible urge to discourse on that?

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster asked me a question several days ago regarding a newspaper article on the purchasing of land by Manitoba Hydro for right-of-way, and I have an answer I have received from Manitoba Hydro on this question and would like to present it to the House in reply to the question and to some other matters that were contained in that newspaper article.

Mr. Speaker, the statement I am making is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Can the Minister indicate whether this is a lengthy article? If so, I would suggest perhaps he table it.

Friday, July 14, 1978

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a fairly lengthy answer but it's actually in the form of notes and I'm not sure it's the sort of thing that is best tabled. I will try and skim through it and give the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: To expedite matters, if it is somewhat lengthy, I would suggest that it be tabled. If the Minister is unsure as to the appropriateness of tabling it in its present form, it would be quite agreeable for him to his office synopsise it or retype it in proper format.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if it's agreeable, what I will do is hold it and try and have it done for this afternoon's sitting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister. Perhaps he could comment now on another story, the accuracy of which I do not attest to, but nevertheless there was a story yesterday that rather than paying double the amount, if I recall correctly, the newspaper story said that Hydro was paying triple the amount.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, again I read the story, and I have referred it to Hydro for their comments before deciding whether anything further has to be done, as the Minister responsible for Hydro. The statement with regard to the Member for Inkster's question the other day, I intended to reply to it as Hydro's reply to me on the matters which I think are self-explanatory. Whether the second news story is self-explanatory, I don't know, but I have asked Hydro to again provide me with their analysis of it so I can decide whether it should be presented in that form or should be further investigated, as a Minister. But I will hold this, since I don't think there is any great urgency, and table it this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I'd like to ask the Minister whether, in light of these stories, or whether in light of general policy intent — whichever — is the Minister giving consideration to the advisability of having land acquisition by Hydro and any other major Crown corporation subject to the very same land acquisition procedures and land value appraisal certificate by the Land Value Appraisal Board, having Hydro subject to the very same procedures as are required of the totality of government departments?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, not to this point, at least, Mr. Speaker, we haven't.

MR. SCHREYER: I'd like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs, reporting to the Telephone System whether he is in a position now or later today to indicate whether there will be a definitive particularized statement of response to the 30-page document that has been circulated by Videon Limited making rather important and serious allegations relative to the attitude, procedures and practices of the MTS and the government relative to cablevision?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I am not in a position at this time to say whether there will an itemized and detailed response to the paper to which the member refers. I am still awaiting a response from my officials in that respect and I presume that next week we will be able to respond in more detail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question also to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, responsible for the MTS and also responsible for Co-ops

in the province. With regard to the Westman Media Co-op which is endeavouring to put into place a cablevision system in western Manitoba, I believe early fall, preferably September, can the Minister now advise whether his Department of Co-operative Development has yet arrived at a decision to assist this co-operative financially inasmuch as they have been experiencing certain start-up difficulties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-ops.

MR. MCGILL: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Can the Honourable Minister advise the House whether, either through his information as Minister responsible for the MTS, which is wholesaling the signals, I believe, or in his capacity as Minister responsible for Co-ops, whether the cablevision system that is being put in place in western Manitoba will be able to be operational by September or has he any idea whether it will be October or is it going to be deferred until spring, or just when will western Manitobans be able to experience cablevision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the delivery of a signal to the Westman area, the original target date was this fall. I have received no information that would change that date. If any such amendment or change is indicated by the Crown Corporation, I would be glad to ensure that the member opposite is advised.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister for his answer and I am pleased to hear of the ability of MTS to deliver the signal at that time. Can he advise the House, however, whether Westman Media Co-op itself will be in a position to be operational for its target date either of September or October?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to speak for Westman Media Co-op.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honourable member's answer and his position, however, inasmuch as the Co-op is dependent upon his Department of Co-operative Development for certain financial backing, would the Minister not have some idea from the Westman Media Co-op of estimated start-up time, because I would think that would be one of the considerations in whether or not you grant further financial assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the member refers to an application which has been received by my department from Westman Media Co-op with respect to the loan guarantees which were originally granted to Westman Media. That application has not been dealt with, or any decision made in that respect, so I am unable to provide any information specifically in reply to the member's question.

MR. EVANS: Well, I wonder if I could ask a final supplementary, then. Could the Honourable Minister indicate to the House when a decision will be made by his Department of Co-Operative Development?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the application is now being processed and I would anticipate that within the next week or two that decision will be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, three or four days ago, the Member for Inkster raised a question that I took as notice in relationship to whether Mr. Steward Martin had been specifically asked for his opinion on the new clause in the flood agreement. I think I clarified at that time that I had not, as an individual, and to the best of my knowledge, I don't believe others have. Now, I should follow that by saying that there's always that possibility that somebody that was dealing with it did certainly or possibly talk to Mr. Steward Martin, but his specific advice by myself, and to the best of my knowledge by others, was not sought. His background material and

comments in that regard were sought, obtained and reviewed, and taken heed of, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: 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 his absence, perhaps the Acting Minister would take it as notice. My question is this: is it government policy that members of the Ingolf Campers' Association at Ingolf, Ontario, be exempt from paying a park admission fee in order to travel on the road leading from Highway 44 to Ingolf through the West Hawk Lake area to reach their summer residence, whereas non-members of the association, even though they may produce evidence of ownership or right to occupancy of property at Ingolf, are discriminated against by being required to pay a fee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister responsible for Tourism, I will accept that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Mines and Resources whether there are any discussions being held at the present time with representatives — or as of recent date — with representatives of the oil industry operating in southwestern Manitoba with respect to the possibility of seeing an increase in the number of exploration drilling rigs in that part of the province. Can the Minister say whether there are such discussions, or have recently been such discussions, and is the Minister satisfied that there is a good prospect of some modest increase in exploration drilling, and the number of rigs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had recent discussions with representatives of one of the oil companies, and yes, there is reasonable expectation of increased activity.

MR. SCHREYER: More specifically, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister say whether it is likely that there will be two, three, four drilling rigs operational before the end of the drilling season.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there is a very good possibility that there will be some actual drilling initiated, probably following harvest.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is a drilling rig operational now, owned and operated by people local to the Virden area I am asking whether there is any reasonable prospect of some — the Minister of Finance objects to the term, I was going to say additionality — I will say incrementality to the number of drilling rigs that are operational in southwestern Manitoba, beyond the one that is existing and operating there now.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was referring to potential deep-drilling for oil from strata, where we had not previously had any oil extraction. My understanding is that the one or two wells that have been drilled to date have been fill-in wells into the same formations that the other wells in the Virden area have been producing from for years. What I'm speaking of is the possibility of new drilling in relation to the leasing activity that has been going on over the past few months, which is aimed at exploration into the Cambrian formation in the southwest.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to both, but since the Honourable Minister has raised it, I would like to renew my question of several weeks ago and ask the Minister whether he has now confirmation of definite intent on the part of Chevron or any other oil company to drill beyond the sedimentary formations which have up until now been the oil-bearing formations, and a commitment, in other words, to go to a deep-drilling program to the pre-cambrian basement? Can the Minister confirm that that will be done, that the oil companies have in turn confirmed that they

will proceed?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied, on the basis of my discussions with the companies, that that drilling will in fact take place. I have no signed agreement that says that they will be drilling. I have had discussions with a company. I would estimate that there have been certainly hundreds of thousands of dollars expended on leasing activity in the southwest, based on the possibility of deep-drilling. There has been a substantial increase in the amount of seismic exploration in the southwest and the companies that are carrying out that work have every intention of following it up with drilling. It's a matter of what one considers as confirmation. I am satisfied that we will see drilling to the new formations within the next few months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development, Mr. Speaker, and ask the Honourable Minister whether he has had any information through his staff as to a cutback in certain medical assistant personnel, medical technicians, etc., particularly those that do testing, lung scanning for blood clots, and so on, at certain of the major hospitals in Winnipeg. Has he been advised of any reductions in staff because of the government restraints?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would undertake to inquire into the matter of whether there has been cutback in medical staff or medical support staff at the Health Sciences Centre, particularly with regard to staff who engage in scanning tests, as I understand . . . This is in the evenings; I am talking about at night and weekends, cutbacks in the weekend period and at night of personnel who previously were available for any emergency case that came in or a case that was destined to go into Intensive Care, personnel that were charged with the responsibility of examining for blood clots in the lung or wherever in the body.

MR. SHERMAN: I will certainly investigate that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines. Can the Minister of Mines confirm that Sherritt Gordon Mining Company has reduced its program in the Province of Manitoba because of lack of public participation in the program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that.

MR. GREEN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister would then examine the statement made by Mr. Thomas, the President of Sherritt Gordon Mines to the Winnipeg Free Press exactly to that effect?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the honourable member is referring to an article that appeared in the Free Press some weeks ago. I have not been in contact with Mr. Thomas or his officials since that time. I would not be satisfied until I had had an opportunity to have direct discussions with him that the report in the paper was necessarily a true reflection of what he had said.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister knows of the statement, that it was made several weeks ago and that I would assume that he is concerned with the level of exploration activity in the Province of Manitoba, wouldn't that statement appearing in the paper have caused him to get in touch with Sherritt Gordon to find out whether in fact, as reported by the Free Press — an admittedly unreliable source — that Mr. Thomas says that the exploration activity has been reduced because of the lack of provincial participation, which was forthcoming in previous years?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, our department and I, as Minister, naturally are concerned about the level of activity in this province, but I am advised and I am aware through discussions with a number

of companies that they are now showing a considerable interest in returning to Manitoba to undertake exploration, that they have an activity that they have not been pursuing for the past few years. Now, I have no firm commitments in that regard. I said during the review of Estimates that this is the indication I have, that the climate for mining has improved in Manitoba in the eyes of the companies that are normally engaged in that activity, with the ending of the compulsory aspect of participation, and I am quite confident that over the next few years we will see a return to an active level of participation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister of Mines could give us the names of any companies which he says have not been participating in the Province of Manitoba in the last two years and are now coming back, because my impression, Mr. Speaker, is that I gave to this House a list of virtually all the major companies who have been participating in the province in the past two years. Which ones does he say did not participate in the last two years?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my reply was to the effect that there are companies that have expressed an interest in returning to undertake exploration in the province. They have not been here for a number of years. The exploration has not taken place yet. The dollars have not been committed yet. I say there is an indication. When that indication becomes a reality, which I am confident it will, I will be most happy to inform the House and the public of Manitoba of the actual companies involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there have been exploration agreements with Sherritt Gordon, with Hudson Bay Mining, with the Noranda Mines, with Nelson McIntyre, with Shell Oil, and all of the major companies who have mined in the Province of Manitoba and who have explored in the Province of Manitoba, which companies does he say were not here for the past two years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable member about repetitious questions. Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: If I might just have an opportunity to respond to the line of questioning that the honourable member was pursuing — he may have left the indication that the province is no longer participating in any kind of joint exploration agreement. I should clarify that the compulsory aspect of participation is no longer in effect but that Manitoba Mineral Resources is continuing to operate in a joint exploration type of operation and that they have money available for continuing with participation agreements which they consider to be in the best interests of the Province of Manitoba. If there are companies that wish to continue to participate with the government as a partner, then I am sure that they will be in consultation with Manitoba Mineral Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the questions of the past few minutes have been relating to Manitoba's policy with respect to participation or non-participation in joint venture exploration agreements with mining companies relative to hard rock mining. I would like to ask, in the same vein, with respect to the potential, such as it may be, for additional oil discovery in southwestern Manitoba, whether Manitoba's new policy with respect to joint venture participation in exploration drilling is such as to have caused the slowdown in the pace of exploration activity by at least one or two of the oil companies for reason for the fact that their budgets are set for a given operating year and in the event that the province does not participate to some percentage share, then there is a proportionate reduction in the level of exploration drilling. My question is, then, can the Minister indicate whether the pace and level of activity both in footage drilled and in dollar terms will be increased in 1978 over last year, or the same, or something less?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the details of dollars expended and the footage of drilling at my fingertips, but I think we have to recognize that exploration activity involves more than simply the actual act of drilling the hole into the rock to look for oil. The fact that companies are expending, as I say, hundreds of thousands of dollars in leasing activity in southwestern Manitoba, paying acreage bonuses of up to \$5.00 an acre and as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, some of those \$5.00 an acre

Friday, July 14, 1978

bonus payments that might have gone into the hands of retired farm people, farm wives in particular, widowed ladies, are now going into the hands of people who were able to take over the mineral rights because of the existence of the Mineral Acreage Tax. But the activity is there in the leasing and the increased seismic activity. Again, as I answered previously, some of the seismic work that was done 15 and 20 years ago is not of the technical quality that is possible to achieve today and so there is considerable seismic activity taking place. I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to interpret that as any reduction in interest or activity. I see it as an increase in activity and I'm sure that within the next few weeks when we are able to formulate, put together and announce our policy which I'm sure is going to cause further interest among the oil exploration companies, that there will be a substantial increase and that will be very evident.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, accepting the Minister's own statement as a starting point, that there is more to exploration activity than the amount of footage drilled, so then on that basis I would ask the Minister whether, with respect to Sherritt Gordon as an example, which is one of the three major hard rock mining companies operating in Manitoba, has the Minister been advised or has he asked his department to ascertain whether in the case of that one of the three major mining companies in Manitoba, that for 1978 the totality of their exploration activity will be increased or decreased over that of the last year or two?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would have to make enquiries as to the specific plans that that company has, but they also are operating under some particularly difficult circumstances at the moment which no doubt would have an effect on their plans in that they have been losing a substantial amount of money, numbering into the millions of dollars, by continuing their operation in Manitoba. I would suggest that they are to be commended for continuing with production in Manitoba and continuing to employ their work force and to make adjustments within their mining operation to be in a position to increase their production from the sites they are working with now three or four years hence when it is anticipated that prices will be substantially improved.

So, under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it would not be unusual if they were forced to reduce their immediate exploration activity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs is now in the House, if I may, I would like to restate the question which the Acting Minister had taken as notice, and direct it to him. My question is, Mr. Speaker, is it government policy that members of the Ingolf Camper's Association at Ingolf, Ontario be exempt from paying a park admission fee in order to travel on the road leading from Highway 44 to Ingolf through the West Hawk Lake area to reach their summer residences, whereas non-members of the association, even though they may produce evidence of ownership or right to occupancy of property at Ingolf, are discriminated against by being required to pay a fee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to honourable members that a question having been taken as notice, to be handed to the Minister, I suggest to a member that should be sufficient. Repeating the same questions in the same question period I find does very little to elicit any further information in this Chamber.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I may, on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the only reason why I wanted to repeat the question is to assist the Minister and assist the House in general in view of the fact that we are now in speedup and it may be several days before Hansard is published and that the Minister will have an opportunity to read the question. So I was hoping that I was doing it more for his benefit than for anyone else's.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago it was brought to my attention by some of the cottage owners in the Ingolf area that they were only passing through a provincial park and were being asked to pay the fee for going through the park. As a result we felt that if a cottage owner in the Ingolf area would show a card which said that he belonged to the Ingolf area and District Campers' Association, that we would exempt them. Now if that is causing

a problem or a hardship for some other people, I will look into the matter, but it was the easiest way of making sure that when this particular cottage owner drove through one of the provincial park facilities that all they had to do was show this little card and that was a standard form. Now if there is something else that we have overlooked on that, we can have a look at it, but this was the easiest way and sort of the simplest way of dealing with the problem.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister further check into the matter because I am advised that all cottage owners and/or occupants of cottages are not necessarily members of the Ingoif Campers' Association. Would the Honourable Minister also check into the complaint that was received by me that, as I had indicated earlier, that having produced evidence of ownership, that that was considered insufficient by the park attendant and a demand for the payment of a fee was still made.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the member will appreciate that for the sake of uniformity what we did was that we asked that the park attendants only recognize the cards as far as the Ingoif Cottage Owners Association. I will check into the matter and see if there is a problem with that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 57 and the proposed amendment, moved by the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it was not my deliberate intention to speak on more than one occasion on this particular bill. I did indicate during the course of what I considered to be intolerable heckling as the First Minister referred to it and which I identified as quite something different, that there would be an occasion perhaps in which I would speak, but, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't necessary for that purpose and possibly some people may think that this particular address is not necessary as well.

But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, for the record and because certain allegations were made and certain representations made concerning what happened in 1972, I want to put on the record, if for no other purpose than that it appear in Hansard in the unlikely event that someone will again refer to this kind of debate as being other than it was, and fortunately there is such a thing as Hansard, that I can at least indicate, regardless of whether or not it had any effect on the vote, that these matters were established at least to my satisfaction and I hope to the satisfaction of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me first of all make several things clear. I, at no time, denied ministerial responsibility for what occurred under the previous administration. At no time did I suggest that I was not responsible and a party to the signing of the agreements with the school divisions. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, not only did I say that I was a party to it but I pleaded guilty, I said I shared such complicity as existed and that I cannot avoid responsibility. And, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that last week, I said that in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, if there is anything that I did on this question which is different than possibly what others did is that I brought it to the attention of the House, that for the first time it was publicly brought to the attention of the House that this procedure had been drifted into and that I was one who had drifted into it, that we didn't start it, that it was started by the Conservative administration, that it was continued by our administration, that it had drifted in that direction and that it did not appear that it was going to stop, Mr. Speaker, and as a result of that particular procedure the First Minister brought forward his resolution in an attempt to do two things. Some say to clarify and, Mr. Speaker, I said and I repeat that it was the intention of the First Minister to extend the principle and extend aid being provided to private schools. I was against that, he was for it, and the debate continued on that basis. At no time, Mr. Speaker, and let it be clearly understood, did I say that I did not know about this. I accepted the fact that it was happening, Mr. Speaker. Since 1972, I was under the opinion that everybody knew about it, that it was a matter of common knowledge, that school boards were doing this, that there were fights at the municipal level as to whether they should get such agreements — the Meers for St. Boniface agrees with me on that point — that it's not a question of some misrepresentation and some claim to be not

or some claim to avoid responsibility, not at all, Mr. Speaker. I merely stated in this House what the facts were, that it was done by ministerial authority, that it was not a subject of Cabinet approval and there is no Order in Council where these agreements were approved in Cabinet.

But I don't say that that absolves a Cabinet Minister of responsibility and have never said so, Mr. Speaker. Quite the contrary, to those who are alleging misrepresentation, I said that I was responsible, that I was one of the Cabinet Ministers who was responsible, that the previous administration was also responsible and that we had continued this procedure. And, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members who now say that were some misrepresentation know for themselves that I didn't misrepresent the position. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says that he can't remember and then he said that he remembers the speech that I made in the House. The speech that I made in the House that he is talking about I made on the resolution. The speech that I was referring to was made, Mr. Speaker, I think a good month before the resolution came to the vote. It was done exactly as the Member for River Heights said it should have been done, the Minister without Portfolio, on the Estimates of the department. He said, "Didn't this come up in Estimates? Didn't you object?" He knows full well I objected.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read my objection of June 5th for anybody who suggests that they didn't know about this agreement; either they wanted not to know or they wanted to ignore it. But, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read what I told this House — and this is the first time it came to public attention in this way as far as I am aware — about these agreements. Mr. Speaker, reading from Hansard of June 5th and what occurred is that the administration, probably innocently — the administration, probably innocently, looked at a couple of difficult situations. This was the previous administration.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going out of the quote and talking about the Conservative administration up until 1969. —(Interjection)— Okay. And I'm not going to blame them. I'm not going to blame because I think we share a complicity, in what way is that an attempt to avoid Cabinet responsibility? But the previous administration looked at a couple of schools and thought they were in trouble, and said, "We are willing to consider agreements," and these agreements took the form, Mr. Speaker — and I have never seen one to the point of reading it; I know about them — does that sound like I'm avoiding responsibility, or claiming no knowledge? — but they took the form of saying that a school division could make an agreement with a school in a division whereby from the hours of 9:00 to 10:00 it would be recognized as a private school; from the hours of 10:00 to 12:00 it would be recognized as a public school; from the hours of 2:00 to 3:00 it would again be recognized as a private school; and those periods when it was recognized as a public school would be entitled to a certain amount to which a public school would receive. That was one form of encroachment, and I don't think that there is anything in particular that can be done about this.

Mr. Speaker, I said I don't think that there is anything in particular that can be done about this. I admit that I hoped something could be done about it. I hoped — I thought that by fighting it, I could stop it, but as will soon be indicated, Mr. Speaker, I clearly indicated that I couldn't stop it. And for anybody to say that I had stopped it, is to fly in the face of what is on the record, Mr. Speaker, in Hansard.

Another form of encroachment — and I don't think that there is anything that can be done about this — is that a particular school division would say that we are willing, within our school division, to buy the services, or to provide as a public school, a school which was previously a private school, which is essentially a religiously oriented school. With the result, Mr. Speaker — and I say why there is complicity — because when we came into government, one of the things that happened is that one of these agreements which had previously been negotiated and which was originally operational was put on the Minister of Education's desk for signature, and since it was a commitment which had already been made, was honoured and executed by this administration.

Now, the Member for Sturgeon Creek says that he doesn't remember that? Well, if he doesn't remember that, that's one thing, but don't say that I misrepresented anything, or I am deserving of being referred to in unparliamentary terms, which I am going to now try to avoid, but which I could come back to, should the need arise. Because this won't necessarily be the last time it comes up. And if we're going to engage in that type of slandering, backwards and forwards, well, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, he said I deserved every word of it.

The fact is, that there were certain words there which I claimed that I don't deserve, and which were used, Mr. Speaker, in a way which I have come to expect from the Member for River Heights, and therefore I don't bother dealing with it. Mr. Speaker, you know, the Member for River Heights says I regurgitate. He has learned not to regurgitate exactly, but to say the same thing. For the members opposite, I want to remind the House that the Member for River Heights once got up to answer me by making the following statement — and I'm paraphrasing; it won't be exactly, but it will be the substance of what he said: that every good lawyer learns that the first thing that you do is to manufacture a case, that one of the first things you learn as a lawyer is to manufacture

a case. Then, when you manufacture the case, you are able to argue it. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that we never learned that in Manitoba Law School, and that if that is what Harvard Law School is teaching, that it is a very strange thing to be taught in a law school. We learned that we have to argue the case on the facts as they exist. We are not permitted to manufacture a case, but the Honourable Member for River Heights says that you manufacture a case. Well, he started his speech last week, Mr. Speaker, with almost the same kind of suggestion. He said, like any lawyer, Mr. Speaker, who doesn't have a case — and he says this is not insulting — they shout, they yell, and they make noises. Well, Mr. Speaker, a good lawyer doesn't do that, nor does a good lawyer learn to do that. I'm beginning to doubt whether Harvard Law School is an elite school, if what they teach you at Harvard Law School is that the first thing you do is manufacture a case, and that if you have a weak case, you posture and make noises and speak loudly. Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to write a letter to Harvard Law School, saying that a graduate of yours says that this is what a lawyer does, and this is what he learns, and I want to know whether that is what they taught him in Harvard Law School, because our law school, Mr. Speaker, teaches you entirely differently, and just the opposite.

"But nevertheless," — I am reading from June 2, which is a month before the debate on the private schools. On the same day, Mr. Speaker, on the same day, June 2, I posed a series of questions to the Minister of Education, for those who claimed they didn't know about it, asking him whether he was going to continue to sign those agreements. Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— I fully appreciate, Mr. Chairman; I'm reading from 2647 of Hansard, but I really think the Minister is not answering the question which involves expenditure of public funds. Will he continue to administer the law as it was administered by the previous administration, or is he not going to do that pending the decision on this issue? I was asking whether he is going to continue to sign the agreements or he's going to stop, pending the decision on the then Premier's resolution?

Mr. Hanuschak, the Member for Burrows, gave the kind of answer that you can expect from the Member for Burrows, and which has put him in the position of voting on this bill, and voting for it. "Mr. Speaker, I'll continue to administer the law of the land, the law as it is in the statute books, until it's contested in the courts, or until it's changed in this House, Mr. Speaker, in much the same manner. Every session sees many changes in the laws, and until such time as a change is made, we're bound and governed by the old laws. This government, Mr. Chairman, changed The Landlord and Tenant law, brought in legislation governing automobiles and so forth, and until the day when the law became the law of the land, we're governed by the old law."

Mr. Speaker, I continued to ask him what the law was, and he said, "You can't ask me what the law was." And I continued to ask him whether he is going to sign these agreements, and he said, Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Chairman, with respect to a reply to the question, are there funds in the Estimates to cover the cost of shared services agreements for whatever purposes, for the cost of teaching or any other purpose? Well, grants are paid only to public schools, and I suppose that a school division that is entering into a shared services agreement with a private or parochial school has a way of showing this as one of the expense items for whatever it may be. And that is included in the grant paid to the public school, but not the private school it approaches; that grant is paid to them." And he insisted that he was going to continue to do that, and Mr. Speaker, I saw no way of preventing it. I did see that I could avoid an extension of the principle of adding to the amount that was being paid to private schools, and that was the basis upon which I resigned from the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker. There is no misrepresentation about that and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that was successful. There was no extension of the principle upon which public aid was granted to private schools during the administration, between 1969 and 1978.

The only principle that was followed was the principle which existed in 1969. So, I am not claiming that I accomplished miracles, but I am claiming that I did only that which I represented that I could try to do. I never, Mr. Speaker, represented that I would not sit in a government that signed these agreements. I sat in one and I admitted that I sat in one, and I said that I considered it wrong and I protested during the Estimates, but is there some suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that because a person administers law which he thinks are not correct, that that is a fraudulent procedure? Because we are going to make a lot of frauds, Mr. Speaker. By that definition, there are going to be a lot of frauds.

The Member for River Heights got up in the House and said he was against premiums on Medicare. He got up and said that he was against premiums on Medicare, but he sat in a government that voted for premiums on Medicare. —(Interjection)— Pardon me. Mr. Speaker, of course he didn't resign. He sat.

I resigned, Mr. Speaker, not on the question of the agreements, on the question that there was going to be a new law with regard to the giving of public aid to private schools. The First Minister was dissatisfied with the agreements. He told the House that. He said, let's clear this up and let's give legitimate aid and there was no argument with that. What the Members of the Opposition who

voted against it said is that we are not going to help clear it up. Now they have brought in a bill not to clear it up, but to confirm what I say, Mr. Speaker, is a totally unsatisfactory situation. If they had said that this situation that the previous government was involved in was unsatisfactory and we are not going to continue it, that would be one thing, but they are taking the situation, which is unsatisfactory, and not only are they continuing it, Mr. Speaker, they are enshrining it into law. But is every member on that side satisfied to administer, in principle, every law that he is doing, Mr. Speaker, because I have done worse? I have administered shared services. If there was a vote on shared services today, if you brought in a vote and found some defect in it and asked me to support it, I would vote against it, but I administered it. We administered this law. You are asking me to now confirm this law as the way I say laws should be written? No, Sir, Mr. Speaker. We administered lotteries, which I got up — not only did I administer, but I said that I would vote for it because I could not leave the government on that kind of an issue.

But, Mr. Speaker, to prove my point that I was not misrepresenting anything, on the very next day in the House, I announced that I couldn't stay resigned on that issue. Nobody yelled "fraud" at that time. Nobody yelled fraud during the six years when we were administering these agreements knowingly to everybody.

On June 6, Mr. Speaker, the day after I spoke about the agreements, I got up in the House and I said, and I'm reading just parts of this, I indicated that the "next year's discussion of this issue might be foreclosed by the *de facto* extension of aid by administrative action," which I indicated it was. "I am also of the opinion that the passing of this resolution will psychologically be used by proponents of aid to create an atmosphere whereby financial assistance will be taken for granted. I am under the impression that some Members of the Legislature strongly oppose provision of aid, disagree with my analysis and will do exactly what I predicted on Friday would be done. They appear to be of the impression that the presentation of a resolution rather than the presentation of a bill is a victory for their position." Their position and mine, because it was a resolution. "Some will be voting for the resolution in an attempt to sweep the matter under the carpet. In my view, they will be thereby facilitating that which they are anxious to avoid, namely they will be facilitating the payment of tax dollars for private schools. I know there are MLAs who disagree with my assessment in this connection and they no doubt sincerely hold their views. I will, of course, continue to resist any attempt to pass this resolution and will further resist any attempt to legislate by statute."

Those were my words, Mr. Speaker. "I will resist any attempt to legislate by statute." I didn't know that seven years later there would be an attempt to legislate by statute, but I made it clear what I would oppose and I made it clear that I couldn't stop the administrative action. Now, how, Mr. Speaker, is that a misrep . . . Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to satisfy my learned friend. The people who were associated with me don't consider they have been misrepresented to and will continue to be associated with me on this question.

However, insofar — and here is what I said about my own personal position: "Insofar as my personal actions are concerned, I will consider the fight virtually lost by the passing of the resolution now on the Order Paper, or the passing of any resolution which is associated with the provision of school aid. I will regret having failed to succeed in this issue, but I am satisfied that I have now done everything possible and everything which could reasonably be expected of a single person to do in fighting for this cause. The issue having thus developed, as far as I am concerned I am ready to assume such responsibilities in the government as may be requested of me by the Premier. In the event that I am requested to assume such responsibility, I will of course reserve the right to speak against the legislation granting public aid to private schools, though at that stage I would consider the fight to be a futile one. In making this statement, I repeat what I said, that I have no reason to assume that I am now wanted as a Member of the Cabinet."

Mr. Speaker, this was said to the House, in public, so anybody who is talking about myself having misrepresented anything, it was put clearly on the record that I was not going to stay out of the Cabinet on the basis that this was being administered in this way. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a resignation has to be effective. I don't believe in resigning for the purpose of being a martyr. You know, my partner, Leon Mitchell, used to tell the story about how his mother would convince him to finish the plate. She would say, "Finish the food on your plate." And he said, "I'm not hungry." She said, "People in Europe are starving." So he said, Mr. Speaker, "So I finished the food on the plate and the people in Europe were still starving."

A MEMBER: That's right, but it showed respect for food.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has the same . . . But it was ineffective to prevent starving in Europe. Mr. Speaker, what my honourable friend would like me to do is to resign and have the law continue to be administered in that way and have nothing to do about it. Mr. Speaker, as I have said to this House, if the opposition is taking the position that we are ineffective in fighting this resolution, if that is what they want to prove, they are right. I concede

that. I don't argue with that proposition; I concede it.

If they are saying that this is a good law, then I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a bad law. This law is like saying — and I'll use a very interesting syllogism given to me by one of my colleagues — that just because what we were doing was horrendous, it doesn't mean that you are not being horrendous. The argument that you are using is that we were horrendous, therefore you can't be horrendous. —(Interjection)— Oh, I've heard it that way too, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that the law as it is being proposed is not a good law. Mr. Speaker, if I thought that you meant what you are saying, and I'll show you, I would run, and get a group to run in the next school board election, because you are giving it to the school board to decide. If we could get five school trustees to vote against it, we could remove the aid that has been given to the schools, which is now being accepted by the City of Winnipeg. Would you then say that that is right, because then there would be fraud, Mr. Speaker.

People here say they are in favour in public aid to private schools but they are going to let me organize a group of school trustees to defeat it, which I think we could. But if I did that, Mr. Speaker, I would leave this House — which would satisfy the Member for River Heights — we would elect the school trustees and then there would be a law that, no, you can't refuse it, you have to give it, because you want that aid to be given on the principle, and if you don't, Mr. Speaker, then it's a fraudulent bill. It is a bill which is saying we can pass this now because the New Democrats can't fight it. But that's no reason for passing a bill. And, Mr. Speaker, it's wrong to say that it's necessary.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek believes that his Minister is courageous, because he is bringing forward a bill, because he won't sign an agreement which he considers that he doesn't know the legality of it. But the legality of that agreement was established by a Conservative Minister of Education, and he didn't have those qualms. Was he a fraud? Was he a fraud? I don't say he was a fraud and I didn't even say so in 1969; I said probably innocently. —(Interjection)— Exactly. But now you have presented this Minister as having courage because he is bringing in a bill.

Mr. Speaker, I only want to state what facts are on the record. I don't want to reveal caucus or Cabinet secrets, and I don't, Mr. Speaker. You know, interestingly enough, the press knows who does that. The press knows who breaks solidarity and who gives stories about internal caucus discussions, and they never ask me because they know they won't get it. They do get it from various people, but I have never done it, Mr. Speaker, and they don't ask me. But they know who to ask, because they know where the information is available. But I will state what is on the record, and what is on the record is what I have stated in Hansard, that no Cabinet Order-in-Council is necessary for such an agreement. And I'm not making a big point of that, because I accept that our government did it. But I don't accept that it was right or that this is a good law, and therefore I intend to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of whether there was fraudulent positions taken, after the vote on the public schools issue, when it went down, I was interviewed by various people. One of them, I think, and the one I think who I had to make this answer to was the editorialist now with the Free Press. —(Interjection)— Let's forget it for the moment. And he said, "Well, what is going to happen on this issue? What about the agreements?" And I said, "I can't do anything to stop them; that's going to have to be done at the municipal level."

I said that at the time, and everybody knows that's what occurred. I didn't represent that I was going to stop these agreements. I did, Mr. Speaker, think I could do that and on June 5th said that I tried to stop them, but on the very next day the Minister of Education said that there was no way he was going to stop signing them. No way. And therefore I said, "Well, there is nothing I can do. All I can do is fight an extension of the aid, but if this comes up for a legislative vote, I would vote against it." And I said that on June 6th —(Interjection)— of 1972. In 1972 when I said anybody suggesting that I claimed I didn't know about these agreements or I was avoiding responsibility for them, at no time, Mr. Speaker, and I went back indicating a willingness to go back into the Cabinet with the existing of the agreement. Was there screams of "fraud"? I indicated that I couldn't do anything. What benefit would it have been, Mr. Speaker? I venture to say that if I was not in the Cabinet, there would have been an extension of public aid to private schools. I don't know that, but you people can figure that out for yourselves. You people can figure that out for yourself. I don't know it. And now we are exactly where we were, except we are putting into statute form this bad law, and I say it is —(Interjection)— Talk to the Portuguese about it. Mr. Speaker, my daughter goes to school with Portuguese children in a public school, which would have been a private school had not I done what I did. The honourable member, I believe the school is in his district.

Are we a better educational system with Sacre-Coeur in the public school system or in the private school system? Because if this resolution had not been defeated, Sacre-Coeur would almost certainly have remained a private school. But as it is, it is a public school. My daughter goes there with Portuguese children and children from wealthy families and children from poor families, and they

all go as part of the public school system, a diversified system in the City of Winnipeg, without paying a tuition, not a monolith, as part of the public school system. Would it have been better if Sacre-Coeur remained a religious school in the private sector, would it have been better? Because when people talk about the public school system not being threatened, Mr. Speaker, the very fact of the separation of those children is a detriment to the public school system.

But even more so, Mr. Speaker, even more so the fact is that once you permit the system to be diversified and to have the diversification in the private schools, the pressure to do it in the public school system disappears.

We had candidates running in the last trustee election — the Honourable Member for River Heights' wife was one of them. One of whose major programs is to get to be a member of the Winnipeg School Board so that she could vote money to the private schools. Not to try to do what the Member for Fort Rouge says and what the Member for St. Johns says, which I thoroughly agree with, I don't believe that the public school system is perfect; I believe that the public school system has real problems, and the real problems are mostly of the nature that the Member for Fort Rouge talks about, that it has been unable to make itself a flexible school system with different regimes of schools within the same system. And the Member for Burrows I fully agree with. I would like all of those things to happen within the umbrella of the public school system, and I do not believe in a monolithic system. I believe in a very very diversified system, and by concentrating and giving the aid to the private schools rather than making the public school system much more flexible and diversified, it will hurt the public school system.

I give my friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, that one practical simple example. Is the public school system better for the presence of Sacre-Coeur within the public school system? Would we have a better system if Sacre-Coeur was a private school and the public schools did not have Sacre-Coeur within it. Because I know, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about Portuguese that my daughter goes to school in a French school, with French the language of instruction, within the Winnipeg School System and pays no tuition. We pay our taxes, like everybody else, but she does not pay tuition and thereby goes to school with children of different races, creeds, colours and religion within the public school system, and I believe in that very strongly. I want to do that through the whole system. And if we don't do that, then the public school system will degenerate. It will degenerate by its failure to become excellent, which it would become if we concentrated on doing it.

So, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— Pardon me? My friend says 100 years. You know, there are two different debates going on here. The 100 year debate has got nothing to do with diversification of the public school system. My honourable friend is mixing up two things. If he is talking about the 100 years of injustice, he is talking, Mr. Speaker, about the failure of the Province of Manitoba to provide for a separate Roman Catholic system, which is the system in Ontario and which some people feel is an injustice. I don't, but that is an entirely different argument.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the need for our public system to develop along the lines mentioned by the Member for Fort Rouge and the lines mentioned by the Member for St. Johns. That's something that I have fought for. I will admit that on this bill — and I said this last time — that the honourable members can be amused, and if the purpose of the bill is to amuse us, that's fine or to amuse themselves. If the purpose of the bill is to embarrass people and to call them names, unjustified though they may be, that's fine. But that doesn't make it a good bill, and it will not be considered a good bill. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the moment this bill is passed, that there will be people saying, now, we go to the next step; it's still not right. We should be able to get our tax money which is going to education out of that system into our own system. And if that's an exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what I have been getting letters about now. The people who are writing me about private schools are not saying, "Please pass this bill." They're saying, "Please do something about our tax money coming to our school system." And that's the same thing that they spoke to me about on radio. I thought that what I am saying is so obviously true that nobody would argue about it; that it's not an exaggeration, that that is the objective, and that this is merely a step along that road; this is movement towards that objective.

So, Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that whatever my honourable friend, the Member for River Heights, wants me to do to say that I am guilty, I am guilty of having been a part of an administration that administered those agreements. I plead guilty. I am not guilty of having made any misrepresentation about what I did. I am not guilty about having made any misrepresentation about why I resigned. I am not guilty about having said, when I came back, that I'm going to be able to do something about this agreement. I said, we're going to have to live with the status quo and the fight will have to take place at the school board level.

But I also tell honourable members who are in the Executive Council that they had better be careful about what they classify as being reprehensible. Every one of you is going to have to

things that you don't 100 percent agree with. I venture to say that many of you do not agree with universal Medicare, but you are administering it. It's one of the things that you have to live with. I venture to say that many of you object to some of the features of our welfare legislation, but you are —(Interjection)— Yes, and Autopac. But you are administering it, and if that becomes a subject of personal condemnation, then you are going to be pointing fingers at yourselves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, the Member for River Heights wants to engage in that; I'm willing to stop, but I'm willing to start again, when it starts again. I'm willing to start again, if that's the way it's going to be, and this will not be the last time that it's spoken about. And therefore, if that's the picture that we're going to have, fine. I participated in two leadership campaigns. No one will find one word that I said against the people that I was running against, because, Mr. Speaker, even if there is a temptation, which I hope there wasn't, I knew that I might be serving under those people.

The Member for River Heights said a lot of things about the First Minister, a lot of things about who was controlling the Conservative Party if he succeeded, and what kind of a party it's going to be, but he is in that Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, living with it. Mind you, he has charted his course very nicely. He has become a member of a Task Force which has reserved the right to make all kinds of recommendations as to what should be, none of which is going to be followed, and then he will get up and say, I signed my name to this. The fact that they didn't follow it makes them the idiots, not me.

Mr. Speaker, when did I pave ground of that kind? I have been willing to fight with this administration on all of the most difficult questions. I have had some minor disagreements which have never gone to the heart of the government — on Information Services; I didn't refuse to administer it, I refused to use it. That's the best that I could do.

And with regard to this particular thing, Mr. Speaker, I indicated at the time that there was nothing that I could do about it, that I would continue to resist the resolution because I considered it an extension, and that I would vote against legislation with respect to public aid to private schools. That's what I am doing, Mr. Speaker. I've never represented myself as having done anything else, or as going to do anything else.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before I recognize the next speaker, I would like to seek some advice from the Chamber on the relevance of debate to the motion before the House. I allowed the last speaker 40 minutes without reference to the subject matter before it, because I realize it's a very emotional debate.\$

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can save you some time. The bill is an amendment to The Public Schools Act, which opens up the entire Public Schools Act for discussion.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that during my approximately 25 years in political life, I have —(Interjection)— Yes. I have never been accused of not giving my right name, and of course I'm referring now to the manner of speech that the Honourable Member for Inkster used in his first speech, in saying that we should be able to not be devious, and say exactly what we think. —(Interjection)— Well, no, I know that. I hope that the Member for Inkster won't be too touchy; I am not referring to him every time that I say it. But I want to make it quite clear that I've always considered or have tried, in my years of politics' of calling a spade a spade, and in fact, if anything, I have been accused of being too direct.

Now, the last — I don't know exactly what day it was, Mr. Speaker, when the debate on this bill started, I had the feeling that I was being baited into rushing into this debate. I had the feeling also that certain members on both sides of the House wanted me to make certain statements that might benefit them, that they could use in their arguments for or against this bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, I intend to make my own speech in my own good time, to the best of my ability, and if certain statements that I make can help either the Member for Inkster or others in defeating this bill, so be it. Or if some of the statements that I make could help the First Minister in some of the things that he's tried to do, well, so be it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's hardly necessary for me to say that I very categorically am very much in favour of state aid. It is my contention that during the past hundred years, through the infamous Manitoba school question, a grave injustice has been made to minorities, especially to two minorities, one the Roman Catholic and one the Franco-Manitobans, and I belong to both, Mr. Speaker.

During the Lesage administration in Quebec there was a division of church and state, there was a divorce, and because of that, I would imagine, we would have been able to rectify to a large degree the injustice that I mentioned a while ago concerning the Franco-Manitobans. Oh, of course, we heard then that governments would be defeated, and so on, and that it would break up the

public school but nothing happened, Mr. Speaker, and in fact, the bill passed unanimously in the House and no government was defeated because of that, and I think it brought Manitobans a little closer together, and it helped the school question, because the Honourable Member for Inkster stated that he was very happy with the school de Sacre-Coeur, in fact, that his daughter was attending that school. Well, yes, and that was done because of this change, because of this correction on the question of French education, and in the words of my honourable friend, this did not destroy the public school system at all, but it helped.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that I'll have a chance to make my speech. The honourable member made a couple of speeches. I bit my tongue many times, and I know that I am a bad one to egg on people, but this I find it's very important to me, and I hope that I'll be given my time. I'm ready to try to answer any questions after this is done.

Mr. Speaker, I don't apologize, I favour aid to private schools. I'm not embarrassed, I will not blush; in fact, I don't regret it, I'm not sorry, and I'm very proud of the stand that I take in this, that I've always taken on this idea.

Now, what is the situation? I don't think that's the most important thing, but many members in the last speech that we talked about, that we heard, talked about the situation up to now, and I must say that I agree with many of the things that were said by the previous people, Mr. Speaker. The situation is this, I don't agree with everything, but the situation is this: that we are presented a bill now — and I certainly agree, and this was a point that I was going to make — I don't have to make it and waste time, the Honourable Member for Inkster made it. The resolution itself, the resolution of 1972, spelled it out, so everybody had to know what was going on. And I'll just quote part, "And whereas instances have occurred in some school divisions of the removal of the distinction between public and private schools through the action of various forms of local agreement and the constitution of parental or other advisory committees such as Brandon, The Pas, Norwood, St. Vital in the school division." And later on, and I skip part, ". . . and because of the anomalies discovered in the actual operation of legislation governing shared services since 1966." So, Mr. Speaker, let's not argue about that; we all knew, or we did not want to know, what was going on.

But then, there's different people with different points of view. I think that if the Member for Inkster felt that he had to defend himself today, I think it's a bit his fault. I think he had it coming because he brought it upon himself, because he called this a devious bill, a horror story. And that I don't believe is true; I believe that it's right, that any Minister — Ministers aren't all the same — we don't all have the same kind of conscience on the same issues. Now, the situation is this. This is the way I saw it. I was told, and I've heard from people that felt that legally it was permissible. Other people felt that it wasn't. Had I been the Minister, I would have had no hesitation in signing at all, mostly because I was prejudiced, because I wanted to give aid, as much as possible, to private schools.

Now, we kept on. It was brought to the attention — and I'll mention that, because it was mentioned before in the House, not to divulge what happened, what was said in Cabinet — but it was brought to the attention of Cabinet and what do we do, because it was forced on us by the School Division of Winnipeg, who felt, well, until this is straightened out, we're not signing it, because it might be illegal. And therefore I will not fault, I will not fault the Minister who brought this legislation, because he is saying, "All right, we're going to do . . .". If the government would try to hide behind this, but I don't think that they have, because, in fact, I was pleasantly surprised that the Member for Sturgeon Creek said, "We're standing on our own two feet. We don't want to stop what was going on because times have changed, this thing is working well, and we'll go ahead with it." And if the Minister feels that he is not going to sign this, if there is any doubt, he doesn't want to be hauled into court — well, what better way than to bring in a bill and say, "All right, let's legalize and I'll sign it." So, I think it is exaggerated to say that this is a horror story. We've all admitted on this side that we knew — and I'm very happy that I knew what was going on, and I don't think that the Member for Inkster has to apologize or to explain too much. I think that everyone accepted their responsibility. In fact, even the government, or the previous — not the government, because many of them are new members, but one of the key members in this government is the one that signed this document, and I think that we agree that we have all gone along, and this is what's going on. So, I don't think that this is that important.

In 1964, Mr. Speaker, I voted against shared services. I voted against shared services because — and I don't think my honourable friend is a genius; well, sometimes I do, but not on this issue — that I think he's a genius, because he is going to prophesy that we're going to ask for more; he's absolutely right. He's absolutely right, and he doesn't have to be a genius to do that. I could even see that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I did not vote for this bill in 1964 because I said, and I quote, "That it would be an administrative nightmare," and that's exactly what it was. And I also said that I could not accept the base of why this was done. I think there were three points that the Member for St. Johns talked about, and that he approved 100 percent; I did not do that.

Friday, July 14, 1978

So therefore we all know what happened in 1972. In 1972, I'll try to tell you very, very honestly, in my own way, what I think the situation was. I'm not making any accusations, no name-calling; I'll tell you the way I saw it through my eyes, and I know that some will not agree with me. The situation was this: that the then First Minister had stated very clearly, openly, that if aid to private schools did not go through, he would resign.

There had been a very strong and good and honest leadership convention between the Member for Inkster and the First Minister of the day. I am not trying to put words in anybody's mouth, but my feeling at the time and still looking at everything, I had the feeling that I could not see why the Meer for Inkster would resign Cabinet, especially when his colleague had to do the work of the First Minister while he was trying just as hard to fight for something that he believed. I'm not denying the right of anybody to do so. I felt it was obvious that the First Minister was going to resign if it didn't work and then the leadership was up for grabs.

Now at the time, the Meer Borowski, wherever he was from and wherever he is, tried to force the issue, the First Minister then backed away when was asked by members of the Cabinet who said, "Well, don't do it, you have got a responsibility, it's not fair for the rest of Manitoba," and he backed away and he said, "All right, I won't resign," and the Member Borowski was mad and tried to get him to stay with that. And this is what happened and there was dissension, there appeared to be an awful lot of dissension, there was dissension in the Cabinet.

And that is where I will fault the Conservative party. The Conservative party then tried to exploit that because there's another person — and I am not saying that in any derogatory manner — there was another person that wanted just as bad to be the Premier of Manitoba. And they used a very — I don't know, it's not even an excuse to be able to say, well, there is no legislation, we'll vote against — and the whip was on. Mind you, it chased one of the meers who said, "the hell with it, I am not going to do it" and I was told by meers of the caucus themselves — I might be wrong, I am telling you the way I saw it and the way I see it now — and, therefore, one person said, "no way am I going to vote for that" and it was 17 to 1. It was 17 to 1 with the Conservative party members only. Just the Conservative Party. All right, of course, I expected that, that they would say it was a free vote; to me, Sir, I will never believe that. I will never believe that and I have been told by members of the caucus that it wasn't a free vote.

Now, the situation was this that the members said, "well it is another committee." But just the year before, Sir, there was a resolution passed in this House that requested the meers to consider the advisability of doing something for aid to private schools. There was only one of the present members of the Conservative party that voted against it, all the others voted for it. Some of the menames ers — and I'll mention the because this is the way I took it in Hansard — those that voted in favour of Froese's resolution on August 3, 1970 to consider the advisability of aid to private schools were Mr. Craik — and he could read his remarks on Page 4677 when he said that he was in favour of aid to private schools; Mr. Einarson; Mr. Enns could read his remarks on Page 4666; I was going to say you, Mr. Speaker, but I meant Mr. Graham; Mr. McGill; Mr. McGregor; Mr. McKenzie; Mr. Sherman could read his remarks on Page 4666 and Mr. Spivak could read his on 4665.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how can they say we will consider the advisability of and be in favour and speak in favour of, then all of a sudden when this is brought up in a resolution to do exactly that, to consider what would be done, exactly that and to have some of their members on this say no, we are not going to do it any more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, to me it was very very clear. Now the Meer for Inkster today seemed to have taken the credit, if you can call it credit, for having this resolution defeated in 1972. It was a question of an accident of history because of this political thing and unfortunately, and I damn the day that politics was introduced into this, because it was going through. When I say "politics" you know exactly what I mean because everything is politics of course. But then that resolution in 1972 went down 30 to 22, so that meant 5, that some of those who I had mentioned who had clearly said yes, we want this, there would have been no doubt at all that it would have gone through.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is past history and I don't think this serves any more the situation if we keep on, keep on harping on this. It is gone but I certainly do admire and will compliment the present Conservative Government not only because they brought the bill — I agree with the Member for Inkster — it's not only a bill that they say, let's go on, you know, so it is just that you're not caught off base, that's it's legal. It's more than that because they have clearly said yes, we are in favour of aid to private schools. So I don't apologize, I am very happy, I rejoice and I congratulate them for doing this. As I said, the Member for Sturgeon Creek who had the guts to say yes, we have had enough, there is too much legislation, there is too much study, let's bring in legislation, I couldn't agree more.

Now I will support this bill, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that it does allow us to at least keep on what we were doing and it was serving the people well. But I do agree again very much with the Honourable Member for Inkster, that this is not enough and this is wrong and you will just have

to come back and fight it again and study it again . If you don't go a little further and have the guts to do exactly what you want to do, that is if you believe in state aid, if you believe that one school division can give state aid, then you believe that state aid is fair, that it should be all across Manitoba and don't push the responsibility on the school divisions. We didn't do that on the French bill.

If this is what you want, it is very easy to bring in certain regulations, to cover that in the regulations and also to cover it in the Act . The Act says, and I am quoting to the Public Schools Act now where it states the French bill, teaching in French: ". . . whose parents desire them to be instructed in the class in which English or French, as the case may be, is used as the language of instruction, the board of the school district, school division or school area may, and upon petition of the parents of those pupils requesting the use of English or French, as the case may be as the language of instruction in respect to those people, shall . . ."

Sir, I wish to serve notice that I am considering very seriously in bring in an amendment to bring this out in the open and I hope it will be settled once and for all after so many years. I don't think it is going to defeat any government at all and I feel that the amendment to me will be to change "may" to "shall". So then we will not be arguing about horror stories, about rectifying things, we will be arguing about the decency, doing something that should have been done a long time ago, of recognizing the right of the people of this province to a fair education and all of it, to recognizing the principle of state aid.

Now everybody tells me what I believe as one of the members that is in favour of state aid, and sometimes I resent that because I think that at times it is devious and is false. And, Sir, this is what I believe. I believe in a very strong, I repeat, strong public school system. At no time did I ever hope or think to try to knock down the public school system; if we didn't have a public school system, I would be the first one to bring a resolution or a bill or something to establishing a public school system. I also believe in parental rights in education, Sir, and I think they have a right — not only a right and a duty, I don't think it is a privilege and I don't think it a state or government or political given right, I think it is a God-given right, a natural given right, the same as you will have if you don't believe in God, look at nature around you, look at animals the way they take care of their children, and I think you will understand what I mean.

I believe in equal opportunities for all students. I don't believe in creating a ditch and making it as hard in bringing deterrent, deterrent, because that is exactly what I heard last week, deterrent against the private school system. I think it is a joke, I think it is devious to say, and I think it is sheer hypocrisy to get up and say, I believe that everybody can have their schools but they bloody well better pay for them themselves. I don't think that this is equal opportunity because some people, at times, can't do it so they will be deprived of that, Mr. Speaker. I also believe in the freedom of the individual to be guided by his conscience and I believe in the freedom to exercise these rights, Sir.

I don't believe that anybody is serious when they say that bringing help will degrade the school system, will jeopardize its integrity. And to say, Sir, to make a big thing and say, well what I want, what the Catholics want or what some supporters of the private school systems want, it is they want their own money — that is not true. That was one of the alternatives because these people have tried everything. I would be very happy within the public school system, I would like to be able to say like the Honourable Member for Inkster says, "Look, that school, Sacre-Coeur, it's working." I don't give a damn where it is as long as the kind of teaching that my conscience and the conscience of the people of Manitoba want as long as that is respected. And there is no such a thing as a neutral school.

You know, the Member for St. Johns looking at the Honourable Meer for Lakeside said, you know, you say non-believer and it was just like you were accusing him. I don't think that. Why should they have exactly what they want, exclude God or exclude anything else, from the school. Am I a square because I believe in Christianity? I'm not trying to force anybody else in my belief but I want the right to be able, as my duty as a parent, I want the parental right to decide what kind of education I want for my children. Am I a bad citizen of Manitoba because of that. I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. And another thing, and I have a lot of respect for this member, but the most ridiculous thing I heard when a comparison was made to Northern Ireland between Catholics and Protestants. The name doesn't mean anything to me because the kind of teaching — if that is the teaching of hate, that is not Christianity, it is certainly not Judaism and it is not Catholic or Protestant because that's not the kind of teaching — in fact, in Northern Ireland there is too many Catholics and too many Protestants and not enough damn Christians and I think that's . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, my first responsibility — and I don't mind private schools but I have got to defend the public school system. What kind of confidence do we have in public schools if we feel that we have to stop people from going their way, doing their thing because that is going to destroy the school system. If it is that weak, it should be protected or it should be changed. And, Sir, it reminds me of the people that said for many years, break up the Montreal Canadiens, break

up the Yankees, they are too strong. You know, bring them down to your bloody level, way down there, instead of saying, let us try to get up there with them. I think that this should be done.

Now, Sir, I think that the people have the same right, if you are talking about certain schools — and it was mentioned in the House, but that's not my concern — for some areas, it might be rich kids — so what? So what if they were kids of rich parents. If it's a finishing school, that's something else. They have the right to send them there, they will have to pay part of it, they pay their taxes, but that's not the people I'm fighting for. I'm fighting for the people that are right at the bottom of the ladder and whose conscience are saying, this is the kind of education I want for my children. Those are the people I am fighting for and those are the kinds of schools I am fighting for. It could be within the public school system like this — this Act is all right if only the government and the Minister would take the responsibility instead of farming it out to the school division. I see nothing wrong with that at all.

And we have talked about — you know, for many years I guess there was discrimination. I think we all discriminate. No matter what, I think the main thing is to try not to act on our prejudices. We all have prejudice. It was said a while ago, maybe when I was young, it's true, I will confess, that an atheist was something real bad. I realize that people are changing and I still think that I am a lot happier in my beliefs. I feel that I am one of the the lucky ones, right, call me what you want, use that against me if you want; that's the way I feel, so I'll say it.

But I've also heard, not too long ago, when we were dealing with the bill to closing hours on Sunday and so on, and some of the members said, well, I'm all for that, but if I thought that it was a religious bill because the people want to observe the day of the Sabbath, I'd be against it. Well, damn it, the member said, that's right. Why, why interfere with me, you can call it what you want, you can go to the beach, you can have a rest with the family, that's important too, but if I want to go and worship on that day, why should you say, if that's what he wants, we'll block it? —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, there's no point of order, let me finish my speech and then if he wants to bring another amendment, he can make a third speech. In the meantime, that's the way I feel, and that's the way I call it, Mr. Speaker, when I get this feeling, that I will call it. All right, well all right, I don't like that, and I don't think it's fair. —(Interjection)— Well, nonsense if you want, nonsense, but all of a sudden . . . I didn't hear too many members say, well, all right, we've got Medicare, but if you ever go to any Catholic hospital, you pay for it. —(Interjection)— No, not a damn soul said that because the hospitals of Manitoba would be closed, because what are our hospitals, they are — and I shouldn't say Catholic, I should say private hospitals. You've got the Salvation Army, you've got the Grey Nuns, you've got the Misericordia Hospital, and the people are saying, okay, go ahead, you're even paying the chaplains now, that's all right, that's all right. It's not destroying . . . We've got one of the best, if not the best, system of health care in this province that you can find in Canada and anywhere else in the world, Mr. Speaker, and therefore, you know, it doesn't matter if you do the work, if you do the work.

I am not trying to send my money for my kids, and my tax, I think that that's going to be a real jangle if you do that. I just want an atmosphere, an area or school, where I can have the kind of teachers together with a group, a large group, and I say, let's not have these crazy rules that anybody, one person, either a snake charmer, or something, can have a school. Put in proper regulations that will protect the public school system, you owe it to the people of Manitoba and you owe it to the public school system, but then when it's feasible, let the people get together and teach what they want to teach, in the way they want to teach it, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was stated many times that I've changed parties, that I was an opportunist, maybe that I didn't have any principles, that I was a judas, and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess it's true to say that I am an opportunist. I've never denied that, but an opportunist because of the things that I'm fighting for, and never, and I will deny that and challenge that, never an opportunist for Larry Desjardins to see what he can get out of it. If you think that going to the Cabinet, and some of these people will wake up pretty soon, is such a great thing, some day you'll wake up. And I think I'd be financially, in a hell of a better position, if I'd never gone to the Cabinet.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I decided that I would support the Schreyer government, and I then joined the New Democratic Party, and I think that we had a fantastic government, and I think that we did an awful lot of work, and I don't regret it. I don't know, as I said before, if I'd have the guts to do it again, but I would go along with what we've done, and the thing that impressed me the most, and maybe I did change, maybe I matured a bit, maybe I became more compassionate, because I was exposed to certain things that maybe I hadn't been in the past. And what I like is the party that will fight for certain thing, for minimum wages, to make sure that you don't just fight for, in other words, for the lower people on the ladder, and that you will fight for redistribution of income.

And that is why I cannot understand, Sir, why some people can say of this party, well, you know, sure, you'll have aid to private schools, but we'll make it so damn hard for you that you will not

be able to attend. That I cannot understand, that my colleagues, who are I think so right in so many ways, would have that feeling when it comes to school. Is it based on hate, on misunderstanding, or what, I don't know! And that is the concern I have, and if sometimes it shows that I might have any doubt, that I might not feel exactly at home in my new position in the New Democratic Party, it is not for what we've done, it is for the fear sometimes of what I hear by some members, that the state will become supreme, and that the family will be replaced by the state. That is the thing that I don't want, and I have a bit of this fear. I don't think that anything was done when I was a member of this party, or a member of the Cabinet, that proved that, but I've had that fear. I'm not completely convinced that I don't have a hang-up, —(Interjection)— It might be an old hang-up, but there are some members in the party who believe that. I hear that in certain areas, and this is the only thing that I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker.

So, as I said, it pains me to see this thing of the same people that are saying, well, let's have a redistribution of income, let's make sure that there is a minimum wage, let's make sure that they laugh at people when they say that they are going to knock off the tax because it's going to help the corporate giants, but it's only going to bring \$13 for somebody, who then say, and I know they're sincere, I believe they're sincere, who say, well, all right, you have the freedom I believe that you should have your schools, but make it impossible for you to attend these schools. To me, Sir, this is hypocrisy, and this is wrong, and this is the same people also, who say, don't bring any deterrent, who are bringing the biggest deterrent of them all for the people to respect, to go ahead and should I say, exercise their right of parental rights and equal opportunity, and it's certainly not equal opportunity when you've got a ditch so bad that you pay for the public schools, and pay until they have everything, and then start paying for yours. And if you're talking about, a little while ago, that there were great defenders of the public school system, that if the private schools came in, they would be better, and therefore they would be the elite. Isn't it the other way around, go around some of these private schools, and look at their labs, look at the facilities that they have, and you'll see how much they're struggling, they're trying to keep their school because it is a matter of conscience with them, Mr. Speaker. \$\$

Now it is unfortunate, as I said, that only five, in 1972, and the Member for Inkster is absolutely right. Some people maybe wanted to close their eyes, I don't know why, I can't impute motives, but the majority of people knew exactly what it was, it was a motion of aid to private schools against aid to private schools. And I think it is unfortunate that it was at this time in history, and I'm not going to repeat what I said before, the reason why I think it was done, but only five, and I've heard so many people speak how much they wanted, and how much, especially when that resolution of Froese came in, the Member for Lakeside also said, yes, I believe in it, and the motion was to consider the advisability of doing more, and all of a sudden when this was presented to them in 1974, got off. Well, you can read Hansard, I see the Minister of Finance is shaking his head, I even give you the page where you can read your remarks on that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, there's a lot of people, and this is why, as I say, I'm not satisfied with this as the bill, and I've got an opportunity now, and as I say, very seriously, I intend to see if I could prepare, and I serve notice on the Minister in the government, not to say, well, all right, it'll take a while because this is what he's going to do. I'm not a lawyer, I don't know how to write legislation, but I intend to bring legislation, an amendment that will change "may" to "shall" and I say to you, if you don't want to have to come back next year, and so on, if you want to do this once and for all, to rectify the injustice of a hundred years ago, well then, please do support this amendment that will probably be brought in.

Now, I think that I have a minute, and I just want to say something else, leave this completely, and talk about the part of the resolution that brings in other languages as language of instruction. I don't know what the Minister has in mind. I believe in bilingualism, biculturalism, and I can see languages of culture, not necessarily in that degree, even in some areas where it could be used as a teaching language, and I don't object to that, but it is something to bring back, the Tower of Babel that we had many years ago, because at one time the teaching was in French and English, and then others were allowed to bring in their language, and then it became a Tower of Babel. So what happened, the Franco Manitobans were sacrificed because then you had to have only one teaching language. And I hope that this will not be allowed, and I hope that this is not something to try to get the backlash of the people. Oh, it's popular at certain times, and it's popular now to be anti-French a bit with what's going on in Quebec. I hope that the members who really want a strong Canada and believe in our country, and believe that we are all equal, and that if we're bad or good or indifferent, it's not because we're French, English, Catholic, or Protestant, it is because of our own nature, and I hope that this Minister does not bring in . . . I'm not making an accusation, but I hope this is not something that will bring back and dilute the French, and the importance of French, as an official language of Manitoba. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak on this amendment very briefly, but I believe it's necessary, because of the remarks of the Honourable Member for Inkster. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that had the Honourable Member for Inkster introduced his presentation on this bill with the tone that he used today, I think the debate would have taken on a different character and quality. But to a large extent, the tone of the debate, awarded the kind of reply which he has objected to because he is the one who suggested that what is being introduced was a horrendous bill, and then went on through a series of, I believe, exaggerated statements to try and chastise the members opposite for the course of action that we have undertaken.

He was followed, Mr. Speaker, by the Leader of the Opposition, after I spoke, who, in a very quiet manner, indicated that in his opinion, this was a clarification. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that the words of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have to be understood to properly reflect on what has really happened. Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest the following things to the honourable member, and I do not want to belabour the point. His course of conduct, his actions, has stopped him from denying that he has a responsibility for what's happened. But, Mr. Speaker, he has taken this position, so long as he was in government and the administrative practices continued in the way they did, that was all right. But so long as the bill was presented to the House, Mr. Speaker, then he has the right to vote. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, if we could go through this scenario —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a Point of Order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, yes, I rise on a Point. . . I never said it was all right, I never said it was all right. I protested in 1972, I indicated that I was contrary to its route, but I said I would have to live with it, but I never said I approved of that system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster, that he raised his point of privilege after the member had completed his speech.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I asked you to make that type of ruling when I was interrupted by the First Minister last week. Since you didn't, Mr. Speaker, I assumed that I was to follow your rulings, and not to reflect on your rulings, that I was to do what you ruled last week, which I have done.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, although the honourable member may have said it was wrong, his course of action, I believe, indicated that it was all right, while he was in opposition. And, Mr. Speaker, I just simply draw this scenario. Let's assume that the former government had been re-elected. The administrative practices would continue, and so long, Mr. Speaker, as they would have continued in power, they would follow the administrative practice which he did not agree with, and, Mr. Speaker, which I believe the majority of Cabinet did not agree with. The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, will be, when the former members of the Cabinet stand up and vote on this particular bill, which is a clarification of their administrative procedures as to how many of them are going to deal with it.

And the amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the former Minister of Education, in his presentation, dealing with this bill which was the clarification of the administrative procedures that he suggested, said, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from Page 4981 of Hansard, "I'm not entirely happy with the contents of the bill." Yet, Mr. Speaker, I want to read if I may from a letter that he sent, as Minister of Education, to the Secretary-Treasurer of the River East School Division, in 1976: "This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 30, 1976, regarding shared services. Please be advised that Section 171(2) of The Public School Act is every bit as legal as any other section of the Act. With respect to your questions regarding the interpretation of the Agreement between Norwood School Division and Holy Cross Elementary School, may I suggest that if you wish, you direct them to the parties to the Agreement."

So, Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Education wrote a letter in 1976, saying that the sections were in fact as legal as any other section of the Act. Yet, when he stands up, Mr. Speaker, he says, "I'm not entirely happy with the contents of the bill." Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a schizophrenia that exists with the members on the opposite side, and that is real, and there is a problem. But I want to assure the Honourable Member for Inkster who has left the Chamber, that in effect, Mr. Speaker, this is not being introduced to try and embarrass the members on the opposite side. This is not being introduced to try and cause some confusion with them. They have a problem and the problem is not going to be solved by the suggestion that this is a horrendous bill, or by the

that this is going to lead to something far more than is suggested by the actual legislative wording. And, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member initially attempted to do this, but I suggest to him that he has put himself into an impossible situation, which he cannot resolve, Mr. Speaker, by his claim that somehow or other he had no responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I want to further document that, because I think this is necessary for the record, to indicate while he says the matter is an administrative matter, which they had knowledge of, that somehow or other there was no Order-in-Council dealing with this matter, which in fact places him into a position of responsibility. —(Interjection)— I think his words were “never came to Cabinet.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have an Order-in-Council, and the Order-in-Council, Mr. Speaker — and this is an interesting one and I'm sorry the honourable member is not here — is dated August 31, 1977, and the number, Mr. Speaker, is 979/77 and it shows Mr. Green as being present, and that is the Honourable Member for Inkster, which deals with Section 171 and, Mr. Speaker, which increases the amount of aid and support given to the private schools under the agreement. It actually increases the amount.

Now the Honourable Member for Inkster, as well as some of the other honourable members who have already spoken and said they were going to oppose the bill, on August 31, 1971, passed an Order-in-Council which increased the amount, Mr. Speaker, given to those schools that comply with the Act and now the Honourable Member for Inkster is saying that somehow or other this administrative practice was not a Cabinet responsibility, but I take some responsibility, but it was never dealt with by Order-in-Council, and it does not wash.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way. The honourable member says he doesn't have to prove this in a court of law. We're not in a court of law, but in terms of the court of public opinion, there is absolutely no way that any of the Ministers opposite are going to be able, as they may want to, to go through this province and start to suggest that somehow or other we have done something that they, themselves, did not do; that they themselves were not a party to; that they had full knowledge of; and that they exercised the executive powers that they had as members of the Executive Council.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the former Minister, the Honourable Member for Inkster, stood and talked about now we have an issue and now we are going to be able to organize, well, Mr. Speaker, he is talking about somebody, you know, and he is talking about — whoever that we is, he has never really defined that — but that's an interesting thing. But I have a suspicion he is talking about a lot of the honourable members opposite, who are going to be part of that “we”.

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and I think the point has been made, and I think it's not necessary to labour it; nor is it necessary to deal in the kind of hysteria that was originally presented by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that although they acknowledged that there was confusion with respect to the administrative practice, in the sense that there were different interpretations — and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has already referred to that — the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that they knew the administrative practice was in fact providing money in the form of shared services agreement, that they in fact as a Cabinet agreed — not just on this one occasion but on other occasions — to in fact increase the amounts, that they all had knowledge of it, and that, Mr. Speaker, their course of conduct, their action, stops them, Mr. Speaker, from in any way denying responsibility and from in any way putting them in a position in which they had any moral justification for not supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it's a complete flip-flop, and I suggest to you that it is not discharged by the remarks that the Honourable Member for Inkster has provided the House. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it only supports the basic thesis that was presented by myself and others in this House, and really the conclusion that we drew, which the Honourable Member for Inkster really became upset with, because, Mr. Speaker, it is an amazing situation.

In fact, one of the honourable members, who was a former member of the government, said, “I have changed my mind.” Well, Mr. Speaker, that's basically what the position is. They have changed their mind. While they were in government, it was all right. While they are in opposition now, it's not all right. And then, Mr. Speaker, in order to justify their position, they then allude to things and suggest things that are not contained in the bill really for a purpose of inflaming the issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been an evolution in the shared services program and while that is not aid to private schools, it is in fact a step towards the evolution of trying to in fact provide a compatibility between the private school systems, Mr. Speaker, and the public school systems. And that evolution comes as a result of the Legislature's leading the public and, at the same time, reflecting the will of the public, at the same time, the balance that has to be developed between those who have responsibility to lead.

I think that one can say that we have taken ourselves from a position in which we had an emotionally charged issue in this province, which was severe, and as a result of a lot of goodwill and a lot of experience, have altered and changed that position. And what we are doing is clarifying

the development and the evolution. That is all it is, and there should be no claim of something different. The honourable members have really got to look in their own conscience and really should reflect, Mr. Speaker, when they vote, on how they are going to vote on the basis of their past actions on the basis of their own complicity, Mr. Speaker, in an administrative practice which they knew very well, Mr. Speaker, was providing in the evolutionary way of shared services a form of aid, and, Mr. Speaker, in the recognition that that administrative practice would have continued on and on, and on, had they remained in government and all we are doing is clarifying it so there will be no doubt in terms of the legal position, and in the course of doing this we are presenting it to the House. We should not be, Mr. Speaker, faced with a situation that there is going to be opposition. Rather, Mr. Speaker, we should be receiving unanimous support from the members of the House, because this in fact was their action. While they may not like it, and while they may have held different views, and while they may have disagreed with it, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely ludicrous to suggest that because it's now presented in legislative form to them that they can vote against it. They have a perfect right. There is freedom. They can do anything they want. They can vote against it but, Mr. Speaker, it is inconsistent. In fact, it's astounding and it reflects, as I suggest, a schizophrenia on the part of the members opposite; it really does. And I suggest that some of the honourable members who have already stated their position, that they rethink their position very carefully. They were part of an Executive Council. They met in Cabinet. There is no doubt about that. They dealt with agreements. They knew full well what was happening. They dealt with the Estimates. They, in fact, were parties to this and they would have continued this had they stayed in power.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there really is no other case to be presented. And not withstanding all the remarks of the honourable member, who tries to indicate his consistency, the only inconsistency in this thing, Mr. Speaker, will be when the Honourable Member for Inkster stands up and votes against the bill. That is the inconsistency.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had intended to enter this debate at an earlier juncture and, to be frank, at that time it was my intention to speak against the bill, but I understand now that we are speaking to the hoist. So I will speak to that primarily.

It seems to be a privilege, or even an honour, in one way or another to speak on this subject during the course of one's tenure in this Chamber. It is a subject that re-occurs and re-occurs. I, for one, welcome the opportunity to add my voice to the din and add my thoughts to the multitudes of thoughts about this subject in this House. For much has been said, Mr. Speaker, and much has been thought about the concept of shared services.

As I said earlier, it was my intention to speak against the bill. It is also my intention to speak against the amendment. Now that the bill is before us, Bill 57, I, for one, wish to see it defeated decisively and deliberately for it has been a question far too long. And while I do not agree with the bill, I do agree with the fact that we are having this open debate on Bill 57.

To be perfectly honest, Mr. Speaker, what I have to say today has probably been said in one form or another in this House many times before. And, quite frankly, it has probably been better put and it has probably been better stated than I can state it, or that I can put it. So I have to be honest. There is nothing new, nor is there anything particularly eloquent about what I have to add to this debate. And at this late date in the session, Mr. Speaker, when all of us — or I imagine that all of us — wish to finish the business of this House, I hesitate to rise to speak when the best that I feel that I can do in this instance is to reiterate and to repeat that which has already been said.

As a matter of fact, in my opinion, it is extremely doubtful whether any of us have any new rationale or any of us have any new thought, or new original thought, to contribute to this debate. Yet in spite of that obvious statement, many of us have and many of us will, I assume, speak to the concept of shared services. For even although we may have nothing new to add, the subject is far from a closed subject. For all the debate that proceeded us, both inside and outside these Chambers, the matter is still unresolved and it is still quite controversial, if we are to judge by the emotional tenor of some of the debates this day and in previous weeks. And it has been but a few weeks since this particular bill was first put before the House and in that short time, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to acquaint myself more thoroughly with the issue and I feel that I have approached it with an open mind. For when the bill was presented to the House, I was of no particular persuasion other than knowing very well the importance of the educational system.

That is why I believe this issue to be such an emotional issue, Mr. Speaker. That is the reason behind the intensity that this subject creates whenever it appears and whenever it reappears and reappears and reappears. Because education is more than books and classrooms and bus routes, and per capita. Education is a moulding force. Education is a weapon through which society is shaped, and shaped in its own image.

As I mentioned earlier, there are no new thoughts in this dissertation. To prove that, I will go back quite some time. Alexander Pope said it long before I do, and far better than I do today. It was he who told us, and I quote him, "Tis education forms a common mind, just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined." So it is not surprising, nor is it difficult to understand why this particular bill would create such a fair degree of interest and emotion. It is a subject that demands attention. It is a subject that begs resolution and that is why I have to speak against the hoist. It demands resolution today, not six months hence. It has been left unanswered long enough.

As I indicated earlier, I intend to speak against Bill 57 but, at the same time, I also intend to speak in favour of shared services and I find no contradiction in that approach, Mr. Speaker, for I support the original concept of shared services, or at least I support what I perceive to be the original concept of shared services. And it is not my observation alone. It is not my perception alone. The interpretation is obvious. This bill goes beyond the original notion and definition of shared services and, according to my quick research, shared services first meant that private school students could share the public school system in a number of different ways, with some very definite parameters placed on that sharing.

It is my understanding that shared services would apply to the use of existing school facilities and the shared use of transportation routes. And I have no objection to shared services of this nature. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would be disappointed if arrangements of this sort were disallowed. I support arrangements of that sort wholeheartedly.

It is my belief and it is also, I might add, my hope that all Manitobans have access to their public schools, both to the facilities and to the services of the public school system, at the mutual convenience of all involved.

The original concepts of shared services, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, was an imminently workable proposition that never really obtained a proper hearing. It was a good idea that was never given a chance.

I should take great care right at this juncture to make known my opinion of private schools for there will be a tendency for some to infer that one's objections to Bill 57 is indicative of one's objections to private schools. And while that inference is ill-founded and, in this particular case, that inference is absolutely incorrect, there will be those that seek to cloud the issue. There will be those that seek to confuse the sentiments of those that speak to this legislation.

So adamantly and deliberately, I have to state my uncategorical support of private schools. And surprisingly, that support that I feel towards private schools also gives me cause to vote against Bill 57, for it is my assumption that this legislation will work to the detriment of the independence of the private school system. To be fair, this assumption is also built upon another assumption which makes for a tenuous base at best, but these assumptions are not mine alone and they have been partially proved by the past so I will proceed in building a base for one assumption upon the base of a partially proved assumption.

The first assumption is that this bill will facilitate future funding. That is, as Dufferin Roblin insisted it was, it was not, that I feel this bill is the thin edge of the wedge. Just as the original concept of shared services was corrupted and expanded upon until we had this bill presented to this House in the last couple of weeks, this bill, No. 57, will too be expanded upon and corrupted, if you will, because as adamant as I am in opposition to this bill, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it goes too far. The proponents of public financing of private schools are also as adamant because it does not in their opinion go far enough. This bill satisfies no one and for that reason it is a beginning, it can only be a beginning, it cannot be an end.

So the first assumption, bolstered and supported by the past and by the comments of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface earlier this morning, leads to the second assumption. That is, this bill, this legislation, will encourage future funding of an expanded nature and that, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, will work ultimately to the detriment of the private school system.

As the funding increases, so will the dependency. The two obviously go hand in hand and unless very stringent or very specific measures are taken and stringent safeguards are imposed, as the dependency upon the public purse increases, and that's what we are talking about, the independency of the private schools will decrease. The private schools will lose that which distinguishes them from the public schools. Day by day and dollar by dollar they will become less private and more public. They will be less controlled by their own internal dictates, and more controlled by the public will. They will have to. They're obvious, Mr. Speaker, as to be lost in the emotional shuffle that accompanies this debate.\$

But there is one major distinction between the public school system and the private school system, and that distinction is a responsibility for administering those two systems. Because the public administers the public school system, it controls the public school system and that system and those schools largely reflect prevalent values of the public. In fact, I would go so far as to say that it imposes the prevalent values of the public, rightly or of ongly, on the young this province.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, because the private schools are financed for the most part

privately, they are administered and controlled privately also and they, by that reason, can reflect and impose their private values on the students, on the young of this province who attend them. And that is the reason why many, or I should say most, argue for the continuation of private schools. That is a primary motivation for their existence, that they can offer private, alternative values to the students who attend them. So to argue for private schools, Mr. Speaker, and at the same time to argue for public funding of private schools, is contradictory. The two cannot exist, or I would suggest that the two cannot exist, side by side. For let there be no doubt, as most members of this House, I am sure, will agree, control must accompany public funding. Public control must accompany public funding, and to do otherwise, to give money away without imposing any control, would be to abrogate our responsibility as legislators, as guardians of the public purse.

So I don't think that even the strongest proponents of public funding to private schooling would want us to write a blank cheque to be given to private schools at large. The less knowledgeable among them, or the less sophisticated among them, might want to give one particular school, their own particular school, no strings attached funding or a blank cheque, but surely even those proponents would balk at doing the same for other schools that just might be teaching values that are diametrically opposed to the values of the one private school. In other words, we have schools that are teaching many different values and some of those diametrically opposed.

We cannot just give blank cheques. First, we, or someone, must decide who is to receive the funding, which private schools are to receive the funding. Then there must be accountability to the source, which is ultimately the public if we are spending public moneys. There must be restrictions as to how the money is spent. Just as we hold the public school system accountable for our tax money, we would have to do exactly the same for any moneys given by us, as legislators, to private schools. Reason would indicate that we would have to be even more vigilant in our control of those moneys when that funding is that far removed from the public domain. We cannot escape our responsibility. We must control the funds; we must control the funding; and ultimately we must control the funded. To fund the private schools, Mr. Speaker, is to make them more public.

There are many issues at hand here, Mr. Speaker. Much has been said in the past, much of which bears repeating in this debate. There are innuendoes and there are nuances involved here that would take days to clarify. So while I cannot say all that I would want to, I have great faith that in the ensuing debate those points will be covered. But I will be content with making one more brief observation and I will try to finish before 12:30 is upon us.

It is my assumption also — it is my first assumption, Sir — that the public funding of private schools will act to the disadvantage of private schools. It is a fact, it is not an assumption, I would suggest, that the public financing of private schools will act to the disadvantage of the public school system. It will harm the public school system because it will mean less money will be given to the public school system for which they can run their schools with. If there is one lesson to be learned by this government, it is that there is only so much money for education. With this government, Mr. Speaker, I might add, it does not seem to be nearly enough. If this bill is passed, what is not nearly enough now, what is too little now, will be spread even thinner. It is pure hypocrisy on their part to tell my constituents in the north, Mr. Speaker, that there is not enough money in the public purse to support the Inter-Universities North Program, an educational program for northerners, but that there is enough money in the public purse to give it away, to facilitate further funding to private schools, schools that northerners have very little access to, if they did have the inclination to attend. It is worse than hypocrisy, it is deceitful.

That pretty well sums up my feelings on the bill, Mr. Speaker, without going into all the aspects of it. I do not believe this bill, Bill No. 57, to be a clarification bill. I believe it to be a deceitful bill. I don't believe it to be necessary. I don't even, Mr. Speaker, believe it to be advisable. Nobody wins with Bill 57. The assumption, and I feel I am correct in the assumption, is that the public school system loses immediately. The other assumption, and I feel I am correct in that also, is that the private school system loses ultimately. It is a no-win piece of legislation. It is the worst kind of legislation that a government can produce. It is a legislation that demands further legislation. While it is shameful that an issue that has been a problem for so very long in the Province of Manitoba, it is shameful that that issue is the beneficiary of such poorly thought-out legislation.

For those reasons, I urge the House to defeat the amendment that is before us so that we may then defeat Bill 57.

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION lost.

MR. JENKINS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the member support? (No support.)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act. Are you ready for the question?

Friday, July 14, 1978

the Honourable Minister of Education will be closing debate.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this particular bill, but I don't think people should duck such issues. We'll leave for history to sort out the debate between the Member for River Heights and the Member for Inkster and other contributors. In listening to the Member for Churchill address his remarks to the House, I was very impressed because he puts before us what we are talking about, and we are talking about the education of youngsters I have said it on other occasions that I'm even worse than this bill in this regard. I think the ultimate responsibility of educating the young is the parents. Perhaps in this bill, while it is a bad bill — I have to agree with the Member for Inkster in that, that it doesn't really resolve the issue — that nevertheless we can put some pressure on the public system to make their schools more related to the community.

The contributions by the Member for Fort Rouge were very well taken and I agree with both the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Inkster, that if it were possible to have the diversity within the public school system that is desirable, then this bill would not be necessary. The Member for Inkster cited an excellent example of how Sacre-Coeur is really a community school within the City of Winnipeg.

But, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debates, I happen to think that how fortunate a human being I am. I remember living in Elm Creek, which is a pretty homogeneous society . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 12:30, the honourable member will have 38 minutes when this next comes up on the Order Paper.

The hour being 12:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.