

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, June 10, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 23 students, Grade 9 standing, of the Sansome Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Howard. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

We have 50 students of Grade 11 standing of the Windsor Park Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Pitcairn and Mr. Cohen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

There are 65 students of Grade 6 standing of the Lincoln School and the Rorketon School. Lincoln School is the host and Rorketon School is the guest. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Fowler and Miss Riediger. These schools are located in the constituencies of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

There are 35 students, Grade 5 standing, of the St. Avila School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Workman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

There are 48 students, Grade 6 standing, of the Montrose School which is the host, and Bowsman School which are the guests. These students are under the direction of Mr. Enns and Mr. Gilfillan. These schools are located in the constituencies of the Honourable Member for River Heights and Swan River.

On behalf of all the honourable members I make you welcome.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 73, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) introduced Bill No. 68, an Act to amend The Wheat Board Money Trust Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. PAWLEY introduced Bill No. 75, an Act to amend The Local Authorities Election Act.

MATTER OF URGENCY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that this House do now adjourn to consider a matter of urgent public importance; namely, that the action of the government through Manitoba Hydro in letting the contract for the installation of control mechanisms on Lake Winnipeg at a time when the plan has been challenged and serious doubts raised about its wisdom by the resignations of Messrs. Campbell and Kristjanson, is in fact improperly committing itself to a course of action that is currently under examination by the appropriate committee of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for giving me notice of this motion to adjourn the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. After perusing the same, I find that the matter referred to in the Honourable Member's resolution, namely, the letting of a contract for control mechanism on Lake Winnipeg is not within the purview of the administrative responsibility of the government but within that of Hydro Corporation. Beauschesne's Fourth Edition, Citation 101 states: "A definite matter of urgent public importance for the discussion of which a member may ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 must involve the administrative responsibility of the government."

Secondly, the Honourable Member himself refers to the fact that the matter is currently under examination by the appropriate committee of this House. Beauschesne's Fourth Edition, Citation 324 (1) states: "Until the report and evidence has been laid upon the table, it is irregular to refer to them in debate or to put the question in reference to the proceedings of

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . the committee." For these reasons I must rule the motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside out of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it is with regret along with frustration that I must challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

MR. ENNS: Yeas and nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. The question before the House - Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Boyce, Burtiak, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski and Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Graham, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26; Nays 19.

MR. SPEAKER declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the First Minister, otherwise I'd have voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable the Minister of Finance. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister and the Minister of Finance, I must ask the House Leader who I should direct a question to regarding the Minister responsible for Hydro and perhaps I can direct it through the House Leader. Was the government aware prior to yesterday of Mr. Kristjanson's pending resignation?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, if that question is not urgent, I'd prefer to leave it for the Minister responsible for Hydro to answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. Will the principle of equal pay for equal or similar value in work be incorporated in the new labour code?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): That is a principle in legislation at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and when the new labour code is adopted that will continue as a policy of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister indicate to the House if any Manitoba eggs have been seized in the Province of Quebec?

MR. USKIW: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question also to the Minister of Agriculture. With respect to the depressed and ruinous egg prices in Manitoba, has this government a program to help these producers until such a time that prices are again stabilized, especially if the Federal Government should not come through with a long enough or large enough stabilized egg price?

MR. USKIW: It seemed like that's a very speculative question. The Federal Government has announced that it is prepared to enter into a purchasing arrangement to take up the current surplus and that it is not prepared to continue that kind of a program to encourage surplus production. Until that point arises, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I should comment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a - I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I wonder could the Minister of Agriculture indicate to the House the surplus of eggs that he knows of at this time.

MR. USKIW: Well, I couldn't indicate in specific terms, Mr. Speaker; but I do know that there is a problem throughout Canada as a whole, as do members opposite, and right now I would say it's rather a scrambled situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader. I wonder if he can indicate to us at this time when the next session of the Public Utilities Committee will be called.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the First Minister answered that question yesterday - early as possible next week. I think the earliest possible date would be Thursday, and I believe that that's the day that will be set, but the honourable members will be given notice before that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Attorney-General. Would the Attorney-General advise the House, has the government or the Attorney-General himself given consideration to having the Ombudsman report to the Legislature or to a committee of the Legislature this session?

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman Report has been filed. I think that every member of the Legislature ought to know that the report was filed and is available for public scrutiny and certainly scrutiny of the members of the Legislature.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The First Minister indicated to the House that he would appear before the Legislature or a Committee as is done in the other jurisdictions, in the Alberta Legislature and some other places.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think that we could consider that but I don't believe that that is in keeping with the spirit of the Act as it's prepared; that the report is filed with the Legislature and any member can ask questions of the particular Minister under whose department any case is being reported or criticized or anything like that.

MR. PATRICK: . . . answer no, then; he would not appear before a Committee of the House or the Legislature?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that that isn't the practice that was assumed would be followed. Now I'm subject to correction. This is my opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask him whether officials of the Federal Government have advised him as yet when it may suit their convenience and pleasure to receive our Air Policy Committee.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question from the Honourable Member for Fort Garry because I was about to make the announcement in the House that I have, within the past two hours, received a telegram from the Honourable James Richardson, indicating that he has now arranged with the Federal Minister of Transport, the Honourable Mr. Jamieson, that they will be pleased to meet with the Manitoba Air Policy Committee in Ottawa, on Thursday, June 17th at 11:00 a.m. The telegram goes on to indicate that they will attempt to have other Ministers available for this meeting as well and he asks if this would be convenient for the Air Policy Committee.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we will be checking out with our Executive Committee to make the appropriate arrangements; first, deciding hopefully that this is convenient to all concerned and secondly, make all the appropriate travel arrangements and any other arrangements that have to be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question through you to the Attorney-General. In view of the statements that have been made today that certain doctors are over-charging the Medicare Services Plan, is the Attorney-General's Department looking into this matter, and if it is so, is he preparing to take any action on it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the fact that there is some public concern.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . I have asked my department to make a full investigation. I don't know what the policy has been previously but we'll look into the whole matter.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I took as notice the question of the Honourable Member from Charleswood a short time ago - I thought he was in the House here - asking whether the Manitoba Development Corporation had made a loan to Northland Wild Rice Growers in the past 12 months and the answer is "no", nor is any loan application now under consideration by the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. In view of Dr. Christianson's recent appointment as Chairman of the Milk Control Board, can the Minister indicate, is it the intention of the government to bring the rest of the province or the entire province under the Milk Control Board jurisdiction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: That, Mr. Speaker, will be announced in due course.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps - could the Minister indicate further to Dr. Christianson's new appointment, will he be spending full time as Chairman of the Milk Control Board?

MR. USKIW: The answer is "no", Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the Minister inform the House as to when the Hog Marketing Commission Act will be amended to make it compulsory for the marketing of hogs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: That is again a matter of policy although I'm not sure that it requires legislation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Are there plans to send another study mission to Europe concerning the matter of generic drugs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, this matter is being considered.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, how many other missions have gone to date?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, under my responsibility as Minister of Health and Social Development, one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. This is perhaps on a point of order and I wish to be corrected if I'm not correct in my statement. I don't believe we received last year's report of the Economic Development Committee of the House. We met on many occasions and we did deal with some business. I don't believe we received that report, and I believe, according to the rules of the House, the report must come to this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that no report has yet been submitted. I believe the honourable member is correct.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. There must be a report coming because the Economic Development Committee has been restructured and it's meeting again.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I confirmed that no report has been received and the other aspect of my honourable friend's question, we'll look at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege and interest to the House, I would like to correct a - I think it's a misprint - in the Winnipeg Tribune of this morning, in connection with the number of agents that would be eligible to be qualified as insurance agents under Autopac. The figure used is 60 and I think it's simply a misprint, because it should be approximately 600, not 60.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of Industry and

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . Commerce. In view of the Premier's announcement yesterday regarding the letting of the contract on Lake Winnipeg to the B.C. firms, what action has been taken by his department to ensure a Manitoba component in this?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it's appropriate to interfere with the awarding of contracts.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I asked the question because the announcement was made in the House and the question relates to any sub-contract work, construction contract, equipment and so on that might be arranged through the Department of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, I think we're all interested in maximizing employment in the province but I think my first answer stands.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I'd like to reply to a question placed by the Honourable Member from Churchill a week or so ago, namely, will the marine underwriters be accepting Mr. Jamieson's invitation to check the Hudson Bay waters during the spring and fall for purposes of extending the marine insurance year. Mr. Jamieson, the Federal Minister of Transport did make an invitation, Mr. Speaker, to the London Marine Underwriters in March of 1971. The invitation has been declined for 1971 but I'm informed it may be accepted in 1972. The underwriters have already indicated a willingness to examine insurance rates in Canadian waters and visited Canada in March this year to examine the St. Lawrence Gulf and the St. Lawrence River. Investigations undertaken by my own department in 1970 showed that Lloyd's of London will be able to accept the Federal Minister's invitation in 1972.

I've also been informed that there is a possibility that a representative of a Canadian underwriting group will be visiting the Hudson Bay area and Churchill this year.

I know the honourable member is most keen on the development of the Port of Churchill, the Town of Churchill, as we are on this side of the House. I just might add as an aside, I think probably the most pressing problem with respect to the Port of Churchill at this time is the need to deepen the harbour, and I might inform the honourable member and other members of the House, that I wrote to the Honourable Donald Jamieson, the Federal Minister of Transport about this subject on May 14th to enquire as to the current status of federal studies on the depth of the Port of Churchill. In many ways, if this can occur, if the harbour can be deepened, this may be much more significant for the economic development of that area.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Could the Minister . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. No pictures are to be taken from the gallery. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Industry and Commerce advise us whether the government would be looking into carrying marine insurance in the Hudson Bay area?

MR. EVANS: Well, we're looking into many things, Mr. Speaker, to improve the situation respecting increased transportation into the Port of Churchill. I think we have taken a look at it and I can assure the honourable member that we'll continue to look at it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view that R. C. Baxter Limited is leaving Manitoba, transferring to Vancouver, would it be right to think that the Centrepoint Development, which was one of the largest undertaken in the city, will not be proceeded with now?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I really don't know whether one follows the other. I truly cannot say and I would hesitate to speculate in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the other day I was asked when the undergraduate students might receive their marks from the university. I'm informed they will be mailed before the weekend so the students should get them by Monday or Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House what action has been taken on the Wheat Utilization Study by Civil Sales Limited made for the Department of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Industry and Commerce has conducted

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . various studies in-house and out-house, in-plant and out-plant respecting utilization of prairie agricultural products, and particularly Manitoba agricultural products.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce could explain Mr. Sam Grower's competence to deal with this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to know what reference that has to this House. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, are you asking a question of me, Sir?

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. What body is putting up the operating capital for CFI?

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

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure whether I heard the entire question. Was it, What body is putting up the operating capital for CFI? Well, Mr. Speaker, the operation there is under receivership and the Receiver is responsible as an officer of the courts to continue or to maintain the assets to the interest of all concerned. So therefore it is in the hands of the Receiver and the Receiver has this responsibility.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question. Since CFI has been put into receivership, how much moneys have been advanced to the Receiver to operate the complex, and by whom?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I'm in a position to answer that offhand but I should have stated in answer to your first question that any funds that the Receiver feels he requires to maintain the assets in good condition and to operate it, if he thinks this is the wise course of action, which I believe he does, then the funds of course come from the Manitoba Development Corporation; which has been the main source of funds all along.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Minister to say that he would get this information? I have a supplementary question, further to the information that if he would obtain it. What are the operating losses per day to date of CFI?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking me a very difficult question to answer. First of all you're assuming there are operating losses - I'm not necessarily debating this one way or the other. The fact is the situation changes from day to day as honourable members on this side are indicating; this is a matter we've inherited; we're trying to make the best of it. The Receiver has an excellent, one of the most competent pulp and paper engineers to manage this, in North America, and I'm sure that the operation is being run to the utmost of efficiency that is possible, given the inherited circumstances that this administration was left with.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister undertake to obtain the answers to the questions I posed and give them in the House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, some of these are detailed questions and if the honourable member would file an Order for Return we will try to accommodate him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House the specific feasibility studies that were presented to the Japanese Economic Mission by Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that, too, would be for an Order for Return; it's asking for a lot of things. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition misunderstood the nature and intent of this economic mission. The group there wasn't concerned with examining and obtaining any detail feasibility studies on any particular industry. However, I can assure honourable members that we exchanged considerable information, reports and pieces of information, valuable information were given to the mission members, both orally and in writing. I really don't see any point, frankly, Mr. Speaker, in the question. I don't even know why I'm standing on my feet answering it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the government has any specific feasibility study for the uranium enrichment plant that was mentioned to the Japanese Economic Mission that were here this weekend.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I heard the whole question because of noise in the Chamber, but I can assure honourable members that we have experts in the government who are keeping on top of developments pertaining to uranium enrichment, not only with regard to the feasibility in Manitoba but with regard to feasibility in other parts of the country. As such, however, no feasibility data were given to the Japanese.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether the Minister can indicate whether the government has satisfied itself that Manitoba Hydro will be able to deliver the power requirements for a uranium enrichment plant at this time.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult question to answer because my reading of the subjects indicate that the feasibility of a uranium enrichment plant is many many years away. As a matter of fact there's a surplus of this commodity right now in the United States and there are many factors that are going to affect the feasibility of it. Not only that, what we think, what the TED Report referred to as a technological feasibility, may be outdated in a few years, so there are too many unknowns, too many variables in the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the next question I would like to remind honourable members that in respect to the question period, I suggested that the questions should be brief, to the point and the answers terse and succinct. Now we are degenerating into a debate in the question period. I would ask the co-operation of all members. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question to the Minister, it's a supplementary. In view of his answer, can the Minister explain why the Premier then offered a uranium enrichment plant as possibility

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That's a debatable question. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Why was there not a report filed on last year's Economic Development Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has he had the opportunity to read the letter of April 22nd from the International Association of Mechanics?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. It is of no relevance to the House whether the Minister has read a letter in a newspaper or not.

On the point of order, the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): The question was asked a few days ago and the Minister undertook to take it as notice and reply later to the House. What my honourable friend is asking now - does the Minister have that answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I recall quite well the incident of the other day and the Honourable Member for Morris is in error. I did not undertake anything other than I would check into my office to see whether or not in effect I had received a letter.

MR. JORGENSEN: May I ask the Minister of Labour has he received such a letter?

MR. PAULLEY: I have not had the opportunity of fully checking into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I ask the Minister of Labour if he will undertake to find out if such a letter is in his possession and if it has been replied to?

MR. PAULLEY: I gave that assurance to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates, Second reading. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call Bill No. 36, please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, rising at this juncture to speak on Bill 36 bears a striking similarity to fighting a losing cause; in fact some of my friends with particular interest in this legislation and the effect that it will indeed have on their municipality, their particular municipal identity, have suggested to me that it is pointless for the Opposition to spend any extended period in the weeks ahead in battling against Bill 36 because it's not only a losing cause, it's

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . a lost cause; and I am forced to admit that my assessment of the situation is much the same. I see no hope of turning the government from the course its elected to pursue with respect to amalgamation of the metropolitan area and therefore I agree with those who say that we are caught in a "lost cause, no win situation." The situation is not unlike that, I suggest, of some of the early natives of this land and of this continent who found themselves up against an authority an administration, a government that was bent on pursuing a particular course from which it could not be deterred. They lost their identities, they lost their cause, they lost their sense of place and participation in the communities of their time, just as many individual municipal identities will disappear, to all intents and purposes, with the amalgamation program proposed by this government.

What concerns me most, Mr. Speaker, about the legislation, however, is not that the government is attempting to impose upon the metropolitan area a reasoned concept for municipal administration that is presented and offered on the basis of its ability to meet the local government needs of this area better than any existing at the present time. What concerns me most is the fact that really behind Bill 36, behind the move towards total amalgamation lie clear, crass and cynically political motives.

I don't think this government is necessarily correct in its assumption that amalgamation will do for it in political terms what it is its ambition to achieve insofar as establishing and centralizing power and control and authority over this area in the hands of the New Democratic Party is concerned. I do not know that the government is correct in that assumption but I am absolutely sure that that's the government's assumption. I'm absolutely certain that they feel that a centralized authority, that an amalgamated metropolitan municipal totality as is proposed in Bill 36, offers them an opportunity, offers them an opportunity to achieve a political stranglehold of a partisan nature over this area - indeed over half the population of the Province of Manitoba. If I thought that the drive and the motive and the incentive for amalgamation were to improve administration, improve services, and improve the conditions of urban life for the people of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area, then I would be I think much more amenable to the overall suggestion that's contained in Bill 36; but as I've said, I don't believe that that is the underlying motivation for it. Despite all the disclaimers of the Minister of Urban Affairs and others in the administration I believe that the procedure being proposed in this bill is basically and fundamentally a partisan political one, basically and fundamentally, it is a design which the government feels will permit it to strengthen its position insofar as it represents a specific political party in this area.

Now, the challenge is obviously clear to those who don't subscribe to the same political persuasion as the members of the government to do something about it, not to sit down and cry about a situation which is obviously fair game in a political arena but to get out and fight on the same level and on the same terms. I don't subscribe to the government's assumption that amalgamation will necessarily have the political result for them, for the government, that they believe it will, but that doesn't alter the cynicism of the exercise itself, for underlying the arguments advanced through all the public debate and quasi public debate on this question in the last few months, is, I suggest to you once again, Mr. Speaker, that belief on the part of the government, that faith on the government's part that this exercise will be a good political thing for the New Democratic Party. I hope the New Democratic Party is wrong about that and I suggest that it's an unattractive motivation for this kind of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the clinical question of the rightness or the wrongness of amalgamation is concerned, I think the government has been insensitive to, unresponsive to and unappreciative of, some of the more legitimate and authoritative opposition that has been raised; and I cite the positions advanced by the local Government Boundaries Commission, the positions advanced, for example, by Mr. Elswood Bole, which positions have already been referred to by colleagues of mine including the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. I cite the positions advanced by individual experts in municipal government, members of this Chamber who have had substantial experience as members of municipal legislative bodies and councils, and I cite also persons in the planning division of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. It's my information - and I'm sorry the Minister of Urban Affairs isn't here - it's my information that almost to a man the planners in the planning division of the Metro Corporation are emphatically and unequivocally opposed to the amalgamation concept proposed in Bill 36. They see it as a sure fire guarantee that government will be removed further from the reach of the people, rather than as the panacea that members of the



(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . administration have suggested this legislation is, where communication between government and the people is concerned. They suggest that where now the individual citizen is only one, or at most, two steps removed from the revenue raising and revenue spending arm of his municipal administration and that after all is the integral, the fundamental unit, under Bill 36, under the amalgamation proposed by the government the chain of communication will be one extending over four or five or more steps to the extent that the direct link, the direct contact and the direct opportunity for citizen participation in revenue matters, in money matters, in matters affecting the taxes that the individual citizen has to pay, will be such a complicated and such an extended one that to all intents and purposes citizen-government communication will not, in fact, exist.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Sturgeon Creek suggested that Mr. Elswood Bole had proposed authoritative figures and authoritative arguments to substantiate his objection to the amalgamation proposal on the basis of excessive costs and the Minister of Urban Affairs replied that Mr. Elswood Bole had not been able, when asked, to produce documented and authoritative cost figures; that he had not been able to produce anything in the way of an authoritative cost picture to substantiate his claim that amalgamation would be excessively expensive for the people of the Metropolitan area and particularly for the people of the City of Winnipeg, excessively expensive to the tune of several millions of dollars a year. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs erred, I suggest, in advising the Member for Sturgeon Creek that Mr. Bole was not prepared, or not able to offer that kind of information, because I have in my possession, which I am prepared now to table in the Chamber, a copy of a letter dated February 22, 1971 from and signed by Mr. Elswood Bole to the Honourable Saul Cherniack, Minister for Urban Affairs on this very subject, and I would like to read the contents of that letter into the record, Mr. Speaker.

The letter reads: "Dear Saul: Your letter of February 17th, 1971 seems to indicate that you and your experts are having difficulty in applying the amalgamation cost formula in Appendix B of the Boundaries Commission Report. It would be unthinkable and irresponsible for a provincial government to recommend a reorganization without calculating the effects, sociologically and economically. As you are having difficulty in applying the formula used in my calculations, perhaps I can help you in checking your method of calculation if you send me your formula and factors for analysis. Yours truly, Elswood Bole." -- (Interjection) -- I said I'm prepared to table the letter. It means that Mr. Bole was prepared to put his calculations on the table in front of the Minister of Urban Affairs. The clear impression left by the Minister of Urban Affairs was that there was no such communication possible with Mr. Bole; that nobody wanted to help the Minister in arriving at a kind of rational cost formula or at a proper understanding of the cost formulas contained in the Boundaries Commission Report.

So I think the Minister of Urban Affairs is in error. He misunderstood the offer of the proposal of Mr. Bole, and had he not misunderstood it, had he accepted it and followed through on it, he would have the answers doubtless that he suggested to the Chamber yesterday were not available.

Mr. Speaker, I've said before that I'm not opposed to some rationalization of the multiplicity of municipal administration and services in the metro area. I believe that 14 individual cities or individual municipalities all competing with one another in vital service areas and certainly competing in terms of available capital, available revenues for growth and orderly urban structure and improvement was far too many. I believed that 14 cities was too many and I think 12 cities such as we have today is too many. I think also that the Local Government Boundaries Commission which prepared an excellent and scholarly presentation on the subject remains on the side that is too high when it proposes a reduction to only nine cities, although any careful and thorough reading of the Local Government Boundaries Commission report persuades one that a very strong case can be made for nine cities as against a lesser number, purely on the grounds of reasonable cost itself.

I think that nine cities is still too many for a metropolitan area with a population of something in the neighborhood of a half million or 550,000 people, but I think one city is too few. I think the concept of one city not only ignores the historic identities that people want preserved for emotional and spiritually satisfying reasons, but I think it flies in the face of all that is being taught us and told us and demonstrated to us today by citizens and governments suffering the urban crises of the great cities in other parts of North America and the world. I think it flies in the face of the modern science of urbanology and the conclusions that scholars

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . .scientists in that field have come clearly to in the past decade. The concentration of the - yes, I'll permit a question - the concentration of the population we're talking about of a half million or something upwards of a half million - and presumably as years go by it'll continue to exceed the half million mark - the concentration of that kind of a population in one urban unit defies, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, flies in the face of the kinds of conclusions that most urbanologists are drawing from the crises in the cities in the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister Without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the member if he'd elaborate on that point. Does he believe it's a valid comparison to compare problems in cities like New York, Detroit and Los Angeles with Winnipeg?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the problems in New York are 10 times or 20 times as great as the problems in Winnipeg, because there's 20 times the potential obviously, but the conclusions, at least most of the conclusions on this subject with which I've been able to familiarize myself now insist that the maximum point of efficiency and effectiveness in terms of urban administration, urban operation, is reached at a population of about 200,000 - that the desirable maximum is about 200,000. When you get beyond that point your services, your administration, your communication, your sense of individuality, your sense of personality begins to break down, not only on the part of the administrative structure itself but on the part of the individual citizens. These are the conclusions of students and scholars in the field of urbanology who are wrestling with the crisis of the cities in North America today. We're talking here about creating a unit that exceeds by 100 percent the projected and proposed safe maximum for efficiency and for a sense of proper identity. So I say that where 14 cities and 12 cities is excessive by one scale of measurement, one city is excessive by another scale of measurement that is equally important if not more important in human terms.

I think that a strong case can be made out, and has been made out, by the Local Government Boundaries Commission for a metropolitan urban community that embraces and consists of three, four or five cities. I know that on a cost basis, as I suggested a moment ago, the Boundaries Commission demonstrates that three, four or five cities are more costly in many respects in terms of administration than the nine would be that they propose; and this aspect of the argument would have to be very carefully studied and scrutinized before I'd be prepared to come to a firm conclusion as to the number which would be ideal. But I say while favouring rationalization as I have, publicly and in this Chamber, for some time and while representing a particular constituency that corresponds to a particular municipality with a unique sense of identity and a unique interest in maintaining that identity, I nevertheless favour a rationalization of all these multitudinous services and municipal identities and I favour a reduction in the number with which we wrestle at the present time. But I don't believe in solving one problem or attempting to solve one problem by creating another one of massive and gigantic potential, which is what will happen when a unit of a population of upwards of a half a million is solidified into one municipal identity, one identity from the point of view of maintenance, of capital cost, capital improvements and regular everyday services; and what's more important, the spirit of individuality, the personality of the individual citizen is reduced and confined, if not defeated by that kind of a municipal development.

I would hope that some success can yet be achieved by those members of the general public who have offered constructive opposition to this amalgamation proposal; I don't hold out much hope for success scored in the name of the official Opposition either of the parties or any of the three parties of the official Opposition of this Legislature, because I'm convinced that the present administration is hell bent on pursuing amalgamation to their desired and intended end, which as I've suggested is a political one, and they're not about to brook opposition, no matter how well intentioned, from other elected public people such as those on this side of this Chamber. But I would hope that private citizens and members of the general public, and members of other elected and elective bodies in this province, not represented here in this Chamber will be able to gain some ground and make some headway in pointing out to the government the pitfalls, the dangers and the illogic of pursuing an arbitrary and a stubborn course which is intended to carry us headlong towards a municipal arrangement, a municipal situation here in the Metropolitan area which has been challenged in scientific and well documented fashion for all the months that the dispute has been in the public arena.

I would hope that some gains can be made in terms of this opposition fight; I would hope

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . that some logic will permeate the thinking and the attitude of the government on this point, and I would hope that Bill 36 and the fight on Bill 36 is not a no-win situation and not the lost cause that I've suggested it is. But I must confess pessimism as far as the opportunities for the official Opposition in this battle are concerned, because I do believe that the political considerations are so overwhelming where the government is concerned that they're not about to brook logical opposition or logical contradiction on a question that is so fundamentally advantageous in a political way to them; and I therefore look to the outside forces in the debate to achieve whatever gains may be possible on this bill.

I would hope that we can at least preserve the identity of certain individual municipal areas, certain individual historic communities in the metropolitan area that give our province, not just Metropolitan Winnipeg, but give our province a flavour unique in all of Canada, indeed all of North America. I would hope that the government is not so pragmatically motivated in political terms on this question that they're willing to sacrifice the kinds of flavour, the kinds of personality, the kinds of individual pride and identity which have made, not only Metropolitan Winnipeg but all of Manitoba a unique mix of individual people, a unique mix of individual ethnic groups and communities and a unique part of the world in which to live.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, the debate be adjourned.

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

#### GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the report of the Special Committee on the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba received by the House on June 9th, 1971 be concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I feel that this resolution is improperly before us. Proper notice has not expired, under Rules 47, 51 and 72.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I believe that due notice was given, it's in the Order Paper for today.

MR. FROESE: On the same point of order. According to the rules, 48 hours has to expire; and certainly this is a new resolution before us because it refers to yesterday's report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the parliamentary days are counted each day, yesterday was a day and today is a day. I am unaware that a resolution of this kind which is to concur in a report that has already been received by the House requires any more notice than has been given.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Rule 72, subsection (3) says on concurrence: "Concurrence in the report of the committee may be moved subsequently after usual notice has been given." And notice is spelled out in Rules 47 and 51.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: That notice was given. The usual notice was given yesterday, and it's reaffirmed today. -- (Interjection) -- It says: "Due notice on concurrence," and that was given.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Rule 47 (2) says: "That notice shall be laid on the table before the adjournment of the House for the day and shall be printed in Votes and Proceedings of that day."

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would refer you to Rule 47 which my honourable friend refers to: "Two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, for placing a question on the Order Paper; this will not apply to bills after their introduction or to private bills or to the times of meeting

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . or adjournment of the House." And therefore by expressing - I refer to the legal expression, *expressio unius exclusio alterius*, which means if you express something specifically you exclude the alternative - it would appear that two days' notice is not required for a motion to concur in a report from a committee. Notice was given yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the matter is now on the Order Paper; and I believe that my honourable friend said "usual notice" so I don't know what he's referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. Rule 51 (2) says: "A motion requiring notice shall be filed with the Clerk and if approved by the Speaker shall be reproduced as notice in the Votes and Procedures and be placed on the Order Paper two days afterwards."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I carry this just a little further. That if the proposition as raised by my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, was the procedure to be followed on motions of concurrence, then when we are considering the resolutions from Committee of Supply, we would then have to have written notice for 48 hours before we could adopt the motions for concurrence in a resolution from that committee. I suggest in all due respect to my honourable friend that this is the established procedure in this House, and clearly has established that the points raised by my honourable friend while valid in the normal sense are not valid insofar as concurrence on the adoption of a resolution or a report, which in essence motions of concurrence are in respect of the estimates.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order as was raised by the Honourable Minister of Labour, I think the Honourable Minister of Labour forgets that when this very point of concurrence is raised, or has been raised in the past, it has usually been by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. In my opinion, a motion to concur does not come within the jurisdiction of Rule 47. The House may proceed. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: In that case, I challenge your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support?

The question before the House, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

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

MR. FROESE: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support for ayes and nays? Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, Jorgenson, McGill, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Moug, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Sherman, Spivak, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Patrick.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 33; Nays, 13.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I was paired with the First Minister, otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Finance. Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House: the report of the Special Committee of Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba received by the House be concurred in. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before we pass this item today I would like to make some further remarks. Certainly we've had a very good example now of what this government intends to do when the new rules are changed. I think the performance that we just had is indicative of what this government is trying to do by bringing in these changes in the rules.

I don't want to go into all the details, however, I think a few things bear repeating.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . When I heard both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Mines speak yesterday afternoon in committee, they were very feeble attempts as to try to discredit what I had said. In fact the Minister of Finance tried to pull over a few red herrings about me not having a seconder and that this was a problem. That was nonsense, pure nonsense, because the changes that are brought about in Rule 68 certainly is the crunch and the government is now jamming its heels down on private members on this side, and probably on their side too, who would like to bring in amendments as they have done heretofore.

The Rule 68 is very ambiguous, very vague, and we've had no definite explanation given in committee yesterday as to how it will work. The Leader of the Official Opposition enquired about this before it was discussed and certainly from the time that the report leaves the Special Committee stage to the time that it should be dealt with further, is unexplained. It is not spelled out in the rules.

Then the matter of combining motions by the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this can be very awkward for you some day and certainly might be the result that many challenges will be facing you in the future on this very point, because I feel that if a member makes an amendment that he should have the privilege of doing so and that the matter is voted on individually and not in a combined way. This certainly will place your impartiality in doubt time and again.

The matter of divisions, here again we cannot call for divisions on any particular motion. They again can be lumped and they can be referred from one sitting to another. This means that in a given day certain members would want to call for a division and are unable to do so because of the Section (11) in the particular rule.

Certainly the way they are set up there's no clear definition on other points as to how the bills will be dealt with when they come back into the House from the Special Committees. It also points out that Notice of Motion will have to be given. There is a 48-hour notice required from the time that the bills are reported to the House from that they can be dealt with again. But in 24 hours you, as a member, will have to have your amendments prepared, tabled, and they have to be in print so that members will be able to discuss them the following day. This is going to be next to an impossibility to many of the members, especially in my case not having any secretarial help whatever, and I'm sure this will apply to other members, and when it involves large bills, involved bills, this will be an impossibility. So that, Mr. Speaker, I find that these rules are certainly unacceptable and we will have a lot of trouble in the future as a result of the inclusion of Rule 68 with all its subsections into our Rule Book.

The matter of debate, whether it will be permitted, is in doubt in certain cases. And the matter of debates of urgency, here again you, Mr. Speaker, will no longer have the power that you exercised heretofore. You can indicate whether you think a motion is in order but it then has to be put to the House and the government can turn us down every time in connection with trying to debate a matter of urgency. It won't be as it has been heretofore, that once you rule that a motion is in order that we automatically then get up and debate it. It will then go to a motion of the House and the government has the right to determine whether they want to hear it or not, and if they decide that it is not to their liking, we will not hear those motions and we won't be able to debate motions of urgent public importance as we have in the past.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly my objection to the changes that are before us. I don't think I should rehash everything I brought out yesterday, the various objections, but certainly once more I want to record my opposition to what the government is doing, that it is trampling on our rights as members of this House; that our people in the constituencies represented by members such as I will not be able to be heard, will not be able to have their respective wishes fulfilled by being able to bring in proper amendments to legislation that will be coming before this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that we now have new rules and that under the new rules, tonight at 9:00 o'clock there would be a Private Members' hour. Perhaps with leave of the House we could postpone that till tomorrow, but my understanding is that we now have new rules.

Mr. Speaker, I take it that is the disposition of the honourable members. If the Member for Rhineland does not wish to give his consent, we will have Private Members' tonight at 9:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the House Leader would allow a little bit of adjustment period to take place and I would suggest if tomorrow night is convenient, we could move into Private Members' hour at 4:30 tomorrow night rather than today. It seems like a little short notice to prepare, because there has to be some arrangements made as to how the Private Members' Resolutions are going to be dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may also suggest for the guidance of the Chair, there's an item that should be discussed by the House Leader in respect of which resolutions are going to come because some have already been debated. There are two at the present time which are open in two members' names who have 25 minutes, I believe, one; the other one has 40 minutes to go. So these are two questions which are before the House on Private Members' Day at the present and take precedence over the normal routine they would be in. So I would suggest that this too be discussed. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes. The only thing that I am concerned with is that tonight we will proceed just as we do sometimes before we've had these rules, by not having a Private Members' hour tonight and proceed with the normal order of business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I would point out to the House Leader that for tonight's Order of Business the first item of business for Private Members would be Public Bills followed by Private Bills. There are a number of Public and Private Bills on the Order Paper and it just may be possible some of those members may wish to proceed with the bills tonight, and if that were the case then of course we would have no objection to that.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members. The House Leader.

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

. . . . . Continued on next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104, and amendment thereto by the Member for Rhineland. To the amendment, the Minister of Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I started yesterday to give some of the answers to some of the questions posed by honourable members, and in particular to the Member from Emerson who posed a number of questions to which I would like to respond.

He asked about the question that has arisen due to the fact that the Attendance Branch was discontinued last year and he says schools and superintendents need to be told who is responsible because there is some confusion. I'm sorry that there is this confusion. I don't know why there should be because the information was contained in the bulletin which I assume, I hope, that all teachers and principals and all superintendents read from cover to cover. Also, I am told that the school boards were also written letters advising them of the changes so that the instructions were certainly made known, the new policy. But just to make sure that they did get the message, I suppose there is value in repetition, we will undertake to repeat or elaborate on some of the instructions that have already been given to them, so that those who may have missed it the first time around will pick it up the second time around. I can't vouch for the third time around at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, the member also questioned the program with regard to the introduction, or the recognition of French as a language of instruction in the public schools. He asked how many people were involved and he thought there were two. As I tried to signal to him last week, or the other night, there are four people involved. There are four on staff, that is there is Mr. Corriveau who is now the head of the Branch, two as his assistant, one a librarian, plus three clerical staff, so there is really a team of seven. All these appointments have already been made. He mentioned the question of the other languages and he may have noticed that there is an ad now running, or it may already be finished, where we were advertising and seeking someone to take over the position which was formerly held by Mr. Corriveau in order to fill that position, and he would concentrate on the other modern languages and other languages that might be taught in the public schools and this would of course include Ukrainian as he mentions specifically.

He also questioned the role of the inspector, and that is a changing role as the member knows. It isn't the same as it used to be where the inspector was the only link really with the provincial department, and because of the lack of expertise in the divisions the inspector was the man that the people looked to to guide them and give them advice. Today under the unitary system there are superintendents who are very knowledgeable, and generally with an upgrading in staff and the calibre of principals the role of the inspector isn't what it was and it is changing.

So it has changed in the sense that they now operate in teams rather than individuals. They operate as members of inspection teams to assist the schools in the assessment of their programs and to assist school divisions in the assessment of the total division program. They have been doing this for some years now and they do present team reports to the Board of Trustees of the division in which they visit. We do have to examine the role of the inspector and, as I say, perhaps we shouldn't refer to them any more as inspectors, it should be headquarters resource personnel if you want to call it another name, because I think the name has to change too.

We are looking at this whole area because, as I say, the traditional inspector's role is changing and there has to be a team approach. I think the team has to be more than just the traditional one of a group of people with exactly the same background, I think it has to be a mix of people representing different disciplines who could visit a school, stay there for a few days or a week, depending on the size of the school, and give an evaluation generally not just on the straight academic training or on the plant itself, the physical plant, but generally discuss with staff, with principal, with the superintendent, the entire atmosphere of the school itself, and so I think you need a team which has on it more than just a teacher. There would be nothing wrong with perhaps having some social worker input into that sort of team or even a psychologist into that sort of team approach, and this is an area that I think we should look at and we are examining and hope to come up with some answers.

The member also asked the question about the Core project and I believe he asked what changes have been made and what changes will be made. Now as he is aware, the report was

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . published and then hearings were held. The results of the hearings have not yet been formalized or put together. I gather they are still trickling in, and they are going to be put into final form and eventually a recommendation will be made. I'm not sure how soon that will be made, it will be probably sometime during the summer, unless the people who are serving on the committee are not available for the summer months due to summer holidays, in which case it may be late summer before that is available. He asked about the cost of the report and I can tell him that the cost of the Core report for last year was approximately \$10,000. I don't have an exact figure but approximately \$10,000 is the figure that I was given.

Mr. Chairman, the Member from Emerson also asked a question about the Boundaries Commission, and he says what is being done about that. The Boundaries Commission report is a final report and there is perhaps some misunderstanding in this regard. The Commission report actually dealt with a number of matters, some with municipal, some with school board matters, and of course the one we are dealing with in the House today, the one dealing with Metropolitan Winnipeg was the third one, and when the final report dealing with the school divisions came out, we met with the executive of the Manitoba School Trustees Association. It was just at the time that they were holding their annual meeting that the report was made public and they met with us after the convention. They met with me and members of Cabinet and asked that no action be taken because they wanted to get a reaction from the various school boards. There were some misgivings on the part of some school boards at the convention itself; others stated that they didn't know enough about it because they hadn't read the report and therefore asked that no action be taken until such time as they had an opportunity to hold their regional meetings, discuss the report with their member school boards, and would then be in touch with me to discuss it further and we are awaiting their developments. I do recognize the points he makes, that some decision has to be made, that there is an uncertainty and people don't like to live with uncertainties, and later on in this session, there is a bill which will be introduced which I think will help to clarify this matter.

In his comments on the Boundary Commission, and also reference to the Core report, the Member for Emerson made the remark that he was glad to find that the Minister did see something of value in the reports and in particular that I saw something imaginative in the MTS report, and this is his way of trying to tick me off for using the word "unimaginative" in reference to the MTS report. I want to state clearly what I said originally that the MTS report is undoubtedly a massive, well-documented study that needed doing and I credit them for doing it. On the other hand, I don't retract what I said, because like all reports and like all studies, it depends on the premise and the assumption from which you start.

In the case of this report, my criticism of it when I said unimaginative is that I could see that they simply started on the basic system that we have in Manitoba and took off from there. They said ten years ago we were at point (a), today we are at point (b), and at the rate of cost increases and everything else, it shows an increase of a 45 degree angle and therefore ten years from now that same straight line projection will hold true. "My criticism therefore was in that regard and that's why I called it unimaginative, because I don't think it was an attempt - and perhaps it's not their business, they are the MTS and they are thinking in terms of their society and in terms of their group - but really I felt that they were more concerned about the "how" of financing education but didn't really talk too much about the "what" of education. The other day in my Estimates, when I introduced them, I felt we had to address ourselves to not only the priorities insofar as how, but we have to examine the philosophy of education, what we are trying to achieve and how we should go about doing it.

So that there is no question that it was a good study from their point of view but they were predetermined, the answers are almost predetermined by the questions that the study pulled. So without in any way denigrating the work done, because I know that they put in many hours of work and they brought in Brock Rideout from Ontario to do part of the study and I know that they had a number of committees working, and it's the kind of study which will certainly be of value to anyone who is interested in the financing of education in Manitoba because they have amassed an awful lot of information which was available but was never really put together or correlated, and they have got it down now in a very precise form.

But, you see, the study I felt never acknowledged as much as it should have the possibility that there may be more than one way of achieving the educational objectives of our society and that somehow programs must continue to emerge from organizations exactly the



(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . . say -- in similar, almost identical to those that we presently have, and this is the sort of criticism that I had in mind when I said it was unimaginative or I questioned the imaginativeness of it. I was not in any way questioning the fact that they had undertaken and had done a good job of compiling information.

The member also asked me to give some clarification of the item on the agenda which I think is 5 (b). He called it the Youth Secretariat, but then he referred to \$600,000 which would be 5 (c), and I'm not sure which of the two he wanted me to expand on before we got to that particular part in the estimates. If he wants it now, I can give it to him now; if he wants it when we get there, I can leave it for later. Later? Okay, because I just couldn't follow. I want to just make known to him so that when we do discuss it later, that it's under the heading of Student and Human Resource Development and there's (a), (b) and (c), (a) being Student Aid; (b) the Youth Secretariat; and (c) Special Projects; and the special projects do not relate to the Youth Secretariat. So you will understand that aspect of it.

Now the member has made the point a number of times in this session of talking about finance and he asked about the \$18.00 per pupil grant. He is suggesting that we are side-stepping the Foundation Program, and if that's what we are going to do then why should he bother with it at all - at least that's what I read into what he said - and if that's what's going to be done then the whole grant system should be moved perhaps to a per capita program. Of course, I think he's the first to recognize the problem there. The teacher grant recognizes qualifications and is geared to the academic standing and degrees achieved by teachers, so that if a per dollar per student program was initiated, it would obviously have a very serious impact and effect upon the whole question of teacher qualifications and the amount of money they would receive in support under any grant formula, no matter what you want to call it, because you see the Foundation Program is really a scheme which was developed in order to provide basic financing for the costs of education, and anything that is included in that program in terms of providing money for a school division is part of that program.

Now I think the Member for Emerson is confusing the present components of the program as they have been to date with the new component, which is a flat per pupil grant, and there is no reason why the existing Foundation Program could not have added to it almost anything that one could think of and still, as a result, you have added to the per pupil grant no matter how you do it. It's how you calculate it. But to move to nothing to a per pupil grant would not be to terminate the Foundation Program at all; it would still be a Foundation Program except it wouldn't be tied to any of the various components that are in it. The only existing basis within which the present program is operated is the authorized teacher and the supply and maintenance and so on, and now we have added another component, but we have not in any way altered the Foundation Program. It's just another enhancement of the Foundation Program.

The member also questioned, or asked rather about SACU, and he questioned whether, or he told of the problem that SACU has confused students and people, many people, and there is a need for clarification. I do know that there has been some confusion in this regard but SACU, which is a method of scoring not actual knowledge but perhaps ability, is a program where we are involved with other provinces in developing these admission tests for universities. In Ontario they have moved pretty well completely to SACU testing and the universities are using them extensively. Here, since this is the first year, the universities have agreed that they would accept the evaluations of the high schools and of the teachers. I can see, however, that on the basis of experience, what may occur is a combination of looking at the recommendation, the evaluation from the school and the SACU scores as well, because it seems logical that if SACU is going to continue that the universities are going to want to use them in some way to help them evaluate who should or should not come into the university. Now there should be some - and I think it will be an influence on university entrance in time to come. It may not, not for this year and maybe not even for next year, because I think they're going to want to evaluate the SACU tests since they're now being taken by every student and compare them, relate them to the experience of the students that are entering university and see how their progress compares to what the SACU tests might have indicated when they were first taken.

If in the end we feel that the SACU tests are not worth very much then we'll discontinue them; I agree that there'd be no sense in continuing to operate them. On the other hand, I think that before we discard them we should recognize that they are of value in other jurisdictions. In the United States they're used, or similar tests are used extensively; that the

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . universities in other provinces are using them, or similar tests, and that we are working with other provinces in developing refinements on this type of testing so that we can arrive at some measurement to buttress and support the recommendations from the various schools as the recommendations are made by the teachers or by the graduating schools.

I believe I did reply to most of the questions which he posed. He did pose one of course and I imagine I'll hear from other members as well - I think there was one other member who did ask the question, and he threw it across at me and said, "What about aid to private schools?" I'll give the answer that I gave last February when I was asked and I've given since. I was asked last February whether there would be legislation at this session, and my answer was I have not prepared any legislation and that answer still holds. If he's asking me to look into a crystal ball and tell him what will be, I don't like to practice looking into the future. I deal with things as they arise. This is a matter of policy and when policy is arrived at, a policy that can be announced in the House, then it will be announced, but until then I think anything else is purely speculative. On the other hand, he did try to toss in what has now become somewhat of a cause celebre, or a tempest in a teapot, and that is what Mr. Shaun Herron refers to as a private school. Shaun Herron has had quite an interesting time of this and I did not respond to Mr. Herron because frankly I hate to kill anybody's good time. He seemed to enjoy writing his articles so much that I felt that to have written him or responded in any way would maybe have deprived him of at least three columns that I know of and sometimes, you know, these people who have to fill their newspapers are looking for stories to write about, so I didn't want any part in that privilege.

But I want to explain this, and in my introduction to my Estimates I mentioned that the department is very anxious and eager to come up with and to help school boards and school divisions to develop new approaches, to develop innovative programs, to break out if possible from the locked-in traditional method of delivering education. We've got to do it, because if we don't the costs - which the MTS study is the very one that points this out - will escalate to an impossibly high figure and so we have to break with the traditional way of doing this. I don't think that research can be done in a vacuum or that Manitoba can undertake pure research. Frankly, as Minister, I could not ask the Cabinet nor this Legislature to finance pure research. It's wonderful to have, but we're not Ontario, we're not California, we're not New York; we're Manitoba, and I try to be practical. We need research here but we want it on an applied research basis and not in the pure sense.

So there is money in the Estimates, as I mentioned earlier, where we are going to try to help fund experimentation and innovation, but of a type that can be translated, is portable, translated from the school in which that experimentation takes place and be used in another school elsewhere, whether it be in Winnipeg or Brandon or in any rural community. Research, pure research, I frankly don't feel that I could justify it, and this particular group which is referred to in these newspaper reports were a group of parents that said they had an idea, and their idea was that they thought that they could have a school whereby using other than the standard approach and by having input by other than the straight academic, teacher professional approach, by having volunteers come in, they thought that they could come up with something a little different. And I said to them as I've answered a number of times in this House, your budget is \$56,000, which is not a very unreasonable amount for an experimental program to cover 150 students, but it has to be within the ambit and under the aegis of a school division and that's why they have to go to the City of Winnipeg, and if the City of Winnipeg School Division had been interested and if they had wanted to support this type of experimentation, then they would of course have contacted me in the usual way as they have for other experiments.

As the member is probably aware, we are sharing and participating in the experiment at Gordon Bell; we are sharing in the experimentation in the River East School Division; there's some experimentation at the Public Trail School Division; and the government and the department lend support, financial support and also backup support wherever possible. Our research and planning group that we're forming this year is going to deal with these kind of matters and will be evaluating the proposals that are put forward.

Another example, incidentally, of experimentation is the Brandon experiment where they're using auxiliaries, and there too I was happy last year to lend support. So to suggest there was any - oh, mysterious or hidden motives, it's a lot of nonsense. If a proposal is good I will listen to it, but in the final analysis it has to come forward as an official proposal

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . . through a school board so that they can, in the final analysis, bring it forward to me. I was not prepared this year and there may have been reference to it, because in the articles there was some mix-up as to different programs suggested, and a reference made that I had turned down a proposal which had been put forward to me by the City of Winnipeg after they had taken some trip to California - I was not aware that any school trustees had ever gone to California - I had never heard of any proposal emanating from that trip, and so it's not fair to say I turned it down.

But there was a suggestion that -- or it was stated that I had however said "no" to a proposal which had been developed through . . . , which the honourable member knows is a group that had been developing a proposal for a research school, and the idea there was that it should not be attached to any school division, it should be a special school operated by the province. In other words, it was a creation of a specially designated school for research purposes. And I repeat what I said earlier, I don't think Manitoba can hope to compete in that area. I can't see Manitoba starting another entirely new institute of studies. I don't think we have that kind of funds and the kind of research and planning that I want to do and we hope to do will be of an applied nature rather than a pure research nature, and if we have to find the results of pure research, I am sure that we can find the results and it'll be made available to us, of studies being made in other jurisdictions where they may have the funds but where we don't have the funds.

The member has made reference on a number of occasions - he did the other night too - about the funding of education costs in Manitoba. He's always somehow suggested and poo-pooed what this government has done in that direction, and that although the \$18.00 was a step in the right direction, that the drop in the foundation levy was not really a good idea and it was unfair. He seems to forget that last year in 1970 we increased special education grants considerably, that we changed the method of paying them and increased what we were paying considerably; that last year there also was a drop in the mill rate by one mill; that we last year also increased the grant towards business education by \$125.00 per student over and above the Foundation Program; that we also increased the vocational grant by \$325.00 per student over and above the Foundation Program; and so with all due respect to the member, I have to say to him that this government has moved in the direction of shifting the costs and last year I think the province picked up about 52 percent of the total cost.

The estimates that we have today, based on known estimates from school boards - I don't think they're all in but approximate - are that we will be picking up, the province will be picking up in the neighborhood of -- we will be picking up over 58 percent of the total cost of education in Manitoba which is a six percent increase over last year. So to suggest that by dropping the foundation levy we are doing an injustice, I say we have picked it up in the sense that we have picked up a greater percentage of the total cost.

The member mentions remote schools, and I'm not quite sure what he was referring to when he talked about remote schools, whether it was what are known as remote schools or what are known as special schools. Is it remote schools? Remote schools. Are these places like Sprague? When I saw Sprague, I thought that the member might have a particular interest in Sprague. No, it's not tied in here, I'm sorry. It's remote in another sense. This is the difference. Now of course the member knows that these remote schools are under the Foundation Program and they are covered by the Foundation Program. They are a problem because they are remote, because their enrolments are small, and because they're small enrolments it just isn't possible to give it the kind of school program and the option program that the member would like to see and that I would like to see, but you can't offer a full choice of programs where schools are very small in their attendance and we just don't have the school population to generate a flexibility and a multi-choice of programs that I would like to see them have as well.

It's a problem that isn't going to be resolved too easily because the distances are great, and if you took every remote school and you put it into a division for administrative purposes it might work, but you still have the problems of getting those children to a school that is large enough to offer them better programs and yet not so far away that it's just impractical to transport them every day. As I say, we're aware of this, but I certainly don't -- I want to point out that they are, if that was the question he asked, they are under the Foundation Program and they're covered completely under the Foundation Program.

On the other hand, the member did make reference, but in a very obtuse way and I wish

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . . he would clarify, and I would appreciate clarification, because he made a remark or made some reference that personnel in the Department of Education should be above politics. I'm not sure what he meant by that. And he said there should not be politics in the staffing, that the high morale of the department is endangered by political appointments. I want to say this to my honourable friend; I will back up any appointee that I have made to this department against anything that he can bring forward from anywhere, and I'll stand by that.

The calibre of people in the department that have come in since I have taken office have been of the highest -- (Interjection) -- not from Saskatchewan, from Manitoba as a matter of fact. It so happens, it so happens that they're Manitobans. But that's coincidental. I'll take them from wherever they come if they have the ability and the calibre. I don't believe in being inbred, because I'd hate to see the day when Manitoba graduates are denied entrance to Ontario because they come from Manitoba. It's a two-way proposition. So if the member has more than just some snide remarks to make and he wants to lay it on the table, let's hear it, because frankly I'm getting fed up with that kind of innuendo which is tossed around here sometimes. I'm answering for my department and my department only, and if a member feels and wishes to challenge the credentials of the appointments that have come into this department, I'll gladly table them before the House.

There has been -- and the member I think knows this if he's made enquiries -- there's been no dislocation within the department; there has been no departures outside of the normal retirements that take place or willing departures where people take other better jobs, but there's been no departure based on political motivation or political pressure of any kind, nor has there been any appointments based on that as such. I'm being perhaps a little angry about it because that is one charge that I couldn't even let pass. Although it wasn't picked up and made an issue out of, I felt it was uncalled for; it was an insult to the people who are on staff, because it almost implies that those who have not retired or have not resigned have somehow capitulated politically and that's a lot of nonsense, because you see the other holds true as well. If the charge is that people are appointed because of their political philosophy, then it also follows that those who stay on must have somehow capitulated to a political philosophy -- and I wonder if that's what the member had in mind. Is he suggesting that every member who stays in this department, every one of my top staff who's remained on, has now suddenly become imbued with a political philosophy? I think he knows better than that. These people are professionals. They are doing a job and they would do a job -- they did a job under the former government's regime; some of them were doing a job before the former government came in and were there when the Liberals were in office -- and they're doing a job now and there's no question in my mind they're doing the job professionally. I have every confidence that when I deal with them they will not betray that confidence, and when they give me advice they give it because of their professional feeling on the subject, their professional knowledge, their professional interest and not because of any personal philosophy.

The Member for Birtle-Russell brought forward a very interesting view; he questioned the high cost of university education and the concept that some places, some jurisdictions have the "open to all" policy, but he says that does require affluence -- and I can't argue with him there, there's no question that it does require affluence -- and he put forward this proposition. He said the business community says that if we would leave post secondary in their hands; in other words, if you simply look after public school education -- primary, elementary and secondary, but leave post secondary in the hands of the business community, then the net result would be a better citizen -- I think that's the words he used -- and better qualified, because business now has to untrain. I find that very interesting, because if anything has promoted and pushed our educational objectives and standards higher and higher, it is the business community. At one time, Grade 6 was considered adequate because with a Grade 6 education one could fit in to what was then the industrial economy under which we operated. Then as time went on it was recognized that that wasn't adequate and Grade 9 became the standard. Today there's no question that Grade 12 is the standard, and I say that it is the business and commercial community that pretty well decides this because they are the ones who want that piece of paper. You talk to the students and tell them the problems they have, about trying to get a job without that piece of paper which says they have got a Bachelor's or they've got a degree of some kind.

I found the member's views very interesting, because when I was in Copenhagen last summer at an OECD conference representing Canada, I found very interesting the great distinction

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . . between the North American approach and the European approach. The European approach is much closer to that of the Member for Birtle-Russell where there's an onus on the firms to pay for the training that they want their employees to undertake. Here in North America the reverse is true. Business takes the position that they want a finished product, and when they seek employees and in the last few years - not right now because of the recession that we're in - but it wasn't many years ago that the large firms haunted the universities and came out there shortly after the first of the year to set up offices to start seeking graduates, potential graduates who might come to work for them. And they wanted those graduates. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- No, now they don't need them, but I'm saying that this is the trend that they went.

So when you say to me though that business has to untrain them, I say if that is the attitude they would not have sought them out in the first place. Why didn't they then just stick to -- your approach would have been simply to say, Give us a Grade 12 student and we will look after the rest. Now if they did that, then I agree that we wouldn't have to and we wouldn't have had to go the way that we did, but we had to go the way we did because business doesn't take that attitude in North America. Business wants a finished product and that is why the Community Colleges are expanding at the rate they do, because the firms that do the hiring, the personnel firms that do the hiring on behalf of business firms, the personnel people themselves who do the hiring in the firms are the very first to make sure to ask what are your qualifications, what have you achieved in your schooling, how far have you gone in your schooling, do you have a Business Administration degree - and let's say we're talking about the post secondary level at the community colleges, have you got your Civil Technology degree, have you got a drafting diploma. These are the things that businesses ask and businesses demand, and as a result of this demand we the government, and the people really, have entered into the field of training on a much larger scale than has occurred in Europe. And I give the example because that's the trend in North America. I'm not going to get into debate whether it was right or wrong; it occurred. And this is the way it is. And tomorrow, if there's a need for people, I suggest to you the same industries will demand the same thing again, because where even though the market today for people is low, as we all know, nonetheless if there was a job tomorrow in an industry, the student who would get it would not be the one who's got his Grade 12 but the student who can come along and say, I've got a diploma from this Community College in this course or I've got this degree.

Now the Member for Birtle-Russell was concerned about the high cost of post secondary education and there's no question the cost is there - we've seen it in the last few years - but if we are to follow the argument to its logical conclusion, the one he put forward because he said that it's too high and it should be reduced in the interest of the taxpayers, well you just can't, you know, just turn something off once it's been launched, nor does anybody, I think, want to. I don't think the member really meant that, because if we follow the argument to its logical conclusion then we'd have to close down the universities.

And yet the truth of the matter is every country in the world today - particularly in the highly developed countries - can show, and I think there is a relationship in the fact that the highly industrialized countries do have excellent programs at the university, that the university is the backbone which backs up the industrial relation and the development of the technology. It is the underdeveloped countries who are scrambling and trying to get their feet on the ladder to improve themselves, to pull themselves up where they are trying to go the same route, but they haven't been able to yet, so that we have to recognize that the answer does not lie in a simple solution of simply cutting or closing down the universities. That's out of the question.

Now I will agree, and I have to accept this particular proposal that has been -- I don't know if it was put forward, but there was a suggestion made that Manitoba can't go it alone, and I'd be the very first to agree that when it comes to education generally, because I don't just stop at post secondary, generally I'm one of those - and I've no hesitation in saying so and I don't apologize for it - I think education is of national concern, not just local, not just provincial, it should be national if we are a country, and certainly post secondary education is and must be a national problem and of national interest and of national concern, because in today's mobile society people are not going to be educated and live and die within a 50-mile radius that existed just 30 years ago. I think that was the pattern; most people lived and died within a 50-mile radius. That is no longer the case. We are a mobile society and people can be educated in one province and then move on to another and this they are doing all the time. So therefore

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . the Federal Government certainly has not only a role to play but a very great obligation in the financing of post secondary education, and when we deal with - and as I mentioned in my Estimates, when we come to the University Grants Commission I'll be perhaps spending more time on that question than I have up to now.

The Member for Assiniboia talked in terms of the trimester system in the secondary level and he talked in terms of - it was in the secondary level that he spoke of - and this would mean eight months on and four months off. In other words, this would be doubling the present vacation which is two months. But really for the elementary or the secondary education this is impractical and it would be just impossible to afford. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, he also talked about university and I'll get to that later. In the secondary I think it would be impossible.

First of all, you couldn't cut the teachers' salaries to eight months where now they are getting paid for the full term. Other teachers would have to be paid a half-year's salary for the additional semester and I don't know if it's rational really to speed up the education in the elementary and secondary schools, because I don't think it's either practical or sensible to get the students through Grade 12 earlier except for a very few who could cope with it. But I don't think the member meant we should try to get students graduating at maybe age 15 out of Grade 12 simply because they would go 12 months to school.

Now to operate universities on a trimester system, this has some possibilities, but the studies that have been made, and I believe there was one made in Manitoba about three years ago, they looked at it, and studies made elsewhere indicate that there's no saving; in fact it raises costs. I think maybe what we should look at, one of the things that I question myself is the 7 1/2 months university year which is so common in Canada. I don't quite know where the 7 1/2 months year came from. I suspect it probably has to do with the fact that we were an agricultural community, or a country, and people just had to be home for seeding and didn't come back until after harvesting and that's maybe where the 7 1/2 months came from. We may have to look at extending or lengthening the period of the university year from 7 1/2 months to a longer period because I believe in the United States it is longer than 7 1/2 months. So these are one of the matters which I think should be examined and could be examined perhaps and some answers found.

The Member for Assiniboia questioned about the possibility of transfer of credits from community colleges, and I can tell him that I have been working on that and I support fully and have been ever since I took office, trying to make people understand and realize the value of transferability from the community college courses that a student might take if he decides to enter university either immediately after or at some other point in his life.

The onus of course is on the universities to offer the credits, not the community colleges. I don't think it's the reverse, although maybe the community colleges are doing exactly what the universities are. I haven't heard of it. I hope not. If I hear of it I'll certainly act because there I can. But there is a need for, I think, transferability and the accrediting of courses which are taken at the community colleges by the universities and this is something I think that the universities have to recognize and will have to accept. It's a matter I think simply of coming to terms with it and finding out some rational method of evaluating the program to see what credits could be made available.

I think I've answered the major questions that were put to me. If I've missed any I'll pick them up next time along. I know that the Member from Emerson I don't think finished his remarks that night and didn't get back on again because some other member started to speak, so I assume he'll have more questions that he can put to me and, as I say, if I've neglected to answer some of the questions, I'll gladly pick them up as I go along.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think I could let this department go without saying a few words on it in respect to the North. I believe that it has to be said again that the priority up there should be one for better public schooling than what is being offered at this time.

I think that when we talk about priorities for community schooling, university, etc. - community colleges, rather, and universities, we take for granted that there is equality in the public school system in the Province of Manitoba, and of course this is not correct. I must lay it before the government; it is their responsibility. It is something that has been with us in the north for many years and until we cope with it properly it will stop - and I repeat this - it will stop the children of northern Manitoba from having an equal opportunity to attend the

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . . higher schools of learning such as university and community colleges; and if we extend ourselves to our universities we may as well say that it is practically impossible for school children brought up through the public school system in northern Manitoba to ever be able to obtain the status that is required to enter university. This is an unfortunate thing to have to admit to but it is entirely correct. This does not, of course, take into consideration the schools that are offered in Thompson and the other mining centers, they are basically of the same standard as those in southern Manitoba, but they are withheld from the people of isolated communities and so those people cannot take advantage of schooling under the normal public school system that we have in this province. People age 10 and 11 may in fact have the education of Grade 1 or possibly Grade 2. This is a terrible thing to say and it is a terrible thing to have to admit up to, but it is, and it will be with us for a long time until something is done. And it has to be a big step, not a small step.

I realize that there is more money being put into buildings and equipment but this is only a small step. We require teachers and we require freedom of curriculum if we are to find any equality and any encouragement for the people and children of northern Manitoba. And here now, we are talking of thousands of people - children, not just hundreds; and it goes on, it goes on every year and every day. I think that you will find that one of the big problems are that we do not have a proper system of kindergarten to look after the children who are considering coming into the public school system or who have to. In many cases they do not know any English and it takes many years before they can catch up with the English and of course by then if they haven't graduated by grades, they have, of course, grown too big to go to the elementary school and they give up and that's it.

There has been no new injection of ideas into the public school system in northern Manitoba these many years. They haven't had the freedom to consider the new types of experiments that are going on in the world of education today. In many cases I must admit that the standard of the teachers have gone up but they are again stopped by the curriculum which is laid down to them and which in too many cases does not take into consideration that these are people from a different area, a different area altogether and different types of approaches have to come to their education, a different type of program. They have it now and are accepting it in many of the schools where you have open classrooms and they've deviated in modern Manitoba in their approach but not in the northern school systems. I think for one thing, we could well look at the history and say, these children, you going to stimulate their imagination by teaching them about the revolution throughout the years in the European countries, the history and geography of lands far away, when they have nothing within their culture that teaches them about far away lands.

I think it would do well for the culture of the Indian population and of other people in Northern Manitoba if their history could be taught on their forefathers and the history of the Indian people in Canada; because if anybody should know it, it should be them. I think that this would stimulate their thinking and I think that it would give them a basis on which to lean against when they are talking to white people or people from other areas. It would stimulate their confidence and they would say, we too have a history. But unfortunately their history hasn't really been passed down from their own generation to generation and I think it is up to us to look at it and say let's do something in this way to stimulate their confidence in themselves to show them that their forefathers were just as great as the Columbus, etc. that came over here. They should have reasons to prove to themselves that they do not have to run second to the European populations that Canada has developed in the last 3 or 4 hundred years. They were here long before and they have a history, and I think it should be shown to them. In that way it would encourage them to tackle the other types of curriculum that will be necessary for them if they are going to step out and take advantage of community colleges, etc. I do not say it all has to be changed, but I say that teachers fundamentally should be given the right in these isolated areas to teach what the children want to learn and through that to interest them to also absorb those things which they must learn if they are going to enter into a competitive life.

It is very necessary, we have isolated them through choice when we first started to iron out the Indian problem and so consequently we must extend to them the necessities if we are going to welcome them back into our life, our way of living. Certainly we have taken away their way of life and we have really not substituted anything to date and I think it's about time that we look at it very carefully, because everything that we have done in the past has been almost an absolute failure, almost 100 percent, and we still haven't come around to finding an

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . . answer. I think it must be - if we go back to them and find out what they want and teach the children what they want, so that as they pass through the education system they, too, can enjoy the freedoms of education.

If a child does graduate from the public school system, which is usually 2, 3 or 4 years later than our own children in southern Manitoba, they have a problem of going to the high school. At present the one big high school we have particularly for them of course is through the Frontier School Division's Cranberry School, and it is a good one. I have nothing to really say against them, there are problems the same as other schools and there are problems there in boarding schools, just the same as there are in other boarding schools in Manitoba, but by and large, it's not doing too badly. But I don't think it could grow any larger than it is today. I think it is large enough. It's not a mill, it's supposed to be a place where you look after the school children and give some personal touch.

I know in the Northern Task Force one of the main requests were for more high schools distributed throughout the northern parts of our province and this is going ahead as I understand it - I believe Split Lake and Island Lake area will have them. I believe this is very necessary and I believe we have to take another look at it and say is this enough, because there are few enough children going to high school, but there is going to be no encouragement for them to go if they have to go too far away from home, because not only they become lonesome or homesick, but their parents care for them just the same as any other parents in the world and when they are taken away from the parents for nine months of the year, that is a long time for parents to live away from their children. Children seem to grow up and leave the home soon enough, but in our cases here, we have our children with us at home every night. This is not the case with the school system that we have at present and we have learned, my goodness, through years and years of trial and error, that the children that do go to the Indian high school system or public school system they had, where they took them away from their parents and put them out into pastures many, many hundreds or thousands of miles away from the community, that these children went to school because they were forced to, they learned because they were forced to and their one aim in life was to leave that high school as soon as possible and get back to their home as soon as possible; even years away from the home did not destroy their willingness, their desire to return to their home. Their home was worth a great deal more than the home that was offered them, even though the home that was offered had all the amenities of modern living, but it didn't have a father and a mother for that child and it could not take the place of the father and mother. So I say that I think the school system should change in the north, but particularly the public school system and kindergarten areas, must be given better encouragement than has been in the past.

I think that there should be extra remuneration for teachers that go out of their way to learn how to teach the Indian children and there are schools, universities that can teach them. Somehow back of my mind I believe we are starting to think about one in Manitoba, there's certainly a famous one in Saskatoon and there is a requirement for teachers to learn themselves and to learn the way of life of the Indian children and to learn just how they can get through to them, and the best way is to get it from the experts who have already learned. I think there should be additional grants given to those teachers that are willing to take those courses - I believe that as years pass, those teachers should have extra remuneration on a yearly basis, because they are giving up in many cases the opportunity of returning to public school system in the rest of Manitoba because it's different, it's very different; and not only that, but we want to encourage them to stay and do the missionary work that is necessary to get these children back into a stream of life where we had left off 3 or 4 hundred years ago in caring for them.

I think that the children as a whole in the north are just as intelligent as anybody else. Certainly they have shown ability to learn in those things that they are interested in and I think that if a little imagination is put into the Manitoba School system to allow them to have credit for those things which they want to learn. Granted they will be a long way away from the credits that are given to the children of southern Manitoba but they have many things in their advantage. For instance, the ability to cope with the things that are closest to their community, the wilderness and all the things that come to them through a wilderness area. They are important to them because they represent the livelihood as far as these youngsters are concerned and they want to learn them. I think they should be allowed to learn them and encouraged to and I think the teachers should be encouraged to change curriculums so that they can



(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . . reach the children.

Certainly if you are talking to those children about - who do not have incidentally the advantage of TV, the advantage of modern theatres, etc., daily newspapers - how are they to know about things that we are trying to teach them in school? What value is the Empire State Building to them? Nothing. Or the Richardson Building. It means nothing to them because they can't see it in their own minds; but certainly they can see the many things of northern Manitoba which they have grown up in, their culture has been passed on from their fathers and mothers and which they take for granted and these are the things that they want to be wise in. I believe if we teach them those things then we can also teach them the things that are necessary for them to reach the higher grades of education standards that are necessary if they are to get away from the isolation that they are in today. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to respond as quickly as possible to the remarks of the Member for Churchill because I agree with him completely. I feel that the native people of the north have in the past been inequitably treated, and I know that the member recognizes that you can't undo in a few months or even a few years, the mistake of a century.

However, I want to assure the member that we are moving in the very direction that the Member for Churchill has brought out. He talks about the cultural differences and we know there are; there is no doubt that a child attending classes in a school, looking at books which do not relate in any way to his own life experience - I can just imagine the kind of impact it must have on him because it must be completely foreign to them since they can't relate to it. I want to inform the honourable member that the Headstart program which was started is going ahead this year and being expanded, that classes will be conducted in 13 different centres, most of these in remote areas in northern Manitoba. That is the 1971 program that we're planning.

Many of the Indian and Metis children will get their very first taste of what school is all about in an environment this year which we hope is going to be a friendly and informal environment in which the teachers or the aids, the helpers to the teachers, will speak the native language, and now as the honourable member is aware, that is permissible under the Public School Act, the native language can be spoken in the classroom and it will be spoken to them. So the child can make a natural adjustment and not feel that he's in a completely alien society, and it will, I think, be a major factor in helping children feel at ease. It's going to make it possible for them to - when they come in in the fall in their regular program, not to come in cold but sort of to be prepared for what lies ahead of them; because the teaching of regular courses is not the primary purpose of the Headstart program, it's rather to expose them and to prepare them for their introduction into the school system. The teachers and the helpers who will be involved in the program will themselves attend a course at the Manitoba School for the Deaf in June - I think it just started yesterday or maybe Monday this week - where they'll be provided with guidelines and directives to help them in their work and to discuss the kind of problems that they might meet in order to help them cope with it and more fully understand the kind of children that they'll be dealing with.

With regard to curriculum I agree with him, that the curriculum that was given to the children just didn't relate in any way to their experience and therefore to their ability to comprehend or to absorb; and when you're educating children, I think it's essential to recognize that what you're doing to a child when you take him into school, an essential element is the building up of that child's confidence in himself. Every individual must have a self ego and that was never developed in the native children, because the curriculum materials didn't do that. I can tell you now, we are working on this. A project which is known as a cross-cultural project. The curriculum materials now in general use have by and large reflected the culture of the majority, and this was noted in the Northern Task Force and it's as a result of the studies by the report of the Northern Task Force that this change is coming about.

So we are going to be trying in this project or this program to identify, to publish and to print and distribute materials which are more suited to the needs of the children of Indian and Metis ancestry; we're going to try to encourage the development of entirely new materials in specific areas of need. These materials are not easy to come by, they're not published elsewhere, they're not easily found. One would have thought that in the many many years the Department of Indian Affairs operated the Federal Indian schools that material would be available, but it isn't, as the honourable member probably is aware; so we have an awful lot of initiating and exploring and studying to do to find the right kind of material that pertains to

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . these children so that it can be imparted to them in a way that they understand and in a way that will be meaningful to them; and we are, as I say, zeroing in on that particular program.

As a matter of fact we were considering this for the fall; we are going to start this summer with a number - as part of the students' summer job program a number of students are going to be hired almost immediately to study, evaluate, seek out and search out whatever materials there are anywhere, to look at them, to examine them and to see whether they could be put to use immediately. Manitoba may end up in a sense pioneering in this area.

We're also - and this I'll go into some detail at another time, but I can mention to the member - I recognize the problem that the teacher who comes from southern Manitoba no matter how well intentioned, simply doesn't understand and can't understand the children that the teacher comes in contact with, so we are starting a program in conjunction with the University of Brandon to make it possible for teachers or teacher aids who are now working in these schools, to take courses which will be prepared by the University of Brandon at the Faculty of Education, where they will be brought into Brandon, perhaps for three weeks intensive training periodically, then go back to their communities where they'll be teaching. We hope, we are planning on using itinerant professors who will come into those communities to work with these teachers-to-be so they don't have to leave their communities and come into the city and then take their teacher training; because in the past, unfortunately, native children who did come in who made it, came into the city, became teachers, but unfortunately did not want to go back and chose to teach and live in the city rather than go back to the communities from which they came. This is regrettable and I'm hoping that by these new approaches we can meet some of the problems that were posed by the Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: It nears the hour of adjournment. I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.