

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
7:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 9, 1974

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education has 20 minutes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, before we rose for the dinner hour I had commenced responding, or continuing my response to the comments made by honourable members. I wish to--(Interjection)--I hear some comments, Mr. Chairman, that I'm giving the kids a bad time. No, not really.

I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Riel for his contribution to the debate on the consideration of my estimates. He expressed his reaction to the CORE Report and he said that we've probably gone about as far as we could go. As you will probably know at the present time we have not implemented all of the recommendations of the CORE Report because many of them still will require further study and cost analysis, and so forth, and that will have to be done before a decision is made on that. He had expressed some reservations about further removal of tests and I would agree with the honourable member that in the evaluation of the academic achievement of students that there probably is need for some balance, some balance of the two, a testing program of some type coupled with an evaluation of the day to day work as it were.

I believe that the honourable member yesterday was about to make some further comments on the Planning and Research Branch, and I'm sure that he will have an opportunity to continue with his remarks and I'll be able to respond to that then.

One of the problems that we are confronted with in dealing with the question of evaluation and that is, what ought we evaluate? Ought we evaluate academic achievement, work habits, various other characteristics of the student, or some combination of both, or what?--(Interjection)--Is this better, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the Honourable Minister that we have facilities to enable every person to hear.

MR. HANUSCHAK: My apologies. I will stand over here and I'll thus be closer to the microphone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

A MEMBER: We want all the pearls of wisdom . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: And this, you know, particularly at this time there is considerable debate amongst educationists just what factors ought we evaluate in determining a pupil's progress. Now the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, who is not in his seat at the present time, he raised two points in particular. One, he sought information on the student travel program, and the other, as he put it, his concern that our education program should be "learning for living." Well, on student travel I hope that I will have the opportunity to comment on it when we come to dealing with the estimates of Colleges and University Affairs because as he had indicated there was a Youth Secretariat within it which conducted a student travel program a couple of years ago, and I would like to advise him that the Youth Secretariat is still very much alive and well and so is the student travel program. So there will be time to deal with that matter when we come to the estimates of the Colleges and Universities Affairs Department, and we will deal with those portions that may be directly relevant to it.

Now I know he is very anxious to enable students to get out to Mafeking to experience the comforts of a one-holer, the two-holer.--(Interjection)--No, no that's not golf courses that I'm talking about and I know that the Minister of Agriculture is proceeding with his rural sewage and water program at a fairly rapid rate and--(Interjection)--Now I'm not making a joke of Mafeking, and for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Swan River I just simply wish to advise him, too, in the event that he would wish to pass on such advice to any of his constituents that if the Minister of Agriculture continues at as rapid a rate with his sewage and water program as he has been to this date then we may have to go beyond the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba to find such facilities, in which case the Leader of the Liberal Party will have to make application to the Secretary of State of the government that this morning I didn't think he had given up and had gone to the Governor-General to call an election because that would be the responsibility of a Secretary of State. Within the province it's our responsibility.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party was also concerned about whether or not there is anything contained within the present education program dealing with matters that are

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) relevant to living as it were, dealing with civics, political education and the like, and I would like to inform the Honourable Leader - and even though he is not here I'm sure that he will read my remarks in Hansard because he will want the replies to his questions - at the primary level the education program looks at the local community and the interdependence of people in it, including their dependence on others for services, and this would include the provision of general services, in a descriptive manner suitable to the maturity of the students. At the intermediate level in Grade 5 in particular in the Winnipeg School Division there is a program being developed wherein the City of Winnipeg is studied as a sample of life in an urban area, and this includes a look at what services must be provided for people in such an area, for example, transportation, fire protection, etc. and who ought to provide these services and how they ought to be provided. And this in effect is a study of municipal government.

Then in Grade 6 the course includes an overview of Confederation which gives an opportunity for the children to realize that there are differences between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments. That at the Junior High level in Grade 9 one of the five units in the history course, the British Heritage, deals specifically with Canadian Government today and the topics are Constitutional Monarchy in the Parliamentary System of Government. And then in Grade 11, the Canadian history courses in Grade 11 deal specifically with the development of our parliamentary system. For example - and we touch upon the provincial. One of the history courses, namely the History 201 which deals probably at greater length with the parliamentary system because many of the students taking the 201 course are taking it as their final course in history as opposed to those taking the 200 course who are taking it as a prerequisite to Grade 12 history or the 300 course. And therefore the 201 course is geared to deal more in greater detail with our system of government of today because as I've said this being their last year of history and recognizing the fact that within a year or two after the completion of Grade 11 they will have to undertake their role as responsible Canadian citizens therefore it's important that they should have an understanding of the functions and the working procedures of our Canadian civic institutions.

In Grade 12 in both courses, the 300 course - a portion of the course deals with a comparison of the Canadian and other systems of government, their structures and operations, and the 301 course which is titled Modern World Problems, one portion of it entitled Man and Society and another Government deals with Government, another Society and the Individual, and this deals with the relationship between the individual and government, the role and functions of government in fact as affecting governmental decisions. And then of course there are pilot studies and pilot programs and other related courses in this field. Political studies is one that is presently undertaken, this is the first year that it's under way in three or four high schools in the province.

Then the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge touched on a number of points. One of his concerns was what protection will there be offered to small divisions to enable them to continue offering in a most effective manner the education program they're charged with the responsibility of offering. Well as I indicated in my opening statement of my estimates that in the process of review of our granting structure that we'll undertake this year and the move toward a block grant system then certainly this would take into account the very type of problems that the honourable member had raised that we're presently confronted with, declining enrollments as well as the demands of the public upon the education system and providing some means whereby both could be accommodated.

The honourable member also spoke of the present situation with respect to teacher oversupply, but the fact of the matter is as I have indicated on previous occasions, that there still is a demand for teachers in many parts of rural Manitoba and in the northern communities and the jobs are there and the so-called unemployed teachers are probably based in the City of Winnipeg. --(Interjection)--Now there are some as the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs has just indicated - made reference to the number of teachers in the Legislature but that in no way contributes to the problem, in fact it ought to ease the problem because that opens up more jobs for teachers in the field.

At the present time my Department has asked the Board of Teacher Education to review our teacher training program and in the process of evaluating it it will also examine the question of teacher supply. I think it should also be pointed out at this point in time, Mr. Chairman

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) that teacher graduates - you know this notion that when a teacher graduates from the Faculty of Education that there must be a job for him in the teaching system, that everyone is aiming for a classroom is not entirely correct, because there are many who graduate from the Faculty of Education who do not go into teaching, in much the same manner as there are people graduating in other faculties and do not go directly or into the active practice of the profession for which they train. And in fact a review of last year's class will show that many graduates have gone into adult education, into manpower counselling, day care, community development and other fields, other endeavours.

The question of pupil-teacher ratio that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge raised - this of course will have to be of necessity part of the review and the provincial study on finance. But I would like to point out to the honourable member that two years ago the pupil-teacher ratio in Manitoba was 21 to 1. At the present time it's 19 to 1, and if you relate that to a figure in the order of eleven to twelve thousand teachers, if one wishes to think in terms of the number of job openings that that provides one could readily see that it does open up several hundred jobs. But then in addition to that I would like to caution the members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that lowering the ratio in itself could have little effect on the quality of instruction, but no doubt would have a very definite effect on cost. So just pupil-teacher ratio alone varying it will not improve or enhance the quality of education, because the question of improving instruction lies more in using all available community resources, volunteers, so forth, starting to differentiate staff as professionals. Now this is more complex but more effective in dollars and in quality than simply reducing numbers. And I might add that my department has encouraged projects in co-operation with ten school divisions in the areas that I've just referred to over the past few years.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge also dealt with the question of school construction. He made particular reference to the fact that we have areas within which there is a declining population and at the same time there are other areas that are in the process of expansion, the process of development. School buildings that may have been built, whenever they were built, to accommodate a certain population that has declined now and is government cognizant of these factors in the planning and the building of schools and what is it doing with the space that is being vacated. Well in many many instances, Mr. Chairman, in the case of buildings which are now acquiring vacant space by reason of a declined population the space so freed up has been put to use for the provision of various ancillary services, either more library space, laboratories, kindergarten and so forth. Now insofar as new construction is concerned to which we contribute - and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge mentioned niggardly support. Well the niggardly support, Mr. Chairman amounts to 100 percent of the approved costs. And he made particular reference to Daniel McIntyre Collegiate, the expansion to it, and the renovation, and I would like to assure him that the plans that have been approved have met with the satisfaction of the Board of the Winnipeg School Division. They're quite happy with what will be done to that school.

And the honourable member will also find that in approving other new construction the community use aspect is taken into account and space is provided for it. Now not financed by the Public Schools Finance Board, of course, because we finance the educational component of schools but the balance is financed from other courses depending upon the use to which it is being put, from some agency of the municipality within which a school is located. But the two are incorporated, you know, be it for kindergarten, nursery, be it for the provision of some medical service, recreation or whatever else. I could think of two or three schools within Winnipeg wherein that is an example.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister's time is up. Resolution No. 47. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, we've dealt at some length with the aspects of education that are of course very important and I think it was worthwhile that the Member for St. Matthews made the observation that some academic matters had been dealt with and it came as a welcome note as far as he was concerned because he hadn't encountered that before to any great depth as far as the Legislative Assembly was concerned. I think that's probably fairly accurate, Mr. Speaker, as far as the observation from this chair is concerned as well because there is a tendency to sometimes overlook the aspects of academic matters that really are the important parts of education.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd)

I did note that the Minister failed to deal within his comments though what I thought was the most important part of the contributions made by the members of the Chamber. That is the recommendation of the CORE Report and whether or not some of the more important recommendations were going to be implemented or endorsed at least by the Department of Education. I noted a fairly high degree of concern from both members on this side of the House and from the Member for St. Matthews with regards to the general philosophy towards education that was indicated by the CORE Report, and I think that the Minister has probably skated around what has been the most important observations made in this session, I mean during this session during his Estimates. I realize that he mentioned them, in his opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, he mentioned the CORE Report but he's avoided so far dealing with what appeared to be the important matters that have been brought up in here; and perhaps he's doing it purposely or perhaps he just ran out of time and he may yet deal with and giving us some more in depth indication on whether he intends to in fact institute the looser type of a structure as far as examinations and other things are concerned in the CORE Report, or whether in fact they intend to carry on and look at it only on a pilot basis, or whether in fact the Department is philosophically in favour of this position or whether they're philosophically more inclined to the attitude expressed by the Member for Brandon and the Member for St. Matthews.

But, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with the niceties of education which we can all deal with in a very interesting and erudite manner, I now want to deal with some of the matters that may be more traditional with regards to the Estimates of the Minister of Education. Because Estimates, Mr. Chairman, do after all deal with money and money in this particular year is extremely important as far as the Minister of Education's Estimates are concerned. It's important because, Mr. Chairman, in the Estimate Book under the Department of Education the real important part is the Public School System and forms the backbone of the whole educational system. And in the Estimates under the item for School Grants and Other Assistance, we find a change from only 125 million to 127 million, a change of \$2 million, or just under \$2 million.

Mr. Chairman, according to the studies that are indicated to us by the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, and perhaps the Teachers' Association may have parallel information, but according to the school trustees who are the administrators of most of these budgets the costs are increasing at the rate of 15 percent a year. So in order to stand still in education if as the Minister indicates the teacher-pupil ratio has gone from 21 to 19, the student count has gone down slightly but basically we have the same number of people involved in education in the public system, then it would mean that to stand still in education that the Estimates should have gone from 125 million up to over 140 million - probably in the range of 143, 144 million. That is, Mr. Chairman, just simply to stand still. So in relevant terms . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. There is too much din right around and we can't hear the Honourable Member for Riel speaking.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, in relative terms in order to simply stand still in education the budget would have had to go from 125 million to over 140 million simply to keep even with the increased demands. Well, Mr. Chairman, that isn't the most important part. The most important part is that what has been the stance of this government with regards to the finance of education appears to be entirely contradictory in this year's budget, in that the transfer of the primary load for the increased costs, which if we assume are again 15 percent this year, the primary cost is not being picked up by the government but is being picked up by the property taxpayer, because if it isn't covered by government it's covered by the special levy on property tax. And, Mr. Chairman, despite the homeowner grant which was created to be the salvation of the tax problem on the homeowner, which adds this year, we understand by government announcement, \$8 million to the pot, in spite of that the mill rates are going up. And as we saw in the total mill rates indicated by the City of Winnipeg for instance, we're now running in the 90 mill range and in some of the rural constituencies by the time we combine the school levy with the municipal levy, we're up in the range of over 100 mills and in many cases a 125 mill range. This means that a person has to pay every year on the assessed value of his property over one-tenth of the value of his property in taxes in order to keep this system going.

So in spite of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister provides us with a disclaimer that the province is picking up 70-plus percent of the cost of education of the public system in

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) Manitoba, it still represents an incredible increase in the amount of the mill rate on property. And if we look only at the homeowner without looking at the effect on business, on the small business, big business and really everybody but the homeowner or the farmer, we find that in Winnipeg area, for instance in St. James-Assiniboia, the mill rate will be up by 15.1 percent; in St. Boniface it's up 12 percent; Fort Garry - 18; St. Vital - 15; River East - 23 percent, and so on, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the disclaimers by the government that the costs of education are going to be taken off property and put on to government sources. That is put on the basis of ability to pay rather than on property. So, Mr. Speaker, you can't help but question what the government's true intentions are with regard to the financing of the Public School System. There's no doubt that last year they made every possible Machiavelian effort, every possible Machiavelian effort to imply to the homeowner that they were going to take the cost of education off the home. Mr. Chairman, they went so far as to even double up on the homeowner grant and not make it deductible off income tax but they deducted it off his tax bill at source.

Mr. Chairman, that's all well and good except this isn't election year, this is the year after an election and what we want to know now is in real terms what the government's intentions are, not before an election year but on the long term basis with regards to the financing of the Public School System. Because if we have to go by their actions, Mr. Chairman, it's far different than going by the promises and indications of the government in the years previous to this year, the year after an election. So here we are faced in this particular year with an increase in the mill rates that are jumping anywhere up to 20 percent on the Special Levy and we find that the increase in amount from the Public Schools Finance Board are ranging in the order of 2 percent for instance in St. James-Assiniboia, 3 percent in St. Vital and so on down the line; at the same time that the Special Levy is jumping anywhere in the order from 5.3 percent up to 23.3 percent. And, Mr. Chairman, this complicated gimmick that the government has devised of the homeowner grant clearly and emphatically is not covering the increased cost of education; despite the disclaimer by the government that they in total are paying over 70 percent of the education, they are in this particular year slipping badly in terms of the financing of the Public School System. And it's a year, Mr. Chairman, where there appear to be no great thrusts as far as education are concerned. There's no great thrust in terms of programs; there's no great thrust in terms of change in curriculum; there's no great change in terms of bringing in a regional system of education that was brought in by the former government; there's no switch to a unitary division, Mr. Speaker, that was brought in by the former government; there's no institution of post-secondary colleges, Mr. Chairman, that was brought in previously. There is, Mr. Speaker, a very clear stand pat attitude as far as education is concerned and still they are disposed in their actions to not increase the support or even keep up with the rate of increase of costs of the Public School System. So we sit here, Mr. Speaker, listening to these very fine remarks but the actions speak much louder than the words. We have a Public School System that in financial terms is in very dire circumstances, a Public School System that is a good public school system but is not being treated in the manner that the government would lead us to believe they're being treated in terms of the finance of education.

Mr. Speaker, we've sat here over the last four or five years and we've watched the growth of the Civil Service grow by leaps and bounds, not only in the Department of Education but in all departments. We've seen the growth by orders of thousands grow from in the order of 6,000 to the order of 8,000 and 9,000 people. Mr. Chairman, we have in the Province of Manitoba roughly 12,000 school teachers, we have about the same number of students as we had back when this government took power. The number of students and the number of teachers have relatively been unchanged; so it must be clear, it must be clear that the direction and thrust of this government has been relatively to hold education at a standstill. And it is not because the education system has been in great trouble, it is simply an indication that the priorities of this government have gone off education, and at the same time as they're prepared to create whole new branches - and I cite as an example the Planning and Research Branch in the Department of Education - where they can create whole new branches to serve their own pecuniary purposes, the real guts of education which is teachers and students has been left relatively in a stagnated position.

So, Mr. Speaker, let it not be said, in spite of the fact that there are a large number of

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) people who should understand the education system across the way, let it not be said that this government has done anything of any substantive nature to develop education in the Province of Manitoba. You have been basically a stand pat government that takes us back to the days prior to Roblin coming into power in Manitoba. You are of an era that is similar to the former days of the Liberal Government in Manitoba in the field of education. You basically are a stand pat government, you're making pronouncements but you're doing very very little in a substantive way when it comes to the classroom itself. You're making a lot of noises but you're doing very little that is evident of a substantive nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47 (a).

A MEMBER: Order, order, he's still on . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I'm beginning to resent just slightly, I'm beginning to resent just slightly, I realize that, you know, we have trouble getting someone who can Chair a meeting in this place, but it's come to a new low.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I apologize to the honourable member, if he is trying to challenge my ruling. I understood that you were trying to sit down. You may proceed.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that some members of this House that belong to areas such as cover certain parts of St. Boniface ought to apologize to the constituents of their constituency about the mill rate of education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. I don't believe that that is in any way, that you are trying to refer to the Chair. I apologize to the honourable member. I thought that he was in the process of sitting down.

A MEMBER: . . . didn't attempt to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So he has the floor. The Honourable Member for Riel.

A MEMBER: Good gracious.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I . . .

A MEMBER: This is ridiculous.

MR. CRAIK: . . . I suggest to you that that advice, that some members including yourself might well take, that when you're out of the Chair is to go back to your constituents and apologize to them for the inability of yourself and other members to look after their interests . . . the mill rate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that the honourable member should be aware that the Member for St. Boniface being in the Chair it is not appropriate to commence a debate with him vis-a-vis his activities. The honourable member certainly is fair game for a debate, but while he's in the Chair it's not appropriate to engage in such debate and I suggest that he - excuse me - the Member for Radisson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Member for Inkster that he go back to his constituents and explain, and explain to them in the field of education where the emphasis has been on shifting the burden of tax from property on to the ability to pay basis, that he go back and explain to them why the mill rate has gone the way it has. And let him explain to them further, the attempt to bring in a system of tax rebate, Mr. Speaker, a tax rebate system that has shown its greatest ability of the government being able to manipulate it from year to year and put it at source on an election year, put it on income tax on another year, increase it at will, double it up in a particular year when they feel like doing it, but most of it, from all the evidence point of view, designed to demonstrate to the people, demonstrate to the people that they in fact can give the people back money they shouldn't have taken away in the first place. But not only that, to do it when they feel like it at will. At their whim, Mr. Speaker. One of the most, one of the most backward steps and ways of taxing for the purpose of financing the municipal, or education system that has ever been devised; one of the most backward methods, Mr. Speaker. And defended, defended by no less than a former Minister and others who state on this side of the House, and of course were extremely critical of it at the time that it was instituted by a former government. But, Mr. Chairman, could not resist the attempt to attempt to imply to people, the taxpayers of Manitoba, that in fact they were giving the people of money, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the answer is that there is no substitute in education for a solid foundation program; and the solid foundation program has fallen into such disrepair in Manitoba

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) as a result of this government's actions that they have had to prop it up by the tax rebate system; secondly, by a student per capita grant system and by a number of other systems that in fact still must surely have now proven, anybody that's reasonable enough to look at it over there, proven beyond doubt that it is no excuse and no replacement for the Foundation Program that was instituted at one time and has gone into great disrepair.

Mr. Chairman, in 1967 when the Foundation Program was brought in it covered the largest portion of the cost of education, it was designed to cover what was considered a basic education. It was described at that time, Mr. Chairman, by the members of the present government not as a foundation program but as a subterranean program, a subterranean program, Mr. Chairman. That subterranean program, which presumably is lower than a foundation, down in the bowels of the earth someplace, has not had the grants for teachers salaries changed since 1967. It's still the same as it was in 1967. Well, I don't know what you describe it as now, because it was described in 1968 by the present members of the Treasury Bench at that time as being that bad, and it hasn't been changed since. The teacher grants now cover 60 percent of the costs of the teachers' salaries, but this government still digs in its heels and says "if there is a problem in education we'll solve it because we'll give the property taxpayer a grant, it'll go to him; and it'll go with our signature on and in an election year we'll double it and if necessary we'll take it off at source, so he knows exactly where the money is coming from."

Mr. Chairman, this kind of Machiavelian politics does not work for long. And, Mr. Chairman, sooner or later, sooner or later even government I think will discover that the people of Manitoba aren't going to be fooled by it; because when your mill rates get up to 90 mills on property, Mr. Chairman, 90 mills when you're taking one-tenth of the assessed value of a person's property every year away from him, and then several months later giving him a bit of a rebate when he pays his income tax, sooner or later that program has to catch up. The people are going to say why don't you finance a proper educational system and stop all this bloody nonsense. You hire dozens of people, you set them over in a building and ask them to give money back to people that shouldn't have been taken away in the first place. You've got senior citizens that haven't filled out income tax forms in years and years and they phone up their MAL and say, "Did I deserve \$50 last year? Could I have gotten back \$50 last year? If I filled out a form this year, could I get the rebate I missed two years ago?" What nonsense! What nonsense! And don't stand up and say Ontario does it, B. C. does it, other people do it, it's all nonsense and you know it is. It was tried out in this province and your system is no better, your system is no better than the system that was tried out here years ago. So bring in a proper educational finance system. Your protestations are not convincing. You stood, you stood and said, accused the Opposition of being afraid to vote for your rebate system bill when you brought it in, and the Opposition stood and voted against it, and you said "You'll get defeated at the polls for doing that." That's their reasoning. They gave it away in a nutshell. They said, they said in reverse, that's why we brought this in. We want to get elected. Because they stood up and accused . . . no the Minister of Finance said . . . you wouldn't dare vote against this bill because you're afraid of getting defeated at the polls. We stood to a man and we opposed your ridiculous rebate setup. And we'll do it again, because, Mr. Chairman, we just happen to be a little more honest when it comes to financing education. We'll bring you a foundation program, we'll give this province a foundation program that does not have to make excuses to the taxpayers of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, and we'll do it in a straightforward manner; we won't double the rebate on a year when we think they have to be doubled for our own purposes. We won't change it from an income tax deduction to a property tax deduction during election year. And I repeat, there has never been a more Machiavelian move by any government in Manitoba than you people with your tax rebate. And you ought to take your tax rebate and swallow it, swallow it good and hard before another election comes around and get honest. Bring in a foundation program that properly finances education in the public system, and stop all this duplication and nonsense of paying back money to people that should never have been taken away in the first place. And some time provide us will you with a count, an estimated count of the number of senior citizens that haven't filled out an income tax form in 10 years and that are still not filling it out and are still not getting their proper money back.

Mr. Speaker, nonsense, nonsense. And the mill rate this year is a true indication of the degree of that nonsense. 90 mills combined taxes in the City of Winnipeg, 125 mills and

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) more in some of the areas of rural Manitoba. Just nonsense. One-tenth of assessed value being paid in taxes. Well, Mr. Chairman, it's high time that they got back to the basics of education and stop playing political nonsense with their rebate system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): I wanted to ask the member a question, I don't know whether he would answer one or not. I was going to ask you, the Member for Riel, did not the Roblin government have a rebate of \$50 in one of the years?--(Interjection)--A flat rebate?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I not only entertain the question, I welcome it. Because as I said in my remarks, it was tried by a former government, but the former government had the good sense and grace to realize that it was an inefficient way of doing something, of rectifying a situation that should not have existed, and as a result of that the Foundation Program was brought in in 1967 that provided a proper financing base for all the school divisions. And I don't mean urban versus rural where the big problems come in, I mean all the school divisions if properly financed through a good foundation program, don't run into the discrepancies that you have to rectify through all this patchwork program that you're going through to do it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There's been a very good discussion on this and I really have appreciated the many remarks I've heard. I didn't really intend to take part in the debate but it's been a good debate and I've a few remarks that I'd like to make, because education is costing a lot of money and I've been one that's said from early on that many of the people are questioning the money and whether they're getting really their money's worth. --(Interjection)--I'm not sure about that. We need education too. I do believe that education is very important, but people do wonder if we're getting our money's worth with the things that are going on these days.

Many people seem to think that if they go to school and get an education that they're assured of success in life and that everything's going to be rosy, but I think that they should always be told that if they don't apply themselves, no matter what career they take, they won't be very successful. I think that many of them should be given this impression because when they feel they got some degree they seem to think that they should get big salaries whether they work or not, and that they're a little bit better than other people.

Education means several different things. I say that there is an awful lot of people that haven't got any of these B. A. 's behind their name but are very knowledgeable in what they make their living at and are very worthwhile people in every community.

When I read the CORE Report through, and I'm not sure that I finished it because, to me, I got so disgusted with it before I was through that I kind of threw it away and thought well I better not make any comments on it because I'm maybe not too knowledgeable in education and I shouldn't be criticizing it too much. But I certainly didn't think too much of it and I was really very pleased today when, it was yesterday when the Honourable Member from Brandon West got up and stated his opinion on it and the Member from St. Matthews spoke today, because this is really just the way I've been feeling all the way along, only I didn't care to get up and express myself, and I wouldn't have taken the chance if it hadn't been that I see this is the way many others are feeling. Because I'm one that seems to believe that often people change just for the sake of change, whether it's better or not. And I think that's very foolish. And the Member from Fort Rouge says something about these here - well I'll call it loose housing way of educating children, and whether it's better or not. We often make changes before we really should and I think this was one time we went in the wrong direction.

Now I think when you're talking about passing students without exams and just let them enter university just with certain credits and the other ones are optional, I think that this is really, as was said earlier, a cop out for teachers and trustees, and I don't think that they're facing up to their responsibilities.

Now I believe that teachers and trustees do what they kind of believe the people want but I also think that education goes a circle occasionally and that what is acceptable maybe now will not be acceptable ten years from now and you'll see them drift back into some of their former ways. And I think that this is what's going to happen with education. And especially with this CORE Report, I think it's been an exercise in futility; I think it's been another make work program where money's been spent, but I'd be happy to see that money forgot about and that

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) CORE Report thrown in the basket and the basket been sure to be put in the garbage pail. That's all I have to say about it. I think that if they're going to go ahead with it, I hope that they'd really give the local school divisions a chance to let their opinions be known, and I feel that if the school divisions are given a chance to express themselves and if you'll listen to them that probably this is just what'll happen to this CORE Report.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have listened, as most of the people who stayed in the Chamber during the debate on the Department of Education's Estimates have, and I have found it rather noteworthy that those who have been intimately related with the educational system have had a great deal to say with the CORE Report. I will certainly concentrate my comments on that same subject. But before I do, Sir, I would like it to be known that as a member of the Manitoba community all of my life I have nothing but praise to make, or praise to heap upon the educational system of Manitoba. By and large I think it takes a second role to no department of education in our Dominion, and for that matter, in North America. I think that that is probably a fact because we have had very dedicated people, and to those people today I would like to take off my hat and compliment them on doing a very excellent job.

It could be, Mr. Chairman, that I am doing this because I come from a family who have been intricately related to the educational system. I have had some of my family in the teaching profession. It is perhaps that kind of a vested interest, and I personally had something to do with the educational system in St. Boniface for a period of six years. That is where I noted that teachers are often criticized, or people in the educational department are often criticized by those who know very little of the challenges that these people have to meet every day. So I think that it is important that we put on the record that we are grateful to the kind of devotion that we have had since the system of education has been in existence in our province.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the system of education as it exists today has three main springs. They were well covered by my honourable friend the Member from Brandon West. Those three systems are, I consider, the kinds of options that are required in a society like ours that is developing in the technological age at the rapid clip that we are all aware of. It will do for these young people the kinds of things that a society would want the system to do and it would seem that the educational system is one that should respond to the wants of a society. It is in essence the mirror and the reflection of that society.

You have the university entrance course which in itself is academic and offers latitude even within the academic subjects. You have the general course which provides a very good basic education for those young people who want a complete course which can by itself terminate at the Grade 12 level, but can of course be carried on if trades are a further option of those young people. Then you have the occupational entrance course which takes care of those either less gifted or who want to go into the trade area at a very early age. Surely I think that these are basic systems that can respond well to the community in which we live. It is a system that can challenge the young people to obtain the goals that they themselves with the help of their parents and counsellors can set. But it seems that there are some people who feel that we have to embark on a new and far more updated kind of program.

Before I start talking about CORE, I would like to refer back to some of the experiments that have been made in this province, because I believe in innovation, I believe the educational system like all other walks of life should be one that is ever-changing and adapting to the new milieu, to the new challenges that are being foisted on us by that technological advance I was mentioning. But we made some trials that proved to be far from capable of reaching the expectations we had from them. I think that all of you will remember the open areas that were developed so that we could provide a continual learning concept. Well many of the school divisions embarked on that without the benefit of any pilot project and were saddened to find that it was not all of the teachers that wished to work in this environment nor was it all of the pupils who were able to accept that new kind of exchange in the learning process between the teacher and the pupil. I won't say it was a dismal failure because for those pupils who are highly gifted it's perhaps an additional incentive to be in a room where more than one level of a subject is being taught. But certainly it was not all it was cracked up to be.

Then there was another experiment and one that I was intimately related with, and that was the team teaching concept. Well I will certainly label that one a dismal failure. There were many structural changes and great deals of capital invested in the team teaching arenas

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MARION cont'd) and I notice today that they're used for all sorts of other things but lecture theatres, which is really what the concept was. We also found out that it was not so easy to bring about the type of efficient team that we wanted in that system.

Those are but two of the kinds of innovations that were brought forward that did not prove successful. I would, if I were to judge, I would say that the possibilities of the two systems that I have just mentioned, their possibilities of success would be at least 100 to one if you're to compare them with the possibilities of success contained in the new credit system - at least a hundred to one.

I read the CORE Report, yes. My friend the Honourable Member for St. Vital said a moment ago, did you understand it? Well I think that some excerpts of it were read by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews and I couldn't understand the jargon and I'm sure that no one else could. There is no doubt that it's wholesale jargon and it is contradictory from cover to cover. --(Interjection)--Yes, yes, those parts that one can decipher are very definitely contradictory. I will appreciate that there are not too many parts in the book that are legible and intelligible but those that are are totally contradictory.

I think that I would like to quote some of the things that I feel contradictory. Now I read this thing again last night, I had read it about six months ago, and I think that I was, if anything, I wasn't angry but very heavy of heart, very heavy of heart that a great deal of time, effort and money were spent in preparing this kind of a report, and now knowing full well after the Minister's intervention or presentation yesterday that the contents of this report are going to become the basis for the education in this province for the students in Grade 10, 11 and 12, starting in 1974 on an optional basis, mandatory in 1974, heavy of heart because I have children in the Manitoba educational system today and they will have to go along with this kind of a credit system. Well let me tell you because I have been closely associated with education I will limit the options, so I will not let my children get involved in opting for the Mickey Mouse courses. But that's not good enough. That's one man. There are a number of parents so darn busy and not knowledgeable enough that they will not be able to influence the children in the kinds of options that are meritorious of consideration. That's the sad part. --(Interjection)--Sometimes - and again my honourable colleague from Assiniboia mentions it's difficult to influence. Certainly it's difficult to influence young people of the ages of 17 and 18 when they - and you'll recall how we were - when they feel that they have all the answers. Four years later they realize they don't have the answers and they realize how much Dad and Mother learned over the last three or four years. But the damage has been done.

I would like to read some of the notes that I took on my appraisal of the CORE Report. The philosophical considerations reflect unacceptable values in my opinion. We are promoting co-operation rather than competition. Do you mean to tell me that I cannot compete and yet co-operate? Do you mean to tell me that our children today shouldn't learn what this world is all about? It is competition, but it doesn't mean that it's competition without co-operation. Now I think that that's one of the loopholes, that's one of the fundamental lacks in the entire CORE Report. We're afraid of competition. Doing what must be done rather than work for works sake. Again the easy way out. Sure I don't like to work for works sake oftentimes, but if I have goals it's important that I roll up my sleeves and I work, and it's important that our young people know that that's the name of the game.

Experiencing rather than achieving. That's an anachronism. Can you not experience and achieve through that experience? Do you sit down complacently and let something happen so that you can experience it without trying to achieve those same things that you've witnessed? No I don't think that that's true. Enjoying yourself here and now rather than thinking about what I'm going to do for the rest of my life, because when I come out of Grade 12 and enter university or go to a trade school, I am then committed for the rest of my life in an area, my academic base is a very short-lived experience.

I think that challenging and developing high ideals in youth is extremely important and it is totally - and this is what again the CORE Report does - it is totally negative to dwell on man's failings. We have all at one time or another said that the society in which we live has a great deal of failings and that we're part of those failings; but we all strive to increase the ideals in man so that these failings will not repeat themselves. That is the sort of ideal that we should inculcate in our young people - inculcate. I don't think that it is--(Interjection)--Well, you know, my honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre berated his colleague and I have nothing to

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MARION cont'd) say to the Honourable Member from St. Matthews except that there is nothing in his discourse that I disagreed with, absolutely and positively nothing. So I can understand why his colleague would berate him. I think that it is extremely important, it is extremely important that the counter culture supporters come down to earth and realize that we must all live with high ideals and these are the concepts that we should bring about through our educational system.

I have, as I said, a number of children - six to be exact - on the educational system. Some are already at the university level. But I can tell you that they're average children. It's too bad that one has to speak of his own but I think that this is the only example I can give. And I'm afraid that I must admit that I have a youngster who's graduating from Grade 12 this year that still to this day has not had the divine guidance to know exactly where he would like to go. He is still searching. What would that young man have done three years ago had he been faced with making a choice on two-thirds of this option. Well I will tell you, and my honourable friend from Brandon West told you when he made his presentation--(Interjection)--half. I have two-thirds here on the point system but I'll be pleased to accept a clarification from the Honourable Minister.

There is only one decision a young man or young lady will take - the easy way. They don't know any better. They have not got the capability, and let's stop fooling ourselves, of making judicious choices. Now they can with the help of counsellors, because in the past decade we have introduced into our school system counsellors who were able to devise and counsel well in the absence of the counselling from parents. But there aren't enough to go around so consequently - and this is a proven fact - I know of some children, some young people rather in high schools that have only a population of 500 students that have never seen the counsellor in four years, so one mustn't tell me that it is possible for young people to have the assistance of a counsellor. Is a system which panders man's most selfish inclination really worthy of consideration? I'm referring to the easy way out. And I know that the answer has to be, you cannot pander, you have to encourage, you have to challenge and you have to inculcate the want and the desire of accepting challenge.--(Interjection)--I heard it a great number of times before the dinner hour and it is an appropriate term and that is why I am sending it back to my honourable friend, but with my connotations.

There is a great man who once said, "I can only promise you blood, sweat and tears." He was a great man and he was talking about a great goal, the preservation of liberty. I say to you that a goal that is almost as equally valid, important, dignified, would be education, and I say that the challenge to our youth today should be, we can only offer you blood, sweat and tears and a great deal of hard work. There is nothing will come easy but you will be rewarded with that sense, with that feeling of accomplishment. To realize what motivates mankind is the result of serious application. To appreciate the fragility of our way of life is to understand the effort required to conserve it. Now that I think means a great deal to me and it can only be brought about by those who are ready, who are motivated to the point that they will give it the effort to make sure that we preserve that very delicate balance that we have. This spells a responsibility acquired through hard work, the kind of hard work a mature person alone can develop. Making a fun place out of our schools will never develop the person needed in our society to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

I read an article, It was an editorial in the Free Press dated March 12th. There are some points that I would like to read to you, quote to you: "Entirely aside from the cost of teaching difficulties involved in such a program, it cannot help but be a blow to educational standards. Mickey Mouse courses, it can be assumed, will be the order of the day; One more step in the erosion of standards that have marked the educational process for some years. It is the latest evidence of political capitulation to the theory that education ought to be entertainment rather than a discipline; that if a student doesn't enjoy what he is doing he can give it up and opt out for something else. All that remains now is for a permissive government to adopt some of the more far out recommendations of the task force on post-secondary education and the erosion of the educational standards in Manitoba will be complete.

I think I would like to make some other qualitative appraisals of what we are embarking upon if we're unable to dissuade the Minister from really taking that step. The proliferation of options in high schools right today, right today, under the system that we have is a real problem. Now we have some large high schools and we have some smaller high schools. In

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MARION cont'd) some of the smaller high schools - and naturally because of the population disparity most of these small high schools will be found in the rural area and there are greater numbers of them right on the urban scene today. Now how are we going to permit, pray tell, Mr. Chairman, how are we going to permit young people using their own options or becoming interested in their own courses. Who will teach these courses?

The Minister responded a moment ago to some criticism with respect to the teacher-pupil ratio and he was right in pointing out what the teacher-pupil ratio was today. What would he say if it were to drop another three or four and come down to the level of maybe 14 or 15 pupils per teacher? Who would live with that system? Certainly, as my honourable friend from Riel mentioned, not the people of this province, we haven't got the means, unless the province is ready to foot the entire bill. Now this is exactly what will happen, if we increase the options today we'll either break down the little high school completely or we will regionalize. Well not again. I don't want to hear the word "regionalizing" any more. We have done regionalization in the rural areas to the point where we've got some young people travelling two hours a day to get that education. Surely that's cruel and sacrifice enough, surely that's enough. If we're going to offer all of the options that young people can dream out, all of the Mickey Mouse courses as well as some that might be more valid, these youngsters might be travelling for four and five hours a day. Now there's no way in this kind of society that we want that kind of duress to be imposed on young people. Do you mean to tell me that we would like to have the people in the urban area going from one extreme of the city to the other to obtain the kind of course that they have opted for? I think that we'd have a pell-mell and a mishmash kind of organization like none of us have ever dreamt was possible. --(Interjection)--Yes. And surely we don't want to proliferate it. So I say that there is no way--(Interjection)--Well we're talking about the courses that young people could dream up that would be Mickey Mouse but would suit them because they wouldn't be tight. Mr. Minister, I talked to you about a problem with a board and I was able to - because of your knowledge - get you to listen to my problem so don't - there are some limitations. I think that the CORE guidelines re developing skills, sequential patterns of learning and continuing study in adult years, these are some of the basics that will be abandoned to school boards, and I say that those are idiotic.

I would like to suggest that we should put first things first and I think that the accent should be placed, and the money, on facilities and techniques for students with learning or perceptual handicap problems, the emotionally disturbed. Now the Minister talked about some of the things that are being done for them, but I would far rather that we did more than we are doing presently for that kind of a program. And another program that we all agree will have to be given much more consideration in the immediate future, and that is adult education right at the divisional level. With the exception of the Division No. 1 there are very few that are offering courses today that can be fulfilling for the adult. I think that these are the kinds of things that the accent very definitely has to be placed on, and the money should be spent in these areas. I will agree that we have an ever-changing and evolving kind of society where many adults today will have to be retrained. Well why should they not be retrained at the expense of a school division properly funded by the Department of Education? In a number of areas training menial or trade classes are not the kinds of options that will be taken, and when those options are not taken I would expect that the school divisions of tomorrow will be offering meaningful courses for adults who want to regroup to achieve yet better ideals for themselves.

It has often been said, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Honourable Minister of Education, that we should go back to the reading, writing and arithmetic, the three R's, because oftentimes I am told by university professors, we have young people coming out of senior high school with the most flagrant incapability of expressing themselves properly, or reading with comprehension and of writing with comprehension. So it would seem to me that the accent rather than running a gamut of options should be that we would encourage these young people to further, by imposing courses that will be beneficial in the long run to them but not by withdrawing those that we presently have by some of lesser real value.

I have had the opportunity of talking, Mr. Minister, with a number of people who have a great concern for education, and let me tell you in the little time that I have left of some of the options that they feel are being neglected at present.

One of the queries that I made was with respect to innovations. Did they feel that

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MARION cont'd) innovations were being introduced after enough research? Well almost 21 out of 25 people that I contacted in my own survey - and that's an 85 percent turn out almost - agreed that--(Interjection)--No, I'm afraid not--agreed that there was not enough research, there was not enough research going into the programs that were being introduced, the innovative programs.

The other question was: how many people feel that the open classroom is the kind of classroom that should be encouraged in rapport with the conventional classroom? Well two agreed out of 24 that the open area was the one that should be favoured, while 18 said that the conventional classroom was by far the most efficient to provide the kind of educational services that parents wanted today.

A third question was should more time be spent at school and at home in encouraging children to read? Now remember I said, at home and at school. This was 24 out of 25 people, mostly parents agreed, mostly parents, agreed that this was worthy of a great deal of consideration by parents and school boards.

Educational travel should be encouraged in a rather high proportion - 15 out of 24 felt that this was a worthy cause. Students are asked too early to choose types. Now, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, this was a question after my initial reading of the CORE Report. Students are asked too early to choose types of courses leading to specialized vocations. Twenty out of 25 or 80 percent felt that this really was the case. Now that's 80 percent. I think that the percentage is standing up in this House right now with respect to the comments made by members of the Legislature.

Schools are permitted to draw up their own programs. Is it imperative, in your opinion, that the Department set minimum standards of achievement? Twenty-four out of 25 felt that this was a responsibility which should be vested in the Department of Education itself, because it had the expertise to evaluate whether or not courses were valuable and whether achievements were of a standard that would make our young people in Manitoba able to compete on an equal footing with the young people in other provinces.

Mr. Chairman, I would have one last comment to make with the little bit of time I have left, and that is the CORE Report is one that can also place the young Manitoban at a great disadvantage. Now, Mr. Minister, I have told you of my anxiety in this regard before in the House; I know you'll recall it. I think that we are living in a society that is extremely mobile. Families move from coast to coast, and it's with very very little notice. If we opt for a system like the credit system that we're about to embark upon now this could have very serious repercussions on the young people who are moving out of this province and going to those provinces that don't have that kind of a credit system. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre have a question?

MR. BOYCE: Yes. The Minister only has five minutes left and I promise I won't be provoked again today. I had one question that I wanted to ask earlier, Mr. Chairman, but just briefly I would suggest the Member for St. Boniface read a couple of books that he might glean something from is Locke's book on Human Understanding, read that first and then Morrow's Education and Antiquity, but not to get into educational philosophy once again because we can go round and round and round on this one. But to the Minister, perhaps he can take as notice and answer when he gets an opportunity. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it quite clear that there is only one person on this side of the House that is in a position to articulate government position, and that is the Minister of Education. I have ample opportunity to make my views known elsewhere and I have taken that, but publicly I speak perhaps with a conflict of interest on this particular point. But it's with reference to the teaching of French in the Province of Manitoba. I hear, because my child attends Tache School, that the St. Boniface School Division is going to phase out Tache School and the children are going to go to Provencher. While they have the option of continuing their education in French, in my opinion I don't think it will be as good as if Tache were kept open.

I chose this particular course because I am more far right than anyone else in this place perhaps. I believe it's the fundamental responsibility of the parent to educate a child. That all any system that you put in place can do is help a parent, but I think the primary responsibility is vested in the parent, and parents should be reminded of this because what they do is turn over their responsibility to others and too many of them forget that responsibility. That

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) if in this country we say that albeit that I would perhaps have chosen to go in another direction, if I had of been around at Confederation perhaps I would have gone the way the Americans did at the Louisiana Purchase, that it was a unilingual country. But nevertheless it is not my choice to make. We are committed, federally and provincially, that this country is going to be bilingual. So my parental responsibility is one of my five children will be bilingual. So the child has gone through a French school system to learn French. Now that is my understanding of it and I don't say that this is how other people should understand it. But I hear in the news, I hear in the news that the Minister of Education has made certain funds available to school divisions outside of the city of Metropolitan Winnipeg so that they can strengthen some of the smaller schools which would under straight economic terms be phased out, and I wonder if the Minister could take this under advisement relative to Tache School.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I believe I only have about a minute or so of Estimates time tonight. There has been considerable discussion related to the CORE Report and the attitude that seems to be taken by many members who participated in the debate is that we have adopted the recommendations of the CORE Report, but I wish to stress the point that whatever changes we've made, any revisions in the high school program that have been announced at the present time are our response to the CORE Report. And the question was asked by a number of honourable members as to whether or not there will be further changes in line with or in response to the CORE Report. I believe that I did make this point, if I did not make it sufficiently clear I wish to repeat it again, that any further liberalization of the school program will depend on the interest and the desire expressed by trustees, school personnel and local communities. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the initiative will have to come from the school divisions, the local community and not from the Department of Education.

Now I suppose, I'll continue my remarks when we next reach Estimates of my Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time of 9:00 o'clock has arrived. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item Private Members' Hour is Bill No. 23. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 31. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 47. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 59. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member have a point of order?

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Bill 47 was called, if the member wishes it to stand in his name, if we might be permitted to speak . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate because of my overall interest in the principle involved in the subject, the basic policy of the parliamentary system which is coming under scrutiny and coming under some challenge by the actions which resulted from the debates and the capital supply bills that were previously before this House. I had not intended until I listened to the remarks last evening of the First Minister who rose to first of all indicate that during his remarks he had not intended to state any positive position with respect to the manner in which his government would finally deal with this bill, but that he nevertheless wished to bring his views to the Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that in his view the way

BILL 47

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) in which the government had acted by using a Special Warrant for what they considered to be an emergency situation was really not very much different than the method that the Opposition had indicated would have been more acceptable to them.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that while the end result may have been the same, there was certainly a great deal of difference in the procedure that was adopted and it was in that basic difference that I felt the First Minister might have been somewhat more frank with the members and have been willing to admit that what his government did was not really in keeping with the democratic system of parliamentary government that we have so long supported.

Mr. Speaker, the government did succeed in achieving what they wanted to do and voted for themselves by means of a Special Warrant under the Financial Administration Act and they were able to circumvent the one device which the Opposition has of indicating its objections to a government, and that is by continuing to debate the matter to the point where the government felt that it had no other choice but to obtain those funds that they required to meet the government expense.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between the method adopted by the government and the one which we represented as being the alternative that was open to them was a very fundamental one and a very important one to the parliamentary system. The government chose by Order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to issue a Special Warrant. We think that the government when they had reached that emergent situation requiring action should have through this Assembly adopted the device of closure on the debate. This is the democratic way because it is done through and in the full sight of all of the elected members of the Province of Manitoba. While it may not suit many of the elected members it nevertheless is a device that is carried out in a proper parliamentary manner during a time when the Legislature is in session. What the government did was to do in a clandestine way what we think they should have done in a very public way and they took the decision behind the closed doors of the Cabinet room; and, Mr. Speaker, the members certainly on this side of the House were not aware of, or party to that decision even though we are elected to represent our constituencies and have a basic responsibility in the way in which the tax revenues of this province are dispersed, we did not know that that was being done until after it had been accomplished. And I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the members other than those of the front bench of the Treasury Bench, I'm wondering if the other members of the government knew and were party to that decision which resulted in the issuance of a Special Warrant and the achievement of the funds for government purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is where the real challenges come in this matter. To have proceeded as long as they could with the regular method of debate of estimates and then to have, when the emergency became a very real one to have resorted to the method of closure of debate would have been the democratic way, although not a very popular way in any democratic system of government, but nevertheless it is the way that legislatures and parliaments in the democratic system act. To do it by Order-in-Council may be the New Democratic way but it is certainly not the way that we feel this should have been proceeded with. So, Mr. Speaker, while the results as the Minister has said were identical in the end, the method of achieving that aim was completely and fundamentally different.

I am pleased that the First Minister did not choose to somehow blame the Opposition for having made this necessary, because it has been mentioned by some of the speakers opposite in this debate that the previous administration had left some legislation in the preparation form and that this simply, this Financial Administration Act had been passed in the form in which it had been previously prepared. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not competent to say whether the bill was in its final form and was intended to be passed so that Special Warrants could be used either during a session of the Legislature or between sessions. If it had been intended that it be used during sessions of the Legislature I think that would be very strange, very unusual, not in keeping with the recognized procedure, because we are told by experts in parliamentary procedure that this device is not resorted to during the regular sitting of a Legislative Assembly or of a Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I think these are the main items, the main points that appeal to me as being of the utmost importance in this debate. The government has not said that they will vote against this bill, however, I don't have any great confidence that they are likely to support it, because even though the bill may have merit, even though the First Minister was not prepared to say absolutely that the intent of the bill was wrong, it is not always acceptable for the

BILL 47

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) government side to support bills which originate with the Opposition. The Member for Ste. Rose will appreciate my point in this respect because in a recent debate he was inquiring with some warmth about the actions of his government in respect to litter and the problem that he was noting with much concern about bottles and so on on the highways. He will recall I know back in 1970 when a bill was introduced from this side that would have provided for a form of compulsory deposit on all beverage containers, and would have done for the Province of Manitoba what has subsequently been done for most other provinces in Canada. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that because that bill originated on this side the government thought it not quite acceptable and they eventually sidetracked the bill so it was not reported, with the explanation that a better, more all-inclusive kind of legislation would be provided that would take care of many kinds of environmental pollution, and that this was a very small part of the total problem and that it could be much better handled by some more complete and all-encompassing legislation in this connection. So the Member for Ste. Rose knows that legislation even though it is important and probably acceptable in intent, if it originates in the Opposition side is likely to find extremely rough going when the final decisions are made as to whether or not to support it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would expect that the First Minister while he dealt somewhat cautiously with the whole intent of Bill 47 will eventually find it in his decision to reject the bill, and I would be sorry if that happens because it would seem to me that in doing so the First Minister is then committing this government to a course of action which takes more and more of the decision-making process of this province out of the hands of this public Legislative Assembly and behind the closed doors of the Cabinet room. And this, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you is not in keeping with the democratic principles we support. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested in the comments of the Honourable Member from Brandon West - he's not here? I was going to make my apologies to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. But I followed with a considerable deal of interest his remarks, particularly his remarks that he was issuing or stating in respect of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose dealing with litter, and he seemed to try to relate that with the question of the bill that we have before us by way of example and I think he did litter up the debate in respect of this bill before us.

The honourable member also said, if you recall, Mr. Speaker, that when he was talking about the possibilities of adopting a bill which may be introduced by the Opposition into this House that this is very infrequently done. I do want to point to my honourable friend that the amendments which were made to the Financial Administration Act were in fact proposals from the now Opposition in order to achieve, or so that the previous administration would be in a position to achieve what was done by the present administration. So I think if my honourable friend, the Member for Brandon, would reflect, he would of necessity come to the only logical conclusion that the present legislation which is now being subject to a bill to repeal that section was conceived in the minds of the Conservative Government of the day. My honourable friend raises a question during his discourse; he didn't know whether the present Act - which was of course as I indicate conceived by the previous government - had been thought out or thought out well before it was introduced. And I would suggest to my honourable friend that this quite well has been the case at that particular time as so much legislation that was introduced and passed in this Assembly by the previous administration certainly was not conceived in an aura that was for the well-being of the people, the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. And that is why we now happen to be on this side of the House and they over there. So this does happen from time to time.

My honourable friend in his discourse made reference to certain parliamentary authorities who expressed opinions. Well I presume, Mr. Speaker, we'll always have parliamentary experts, we've had them for a thousand or more years and the more one reads of the opinions of the so-called parliamentary experts the more we question whether even they know what they're talking about because they're constantly in conflict one with the other. I know that the members of the Opposition were very happy when a very eminent gentleman, now a Senator, who formerly was connected with the CCF Party, one Senator Eugene Forsey, raised a question on the actions of this Cabinet and stated that it would have been far better in his opinion to introduce the measure for closure insofar as the bill under consideration at that time, the Interim Supply Bill.

BILL 47

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) But he didn't rule out, he didn't rule out or didn't say with any of the reading that I made of his pronouncements that we did anything that was wrong but that he suggested an alternative that might have been. Now my honourable friend states that in his opinion it would have been far more democratic to have brought in the instrument called closure. Mr. Speaker, how can my honourable friend with his capability, with his intellect and I credit him with having that, say that closure is democratic? I don't think it is.

I recall a great debate that took place some years ago in the First Parliament of our Dominion which dealt with the question of closure. A government was defeated on the basis of introducing, what my honourable friend from Brandon has just stated, a far more democratic procedure than using the law of the Province of Manitoba which the Cabinet did. --(Interjection)-- That's what I mean. That's what I say. I say to the Honourable Member for Morris, how ridiculous can his colleagues get? When he's talking about democracy is far more democratic to use closure than to use the prevailing law of the Province of Manitoba to achieve it.

MR. JORGENSEN: Will you permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: After I'm finished.

MR. JORGENSEN: You're afraid of one.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not afraid of you in any debate or any question and I reserve the right to answer you whenever I choose.

MR. JORGENSEN: No doubt about that.

MR. PAULLEY: No, there's no doubt about that and I believe my honourable friend is well aware and has done this himself on numerous occasions. So I say, Mr. Speaker, here we have the Member for Brandon saying closure is far more democratic than using the present law which was conceived - it may have been conceived in sin by the previous Conservative . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Conservative administration and how typical. How typical it is for those members opposite to talk of the democratic process while with the interjections that I'm receiving from the mimic of John Diefenbaker, the Honourable Member for Morris. One of the --(Interjection)-- Flattering? I don't think John Diefenbaker considers he's flattered when you stand.

My honourable friend, the Member for Brandon, posed a question in his deliberation and he wondered whether or not the caucus of our party other than the Cabinet, as distinct from the Cabinet, knew what we were doing. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is firmly in the affirmative because our caucus knows of the responsibilities placed upon this Cabinet and we have continuing consultation at all times. Now it seems to me that it's very evident from the debates that have taken place since we commenced this session in January such is not the case with the Official Opposition. They run with the hounds and the hares and sometimes they get in hairy situations that they don't know which to run. So our caucus does accept the fact that our Cabinet has its responsibility to govern the affairs of the Province of Manitoba just as the voters in Manitoba placed their confidence in us on two elections and I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that that confidence will be continued for many years to come.

Then my honourable friend in his discourse, and I don't know whether or not he really meant what he said, he said that the decision to pass a Special Warrant under the law of the Province of Manitoba was done behind closed door in the Cabinet room. And now I want to tell my honourable friend if in the unlikelihood of he being a member of a cabinet of the Province of Manitoba - I say unlikely unless he changes his political attitudes - he may be privy and privileged to go behind a closed door to help arrive at a decision that is the responsibility of Cabinet. And my honourable friend went on to say, condemned us in essence for going behind closed doors and he stated that the decision that we were considering there and the discussions that took place in effect were not privy to the Opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend suggesting that when Cabinet is making a decision that the advice should be sought behind these closed doors of Opposition or that the Opposition should be made aware of the contents of the decisions or the basis upon which those decisions are to be made. I don't think really my honourable friend realized the import of what he was saying because Cabinet met behind a closed door and that the Opposition were not privy to the discussions that were taking place at that time.

I say to my honourable friends--(Interjection)--Oh, we attempted to do it in the

BILL 47

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Legislature, Mr. Speaker. We attempted to provide for Interim Supply in this House but for, I believe, the first time in the history of Manitoba tradition was broken because of an ineffective, inefficient Opposition, Opposition who wanted to deprive the right and the responsibility of government to pay its accounts. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend from Swan River has just interjected that democratic procedure that they would use "closure" in order to pay our civil servants.

There was ample opportunity given to the opposition. They should have known, at least those that were privy to the compilation of the legislation that was proposed by the Weir administration, what this was all about. But there was a big difference in those days to now. Opposition at that particular time realized its responsibility and would not have placed the government of the day in a position where they would have even considered the necessity of closure. --(Interjection)--Of course it was our fault. Do you know what was our fault, Mr. Speaker? Our fault was because we didn't realize how irresponsible that the Opposition were when they stood this resolution time after time after time without participating in the debate. Day after day, we should have then known, Mr. Speaker, how really irresponsible they were. But even then, Mr. Speaker, having introduced and had accepted - I believe unanimously - the measures or the amendments to the previous Financial Administration Act concocted by the Conservatives, we surely had the right to expect that they would have endorsed that legislation and allowed the government of the day to accept its responsibility which at that time was to have moneys provided for in order to pay the employees and the bills due to our creditors. But oh no. This democratic Conservative Opposition said, bring in closure so we can go howling on the wide winds of Manitoba that the government wouldn't allow us, wouldn't allow us to speak and they brought in closure. And what we did - and I repeat - was to use a methodology which was absolutely legal, that was conceived by the Conservatives and I believe supported by them when the legislation went through this House. Democratic procedures. Closure. My honourable friend from Swan River--you bet. How would he have liked, how would he have liked, Mr. Speaker, with the Swan River Times or whatever the dickens they call that paper up there, as the editor of that to put in the headlines . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . headline of that paper in four-inch letters with red ink, NDPs Bring in Closure Which is Undemocratic. Now that's what he would have done, Mr. Speaker. I know he would have done it because I know the irresponsibility of my honourable friend from Swan River.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I know that that's what would have happened. And, Mr. Speaker, this government and this Cabinet accepted its responsibility to its civil servants, to the people of the Province of Manitoba, and I would suggest, I would suggest the course that we took was the only course that we could have taken. Because if we hadn't of taken that particular course there is the possibility that my honourable friends opposite would still be yapping about Interim Supply and depriving us of the opportunity to play fairly with those that are in our employ. That is what it was all about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: On a point of order. I didn't want to interrupt the Minister when he was in full flight but he made the suggestion that we stood Bill 34 day after day after day. I've just checked the record and if he will look at the record himself, he will find that after the bill was introduced it was interrupted by the Budget Debate and when it proceeded, following the Budget Debate, it continued continuously without standing until it was completed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . didn't tell the truth to the House and I think you should.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek wish to debate?

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we often hear from the Minister of Labour who is chosen by the government from time to time to try and cover up the inequities and stupidity of the government when they get themselves into an entanglement such as they have or they did by passing an Order-in-Council for \$30 million, to spend \$30 million passing warrants while the

BILL 47

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) House was in session without it coming to the House.

Let me make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that it's obvious that the draft of that bill was done by the previous government and I believe after just reading Hansard that the Honourable Member from Morris explained how, explained how that happened to be in there the way it was, and certainly the government of the day when they passed the bill did not choose to change it and presented it that way.

I would like to go back and if it hadn't been for that dreary dark day in 1969 when the NDP became government in Manitoba I would say, Sir, that if that bill had of come to the House in the form that it was brought to the House by the present government, the NDP Government, I could visualize the Minister of Labour practically standing on his desk on top fighting it - the fact that this side missed it and then saw the government use it - and we realize the mistake in the bill and there's no question about this side of the House, we have broad shoulders enough to say that there was a mistake made, we say that we did miss it - there was a government who took advantage of it and used it so we say that it should be changed at the present time. Let's have no misunderstanding about that position.

The Minister speaks about "for the first time in history." For the first time in history Interim Supply was held up. For the first time in history the financial situation of this province was in such an entangled terrible mess that it was necessary for the Opposition to present to the government facts, figures of the problems even documents, testimonials which basically said somebody is wrong, somebody is not telling the truth about what's happening with the financial position, how the money is being handled by boards, commissions, co-ops, etc., and we said there should be an investigation, it should be found out what is happening to the money of the Province of Manitoba. We got no answers; we got no satisfaction whatsoever and we were expected to pass more moneys for that government. Mr. Speaker, how naive does he think we are? Mr. Speaker, if he had come to this House, if he'd have come to this House and said, you know, we would like to have a bill passed in a hurry for the amount that was the salaries for the employees of this government and explained that, it would have happened. But no. No, no. They chose to go back and use a section which I am sure the Minister of Labour would have fought tooth and nail if he'd of caught it, and which we didn't, but if he'd of caught it, he'd of fought it tooth and nail.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister also uses the same socialist principle which is basically socialism is good for you but not for me that's administrating it. But here we have another situation that says, you know, it is not the democratic thing to do to pass warrants while the House is in session. But mind you, in the situation, because it's us and because we don't want anybody else to do it or we don't think it's a good practice for anybody else to do it and they've basically admitted that you know. There's a half admission by the government at the present time because they seem to think that if they brought in the, brought in the request to pass the warrants and there was a debate for one day in the House that it might be all right. That's a half admission that it should be here, sort of a roundabout way of saying, well we don't like the way we did it, maybe we should do it a little differently. But it really boils down to that it should never have been done.

The principle behind this, Mr. Speaker, is - and I explained this once to the Minister of Labour and he doesn't seem to be able to answer me, or he doesn't want to answer me. Mr. Speaker, the principle of the Minister of Labour regarding situations that are emergencies are that within the union negotiation process which he set up in his own bills and labour bills is that you stand by your principle come hell or high water, because that's the only way, the only way we can finally have what we want or be treated fairly. And to interfere in any way, shape or form is absolutely last resort.

A MEMBER: Dastardly.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Dastardly. So he says, closure is undemocratic, and that's really what we would have been doing, if they had've come to closure he would have used the last recourse the government has. It's a recourse that the government has if you have an irresponsible opposition, it's a recourse that you have if the government won't agree with you, that you can put through your legislation because you have majority and that's democracy. Mr. Speaker, nobody asked this government for closure. All we ask is for some meaningful, meaningful investigation into the expenditures of moneys of this province. And we said if you would do that, give us some, give us some indication that you're going to do that, I'm sure

BILL 47

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) that we could release more money to the government. So, Mr. Speaker, this is the principle that the government works under, but what do they do? They are like a group of little children who say if you can't have it my way I'm going to take my rattle and I'm going to put through the legislation to have my way because I can force it upon you. They won't stand up and be counted and they accuse the Opposition, they accuse the Opposition. First of all they say it was our bill, then they accuse the Opposition of not being traditional by holding up a money bill or Interim Supply, when they themselves presented a bill knowing full well that the finances of this province were a mess and expected us to knuckle under to them because it was tradition. And this was the government in 1969 that read a Throne Speech which said "we will do away with old dogma." This was the government that said we should really start changing things and looking forward. And this is the government that goes in and passes warrants while the House is in session. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that it's not only a first in Manitoba, it's obviously a first in Canada. It's a first because it's an NDP government, and it will come from other NDP governments, because they believe that they would like to have legislation that says, we really don't want to have the Opposition here. When we have this little section, you know, with that section, Mr. Speaker, with that section, Mr. Speaker, they could have not only passed the 30 million they passed, they could have passed the 78 or 800 million budget that way. And that's the first step into doing it. And they will some day say, and the way this government is going with control and taking control from the elected members, to work in behind the Cabinet room behind closed doors where they decide the number of councillors for the city, and decide all these things behind closed doors, Sir, this is what we now have. We have proof, we have proof that the NDP government in Manitoba was the first government in the history of Canada to pass warrants while the House is in session, used a piece of legislation - which if they had been men enough they'd have come forward and changed it themselves, because the Minister I know would have fought at the beginning - used a piece of legislation to start a trend which means that we don't need the rest of you in this House, we can pass all the money we like by warrants behind closed doors. Now that's not just a first for the Minister of Labour, that's a first for the NDP government in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, for anybody, anybody to stand up and defend that type of legislation I say does not believe in the democratic system, does not believe that we should be here once a year, because obviously you have proven you don't need us. You'll pass it--(Interjection)--wait a minute, Mr. Speaker, the next time if they want 80 million, you know, if they get the 50, if the province's financial situation continues to get into the mess that it's in and we hold it up next year because we want some explanations, they'll pass 80. Then they'll say, you know, we're having a lot of trouble with these fellows these days, they don't seem to like the way we mess up the financial situation of this province so why should we even bother presenting to them at all. We'll just go down to the Cabinet and we'll pass some warrants, we'll pass some warrants for the whole estimates. We really don't need them any more.

Mr. Speaker, this government should have had the internal fortitude, the same as the Opposition does, to stand up and say "there was a mistake made". This government should have had the courage, the courage to say that this legislation wasn't right, is not written the same way. But what did they do? This government said, "Boy, we've got a mistake here and now we've got a real good way to put the socialist principle into power and in action, without any problems at all. And he says, the Minister says, we did it legally, we did it legally.

Mr. Speaker, that's like saying that every law that's ever been passed is perfect. That's like saying that there are laws on the statutes that have been there for years and years, that should be changed, are absolutely right. And here we are - yes, the Minister says, I voted for it.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And the Minister, you know, I had to remind him of something I said three weeks ago, I now have to remind him of something I said five minutes ago. Yes, we passed it. We made a mistake. We made a mistake and realized that we would be the only government in Canada with that type of legislation.

A MEMBER: In the Commonwealth.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: In the Commonwealth. We came to our senses and said that this type of legislation, that if it remains on the books can be the downfall of democratic government in Canada. --(Interjection)--Oh, nonsense, nonsense, nonsense. Mr. Speaker, it is nonsense when we have living proof . . .

BILL 47

A MEMBER: 30 million dollars worth.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . living proof that this government passed 30 million dollars worth of warrants while the House is in session, and he says, nonsense?

A MEMBER: With your agreement.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: With our agreement, yes, and I tell him again, I told him, Mr. Speaker, I remind the Minister what I said 30 seconds ago, 30 seconds ago, 30 seconds ago I said we admit a mistake, and that government hasn't got the guts to admit it either.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't see the Minister of Labour, I didn't see the Minister of Labour down at the post office when old age pensioner cheques were being held up, pleading with the people that were striking to "please, it's an emergency. Go back to work and send those letters." The Minister of Labour lives by that principle when he likes it but then he stands up and says you are not, you are not paying the people, you are not paying the people, you are holding up the salary. The Minister of Labour as far as that is concerned is cold, calculating, doesn't give a damn, at any given time when that situation arises, but he stands up and he pleads in his way, that only he can plead, Mr. Speaker, and as we all know only how he can plead. "For the first time in history, Mr. Speaker, we have had Interim Supply held up and these members of the Opposition don't care a continental, don't care a continental for the people that work for the Province of Manitoba." What trash, that's what the Minister says. But, when it goes to the other side, when it's on his side, and it's something that he believes in the other way, he is cold, calculating, and doesn't give a damn. So it all depends whose ox is being gored is the rule he lives by.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I say that this government, the NDP government in Manitoba has given proof that they haven't got the fortitude to change a bad piece of legislation. There has been legislation gone through this House, I am sure in the last hundred years, that has been wrong and has had to be changed. Nobody is perfect. But they haven't got the internal fortitude to change it. We have got the shoulders to stand up and say that it was wrong and it shouldn't be done and it should be changed, but the NDP government defends, defends the principle of passing warrants while the House is in session, which basically says we don't need the Opposition, which basically says they don't believe in the democratic way of government that has been done in the British Parliamentary system for years. Mr. Speaker, that's what they say. Thank you.

. . . . continued on next page

BILL 47

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in the very few minutes remaining, I would like to respond to some of the comments made the day before by the Leader of the Official Opposition, and tonight by the Member for Sturgeon Creek. You know, the Member for Sturgeon Creek has a very good delivery. He expounds loudly and forcefully, but when you come down to what he is really saying, you have to question whether he's not trying to kid us. You know, he's critical of our saying that what we did was legal. He admits that it was legal, and therefore there is no question, there's no disagreement on our side and his side, that he says they have seen the light. That the Opposition recognizes that it is a mistake to have this kind of legislation and now they want to change that error, because otherwise democracy may be shattered, they may be shattered. Well, what really are we talking about? If you want to talk about a sense of responsibility, and that's needed in a democracy by everyone, then the greatest sense of responsibility was the lack of responsibility indicated by members opposite when they did what was never done in Manitoba's history before, was hold up the vote on Interim Supply. In all the years of this Legislature, long before I ever got here - I know, I'm new at this - but I'm told long before many many decades, never was an Interim Supply held up, because it was recognized that when sessions start in the winter or in the spring - and we've had sessions start in February, we've had sessions start in March, there is no way could the estimates and the budget, etc. be passed by April 1. And therefore, it was always accepted by a responsible Opposition, that's the key, Mr. Speaker, a responsible Opposition, that the Interim Supply be passed. And I recall sitting here and doing exactly the same thing. And I didn't feel that by holding up the debate that I wouldn't have an opportunity to debate later on. Because there is ample opportunity to question the government, to challenge the government, to scrutinize the government, to ask questions, there's all the time in the world, and in this particular Legislature, Mr. Speaker, which is probably the most democratic in Canada because we've wide attitude, far wider than other Houses, that there is ample opportunity. So the question really is this. The Leader of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MILLER: . . . Opposition says we mustn't deny parliament its right. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba mustn't be denied their rights either. And when the Opposition is irresponsible they are denying the rights of the people. And they have all the time in the world to scrutinize all they want. They can sit here until September if they want to. And they know that. The argument is, Mr. Speaker--(Interjection)--no I'm sorry I'm running out of time. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said, it is the right of the Opposition to withhold funds and therefore to influence the government. Mr. Speaker, is it the right of the Opposition to withhold funds by voting against the government when a vote comes up? I don't agree it's a right of the Opposition to use a tactic, to employ a tactic, a strategy to try to impede the government from doing what it has to do, which is required to do under statutory law. It isn't just a matter of salaries to individuals, it's a matter of the grants to hundreds of organizations to which money must flow, otherwise they cannot operate. And this is what had to be paid. It was this kind of payment that had to be made. They want to influence government by all means, they do that day and night. They're here influencing government and influencing the electorate through the speeches they make, and that's what they're here for and that's what they should do, quite correctly. And I can assure them in many cases they do influence the government. But don't use a back room tactic of trying to govern when you're not the government. But by trying to use . . . You weren't elected in June. Had you been elected you would be sitting here, but you weren't. You took your case to the public and you lost. Now therefore recognize that you have the right to criticize, you have the right to question, you have the right to deny on a vote, but you do not use a tactic which is simply a strategy and a device, and an artificial device, to try to force the government to do what? - to bring in closure. And would they have hollered had we brought in closure. Oh my god there'd have been a revolution. It would have been called dictatorial, it would have been called communism, it would have been called - you name it - it would have been called anything at all if we had brought in closure. Because that would have been trampling on the rights of people to speak had we done that. Because we did what we did within the law, they were deprived of that plum and this is what's really griping them right now. That they were denied - they must have spent hours, I suspect, figuring out how are they going to do this, how are they going to maneuver this government.

BILL 47

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . . They finally came up with this brilliant idea, they were going to force the government to invoke closure. And what do you know, it didn't happen. And I feel sorry, they're very frustrated people. I feel very very sorry for them. They're very frustrated. So I say to them, we did what we did, it was legal, but apart from that, I want to add one more thing to say to the Member for Sturgeon Creek. Not only was it legal, as far as I personally was concerned what we did was consciously correct because we felt a responsibility to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the member talked the British system. Mr. Speaker, this kind of tactic that was used, was attempted to be used in this House is not a tactic of which any Opposition can be proud. It's not a tactic of which any parliament can be proud, because that's all it was, is a tactic, a device, and therefore it doesn't warrant, it doesn't warrant the kind of comments that are made on the other side; it doesn't warrant our wasting time with it or giving it much credence. The people of Manitoba are not going to be interested and caught up in this kind of parliamentary squirming and tactic. They want a government that can govern; they want action when they need it; they want the programs to continue smoothly and regularly. They don't want to be caught up in Manitoba by the tactics as between an official opposition and the government of the day. To do that is to deny, I feel, the proper procedures of parliament and the proper procedures for government.

MR. SPEAKER: The bill stays in the adjournment for the Honourable Member for Radisson.

The hour of 10:00 o'clock having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)