

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, May 18, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; The Honourable Member for Logan.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: We're just waiting one moment until the Clerk gets back.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Jenkins as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that, for the remainder of this session, the quorum of the Committee shall consist of 16 members.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 4 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (1).

No. 15 - An Act to amend The Married Women's Property Act.

No. 16 - An Act to amend The Tortfeasors and Contributory Negligence Act.

No. 25 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act.

No. 30 - An Act to repeal The Small Debts Recovery Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 2 - An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act.

No. 20 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

No. 26 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Yes, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could indicate whether he consulted with all the police throughout Manitoba before he decided to get rid of the slips that you have to sign at the various liquor outlets in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): No, Mr. Speaker, I did not personally consult with them. I think that representations in all likelihood were considered by the Liquor Control Commission Board themselves.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney-General has had complaints from various police forces that there's going to cause a problem insofar as enforcement is concerned to those under age who purchase liquor.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY - SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, just before we get to the Order Paper I would like to obtain the consent of the House that all bills from now on, and indeed all bills that were not previously referred to Law Amendments Committee, be referred to Law Amendments Committee rather than the other Standing Committees so that --(Interjection)-- Well, of course, except the bills that do not go outside of the House. There have been several bills that have been referred to Municipal Affairs Committee; I think one or two to Agriculture. We would prefer to have them dealt with by Law Amendments Committee and all future bills go to Law Amendments Committee

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you then call Bill No. 52, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. GREEN: Oh, excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, No. 55.

BILL NO. 55

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona) presented Bill No. 55, an Act to amend The Civil Service Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a number of amendments to the Civil Service Act. Honourable members will recall that when the Speech from the Throne was read, there was an indication at that particular time that there may be a new Civil Service Act proposed for the consideration of the Assembly. Following that, however, it has been deemed advisable by my colleagues that, rather than have a complete revamp of the Civil Service Act, that certain amendments should be made.

Honourable members have now received copies of the bill to amend The Civil Service Act, and I ask their serious consideration to the provisions contained in Bill No. 55. There are a number of provisions in the bill, which I now propose for the consideration of the Assembly, of a more or less technical and housekeeping character.

It could well be, Mr. Speaker, that members of the House have followed the one or two matters that have been under contention and within the Civil Service Act, and in particular a matter that was referred to the courts as to whether or not the Management Committee of Cabinet, which of course, Mr. Speaker, was established by the previous administration, had the right finally to decide whether or not that committee had the right to decide whether an appeal by our Civil Service should be referred and conclusively agreed to by Management Committee, or whether an individual asking for reclassification and making an appeal, should have that appeal for reclassification, should have it referred to the Civil Service Commission rather than Management Committee.

The matter was referred to the court and the court decided that the appeal should be made to the Civil Service Commission, and one of the provisions, Mr. Speaker, in the act, which I now present for the consideration of the Assembly, establishes that point.

There has been some doubt whether or not the present Civil Service Act makes provision for a clear definition of various categories of employees within the Civil Service, and it is hoped that the amendments that I now suggest for consideration will delineate those various categories of employees.

Another section that is proposed in the amendment, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker, excuse me, deals with the matter of the number of Civil Service commissioners. In the present act there is provision for three Civil Service commissioners. I'm sure that honourable members will recognize that due to the increase in the number of civil servants, due to the increase in appeals for reclassification to the Civil Service Commission, that it may be advisable to increase the number of Civil Service Commissioners. And in the bill that we have before us, Mr. Speaker, there is the provision that there should be not less than three Civil Service commissioners. And I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the intent of the present administration to have as many Civil Service commissioners as we may have Civil Service employees, but to have a provision whereby we can go beyond the three, because at the present time, Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission is overburdened with work.

A few other provisions in the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, are aimed at the clarification of the administrative procedures following reclassification of an employee's position and his subsequent promotion to a new level of position.

Another provision goes forth to clarify former wording regarding a demotion for other than disciplinary reasons, with regard to the rates at which the employee is to be paid.

In the present act it seems, Mr. Speaker, that there is no clear-cut definition as to what rate of pay an employee who may be demoted should be paid, and it is our purpose in this act to clarify that situation. And as I indicated in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, one of the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) suggested amendments in the act is to provide a mechanism for the investigation and the hearing of appeals on selection, apart, separate from the normal appeal procedure. The present system allows the Civil Service Commission to hear appeals on matters which originate from its own decisions on selection.

Then there's another section in the amendments that I now propose, Mr. Speaker, to allow the probationary period to be extended in favour of an individual employee rather than an entire class of positions.

I don't know if my honourable friends are interested in the Civil Service Act or not, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to point out that there is confusion in the present act as to whether or not the probation period, which is six months at the present time, can be extended or whether or not it should be extended. Pardon? Yeah, that's right, and I hope my honourable friend from Rock Lake will have some questions.

Then, as I indicated previously too, Mr. Speaker, a section is amended to clarify that the right of appeal extends only to those matters which are appealable under the act and the regulations. This wasn't clearly delineated before.

Amendments are proposed to provide for the appointment of temporary employees consistent with the unique defined categories of employment. Under the present act it is not clearly delineated what really is the position of term employees and it is hopeful that under the proposed amendments that this will be more clearly put forth.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major changes in the amendments that I now propose deals with the rights of the civil servants to participate in political affairs, and we are proposing in these amendments to update current government policy regarding the rights of Civil Service personnel respecting elections. There are a number of other references in the act, Mr. Speaker, of a purely technical nature, in order to more clearly indicate the status of our Civil Service apart from the rights of participation in political elections and involvement.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that in proposing the amendments that are contained within Bill 55, that there may be some individuals that may question the advisability of allowing civil servants to participate in the democratic process of government. It is our opinion, Mr. Speaker, that our Civil Service should not be classified as second-class citizens in Manitoba. I realize as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, that this is a matter that has had a considerable amount of consideration over a number of years. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the time has long gone by when we should deprive our Civil Service from the opportunity of exercising their democratic rights as participants in political matters. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that when I was a member in opposition that the nephew of a former Premier of Manitoba was threatened with dismissal because he dared to become a nominee of a political party. Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, we have advanced beyond that stage.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I realize quite fully that there may be certain classifications of individuals within the Civil Service that should not be included in categories that have the right of participation, due to the area of confidentiality. They are not deprived from their rights of participation, Mr. Speaker, by this act precisely. Hitherto any civil servant of Manitoba has had the right to participate in political affairs providing he or she withdrew their services within the Civil Service. The purport of a section dealing with political involvement makes it possible for all of our employees, Mr. Speaker, to become involved, with the exception of Deputy Ministers and those designated by the regulations --(Interjection)-- I didn't hear my honourable friend. Pardon? --(Interjection)-- I didn't hear my honourable friend. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'm glad that my honourable friend will participate, and I trust and hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will agree with me that we have made advances, that all Manitobans should have the opportunity of free participation in political affairs, and that of course is a basic principle of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I realize, I realize that there has been a controversy in this area. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that some of the members of the Manitoba Government Employees Association have raised objections to suggestions that I have made in the past of Civil Service personnel being allowed to participate in political affairs. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that certain members of the executive of the Manitoba Government Employees Association are on record as opposing the extension of the democratic process to allow participation in political affairs by civil servants, but I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that at a number of conventions of the Manitoba Government Employees Association, a majority of the membership have agreed

BILL 55

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) that they should have the right of political involvement. I think the majority is right, even though it may be a relatively small majority. But, Mr. Speaker, to deprive any individual who happens to be engaged in the Civil Service of Manitoba his or her rights of participation, I think is wrong in the face of the advancement of our parliamentary system and our freedom of participation in political affairs. I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that there may be certain individuals within the Civil Service that may not desire to become involved in political participation for the fear that they may be prejudiced against by any political party that may form a government of the Province of Manitoba, but I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should have every respect for the intelligence of the Civil Service personnel in Manitoba, that before they make their decision as to whether or not they may become participants in a political campaign or an election, that they should -- and I'm sure that they will, Mr. Speaker -- realize possible consequences of them standing on their own two feet as New Democrats, as Conservatives, or as Liberals, or as Social Credits or Independents. --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? That they should be allowed to make their decision as to whether or not they should designate themselves as supporters of any or no political party in Manitoba. I do not think, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that these people have that right under our present Civil Service Act. You know, in many jurisdictions we have had a situation whereby on a change of government there has been tremendous change within our Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, over the years that I have been a member of this Assembly under a Liberal, under a Conservative, and under a New Democratic Party government, there have been relatively few changes within our Civil Service. But, Mr. Speaker, our civil servants have not had the opportunity of participation and I think that they should have. A provision of the act that I present now for the consideration of the Assembly, says in effect that if a Manitoban, albeit he or she is a civil servant, will have the right to seek political office as a candidate. If successful, in effect it would mean that they are members of this Assembly; if they are not successful, then they have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of being reinstated, --(Interjection)-- and indeed protected, or I say, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad the Honourable Member for Lakeside raised that question, because I am convinced that any government would accept the right of an individual to run and to be reinstated. If we are going to prejudice against an individual, and I use as an example, Mr. Speaker, if I as a Minister for the Civil Service Commission, would not allow a Conservative who ran in a political campaign to go back to his job, or to her job, I think I would be violating the general principle of democratic participation in an election and I should be faulted. And I trust, I trust, Mr. Speaker, that if this act is accepted and we are not the government following a general election, that whoever may be our successor will take the same position as I am taking now. I will not -- and I make this pledge -- prejudice against any individual who declares himself as a candidate in a political campaign. --(Interjection)-- Yes, that's right, or anywhere else.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is something that we have got to come to realize, that the employees of this corporation, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is only a corporation, should not be deprived of the rights that they may have if they were employees of any other corporation, and that is the situation that's prevailing at the present time. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am of the personal conviction that we should introduce legislation in this House to prohibit any employer in private industry or private enterprise, we should prohibit any employer from prejudicing against an employee who is desirous of taking part in a democratic process of government. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, that we have an opportunity, as a government and as an Assembly -- and I think more importantly, Mr. Speaker, as an Assembly -- to set a pattern for participation. Pardon? Appealing to the same Minister? Of course. It's through a board, it's through a board, the Civil Service Commission, whom we presume to be, and I trust that they are, an independent board, because the Appeal Board, Civil Service Commission, after having once been appointed is responsible to the Legislature of the province, so I think the point of my honourable friend is

Mr. Speaker, I think, as I have indicated on a couple of occasions or points in my introduction for the second reading of this bill, I have indicated that we, not as government precisely, but we as an Assembly and the employer of a group of men and women, that they should have and should not be denied the rights and privileges that each and every one of us in this Assembly has insofar as political involvement is concerned. I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the Manitoba Government Employees Association is concerned, that

BILL 55

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) by a majority vote that association desire to have the right of being free citizens in a free society in a free province of Manitoba. I think that we should give them the right of this participation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, why should not the man or the woman who comes into our offices to clean them up, why should not the man or woman who comes around with a mop to clean the corridors of this Assembly after we get out of here at 2:00 or 3:00 o'clock in the morning, have the right to participate in the political process? That is deprived to them at the present time. --(Interjection)-- Well, my honourable friend from Rhineland says, have I installed a shredder; my answer, of course, to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, is no, but we have prohibited, we have prohibited the person who may operate the shredder from being a participant in the parliamentary process. That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the basic principles of the Act or the amendments that I now propose for the consideration of this Assembly.

In all due respect, I think the main and major question for the consideration of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is: Are all Manitobans Manitobans, or should those people who serve the people of Manitoba be deprived of the right of full participation?

That is the basic principle of Bill No. 55. I realize that there may be some questions in the minds of some. I can realize, Mr. Speaker, that in certain instances there may be some question of the employer being prejudiced against the employee. I trust and hope that at least we have reached, as employers -- and that's what we are, in this Assembly -- I trust and hope that we have reached a plateau that we can give to others what we deem to be our privileges and our rights in a free society. That was the purpose, Mr. Speaker, of Bill No. 55. I ask all members of this House to give me, as the sponsor of this bill, their support and to remove for once and for all the prejudices, the restrictions, that are placed on the Civil Service of the Province of Manitoba. And I say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that many other jurisdictions have removed, with limitations it is true, the restrictions of participation in a free society.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I should state at the outset that, having just listened to the Honourable Minister of Labour's explanation of Bill 55, that to some extent I would make the remarks I would choose to make at this time as the private Member for Lakeside, not necessarily as the Deputy Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, not having had occasion to caucus the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that it is so easy, indeed Mr. Speaker, so very easy to concur and agree with the Honourable Minister of Labour's final remarks that he wishes that all members in this Chamber concur with the bill that he is now sponsoring; because, Mr. Speaker, when you accept it at its surface level, then surely the Minister of Labour has a very legitimate point. Why, Mr. Speaker, should a person's employment or station of employment, with whom he is employed, be a factor as to is participation in the political affairs of this province? And one is just about rushed into supporting without further comment, without further dissent, the bill now being proposed by the Honourable Minister of Labour. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not that simple and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that unaware to most Manitobans, to those Manitobans now seated in the public galleries in this Chamber, much less the millions that are -- the less than million, pardon me -- that are out of this Chamber, that it is a pretty significant and a pretty important bill.

It hasn't escaped my attention, Mr. Speaker, that it is -- this compulsion to pass this kind of legislation is concurrent with the kind of totalitarian regimes that have been under some discussion in the last few days in this Legislative Assembly. It was very important to a Mr. Adolf Hitler that all those who worked for him should be in a position to politically support the party. It is very important, Mr. Speaker, in most totalitarian social regimes, that you are a prominent person politically, and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that we should not be all that surprised that it is a Socialist regime in this province that now chooses to bring forward this particular piece of legislation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let's examine the legislation, let's examine the words that the Honourable Minister of Labour has just told us about how wonderful it is that the Civil Service should fully participate in the political affairs of this province. And, Mr. Speaker, like so many, like so many other Socialist pipe dreams, it sounds so beautiful and it sounds so nice, but now let's give you a practical example of a director of the Minister of Labour out on the hustings saying that the Minister of Labour "is a no good cook; has never done an honest day's

BILL 55

(MR. ENNS cont'd) work in his life; every policy that he stands for I deny. He is deliberately misleading the people." And the Honourable Member from Flin Flon tells me, the Honourable Member from Flin Flon tells me that after he has run that kind of a campaign for ninety days, that the Honourable Minister of Labour is going to take this member back into the Civil Service, welcome him with open arms, and say, "My friend - let bygones be bygones. You're a trusted member of the Civil Service. Your full rights are restored. Your seniority is restored. Here is your position, here is your pension plan; and in fact, when next your name comes up for promotion, I will have and bear no prejudice against you. I will bear no prejudice against you."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the reality of what the bill that we are dealing with talks about. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to take it both ways. I'm not prepared to indicate whether I want to support it or not. --(Interjection)-- No, no, Mr. Speaker. On my job, my official job as a representative of Her Majesty's Official Opposition, is to tell some of you fellows what the implications of that bill is, and I'll tell you what some of the implications of that bill is. The implications of that bill is essentially that you want to duplicate, or you want to move towards the American type of politics where, when a Republican President walks into the Capitol, into the White House, 7,000 Democratic employees leave and he's followed with 7,000 Republican employees. Do you really want to, or have we arrived at that stage in our politics in Manitoba? --(Interjection)--

Well now, Mr. Speaker, let's get something established very clearly. The Honourable First Minister has on several occasions, on numerous cases, indicated that this government, his government's record is as good as any other government's record, and he has referred to a particular government in this Dominion as having kind of stood out for the kind of action that I deplore, and the main one, the one most often referred to, or the action taken by the then Premier-elect, Premier Thatcher of Saskatchewan, and his particular actions and his treatment of the Civil Service of Saskatchewan when he took power. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the veracity of the statements made or the reference made by the First Minister when he refers to that situation, Mr. Speaker, although not involved in this policy at all, but I recall, it seems to me, a picture in the newspaper of the Premier-elect kicking in the door of the outgoing Premier Douglas which certainly set the state of the kind of hostility, the kind of hostility that existed under those circumstances. But, Mr. Speaker, when the First Minister attempts to equate that situation with for instance the change of government from the Liberal administration in this province in 1958 to the Conservative administration in 1959, that is not a fair, that is not a fair anomaly at all, Mr. Speaker. Well okay. The lawyer of the House has corrected me - it's not a fair analogy - analogy - not a fair analogy at all, because, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is and the truth of the matter is, and I'm sure not too many people in this House will deny, it was since 1959, '60, '61, '62 that the Civil Service of this government and this province was born, in its stature that you now have, in its stature that you now have it, and that there was not a question of firing people or moving people out because of their past political association, indeed it was an honest and a hard search for capable men and women of this province to serve the kind of expanded programs and policies that a progressive government was prepared to bring to Manitoba at that time. Now that's a good statement and I even got a smile out of the Minister of Finance for . . .

Well now, Mr. Speaker, okay. --(Interjection)-- Well now, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that if those employees want years, and, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that they, as other citizens of Manitoba, deserve the kind of consideration that is contemplated in this bill. --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, he does not have my automatic support. Because, Mr. Speaker, in his explanation of the bill the Minister of Labour, you know, came through with those operative phrases that those non-socialists in this province have become, you know, wary of, that they the government will decide which classifications of civil servants are going to enjoy the benefits of Bill 55. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, no, no. Let's not confuse the issue. Let's not confuse the issue. It is in the hands of -- with all this window-dressing that the Minister of Labour is bringing forward, the fact of the matter remains that it is in the hands of the politicians opposite that will decide which particular classification of civil servants have the privilege of running for public office.

Now despite all that little sentimental garbage and tripe that the Honourable Minister of Labour just gave us about the person sweeping the floors or cleaning out our caucus rooms just

BILL 55

(MR. ENNS cont'd) a few moments before, indicated that it was obvious that there would have to be some regulation, some control. Exercised by whom? Exercised by the government of the day. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask honourable members to examine their conscience on that particular question. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that before I can support that bill, Mr. Speaker, before I can support that bill and before my party can support the bill, then I would want that spelled out in the Act and not left to regulations. And that if the government is not prepared to spell it out in the Act, then that they would have to be prepared to consider some amendments that we might want to bring forward to that Act, to spell it out in the Act before we leave it to regulations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Labour says it is okay. It is the principle, Mr. Speaker, that does give me my serious reservations. Mr. Speaker, I would like to think and I would like to suggest in the vein that the Honourable Minister of Finance not so long ago suggested a topic that he was, in my judgment unfairly, unfairly taken up on by members opposite and misconstrued, in fact it may be misconstrued by members opposite or indeed members of my own party if I now offer a similar kind of suggestion. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that rather than concerning ourselves with the denial of certain privileges to a certain group of people, namely the Civil Service in this respect, why can't we divorce ourselves as legislators, as government, and as opposition from taking on that degree of -- and I'm trying to choose my words carefully -- total responsibility for the actions of the Civil Service? Why can't the government be just as excoriated when there is a transgression of responsibility or a wilful abuse of authority on the part of the Civil Service as we in the opposition?

Mr. Speaker, I answer my own question. As the matter stands right now, unfortunately we in the opposition are all too prepared and all too ready that the minute that a civil servant, a bureaucrat, somebody within the realm of human error makes a bad judgment, makes a mistake, that we hold the Minister responsible and we ask him to answer for it in this House. And certainly he is responsible and he does act, but my further question is -- and I'm not necessarily doing a good job in putting forward my idea -- but my further question is: why is there that necessity that I felt when I was a Minister, and I suspect that most present Ministers feel, that we automatically have to defend the actions of our Civil Service. I don't think we have to, I don't think we have to and I don't think we should, I don't think we should, I think they should be protected; they should be respected with all the tenure and security of office insofar as that they're performing their responsibilities properly, but an extension of that they do not deserve, and that they should not be expected to receive from either members of the government, their Minister, or members generally of the Assembly who are elected essentially to try to formulate policy and not accept the responsibility of the administration of that policy. None of us, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, in the argument that I'm advancing, including the Ministers, in the growing complexity of government can really expect an individual, a Minister, or 57 members of us to answer for every dotted "i" or crossed "t" as to how that policy is being carried out. And if it is being abused, authority is being overstepped, then the government should as willingly as we in the Opposition bring that to the public attention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under the present system, I suspect, of course this is taking place. If a Minister and if the government recognizes or sees this, I'm satisfied that within the realm of human possibility action is taken. But all too often, Mr. Speaker, because of the kind of interpretation, the kind of position that we have placed the Civil Service in publicly and in this Chamber, they're accorded a special status that in my judgment bears further examination in this day and age. That all too often --(Interjection)-- True. The Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges made a remark that I may not have understood or heard, but we feel that compulsion, that honour, that responsibility for persons who cannot answer for themselves in this Chamber, in this debate, that they must automatically be defended in this way. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be a student of how other jurisdictions operate; I do try to read certain things, and I find for instance that in certain Scandinavian countries there is a greater degree of separation between the process of the legislative and the policy-setting act as compared to the established Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, I quite frankly hold out to you and through you to the honourable members of the government, that what I have reservations about in this bill, that before we rush to -- in a very legitimate and understandable, you know, feeling about recognizing the rights of our fellow Manitobans, those employed in the Civil Service, recognizing their political rights, and

BILL 55

(MR. ENNS cont'd) in my judgment we're rushing into a situation, we're rushing into a situation that wishes to recognize these rights, and they are commendable. There's no problem about that. But are we really prepared to give up a system that has served so well over the many years, and has in my judgment prevented the kind of situations developing that we see in some jurisdictions where the Civil Service does become indelibly imbued with a political hue and the inevitable coming and going of Civil Service when governments change? That really worried me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's not the individual person that finds himself incompatible with the present government; it's not the individual Minister that finds himself incompatible with the Civil Service. But these are questions that I think that we want to examine. I'm only suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that I for one would be prepared to acknowledge that there have been instances where the members of the Opposition -- I would be more specific if my colleague the Member for Riel were here -- where we have felt compelled, you know, to defend a particular civil servant or his release or his firing, simply by the very nature of the kind of position that we're bound into, the kind of position that we're bound into. But I'm suggesting, I'm prepared to suggest in all seriousness to the members opposite, that I would far sooner put my energies into developing and into sustaining a first class professional Civil Service devoid of politics, devoid of politics and a Civil Service that would have to stand on its merits of performance and its administrative capability and be under the threat of constant attack from either side of this House. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that, I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that No. 1, I don't speak from the best of positions because members opposite would be the first ones to say, "Well now, that is fine for a Conservative spokesman to put forward that idea." You know, having had past occasions of government, many years of historical government where, if they should elect to choose or would like to allege that we have shown a degree of political favouritism with respect to the Civil Service, it is now fine for me to proffer this position because we are now out of office.

But, Mr. Speaker, just as the other night -- and I don't want to raise necessarily the debate of the other night -- this government now is choosing to formalize a situation. If, Mr. Speaker, members opposite feel that there was a degree of abuse or indeed a denial of privilege in previous years under previous administrations, just as they felt that perhaps up to now or in previous years there was not a formalized degree of political instruction to our high school students which they now wish to change, well, Mr. Speaker, I make one simple plea, that we acknowledge what we're doing. I suggest to you the impracticability of their plea, of their program. I suggest to you that of the four or five senior civil servants presently working for the New Democratic Party, Assistant Deputy Ministers and the like, who are going to be running in this election and who are going to be calling Harry Enns every name under this world; who are going to be calling Sidney Spivak that scoundrel, that thief, that man that absconded with 90 millions of dollars; that are going to be calling the Member for Arthur that no good former Minister of Agriculture; that are going to refer to the Member for Roblin that -- well, that fellow that writes letters to the Welfare Department, who are going to refer to the Minister of Education that digs up garbage -- (Interjection)-- Right. And, Mr. Speaker, you're telling me, you're telling me that when we form the next government they are all going to be back in their Assistant Deputy Minister jobs? Well I want to tell you something right now. That's utter garbage. That's garbage. And that's the kind of system and that's the kind of program you're going to put the Civil Service into. And I only want to say one thing, Mr. Speaker. Let it be known that it is a socialist New Democratic Party Government that is prepared to abuse the Civil Service that it took so long to build up in this province and bring it to that state.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, that the debate be adjourned. Oh, by all means, Mr. Speaker, if there are other speakers I'd be glad to yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make a few comments at this time after hearing the Member for Lakeside. I was rather interested in hearing the comments from the Minister of Labour when he introduced the bill in connection with the matter that was raised by the Member for Lakeside. I really don't want to dwell in that aspect as much because I think, since he debated that, I will dwell on one other aspect.

BILL 55

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

I am rather interested in the matter of appeal that is set out in the Act. Under the selection appeal, if a certain employee does not get a job or does not get the job and another employee is hired, who does not have the merits in fact as is pointed out here in this provision, that the applicant can then go and appeal to the Minister and he can appoint an investigating person, investigator, to bring in a report to him and he then decides on the appeal. Mr. Speaker, that type of appeal is similar to the one that was embodied at one time in the Fish Corporation Bill when it was first presented to this House some years ago, where the Minister was also set up as an appeal board. And tonight I heard Mr. Doug Rowland, the MP for Selkirk, on T.V. and he deplored the activities of the Fish Marketing Corporation, to which this government is party to, when the legislation was brought in. I remember, I recall that the bill was first introduced by the Conservatives early in 1969 and the matter wasn't completed. Later on the New Democratic Party brought in another bill, there were changes made and it was passed, so that we are party and parcel to the legislation that was set up at the time and enabled the federal corporation to function. And tonight we hear by the MP for Selkirk, that there is mishandling and shortages of stock and inventory and huge deficits. The Corporation is plagued by huge deficits and --(Interjection)-- Yes. The Freshwater Fish Corporation which has a plant here in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I trust the honourable member is going to show relevance soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The point is well taken.

MR. FROESE: The Minister of Mines and Resources is very anxious that the story be short. I will come to the point that is

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the honourable member withdraw that remark. I have a point of order relative to his relevance in debate. I am fully prepared to debate the Fish Marketing Corporation with him on a bill or resolution dealing with the Fish Marketing Corporation, and he will come out second best, Mr. Speaker, in such a debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: The relevance, Mr. Minister, is that the first bill had a similar clause of appeal, a section in there as this one has, where the appeal was to be made to the Minister concerned. And we know the experiences that were experienced by the fishermen and the fish processors in connection with the redundancy clause. No payments were made to my knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: There is no provision in The Civil Service Act for an appeal to the Minister. It is to the Civil Service Commission. So when my honourable friend from Rhineland refers to an appeal to the Minister --(Interjection)-- Have you got the Civil Service Act amendments?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well, with the Minister's permission, I will continue my comments. I'm speaking to

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Bill 55.

MR. FROESE: . . . Bill 55, an Act to amend The Civil Service Act, and under one of the provisions -- and I'd better read a portion of that into the record so that the Minister is assured that I'm referring to this particular bill:

"Where an unsuccessful candidate for a position is an employee who is of the opinion that the appointment of another person to the position was based on matters other than merit, that employee may, in writing, appeal to the Minister who shall appoint a person to inquire into and investigate the matter and submit a report thereon to the Minister who, after receiving the report, shall decide the appeal, and the Minister's decision thereon is final."

So the Minister concerned who introduced the bill will be the appeal -- the one to whom the appeal is made, and he will make the decision; and I was referring to another Act which had more or less a similar provision where the Minister too was the party to whom an appeal was to be made. The original - I'm talking of the original bill that was introduced early in 1966

And there is still one appeal section in the Fisheries Act and this has to do with inspection, but the earlier one had to do with other matters as well. But I think that when you make such

BILL 55

(MR. FROESE cont'd) provisions, where the appeal is directly to the Minister, I don't think that this is good legislation. So --(Interjection)-- Well, I at least can state my opinion because the experiences that we've had in other legislation where we have had similar provisions for appeal, in my opinion they did not work out satisfactorily, people weren't dealt with satisfactorily, we've heard from these people that they weren't dealt with satisfactorily, so this is where I base my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order. The honourable member has referred to an appeal to the Minister in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation Act. I sent him the statute. There is no such appeal. --(Interjection)-- But there is none in the Act that he is saying that there is an appeal to the Minister on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well, I have it right here. This particular one deals with fish inspection and the former one, the original bill the original bill dealt with redundancies as well. --(Interjection)-- I stated that the original bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us stick to the bill we have before us and forget the Fish Marketing Corporation. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, there was one other matter that I wanted to comment on and that has to do with the retirement of commissioners, where we're making it compulsory that he will have to retire at 65. I think that in this type of organization, if we can call it that, or at least commissioners who have had years of experience dealing with this matter, I don't think we should have a fast rule that at 65 he would have to resign. And we are now putting in such things into the bill, except if the Lieutenant-Governor in power sees otherwise. Well I think we as members on this side should have some say, too, and why not leave it open, why not leave it open so that we don't have a fast rule in this matter.

On the matter dealt with by the Member for Lakeside, I still have my reservations, too, and I do hope that when we deal with this bill in committee that the spokesmen for the committee appear before the committee so that we can ask them questions and get some answers from them direct in order to satisfy ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief observations on this bill. I believe it is a very important principle involved in Bill 55, an Act to amend the Civil Service. Aside from being a very simple housekeeping bill I do believe there's a very important principle and that's involving the rights of the public civil servants respecting elections. I see three very important items in it, that an employee would have the right to stand for public office, to run for public office, which in my opinion is one of the highest calling that any individual could have a right. I do believe that.

There's another principle involved. There's nothing that would prohibit this same employee from supporting another candidate or supporting his fiscal policies and working for him. And also, the Act does not prohibit any employee in the Civil Service from getting involved to the extent except that he would not reveal certain departmental matters in a campaign, confidential matters.

I do have some concern -- the Minister stated that this would not allow the Deputy Ministers -- I haven't had the time to give real due consideration to this bill, but one can easily say that if you give this right to civil servants why not to a Deputy Minister, because he already is prohibited from revealing anything of confidential nature in respect of the department or very important figures. So, I see some difficulty in there because it does discriminate as far as certain civil servants are concerned.

On the other hand, we have almost 10,000 civil servants and to me I think it's a basic right that they should have to stand for public office or have a right to endorse certain fiscal policies or endorse certain candidates. That's my opinion.

But while I say these things, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned that it is open to abuse and time will only tell, and this is the concern that I have at the present time. In my opinion it is a serious concern. Because, Mr. Speaker, what happens, and I believe that I trust the Minister of Labour enough and perhaps he would have to send a memo to all his Ministers instructing them what should take place when this legislation passes this House, because in my time that I've been a member of the Legislature, I have never had any occasion before or

BILL 55

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) prior, except this year, to have had several civil servants come to me and were quite concerned about the matter that I've brought to this House before. And that was the occasion when the Minister of Agriculture had an opportunity to talk to his staff in the Fort Garry Hotel, and perhaps it was misinterpreted but the several ones that I talked to they came to me and they said, look, the Minister stated that we want you to get involved in the next election, and their concern was -- and they were very sincere and quite concerned and they were serious -- they said the concern is if we don't get involved what is our position as far as maintaining a job, and if we get involved and say the government is not re-elected, where do we stand then? And this must be the problem of every civil servant. It must be, and I'm sure that many of them are concerned in this area. So I feel that there are dangers of abuse and we hope that this would not happen, not take place, and I would hope that there would be no pressure on any civil servants to get involved in any electioneering, it should be left to themselves if they wish to get involved. But as far as the right of civil servants standing for office or endorsing policies of a certain party or candidate I think it should be their basic right, and there's many of these people involved.

I do have some concern, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know if this is a standard clause in legislation, but I do have some concern in respect to the section concerning appeals, and that is -- I'm sure that the Minister, I hope will give it some consideration because it states that where the candidate was not successful for a position as an employee and another person was appointed who perhaps did not have that same qualifications or merit and in case of an appeal --(Interjection)-- that's right. Yes, the Minister can appoint an independent, one individual to do the investigation and the report will go directly to that same Minister to make the decision or not, so --(Interjection)-- that's true, I know it doesn't, but I think it's a new clause in the Act, and I wonder should it not go back to the Civil Service Commission to do the report and then let the Civil Service Commission give that report to the Minister, instead of one individual who the Minister at his discretion may appoint. It may not happen that the Minister would ever abuse his powers but there is that option to the Minister to appoint anyone he wishes; it could be a friend of a certain individual who feels that he, you know, didn't get a proper treatment, or it could be the other way around. I feel maybe that report should be reviewed by the Civil Service Commission and then go back to the Minister again and let him make that decision; but I feel there may be abuse when the Minister himself will appoint any individual he wishes and that report will be turned back to him and he'll make the decision. So I hope that that will be reviewed or the Minister can give it some consideration, because I feel it's -- not that any Minister would abuse but that it's there, that it could be open for abuse.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the points that I want to make on this bill. I would hope that -- would there be anybody from the Civil Service appear before Law Amendments or not, I hope that there would be some so that the members in the House could get some indication -- you know, what kind of support it has from the Civil Service; and it may not be 100 percent support, might not be 75 percent, I don't know, but I think that we should be able to ask then what support it has. But in my own personal opinion, and I'm not speaking for the Party, my feeling is that it is --(Interjection)-- well okay, I am. But I think it's a basic right, you know, when you have that many people to seek office, but I do have some reservations in respect to abuse.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question? He raised the question as to the exemptions contained within the Act, and if I may, Sir, refer to 44, subsection 2 which dealt with the question of the Deputy Ministers. Would he be amenable to the deletion of that particular section so that each and every individual knew where they stood and that there were no exceptions for them, and that the judgment as to whether or not they would be participants . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm asking a question, Mr. Speaker, of the honourable member who spoke because he made this observation. I'm asking him whether or not the point that he was raising was that there should be no exemptions at all, Deputy Ministers or otherwise, and the onus was placed on the individual rather than on the position?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: . . . that was the observation I made, Mr. Speaker, because on one hand we're saying that we allow now any civil servant to support any political Party, to endorse

BILL 55

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) any political candidate, to endorse his fiscal policies, we're saying that to civil servants, the majority of them; on the other hand we'll say but still it shouldn't apply to some Deputy Minister, or there may be two or three Deputy Ministers, and I think that we're showing discrimination in the legislation. For that reason I raise this matter. I know I'm finished speaking, I did have some other points that I've forgotten, that just came to my attention. --(Interjection)-- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a former union man and a vice-president of a steel local in Thompson, I think that I have some opinions on this bill that should go on record. I haven't read the bill completely, Mr. Speaker, and I don't have to knowing the Minister of Labour and his almost schizophrenic obsession of Swedish equalization for everyone, I know without reading what is precisely in his mind, just as I know what they have in The Human Rights Act where they want to have everybody equal, even though we know that there's some difference between men and women, the government is determined to make them all equal.

The Minister is determined to impose his idea of equality, whether it means the right to strike for a fireman when a house is burning or for the midwife or for anyone else, he is determined that everyone is going to be equal, Mr. Chairman. And I'm suggesting to him we live in a society where that is impossible, it has never been possible, it cannot be possible. We have, for example, in the trade union movement, which this government accepts, that you cannot belong to a union if you are a foreman, a shift boss or superintendent. No one in the position of authority of demoting or firing or recommending disciplinary action or firing is allowed to join a trade union in this province. And we all accept that, Mr. Speaker. No union man wants to sit shoulder to shoulder with a company "flunkey" as we call him who tomorrow can walk in and discipline him and recommend his firing. We all accept that, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Labour accepts it. It's impossible to have equality. Even though in this case that foreman does not have the privilege accorded the union man, he does not have the right to grievance, the company can fire him without any reason. He can't go to the union and say, I want a grievance. He does not have any of the protection that union members enjoy. And we accept that. And I'm sure this government perhaps more than any other government accepts that, and I haven't heard of anybody attempting to change that.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that's being presented to us is presented on a basis of freedom of participation for everyone, that is whether you want to run for office or if you want to participate in the campaign; and I think the Member for Lakeside made an excellent case when he referred to the Deputy Minister. I am absolutely certain that if his Deputy Minister ran for any Party and said the things that is normally said during an election -- some of them say worse things than others -- that it would be impossible, even if the Minister wanted to it would be just impossible to work together with such a man.

The net result of this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, has to be that it's going to benefit only the government, because the only people who are going to run are those who are working for the government. If they are Liberals or Conservatives or Social Credits or whatever, they're not going to stick their neck out and run, because if they lose the election, or if the Party they're running for does not get elected, they know what's going to happen to them. So what person who has spent a great deal of time, and we have very senior civil servants -- when I say senior I'm talking in terms of years and seniority -- what civil servant is going to risk his years of work for a government and take a chance of getting fired. And he surely will get fired; there's no question in my mind that he will get fired. --(Interjection)-- Well a lateral transfer would be not bad, that wouldn't be bad, but I just cannot believe that a person could run against the government -- and he will have more knowledge than other members of the House, he's going to have a lot of information -- we seen that cute paper that was brought in here last night -- civil servants can find other such embarrassing papers to the government, and wave them around in front of the electorate, and what is the government going to say? --(Interjection)-- The one about bringing in Bolshevism into the schools and Fascism and the Regina Manifesto Civil servants can turn around and I'm sure look under the rugs in the Minister's office and in other offices and they will find other such embarrassing documents, and what is the Minister going to do, after the ballots are counted and that Minister is securely in his office for another four years?

BILL 55

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd)

We know, for example, just in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, we enjoy benefits that on one else has. I'm sure that the Minister of Labour wouldn't want to give the public the equality we enjoy. You can get up here and slander anybody, but under the laws of this province you can't be sued. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, you can go and beat somebody up down the street, you can't be taken to court until 40 days after the session.

So, is the Minister of Labour -- I mean, with his obsession with equality is he going to suggest that we're going to give the public the same immunity to go out there and make slanderous charges against someone and not be faced with the prospect of court action? Of course not. Of course not. So his speech there that sounded so logical and so reasonable is a lot of baloney, Mr. Speaker, because he doesn't mean what he says and he has no intention of bringing that type of equality. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind telling you, I have no intention of fighting for that kind of equality either. We know there's a difference between men and women and we know there's a difference between a Minister and a Deputy Minister, and nobody, no laws in the world are going to change that. When we get to the point where civil servants can go out and campaign, what we're really going to have, Mr. Speaker, whether it's this government or the Conservatives, we're going to have a bunch of people on a government payroll assisting the government to get re-elected, because there can only be 57 candidates per party and at most, let's say we have several dozen civil servants running as candidates. But there are several thousand that could be used to knock on doors and to use their vehicles to travel, to transport people, and to put up signs and to put up posters. So it seems to me that this is a nice scheme for a government to get a lot of free assistance at the taxpayers' expense, and I don't think that they should be allowed to get away with it.

We have, for example, in our society the ombudsman, the judges. There are many people who don't have the same rights as other citizens and they have never asked for them and I don't think anybody would suggest. The Returning Officer, for example, doesn't even have the right to vote. Anybody think that's terrible? He can't even vote in a free country. And we all accept that because we know the system, the democratic system that we have as such, that certain people are deprived of certain rights and they know that before they take that job on. And when a Minister brings in a bill to try and change that, I suggest to you it can only create problems not so much for the House here as for the Civil Service, which we are told every time anybody gets up in this House, is the finest Civil Service in Canada. And I'm not going to argue that. There's some deadbeats and meatheads in the Civil Service but I think by and large they're a pretty good bunch and they're doing a good job; they're fairly competent. You don't have the type of a pork-barrel system that the late Ross Thatcher had in Saskatchewan. When he walked in he put the axe or the boots to the Socialists that were in there because he couldn't stand Socialists even though they were eminently qualified. I think he got rid of something like 280 of them because they were hired by that government. Nobody wants to see that, Mr. Speaker. But this type of legislation is going to invite that, because there is no way an incoming government is going to tolerate and have those people who call them all kinds of names in election, continue to employ those people.

Mr. Speaker, as a Minister of Highways I had twelve districts in a department and they were pretty well scattered throughout the province. A District Engineer had a large budget, some of them running into millions of dollars, and large staffs, trucks, cars and a great deal of authority. And this authority was given, perhaps I gave them more authority than other Ministers had previously, as I as a working man have always believed that a guy who's on the job knows more about what's going on than somebody sitting in an office. And that District Engineer, whether he wants to campaign for the government or whether he wants to run as a candidate, is going to be in a position, in an intimidating position to all his employees. I mean what are they going to do, if he's a candidate or if he decides to support the Minister of Highways? What are all those employees going to do, Mr. Speaker? I leave it to your imagination.

We have a better - I can give you a better example of how you can get into real problems. What about the well people that are on welfare? How can these people who are on welfare put up signs in the window supporting someone other than the government? We understand that the welfare queen herself, Una Decter, is going to run in this election. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, how is a welfare recipient and I don't know how many there is in the constituency that she is going to run - how is a welfare recipient going to stick a sign on the window saying

BILL 55

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) that "I support the Conservative candidate" or the Liberal candidate? She wouldn't dare, because that welfare queen will know about it as she has the economic power of life and death over everybody that gets welfare in this province. --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Labour, Mr. Chairman, is saying to me that I am a sick man. Let that be recorded.

This government here, they think they are so clever, they hired some pollsters to give them some idea of how popular they are and the polls must be fairly good right now judging by their actions. Anybody who comes in here with criticism, valid criticism of a very serious nature, they call you, they tell you you're sick or there's something wrong with you. I've had that thrown at me time and again, "There's something wrong with you." Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I am telling you as a union man that this bill, on the basis of what that Minister has told us, is going to cause chaos in the province and chaos in the civil servants, and they're going to be in effect using many civil servants to try to perpetuate themselves in office. And that to me is repugnant and I am really shocked that the Minister would come with such a thinly veiled scheme to try and get the public to get him back into office.

I hope, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will get up and answer those questions, and if they're not answered properly that everybody on this side will consider defeating that bill, because it's not a bill to help the civil servants. I say it's a bill to help the government to get re-elected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of . . .

MR. GREEN: I believe that the bill wants--unless somebody wants to speak, I believe that the Member for Emerson has taken . . .

MR. SPEAKER: When moving the motion, when I gave the floor to the Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 61

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Bill No. 61.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of . . .

MR. GREEN: It's on the revised Order Paper. Some members may not have it.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba). The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns) presented Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure in the last four years to introduce bills and income tax bills which I have felt were worthwhile introducing and for which this government has never found it necessary to be apologetic but rather has been able to speak with pride about the tax adjustments and tax programs and attitudes that this government has to the purpose and principles and policies related to taxation.

The bill before us is not a difficult bill; it's not an extensive bill. It deals with two matters. One is where it involves a housekeeping amendment to the Income Tax Act to provide parallel income tax treatment for mutual fund trusts and corporations in Manitoba as is provided in other provinces and, more important, to implement the changes in the Manitoba system of property tax credits announced in the Budget Address in March. The changes to the Income Tax Act affecting mutual funds are a vestige of the federal attempts at tax reform. There's the Benson document that was produced, there was legislation enacted by the Federal Government, complementary legislation by our government, but in this case the amendment is required to duplicate a provision in federal legislation which is designed to prevent double taxation of capital gains once in the hands of the mutual fund and then again in the hands of the individual. Accordingly, under this legislation, capital gains are to be taxed when realized by the intermediary the mutual fund, but the tax is to be refunded to the intermediary upon distribution of the capital gain to the shareholder or unit holder. In this way, gains cannot be accumulated tax free in the intermediary, but the full amount of the capital gain may be distributed to the shareholder or unit holder to be taxed at his own particular rate, while federal tax reform legislation covered only

BILL 61

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) federal tax refunds on these capital gains. Accordingly, legislation to be provided for parallel refund of provincial tax is required.

Mr. Speaker, up to now I've not spoken with too much enthusiasm because I've been explaining what has to be done to parallel federal legislation and is in accord with matters that have been brought to the attention of our government some number of months back, where we explored it. It was brought to our attention by the mutual funds and the mutual fund companies, and we agreed that there was a danger of double taxation in the way the federal legislation was written. Representations were also made to the Federal Government and by general agreement it was felt necessary to make these changes to avoid double taxation on capital gains in these particular cases.

Mr. Speaker, what makes me somewhat comfortable to proceed with this bill is really the other portion of the bill. That is the one dealing with several important amendments to the Income Tax Act which deal with the Manitoba system of property tax credits. And while the amendments appear quite minor in the legislation, they don't take up much space in writing or on paper, let me assure all honourable members that their impact is quite, quite substantial.

The base on which tax credits are allowed, is to be doubled to include all property taxes not just school taxes. This one change alone will double tax credit benefits for some low income Manitobans. Furthermore, the benefits available under the plan are to be increased substantially for all property taxpayers under a new formula of \$200.00 minus one percent of taxable income, to a minimum of \$100.00. Once again as last year, no one may obtain more in tax credits than he has paid in property taxes or in the rental equivalent of property taxes that now we speak of property taxes and not education property taxes. And in order to ensure renters as well as homeowners added benefit from the expanded plan, the rental equivalent of property taxes for tenants now becomes 20 percent of the annual rent, which is double the 10 percent which was used in last year's program.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to distribute and table and distribute to honourable members a series of examples, just so that honourable members will be reminded of the nature of this. These tables, this set of examples, Mr. Speaker, were included in the March Budget presentation and show the impact of the 1973 Manitoba Property Tax Credit Plan on various family units by income level and family size. And I would ask all honourable members, or at least I would suggest to them that they pay careful attention to these tables.

As well as illustrating the credit entitlements of a single taxpayer, married taxpayer, and married taxpayer with two dependents, the table shows the estimated distribution of benefits under the new revised system of property tax credits. For example, Mr. Speaker, for a married person with two children, the maximum benefit of \$200.00 will be payable until that person's annual income approaches \$4,000.00. Benefits are scaled down to \$189.00 at \$5,000 income; \$179.00 at \$6,000; \$169.00 at \$7,000, and so on until the new general \$100.00 minimum benefit floor is reached at \$13,900.00. And people who earn beyond that sum \$13,900 will be recipients of the minimum of \$100.00 on the assumption, which is a very fair assumption, that their taxes are in excess of \$100.00, their property taxes.

Tables also show the estimated distribution of benefits. Almost every second tax filer eligible for tax credit will be entitled to maximum benefits. Among married couples, almost 40 percent can expect maximum benefits. For married couples with two children, over 30 percent of those eligible for credits are likely to be able to claim the maximum.

With the new minimum level of benefits established at \$100.00, all credit claimants will be eligible to claim at least \$100.00 except in some cases where, as I pointed out, the total property tax is less than \$100.00. And in those cases the credit benefits will offset completely the property taxes for which they will be liable in the year.

Our calculations indicate that of all pensioners who normally file income tax returns and are eligible for property tax credits, some 81 percent will receive the maximum \$200.00 credit and a full 92 percent will receive benefits in excess of \$180.00. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to compare that program with the protestations from the other side and especially from the Liberal Party, who are talking about assisting pensioners in handling the additional burden of taxation due to rising costs.

Of the pensioners who normally file income taxes, income tax returns, and are eligible for property tax credits, all but .3 percent will be entitled to credit amounts above the standard \$100.00 minimum, again except where taxes are under \$100.00. In such cases again, the full

BILL 61

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) property tax will be offset by this credit plan. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we expect that about 83 to 84 percent of Manitoba farmers who normally file income tax returns, will enjoy the maximum credit amount of \$200.00, while a further 12 1/2 percent will have tax credits of between \$160.00 and \$200.00. Thus, some 97 percent of eligible farmers in the province will be receiving benefits in excess of \$160.00, and overall every eligible farmer will be entitled to a credit of no less than \$100.00, and of course I don't believe in any case does he pay less in property taxes than \$100.00.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this expansion of both the base and the benefit levels of the Manitoba Property Tax Credit Plan will direct \$42 million to the citizens of Manitoba, a substantial relief particularly for those people of low fixed and low middle income people; \$42 million, Mr. Speaker. And when the Leader of the Opposition goes out and makes speeches, and his colleagues, about a \$700.00 budget, never once do they admit --(Interjection)-- \$700 million budget, we think in millions when we talk about doing something for people in Manitoba. And when they go out and they talk about a \$700 million expenditure requirement by this government in this year, I haven't heard one of them, heard of one of them saying \$42 million of that is a direct rebate into the pockets of taxpayers, of property taxpayers, and if you want to accept it then you recognize that of the 700 million this 42 is clearly a tax rebate.

Now members opposite are waving their hands at me and I'd be glad to understand them, but if they're waving encouragement, I do appreciate very much their encouragement. Because, Mr. Speaker, one can't help but become somewhat enthused about being able to develop a plan of rebate of taxation, of recognition of the fact that it is necessary to attempt to hold down the increasing costs of property taxation and at the same time do it on a selective basis so that the people who are most in need get most of the benefit. Of course, there's nobody waving encouragement across now because the party opposite and the party on my right and to their left are both committed publicly to across-the-board tax cuts, and that is something different. Quite different. Mr. Speaker, I hope the people of Manitoba realize the difference.

When the Leader of the Opposition goes out and says we will cut your taxes, he means we will cut your taxes across-the-board to everybody regardless of ability to pay. And we say, we have cut your taxes, we don't have to make promises. It's on the line, we've proven it. And we say we have cut your taxes, we mean we have cut taxes of all people who pay property tax, but in relation, with a measure, with a sense of proportion related to their ability to pay. And that's a matter of pride, it's a matter of pride for all my colleagues I know. When we agreed on this proposal there was enthusiasm because last year we said we are starting a program which will be beneficial to Manitobans, especially those on low and fixed income, and if we can do better we will. And in one year we've done substantially better and my colleagues and I have been very pleased to be able to bring this program to the people. (applause)

Now to assist resident homeowners who will face the immediate cost of property tax bills, we have set aside \$19 million of the total property tax credit funds which will be advanced to resident homeowners of single dwelling units in the form of deductions from their 1973 property tax bills. And this advance, which of course is made possible through the co-operation of the municipalities, will provide up to \$100 as a payment of part of the 1973 Manitoba Property Tax Credit benefit to resident homeowners. So they won't have to wait until next spring to be able to obtain their rebate. We are prepaying that. And for them to know what we are doing, we have received the co-operation of the municipalities to inform them at the time they get their tax bill of what the benefit is and how they must deal with it when it is necessary to apply for any balance owing to them at the time of filing their 1973 income tax returns next spring. That information they're entitled to get, that information they are getting and we have the co-operation of the municipalities in that respect to give that information.

This amount, this \$100 which is being paid now is a reduction of their property tax credit benefit, will of course have to be credited to their claim, deducted from their claim, when they make their claim for the balance of the money in the spring of next year. For resident homeowners of single dwelling units whose property tax liability is less than \$100, then of course their entire property tax is being paid for them now at the time of the billing of the tax bill and they will receive a nil bill in effect.

I'd like to emphasize that in cases where the tax credit entitlement for 19. --(Interjection)-- all right - for 1973 is greater than the amount advanced, the additional benefit will then be claimed in the spring of 1973, and will be made on the 1973 income tax return, and

BILL 61

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) people are being informed through the instrumentality of the notice given to them with their property tax credit that that claim must be made under the income tax form not through the municipality. In some circumstances advances may be received on residents which are not occupied by the owner, and where this occurs the full amount of the advance is required to be returned to the Minister of Finance. And, Mr. Speaker, generally, that is the bill before us; at the time of the bill I've had distributed a rather detailed explanation of the various sections to be helpful to us during the committee stage. Because may I say, Mr. Speaker, the meeting of the Conference of the Premiers of Canada takes place this next week and I will be expected to be there on Tuesday, or going there Tuesday, as a result of which, unless honourable members are able to accommodate through dealing with the matter tomorrow, I will not be able to participate further in the debate, which of course I regret very much because I would like very much both to hear what honourable members have to say about the bill and about the various items. I would like very much to be able to close debate and then I would like to be present in this Chamber when we go through the committee stage in order to deal with the sections item by item. But honourable members may not be ready to complete it tomorrow, of course that's quite possible, in which case I'm afraid my honourable colleague on my right will have to conduct the balance of it.

But I don't think it's difficult to go through the mechanical drafting and the words that make up the sections. What is important is the concept. Of course there are some people who may not really accept the concept or agree to the benefits. It may well be that members opposite will not want to support this bill. That may well be. As a matter of fact, I'm just wondering whether or not they will, I'm looking forward to finding out. Because, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know how consistent they are. Are they going to vote for the bill, I'd invite them to do so. They are in a terrible quandary of course, Mr. Speaker. They don't know just how to handle themselves in relation to this bill because last year the Leader of the Opposition called this plan a colossal blunder, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition called this plan a hoax, he called it a basic contradiction. Nobody is asking me for the citation but if they did I'd give them the page number and the date in Hansard. Oh, the Member for Rhineland would like to be able to check. And that's all right, Mr. Speaker, I have learned, especially yesterday, to realize that it is well to ask people how well they can support the statements they make when they wave papers around and say this is a document I know of.

So I want to give the Honourable Member for Rhineland the opportunity to check how I'm quoting the Leader of the Opposition. "Colossal blunder" it appears on April 10th in Hansard of last year on page 817. "A hoax" appears on the same page. "A basic contradiction", that appears on a different page, 822. That's three pages or four pages later. And, again on page 824 he had to say "a half-baked ill thought out shambles". That's what he said about this plan. And finally on page 825 he reached the crescendo of something or other and he said the most serious blunder yet perpetuated in a Manitoba budget. Now what's he going to do with this bill? This Tax Credit Plan happens to have been adopted to a large extent by two other provinces in Canada so far. --(Interjection)-- Which one? One is to the east of us, and that is a fairly large province called the Province of Ontario. That they introduced this plan. (hear, hear) They have a Conservative Government. It so happens that a province to the west of us has also just recently announced this type of plan. I am asked, Mr. Speaker, what province it is? It is the Province of Alberta, the Province of Alberta, a Conservative Government has taken on this plan. So we find that we, with two other provinces in Canada, have embarked on tax credit plans. We now have partially gone through the first year's experience on the plan. And I expect other provinces to follow on this plan because it is proving to accomplish those ends for which they were planned.

So, Mr. Speaker, one can only conclude that the real basic contradiction the Leader of the Opposition had in mind is a contradiction that's so evident and the Conservative Party which rejects tax credit in Manitoba --(Interjection)-- oh, I'm told that it's not true, that the Conservative Party does not reject tax credit in Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- The Member for Souris-Killarney, the Member for Lakeside both said not true. So apparently I'm wrong. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? --(Interjection)-- Well now I still don't know whether they accept it or not. The Member for Souris-Killarney who today refused to acknowledge that he made a statement yesterday when he was seated is now again yelling from his seat, and then tomorrow if we say to him: "is it true you said so and so" he'll say "what I said on my seat is not

BILL 61

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) something for the record." So I'd just as soon be kept quiet or left the room rather than continuing to talk.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, now I really don't know, Mr. Speaker. Last year I know they were opposed to the plan. This year I am now kept in a state of suspended concern. Are they in support, are they not in support? Is it a hoax, is it not a hoax? Because it's the same plan and the ex-broadcaster across the way is ready to go back to his old trade and say, tune in tomorrow - and I will, I will, I will. I will not leave, and I only hope I can count that tomorrow, if not tonight, I will hear exactly what the Conservative Party proposes to do in connection with this plan. The Conservative Party can no longer surprise me. I've gone through the stage of being surprised with so many vacillations I can no longer be surprised. So I must tell the Member for Fort Garry that it is no longer with surprise but with interest to see which way they'll flop this time the penny is pitched - a contradiction which the Manitoba Conservatives had and they vote against measures to grant real relief to Manitoba property taxpayers last year, and we'll see how they vote on this motion that was proposed in this year's budget statement. Maybe their solution should be that the Liberals used some years back where they all switched seats around and therefore there is no record of how they stood.

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters on the other side of this House are to be taken seriously at all in their criticism of the Manitoba system of tax credit, let them vote against, let them vote against this bill. But let it be understood, Mr. Speaker, once and for all, that in voting against this bill as they did last year, (that's why one would expect that they will this year), they are voting against a system of tax credits which is designed specifically to extend the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, last year the Leader of the Opposition he cast many aspersions on our estimates of benefits under the 1972 year credit plan. We said that according to our best calculations at that time there would be some \$28 million payable, and he said it won't be anything like that. And I said I hope you're right, I hope it's less so we can do better the next time around once we've had the experience. But of course he spoke with great knowledge. All I said is I recall it is the experts who advise me, inform me that to the best of their ability and subject to the fact that there is no history or experience, \$28 million is what they think we have to set aside for that purpose.

I am happy to report that the preliminary information that is presently available on the tax credit benefits paid to Manitoba taxpayers on our behalf by national revenue, indicates that the 1972 Education Property Tax Credit Plan will result in benefits which will be somewhat in excess of \$26 million being paid to our taxpayers for 1972 taxes.

A MEMBER: Pretty close. He said about 12.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, I think he may have said 20 or 18, I don't remember exactly what he said, I haven't got the quotes so I better not attempt to quote him unless I fall into the trap of one of his seatmates.

In his remarks he claimed that the administrative costs including advertising of that plan would be in the order of a million dollars. A million dollars he said is what the administrative costs including advertising - if the honourable member wants a reference, I'm informed, it's on page 201, March 29, 1972, in Hansard.

Well, Mr. Speaker, once again he's wrong. Once again he's wrong. He is the gentleman who somehow succeeds every time he gives an estimate with certainty, he somehow succeeds in doubling or about doubling the amount that it costs. He talked about a letter sent out by the Premier to inform people of their responsibilities and their rights in regard to Medicare program. What did he say? - 60, 70, 80 million, I forget what he said. He may not remember either. But I remember knowing that it was roughly, it was actually half of what it was. And I can inform the honourable member that as far as we can see now, and we're well into it now, the cost of advertising and of administration of the 1972 Education Property Tax Credit Plan was just over one-half of his figure of \$1 million. And may I point out he's only out by half, he's only out by 100 percent, that's all he is in his estimates, but he speaks with certainty and of course he never retracts what he says because he'd rather let it lie. --(Interjection)-- Now the Member for Lakeside is again jabbering from his seat and if he wants I'll stop for a minute so I can at least hear what he says to judge the value of what he says. I think he and I have the same lack of confidence in the value of what he says because when I stopped talking so did he.

BILL 61

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, it may be of interest, I think it's of interest for honourable members to know the responses in relation to the advertising plan that we had in order to encourage people to learn about the nature and effect of the Education Property--Property Tax Credit Plan. I'm glad that the Leader of the Opposition found it amusing. Possibly he's not interested in the kind of enquiries we receive. Now he said something. What did he say?

A MEMBER: He says, "I have some idea of what people think of it."

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, well I'm sure he does. He's been seeing the polls lately. He knows exactly what people are thinking about it. And Mr. Speaker, the queries for the period of January 8th to April 30th, 1973--and I'll read these figures quickly: By telephone - Winnipeg calls 19,715; Other - 5,376; Interviews in Winnipeg - 1,681; Outside - 1,594; Letters from Winnipeg - 85; Letters from outside - 294; Shut-in visits made in Winnipeg - 122; a total of 28,867 enquiries about the method by which one can obtain the rebates. Breaking that down into homeowners and tenants was 15,280 homeowners, 8,443 tenants, and something over 5,000 miscellaneous which includes unclassified queries. I have a note that 6,462 were pensioners.

And when the Leader of the Opposition talks about the cost involved, I can tell him it's a lot cheaper to put in across-the-board tax cuts. It is a lot cheaper administratively if you don't care to recognize the difference in the ability-to-pay and the burden of property taxation, and if the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about cutting costs, and that's what he talks about, I must say, Mr. Speaker, he's not yet produced any worthwhile figures to show where that 50 - 60 million dollars he talks about in expense reductions will come about. He keeps saying it will yet come. It'll come. It'll come years from now when he's sitting as a grey-haired or grey-bearded old man in his back room trying to figure out just what he was talking and what happened to him. --(Interjection)-- Counting on his fingers.

Mr. Speaker, he can do it cheaply. It doesn't cost much to print some paper changing a tax rate and reducing the rate. But in order to do it at an equitable, understandable way in order to do benefits, one has costs. And if the costs are something under one percent, that ain't bad, Mr. Speaker. And I'm saying that for the benefit of some members who would like to hear that kind of response.

Now Mr. Speaker, I think that I have described the bill, I think I have spoken in such a way as to receive the support of members, in my own inimicable fashion, the Member for Fort Garry says, such as I hope will succeed in persuading some members opposite to recognize this year that this bill is a bill which is worthy of support because the plan is a vital and important and good one. I hope that there will be members opposite who will be able to say that "last year I made a mistake, that last year I voted wrongly, that last year I should have supported the bill." And that we'll be able to do so by supporting the bill this year. I happen to have a copy of the page of Hansard, Page 3300 of last year, which gives the ayes and the nays, and the people of Manitoba are indeed fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that there were 28 yeas and 17 nays. Indeed they were fortunate. 17 nays.

Mr. Speaker, is it in order if just to -

A MEMBER: Well, why not?

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh I'm being asked now, and that means if I read from Hansard I will have to refer to the names of some honourable members and I do so out of respect and out of the fact that I'm reading Hansard. The nays, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- Messrs. -- the Member for Lakeside is so co-operative - Messrs. Bilton, Blake, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham - may I interrupt to say yes, so are they all. All honourable men. Well I said honourable men. I'll be back; Bilton, Blake, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill and McGregor and McKellar, and he's here and he's ready to vote in the proper way. Sherman, Spivak, and Mrs. Trueman. 17 fine names, and they are fine names. They are nice-sounding names and they are good names and they are all honourable men in every sense of the word.

Well I am looking forward to their recognition, Mr. Speaker, of the need for the support of a measure which has proven itself to be an important one good for the people of Manitoba, especially good for the people in the lower income brackets, people on fixed income. And let me just conclude that when I said good for all Manitobans, that includes, Mr. Speaker, those people who will only receive the minimum of \$100.00. People on large income. Because if

BILL 61

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) you go up and down and knock on the doors, say the retail stores on Portage Avenue, and ask them how is business, they will be ones who will quickly tell you that the moneys that were turned back into the pockets of the people of low incomes are moneys that were expended for necessities and for some little luxuries immediately, and not hoarded and not put away and not taken out of the economy as an investment, but rather put right into the economy to work and stimulate the general economy of the province, so when I said "is beneficial to all Manitobans", indeed it is, but to the degree that there may be an imbalance, an imbalance in the benefit, then I will vote, my colleagues will vote in favour of the imbalance being for those on low income, on fixed income. How the members opposite will vote will be revealed; as the Member for Fort Garry said, come back tomorrow and see what we will learn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question or two?

My first question is, the amount budgeted last year of \$28 million, from the experience that they have gained this year in making the payments, will there be a substantial surplus on that \$28 million?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I was speaking a little too enthusiastically about the plan and possibly too loudly, and therefore possibly the Member for Rhineland didn't hear when I stated that as far as we can now see, where we had estimated \$28 million for last year's program, it appears that it will work out to in the neighbourhood of \$26 million.

MR. FROESE: My second question, and this no doubt will be very delightful to him, is the Honourable Minister aware that in the Garden Valley Division, where we still were non-unitary, and we had the \$50.00 rebate on the residential and also on the individual properties, plus the tax credit plan, that many people with small holdings received much more than 100 percent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Pardon me - they received much more than 100 percent?

MR. FROESE: Much more than 100 percent of their taxes paid.

MR. CHERNIACK: That we rebated to them in excess of 100 percent of the taxes?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed interested because I now would ask the Honourable Member for Rhineland to give us a lead so we can get recovered - recover from them moneys that apparently the Federal Government returned to them in excess of the moneys which they are entitled to keep. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Oh, the 1964 plan, is that what the honourable member is talking about?

MR. FROESE: No, I'm speaking of last year's experience under the non-unitary system.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh based on the -- Well there's an explanation which of course accounts for the honourable member's statement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, at the specific request of the Minister of Finance, who knows how difficult it is for me to refuse to be aroused to speech when he makes that appeal, and unprepared as I am, let me nonetheless offer a few comments about the bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, I can't really make any comments without at least reminding the Honourable Minister of the occasion when he first introduced this legislation to the House. He was then Minister of Finance and it seems to me that I had just about that time received into my hands a copy of the new Federal Income Tax form, the multi-pages of which I fluttered for all to witness, and indeed the Honourable Minister of Finance witnessed them, but aside from that little bit of theatrics it seems to me that I expressed some concern, which of course the Honourable Minister of Finance poo-pooed and said it was my usual acting style and that it wasn't to be taken seriously, that there was going to be no problem, no problem at all on behalf of any citizen of Manitoba to claim his legitimate tax rebate form.

That was when the Minister introduced the plan. Well, Mr. Speaker, would you believe \$100,000 next--no, \$200,000 next, \$300,000 next, TV advertisements about that lovely housewife that was busy dusting her chair and all of a sudden pops out and says, "Have you filled out your tax form yet?" or that fellow shovelling snow and says "See what a fine lovely bunch of fellows we have. I've just got to fill out that tax form." That was I guess about the \$300,000 or \$400,000 mark. Just about then, of course, just about then, of course, they had over a million dollars budgeted, but just about then, just about then even the ridiculousness, the waste,

BILL 61

(MR. ENNS cont'd) the sheer government waste of this caught on to the then Minister of Finance and they, I suspect, if they were honest and showed us the advertising budget, they curtailed the program. They said "Shut it off. Shut it off. Even we are not that stupid; we can recognize when we have overdone a good thing, you know. We just can't carry on this way." Because after all, if you keep on this way the Member of Lakeside might be proven right, that the people of Manitoba are going to find a great deal of difficulty in understanding that complicated formula that the Minister of Finance announced, and that this government has spent, you know, Mr. Speaker, a hundred thousand dollars, two hundred thousand dollars, a half a million dollars they spent.

Okay Mr. Speaker, I will go back. I'll go back--I expect that he probably has invoices to show that he only spent \$300,000, but Mr. Speaker, I also recall that they hired four or five civil servants to travel the countryside. Everybody in Manitoba can phone a Zenith Number if he's in trouble. What is that charge, Mr. Speaker? We have people, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I used that services, because my good people for whom I expressed some concern about in the Interlake, we had not one but three meetings about people who had never filled out an income tax form before, wanted somehow to find out what largesse this government was providing them with, and of course, all that was laughed at, all that was boo-hoed, but this government, this government, Sir, and this Minister of Finance, who I am the first to acknowledge as being, you know, the master of acting in this House, I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, he has paid me that tribute. He has paid me that tribute from time to time but Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that as when Sir Laurence Olivier pats Tony Perkins on the back, and I acknowledge that, in that context, and if he thinks I'm an actor, then at least put me in the stature of a Tony Perkins and I take off my hat to the Sir Laurence Olivier of this House because, Mr. Speaker, with what righteousness, with what righteousness did he discredit any idea that it was going to be a complicated bureaucratic red tape system of returning some of the people's money that they over-taxed in the first instance.

Well Mr. Speaker, so much at least, I know, you know, these . . . we've all, every Manitoban has seen the advertisements, heard the radio advertisements, has seen the full page ads. Mr. Speaker, you know, even in the wildest days of Duff Roblin, who used to be accused of spending taxpayers' money like a drunken sailor, you know, in the wildest days of Duff Roblin, never, never was the abuse of taxpayers' money more evident than in the program that this very Minister brought into being. The Stonewall Argus, the Teulon Times. Well, Mr. Speaker, okay laugh, laugh; they well might laugh at the contempt for the rural weeklies. They may well laugh at the Brandon Sun. They may well laugh at the Gladstone Times. But these happen to be papers, these happen to be journals that I and my people read and my constituency read. Well, Mr. Speaker, they'll find--let them equivocate what the point of course was. They were going to argue, just like the other night they were going to argue as to whether the argument was between Nazis and Communism, now they are going to argue about the size of the ad. Was it a full page ad or a half page ad? Well, Mr. Speaker, let them argue. Let them argue that finite point. Let them argue that finite point.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that while a previous administration tried a similar scheme, and indeed we milked it politically too, I can recall and most residents recall and the official journals of this House have recorded the fact, that in the payment of the cheque, the \$50.00 rebate that was sent under that system, there indeed appeared a little notice signed by one Duff Roblin, signed by one Duff Roblin, and that was the extent - and that was the extent of the advertising of that rebate campaign. Now do you want to compare that, do you want to compare that to the massive TV barrage that we've had, to the radio barrage that we've had, to the newspaper barrage that we've had, and to the, I don't know how many civil service people that have been hired to wander around the countryside to help facilitate this cumbersome scheme? Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, like in the Autopac scheme, if the Minister of Finance is prepared to say honestly that he spent \$300,000 on the scheme, then I tell him directly that he spent a million. The only difficulty is I can't find the other 700. I can't find the other 700. That's right. That's right, but we're agreed at least on that. We know how lousy your accounting is on Autopac where \$5 million deficit all of a sudden becomes an asset. We know that kind of accounting. So all I can tell you my friend is that if you admit to a fact of having spent \$300,000 on this program, that I am reasonably assured that about a million dollars has gone down the drain on that program.

BILL 61

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for that particular aspect. I had to get that off my chest; I had to get that off my chest because --(Interjection)-- No, well, Mr. Speaker, it was only because of the fun the Honourable Minister of Finance made at me when I happened to suggest, when I happened to suggest to him when he introduced the scheme that it would take a little bit of explaining, that it would take a bit of money, that it would take a lot of PR, it would take a lot of effort to make people understand that. He thought that that was not the case. I think he now acknowledges publicly that in fact that was the case.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with one other aspect of the bill. And really it deserves a little bit of attention. The Minister of Finance and the members in the government opposite generally, like to dismiss, you know just with a wave of the hand, our suggestions of a general tax cut as being discriminating in favor of the rich and not taking into any consideration the legitimate problems that the lower income people of this province face and the real aims that it has to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's really take a short look at what we mean and what we feel that across-the-tax-board deduction means. --(Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Speaker, it surely means at face value the kind of arithmetic that members opposite are so prone to throw at us. It means perhaps a \$200 or a \$300 saving to that man in the \$15,000 or \$20,000 income as compared to a \$10 or \$20 or \$30 saving to the man in the medium or low income. Yes, you're quite right, that's exactly what it means. But, Mr. Speaker, to show you the callousness, the utter disregard and the utter meanness for political expediency that members opposite have, these same people don't give a cotton-pickin' damn about raising the price of bread, about raising the price of hamburger, about raising the price of butter for the very same people that can least afford it. They with disdain, with disdain, wash that off. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes, there's the smear again, there's the smear again. Well, Mr. Speaker, really, do you think, do you honestly think, do you honestly think that we can pay our - well grocery clerks, or our tellers at the grocery clerks, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 15 dollars an hour and not have that affected on the price of groceries? Do you think that you can keep on adding government tax loads on to wages and that that's not going to be a pressure for increasing wages and that's not going to reflect in the price of food? Surely, Mr. Speaker, there has to be a time when we start to realize that.

And, Mr. Speaker, the real concern of course is that those more fortunate for one reason or other, whom the effects of rising food prices, whom the effects of rising rent or rising costs of shelter bear least on, they can withstand that kind of inflationary pressure best. The persons, the persons that this government all too often reminds us is most dedicated to represent in this Chamber, most dedicated to serve the low income earner, the person on fixed incomes, for them they show utter disdain, utter disdain, because rather than implementing the kind of fiscal responsibility, fiscal responsibility that cuts down the cost of government, that can provide for lower food costs, that can provide for lower rents, that can provide for lower shelter costs, they would rather take the avenue where there is a big ripoff firstly for themselves in terms of the half million or million dollars advertising expenses. They'd sooner extract the tax money and then pass it out, then pass it out as grand fellows, well met, in the hope that that will get them re-elected. Well, Mr. Speaker, it probably will get them re-elected in certain seats in certain areas. But, Mr. Speaker, let it be said that I have no apologies, I have no apologies for taking a consistent position with respect to the vote on this matter last year - the matter of this vote last year.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that we have a responsibility and we believe that we have a genuine responsibility, particularly to those people, to those people who are locked in, to those people who are locked in with fixed incomes, with pension plans, whom the inflationary spiral that this kind of government hurts most and has no regard for, has no regard for. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of this is, and unfortunately the Member for Crescentwood who of course has lost interest in the people of Manitoba and has not graced this Chamber for a considerable length of time and --(Interjection)-- Well now, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what happened. If you want to talk about a deal, a deal has been made, the deal has been made with this government, with the Premier and the Member for Crescentwood--says Mr. Member from Crescentwood you will do me a service if you do not run for me because that puts me into a better position. After all that doesn't fit, that doesn't fit with the Schreyer image, the Schreyer administration. You want to talk about a deal that's been made, the biggest deal has been made with convincing the Member

BILL 61

(MR. ENNS cont'd) from Crescentwood that it would be better that he not run, that it would be better that he not run. Now that deal has been made and it's evident by his lack of interest in this Chamber. He hasn't been in this Chamber, he of course is holding down his 14 or 15 thousand dollar salary as a University Professor. But, Mr. Speaker, I am returning to the bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Thank you. I would like to ask the co-operation of all the honourable members. I know that every so often they have to have a little loud hour, but it's over. Let's get back to the bill. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I was attempting to say, and this is really why I was diverted, as I've been known to be diverted occasionally, when I thought about the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. Because, Mr. Speaker, if he were in his seat then he would be the first one to stand up and support me that the inflationary pressures hurts the least those in the best position who can cope with it. He's the first one to suggest that if we have a wage increase or if we have an inflationary spiral General Motors doesn't get hurt, they increase the price of cars; U.S. Steel doesn't get hurt, they increase the price of steel, you know; and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said that. But, Mr. Speaker, who does get hurt and who is prepared to let them get hurt? Who is prepared to let them get hurt? Who is prepared to let them get hurt? Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is, all I am saying is that if this government was prepared, if this government is prepared to give back to the people of Manitoba \$28 million of taxation, then for God's sakes give it back to them. Don't bullshit them into giving it back to them, don't put out a bunch of newspaper ads, don't hire a bunch of actors to act it out for them on TV; give it back to them. You don't have to, you don't have to - you know, where's all this--you know, you've talked to me, Mr. Speaker, I've been accused of acting, but, Mr. Speaker, this government not only acts but they hire them professionally to act out their government policies on TV. About how the little girl dusts off the chair and wipes her brow and says, "Now a message from the Minister of Finance. And I've just got, I've just got my \$100 tax rebate, aren't they fine fellows." Well my goodness gracious, my goodness gracious. Mr. Speaker, it's a tragedy. --(Interjection)--

Well my Honourable Member from Morris has just come to my aid and he says that it's something that I should put on the record. It's entitled the Gonick Thesis or the Member from Crescentwood's thesis. It is simply this: "When the government passes consumer legislation or raises corporate income taxes in order to lower medicare premiums and the corporations pass on the additional cost of such government action to the consumers in the form of higher prices, in the end the consumer ends up paying the shot, no matter how much the government strives to redistribute income." So, Mr. Speaker, from the oracle, from the words of their prophet, whom they have convinced that he should temporarily leave them during the course of this election, because of possible election embarrassment, who I'm sure we'll see much more of should that undesirable event occur as this government should come back, but nonetheless who has temporarily left us, there is the words from none other than the prophet on high.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me end with one another prophet whom I happen to have even greater respect and regard for, and that is none other than the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who has stated in this House that no matter what government does, if we double production, if we double the gross national product, if we double wages, if we do whatever, but if in the end result we haven't basically improved the lot of the 25 or 30 percent of our poor then I have done nothing. And I'm paraphrasing loosely a speech that he made in this House.

Mr. Speaker, he made that speech in '68. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Barber Report issued after three or four years of administration of this government essentially substantiates what the then Member for Inkster and now Minister and House Leader of this government said in 1968, that they've done nothing. And of course, Mr. Speaker, that is the real tragedy of my socialist friends opposite. They have nothing to offer, they have nothing to offer the poor and the underprivileged. All they have, all they have to do is to tear down and to pull down those who have achieved something, whereas, Mr. Speaker, I aspire to nobler hopes. I honestly hope that it would be my good fortune to create the kind of society where we can all aspire to better things rather than be pulled down to the common denominator that is all that a socialist government can offer its people; all a socialist government has ever offered its people here, other countries and ever will. Because Mr. Speaker, essentially they're

BILL 61

(MR. ENNS cont'd) bereft of spirit, they're bereft of imagination and they're bereft of belief.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to speak for a few minutes. The honourable member has --(Interjection)-- Well I promised my colleague that I will only speak for a few minutes. The honourable member paraphrased me and he is in the right track but not exactly so.

The figures that the previous administration previously used to cite were retail sales, GNP, other economic industries - manufactured goods, exports, things of that nature. And I said that if you doubled the GNP and if you increased the export, if you increased your manufactured items by double, if you did all those things but you did not improve the general well-being of the people of the Province of Manitoba, then those figures meant nothing. Now if you double wages, if you double wages and left the 25 percent poor in a position where they're still poor, I think that would be dreadful, but you would have increased the lot of some people and I really am only saying this, not for the purpose of challenging the honourable member. Well the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Leader of the Opposition is shaking his head. There really isn't a great deal of difference in sympathy because I would accept the honourable member's statement that if you double the lot of the top 75 percent of the population and left the other 25 percent where they are I would consider that horrendous, and I would say that if we did that that would be a terrible thing and probably I would be just as upset with that kind of result as the result I spoke of in 1968. But if the honourable member wants to know what I said in '68, it was that the economic indices that if they all increased and none of those economic industries resulted in better housing, better health care, better education, people being better fed, people being better clothed, that that would mean nothing to me. I would feel that I have not done anything as a member of a government. And therefore although there's not a great deal of difference I think the honourable member should be at least be aware of what I did say.

The other point that I wish to make is that I believe that substantially the position that he has put with regard to taxation is correct. I repeated on numerous occasions that changes in taxation ultimately do not effectively redistribute wealth. That those people who have the power, who are in positions of power, who are in positions where they now are able to avoid taxes, if you increase the taxes on them, such as doctors, such as lawyers, and to get down to it, such as plumbers, such as field workers, that if their taxes go up at the next round of negotiations the first thing that they will get is that they will go back to their net pay position. I said that, I repeat it, I have always believed it. I have never considered taxation measures to be the effective way of distributing. But that doesn't mean that when you're looking at one tax form as against another you do not try to choose the best form; and it also doesn't mean that there isn't some change and that there has to at least be an adjustment in terms of the economic status quo asserting itself before that change is effective.

So that essentially what the honourable member says in that respect - he doesn't necessarily have to quote the Honourable Member for Crescentwood as an oracle and say that they have to get rid of him in order to keep that kind of talk out, because if they had to do that they have to do that with the Minister of Mines and Resources as well, and so far I am still on the government benches, have been nominated, will participate, will be participating in the next election, although the position with . . .

A MEMBER: No question about that.

MR. GREEN: . . . regard to the position with regard to taxation I really think that those who believe - and there are many who do - that you can effectively redistribute wealth by taxation are really barking up the wrong tree. You can do something, but you cannot effectively redistribute wealth. I know that when I was a lawyer . . .

A MEMBER: When you were a lawyer?

MR. GREEN: When I was a lawyer, a practising lawyer, if the government decided that they wanted to tax me a little more it just meant that I had to tax my clients a little more, because I didn't want to live any less good than I lived the day before they levied those taxations. And the same is true with people in positions of power.

Now for the honourable member to take those two propositions, which I essentially agree with although the first in a little different sense, and say that means that we have done nothing

BILL 61

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . is not correct. Because the New Democratic Party in four years in power has done more to effectively make a move in the direction of changing the economic status quo than any government I think in the North American Continent. That the fact is that the change in the economic status quo that resulted from 35 to 40 million dollars of automobile insurance premiums coming into the public realm as against the private realm was a very effective change in the status quo. That the provision by this government of nursing home services on a fairly universal basis to all of the people in this province is an effective change in the status quo. And my honourable friend should understand that when he talks about poverty. And I believe that he and I are not much different in this respect. Poverty means that you can't get things, and when there was only a select part of the population that was entitled to an education and they brought in universal education, they effectively dealt with poverty. When it was in fact that only a certain people could get health care, and I told my honourable friend that when I was a child, the fact is that I would not go to a doctor, although I had broken a knee cap playing rugby, because I knew that that was a terrible expense, and I hobbled around with it for two days, not going to a doctor, and when it was a case that no person need worry about the individual expense of getting health care, that is an effective attack on poverty, and the difference between you people and us is that you people have always opposed those things. You opposed universal education, you opposed universal hospitalization, you opposed universal medicare. I hear you making different statements now with regard to pharmacare and with regard to nursing homes, and I am really pleased to hear it, because in the last analysis I don't care who does it but the fact is that you opposed each of these things. You opposed Workmen's Compensation on the basis that it was an interference with private insurance, and you can go historically through the debates, and if it wasn't you it was your cousins; because it might not have been the Progressive Conservative Party led by the Honourable Member for River Heights, but it was that part of the political spectrum and there is then and there has always been and there will continue to be that part of the political spectrum which says that it is the responsibility of the people through their elected representatives to try to see to it that the goods and services that we all produce are equitably distributed, and there are those who say that that is not the job of the government. You people are on that side, I'm on this side, and we have more of a chance of doing something about poverty than you have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside have a question?

MR. ENNS: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would answer me whether or not he considers it a viable and possible suggestion that it was possible, or that he would have taxed the people of Altona for a national or a provincial medicare scheme when there were no roads, no means of transportation, never mind a doctor, nor a hospital, in that community to provide it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: There is a difference of opinion in priorities. --(Interjection)-- Yes. When the Honourable Member for Rhineland, when the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who is a drain Socialist and a damn Socialist, says that it is important to collect public revenue to provide drains so that lands will be healthy, and there are at the same time in our society sick children who have to be made healthy, and I have a choice of providing the money for the drains or providing the money for the children - both of them are socialism in his term and in your term. My terms, as you know, I don't speak in those terms, But both of them are socialism in your term and in his term, and I say that all that we are talking about is priorities, and I have always been of the opinion that the priorities are for people and not for property, and that is really the difference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well just one final question Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister would permit. The point of my questioning is, would he concede that it was perhaps not feasible or possible to introduce a medicare scheme 97 years ago, or an auto insurance scheme 93 years ago? The point being is that --(Interjection)--

MR. GREEN: . . . like the mutual admiration society, I have respect for the honourable member and he has respect for me. He is avoiding the argument. The fact is that in each case, when these things were opposed, they were not opposed on the basis of them being priorities; they were opposed philosophically. You people said not that you can't afford them, you said that they were wrong. You said that it was contrary to the freedom of the individual. You said that it was dictator . . . --(Interjection)-- Now the honourable member says who put

BILL 61

(MR. GREEN cont'd) it in? He knows that his leader stood here, Walter Weir stood - Mr. Speaker, Walter Weir --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will accept the fact that they were forced to put it in, if the honourable member will accept the fact that his premier of the province said that he was so much against this program that he was going to sue the Federal Government --(Interjection)-- he and the premier, the former premier of Alberta - Premier Manning. They were going to get together and sue the Federal Government for encroaching on the freedom of the individuals which would be encroached on by making a fund whereby everybody who was sick would be able to go to a doctor and have society pay. They opposed it not on the basis of whether they could afford it; they opposed it philosophically; they said it was wrong. They said it was dictatorship; they said it was socialism; they said it was the - what did the Member for Fort Garry --(Interjection)-- the jackboots, and they will continue to say it, and that's the difference. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that the debate be adjourned on Bill 61 -

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call the concurrence motion please.

. continued on next page

CONCURRENCE - EDUCATION

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. We are on Education. The Honourable Minister of Education has five minutes left.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker. At the time of adjournment, at the time of adjournment, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to you the state of affairs with respect to the alleged teacher's guide that the honourable member for Riel made reference to and I had intended to spend the remaining portion of my time dealing with another branch of my department. However . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: However, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- However, Mr. Speaker, I did notice, I did notice in tonight's paper a report of a meeting attended by the Honourable Member for Riel, and namely his nomination meeting, and it's rather interesting that at that meeting in an attempt to appeal for the support of his constituents, he did not make any reference to the platform of his political party, to the program of his political party, but rather to smear, deceit, falsehood, such as he demonstrated in this House last night. That was what he based his nomination campaign on.

Mr. Speaker, you know after reading that story I felt that perhaps I ought to ask the honourable member for an apology but on second thought, maybe I won't, maybe I won't, because I seem to recall that in 1969 there was only a difference of how many votes? Just a handful, 25, whatever. In other words, if the scales tip 13, 14 votes the other way, and I'm sure that in that manner the electors of Riel constituency will demonstrate to the Honourable Member just exactly what they think of that type of approach to politicking. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, rather there was comments made about the Planning and Research Branch of the Department of Education, and the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie made a comparison of the expenditures. He went back to 1968 and quoted a figure down something in the order of \$40,000 and attempted to compare that with the amount spent today. Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies whatsoever for the increase in expenditures in the Planning and Research Branch of the Department of Education. If the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, who prides himself in being such an expert in financial matters, if he'd referred to the report of the department and turned to Page 34, and I'm not going to take the remainder of my five minutes reading that portion of it to him, I presume that he can read, and if he and the Honourable Member for Arthur who is on his feet, for what purpose I do not know -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member state his point of order?

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Point of order. We were assured by the First Minister that the Minister of Education would get up and he would give us a full explanation on the document that was presented by the Member for Riel last night, and he said . . .

--(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. ORDER, Order Please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. The Honourable Minister continue. He has two minutes left.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, all I wish to do is refer the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to pages, 34, 35, 36, 37, and there he will find explained in detail the programs that are taken by the Planning and Research Branch and read it and --(Interjection)-- had you handled the estimates debate differently there would have been ample time for me to explain to you even in ten times the detail what we did, and you know it. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker in any department, in any department, an attack, an attack on the Planning and Research Branch, that's fair game, that's fair ball, that's the one, that's the most sensitive branch of any department, and this any minister can expect, one heading any department having a Planning and Research Branch, or Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet. But, Mr. Speaker, when members of opposition, when they resort to attacking individuals, when they resort to attacking individuals who do not have the right to stand up in this House to defend themselves, well that's stooping about as low as one can possibly stoop, Mr. Speaker, if not lower.

And I just wish to in the closing few moments, in the closing few moments, Mr. Speaker, the question was asked about the role of Planning and Research Department, that it appeared to encroach upon the role of other branches, far from it. In fact, the function of a Planning and Research Branch is quite the opposite and it has demonstrated that, that it is not to encroach upon the function of other branches but rather to supplement, to assist and to enrich,

CONCURRENCE

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) and make all the entire operation of the Department of Education more effective, and as the requests that we receive from the various school divisions indicate.

One further question, Mr. Speaker, and I will take my seat, asked of me by the Honourable Member, the lead-off man in Education --(Interjection)-- no, no, the Honourable Member for Roblin, Roblin - yes, yes, and he asked me, is staff of Planning and Research political? Of course they're political, and they're political in this sense that they can respond to the philosophy of government and translate it into meaningful programs for implementation of my department, and in that sense they are political. You're damned right they're political in that sense.

Are they qualified? The NDP senators? Yes, they're qualified; everyone is a professional. Everyone is a professional in his particular discipline. And when Planning and Research . . .

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

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed a rather agitated performance on the part of the Minister who normally doesn't become that agitated, and one can only speculate as to the reasons why he becomes so excited, and becomes so disturbed over the comments that were made by my colleague the Member for Riel the other night.

It was an interesting spectacle, Sir, when the Member for Riel was revealing the contents of that document, the hurried caucuses that were being held on the other side of the House; and the Watergate document, the one that was tabled in the House here last night, my honourable friend knows very well the one I'm speaking of, the Political Studies 201, Teachers Guide, and I hereafter, Sir, will refer to it as the "Document", so that my honourable friend will know whereof I'm speaking.

But the --(Interjection)-- well it was prepared by the staff of the Minister. It was prepared by the staff of the Minister; if you want to call it a Garbage Document you're perfectly willing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware whether the Honourable Member was in his seat this morning. Perhaps he was not, but at that time I did indicate while speaking in this Chamber, in my seat, that that document was not prepared by a member of my staff, that that document does not express the views of the Department of Education, and I regret that the honourable member did not hear or had forgotten that I had made the statement, but that was the statement that I had made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: It would be rather interesting, Sir, to know where it came from. It came out of the Minister's department, and it's rather - this is rather interesting, now the Minister denies parenthood of this document. He tries to tell us that he was nowhere around when it was prepared, and yet the hurried caucuses that were being held during the time that the Member for Riel was speaking indicates that he knew something about it, and so they threw the member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, hurriedly into the breach, and the contents of his remarks simply were to repeat, in detail, the entire document that was tabled and to suggest that, why it was a very simple thing. All you had to do was take the opposite view of whatever was contained in it herein, and then you had the answer to all of the arguments. That was the answer, Sir. Then we had the member for St. Matthews who rose in his place, and quite rightfully said that the teachers in this province are not so ignorant that they couldn't recognize garbage when they saw it, and I agree with that. So why the Hell was it prepared in the first place, if all the teachers recognize that? That's the same position that was taken by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the teachers had a lot more sense than to pay attention to this kind of garbage, and my experience with the teachers in the area that I come from would justify that position, and would certainly justify the position that was taken by those two members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the matter of privilege is this, and I repeat again, that whatever it is that the honourable member is referring to was nothing which was in

CONCURRENCE

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) any way circulated for the teachers to follow or to pay any attention to, or as any directive to any teacher, and it really shocks me that it's so damnably difficult for the honourable member to accept the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: You'll recognize, Sir, that that is in no way a question of privilege or a point of order, or anything of that nature.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. JORGENSON: What the Minister is attempting to do is to convince me of that which I know to be otherwise. And I don't care what he says. And I don't care what he says, Sir, because we had another document that was revealed, we had another document that was revealed some time ago and that was the Guidelines for the Seventies, and we saw it in its original form and they said, well you know there's nobody here but us chickens. We never prepared that sort of thing. We wouldn't even think about that. But it finally did come out didn't it? But it came out in its purified form; it came out censored; it came out in much cleaner language and a little more obscure. It was a lot more difficult to find fault with it after it had been sterified and purified by those who were given that responsibility.

Now we have another one and I suspect that it won't be very long before we'll have that in a more--in a purer form so that it won't look so that it won't look as though it was prepared by socialists. It seems that the government has a habit of doing those things. The government has a habit of trying to pretend that which they are not. If they are afraid and ashamed of socialism, then why are they there? They're trying to convince the people of this country that they're not socialists, not really, not really, because they know if they admit that, as the Member for Crescentwood was honest enough to do, they won't get elected. So they're like the fellow walking into the beer parlour backwards to try and convince his wife that he's just coming out. And that's been a typical tactic of this government, and particular its Leader, particularly its Leader, who tries to convince the people of this province that he is something that he isn't. And, Sir, we've seen too much of that nonsense in this House, and we've seen too much of that nonsense across this province to be fooled again by the words of the Minister who is trying to convince us that this document is something that it isn't.

Sir, then we had that performance on the part of the Minister of Labour last night. You know the arm waving and shouting and rearing was a sight to behold, and somehow or other during the shouting, it was very difficult to understand what the Minister of Labour was saying, but he seemed to have something against somebody called Rasputin, but he never, he never did tell us in what school division that Rasputin was teaching, so we weren't sure, we couldn't relate it to the subject that was under discussion at the time. And I wish the Minister of Labour was in his seat now so perhaps he could tell us that Rasputin was one of those teachers that he has been - for some reason or other, has found some reason to be opposed to.

Well now, Sir, the Minister, the Minister went on to say, and I commend him, I commend him for a policy of attempting, attempting to encourage students to learn more about our system of government, a policy that is worth pursuing, and I commend him for initiating, and I think he said there are four or five pilot projects going out throughout this province, and I'm one that has believed for a long time that more of that should be done. But, Sir, if they're going to teach students the elements and the principles of democracy, how constitutional government works, and things like that, then I think those who are doing the teaching should know a little bit about the subject themselves. And it's been my experience, Sir, that - and I've had the privilege of taking a number of classes. I make it a point of doing that in the high schools throughout my constituency for that very purpose, to discuss with the students just the role of government and the role of parliament. There's a lot of people who seem to confuse the two but in my view they're two separate roles and they should be understood. They should be understood in order to be appreciated and in order for students to know just how they can use them. And I think that any effort that is made to encourage students to learn more about their system is a worthwhile project that should be given a great deal of attention to.

But, Sir, in this document, the Teachers Guide, if, as the Minister says, they're going to attempt to direct their thoughts, they're going to attempt to teach them to think for themselves and to learn about government, then why, Sir, don't they use Canadian examples? Why don't they use an example of the Canadian system of government, because that's the one that in all probability they'll be using. Then why don't they --(Interjection)--Well I was here this

CONCURRENCE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) morning, Sir. I was here this morning, Sir, and I listened very carefully, and I listened very carefully to what the Minister was saying during the raucous interjections of the members from his own side of the House, who are also interjecting now. It doesn't really matter who speaks, they, you know, they haven't learned the good manners to sit down and listen to what somebody is saying, even their own Minister, and I listened very carefully to what the Minister was saying because I am very interested in this particular subject. But I'm saying that if they're going to introduce those subjects into our schools, and if they're going to teach the students a little bit more about Canadian system of government, as I believe they should because that's the system we hope they'll be living under. We hope that they remain in Canada and stay Canadians. Well then why don't they use the examples that are here in Canada? Why don't they use the political parties that are in existence in Canada? --(Interjection)-- Well then what's this garbage all about? What's all this garbage about? The Nazi Platform. They talk about teaching the students ideology, ideology. What's the Nazi platform? What kind of an ideology is that that he--they'll find out about it. --(Interjection)-- The Regina Manifesto. Guidelines for the Seventies. Is that an ideology? Guidelines for the Seventies? The Communist Manifesto. I recognize that as an ideology, and here you have the Guidelines for the Seventies tucked neatly in between the Regina Manifesto and the Communist Manifesto. And, Sir, they try to tell us, they try to tell us, Sir, that they're doing nothing more than teaching Canadian parliamentary government to the students. Sir, if that is the case then why are these suggestions contained in this report? Why, Sir, as my friend from Riel said, are there not suggestions of a nature that will give to the students an idea of the total political spectrum in this country? --(Interjection)-- The Minister--I have never seen the Minister so agitated and he has - he has finally come to life. Well the Minister makes reflections on about other people who cannot read. Maybe the Minister might be interested in hearing some of the comments that I hear about him from teachers throughout this province. And I won't repeat them, I won't repeat them for his benefit, I can tell you that.

Sir, in a rather interesting episode the Minister of Education who now claims that he has had nothing to do with this document, that there are other documents, and I presume now that there's going to be a disclaiming on his part that he--the Planning and Research Department have had nothing to do with this thing - Media of Teacher Information User Manual. Well, Sir, have you ever gone through this thing?

A MEMBER: He can't even read it.

MR. JORGENSON: You talk about garbage. This Planning and Research Department is obviously there for the purpose of giving a few people an opportunity of shuffling papers, and if there ever was an example of a useless exercise it is the filling out of this Teacher Information User Manual. You can't even read the writing on it. And if one was to calculate the man hours that are required by each teacher to fill out that stupid document it would, it would be incredible, the waste of teachers' time filling out junk like this for what purpose? No other purpose that we can see, Sir, than to give some people jobs.

Sir, I placed a question on the Order Paper at the beginning of this session asking the government to advise me how many people, in what categories, had been appointed outside the regular Civil Service examinations. Sir, I won't get an answer to that question, although the government accepted it, and that is another example of the hypocrisy of a government that says, oh yes we'll do something, when they know full well they never have any intention of filling out that Order for Return. Because that Order for Return will be a little bit too revealing, a little bit too revealing. Sir, I asked for information which I thought would be very simple to provide. I asked for the names of the executive assistants the first day that this House met. I still haven't got that. This is the kind of a government, Sir, that --(Interjection)-- yah, where are they going? Are they moving so fast into the civil service that it's difficult to keep track of them? What's the reason for all this secrecy from a government that claims to be so open? Sir, we've had too many examples. They stand here and they holler "smear" and "innuendo" every time one rises in his place to criticize them. I know, I know what they mean by opposition because the Minister of Mines and Resources has indicated what he means when he says we should have opposition in this place. What he means when he wants opposition is that we should urge the government to spend more of the taxpayer's dollar; we should urge the government to move faster and further into the socialist state. That to them is opposition. If you reject that, if you reject that; if you happen to criticize them for moving in that direction, because if you

CONCURRENCE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) believe that it's wrong, as I believe that it is, then you're smearing; then that's the sort of thing that must not be done because that is smear and that is innuendo. What a conglomeration of honourable gentlemen. Sir, this province has never seen the like of gentlemen opposite, and God forbid that after the next election we won't see them again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolution passed? The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, at the outset may I indicate my surprise at the revelations of the last few days, especially in the area of education, and as one who is somewhat familiar with the present course in History 201 I must confess that I find this kind of document interesting and no doubt a far departure from the present course that is outlined. I understand the Minister to say that this has not yet been mailed to the schools, and I hope that before it is mailed to the schools that definitely it be reconsidered.

Well now the Minister argues that because I wasn't here I didn't know what he said. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I have been hearing the Minister so long that right now I wonder if it matters what he said because, Mr. Speaker, let me be very plain. I said in this House last year that I had absolutely no confidence in his administration, and if anything, Mr. Speaker, I have less now. And so what he said, or says, to me is not terribly valuable because I don't really know the meaning of it in the true sense. And so let me question the fact that this piece of information has not yet reached the schools. Let me question, why? Let me also question, when will it? Let me also question, Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of it in the first place if it was not designed to reach the schools and the teachers of History 201. --(Interjection)-- I would like to terminate if I could. I won't be very long and I'll be glad to entertain your question after.

Now I would like to talk a bit about changes that have occurred, or changes that have not occurred in the area of curriculum. If this is the kind of change that we are going to be headed for, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that maybe the no change that we have had has been the good thing. Because in the area of curriculum, and let me tell the Minister of Mines as well - I might tell the Minister of Mines that in the area of curriculum the last four years have been years of stagnation. They have been years of stagnation in spite of the grandiose speeches of the past Minister and this Minister that, you know, it's important that we treat students differently, that we respect their intelligence, that we bring a more questioning kind of a curriculum forward. And what have we done? We have lived with the status quo. We haven't really changed the curriculum to any extent compared to the changes in curriculum that were done in the previous five years.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Yes. Around 1969 particularly in the field of history many of the courses had just newly been introduced, granted under your administration. Now is it not customary when one introduces courses that they be tried out at least for a number of years in order to determine whether they're good courses?

MR. GIRARD: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. You see the problem is that the honourable gentleman who was a history teacher is familiar with the history curriculum, and I'm not speaking of the history curriculum only, I'm speaking as an administrator who's had the view of all the curriculum, and I suggest to you that while there were changes in history, while there was changes in history in 1969, there, you know, there are many courses, many courses, where we're using textbooks that were used some ten years ago. And I suggest to you that that is not good enough. Not that I mean that a textbook must be changed. I think the curriculum has to be modernized or reoriented very much more than it is being oriented. And let me be more specific for the edification of my friend. I would like to suggest to you that over the years we have attempted to teach languages in our public school system, and the objective was quite honourable. What we wanted to do was give students an opportunity to learn a language other than their native language; and in some schools we taught Ukrainian; and in some schools we taught German; and in most schools we taught French; and there was a time when we even taught Latin. And as we see the graduate pour through after the 12 years of schooling, we find Grade 12 students who have spent some 8 or 9 years studying French, who have achieved good marks in their examinations, who have qualified for university entrance, who by our own system have been certified as graduated, and yet have no means of oral communication in that language. And I say why is it that if our objective is to graduate students who for all intents and purposes

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) could be multi-linguistic if not bilingual, we have failed, And we have failed because, in my view, we lack the imagination in the designing of curriculum, in the use of hardware materials, in the use of teacher technique, we have not given the kind of leadership in that area of education, in that area of curriculum alone. There has been no change in the last four years in the French program. We're using some of the books that were used years ago, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that we're sleeping at the switch. Our curriculum revision in the past four years has been insignificant for a government that spoke of how high their ideals were and how they were going to renovate in education. I find it a little surprising.

I take another example. We talked in the early sessions of 1969 of religious instructions in schools, and I pointed out at that time that I felt that teaching of religion, not indoctrination, but teaching of religion as a subject, as a history, as a group of ideologies, was creditable, honourable, and should be recognized as a credit in schools. I have said that, and the then Minister of Education agreed, applauded, and the present Minister agrees fully. What have we done? Nothing. What have we done? Nothing. --(Interjection)-- Well he told us this morning Mr. Speaker, some four years later when there's an election coming up, we need something that might sound good, and consequently we're telling this morning -- I say you should have told us that three years ago. In fact you should have done that three years ago. Not now. But it only points out to a further, a further kind of suggestion that I wanted to make --(Interjection)-- Well I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if I should counteract that kind of suggestion of the ready-made courses because that is repulsive to me and I don't think that is the kind of thing that I would like to be advocating.

A MEMBER: We agree with that.

MR. GIRARD: I think that there is room in the present curriculum to look at different courses, courses different from the courses that are taught today. I think we're a little bit hidebound in our school system by which we stay with, you know, the English and the mathematics and the science and the French, or whatever, and we have lacked innovativeness in designing courses, matters of very great interests to students today, but they'll never find in their curriculum. If they're going to learn anything about that they'll have to learn it outside of school. Now granted you can't teach everything in school, but I would suppose that searching kind of subjects, such as the different values that people place upon different things in different areas --(Interjection)-- different ideologies if you will. Yes, I grant it, different ideologies. But where I stop, Mr. Speaker, is when it becomes indoctrination rather than educating. And as I read the document that the Minister of Mines would like to justify, I say, Sir, that this is indoctrination if it's followed. I say that this is indoctrination if it's followed, and the Mines Minister would vote against this I'm sure if he were consistent with his stand on aid to private schools for the same reason. --(Interjection)-- That's right. I have a great deal more confidence in the teachers that were on my staff than I've ever had in the Minister of Education.

It's a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, when one has spent some time in education to find that probably the most consistent thing in curriculum is that little bit outlined at the beginning of every program which sets out the objectives of the course. And it's a little bit annoying to me to find that teachers, and you might say I'm critical of teachers which would be true, to find that teachers too often use the cook book approach. They turn the page to the part that says objectives; they use last year's notes, and they follow through. I would like to see a system that gives credit, that gives encouragement to teachers who wish to be innovative. I would even go further. I appreciate very much the university out-course outlines where teachers at the university level, where professors have a great deal to say in designing their own courses. While I can see some very serious downfalls in authorizing teachers to design their own courses, and I grant you that a good deal of study and supervision has to be exercised. However in my view it would be profitable to both the students and the teachers if we could see our educational system go in that direction.

Let me talk a bit about education finance. This is an area of course that has been of some degree of annoyance to me, and what annoys me even more, Mr. Speaker, is to find the Minister in a seemingly arrogant fashion ignore the fact that the problem exists, and when I asked the Minister, why is it that the Winnipeg School Division was able to spend last year \$925.00 per pupil while the rest of the world paid - or the rest of Manitoba at least - paid some \$650.00 per pupil, well he said, "maybe it's because there's a difference in the tax base." And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister was absolutely right but he hasn't done a thing about

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) it. He hasn't done a thing about it. He says, and the Premier says, oh, we have equalized to a maximum tune of some \$21.00 per pupil - an insignificant effort in terms of equalization. But I'll tell you one thing they've done, Mr. Speaker, they have seen fit instead of equalizing opportunity of education in Manitoba, to give tax rebates. They've seen fit to spend money in giving tax rebates rather than increasing the grants where grants are needed. And if you go on to the next step and ask yourself well why, I can't but think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister at least, or if not, the government, someone has deducted and may-be quite wisely that they're more votes to be gotten by paying rebates than doing what's right in education. And I deplore that kind of administration.

Let's look at matters of band-aid approach in education finance. We found a situation in Ninette where the people of Ninette appealed to the Minister and said, Well look if you don't build a school we'll operate our own. The Minister of course can't stand this kind of public pressure so he says, well now we'll give you these additional grants -- and by the way he denied in the House one day that additional grants were paid to Ninette. That's quite true, it was paid to the school division and not Ninette, but I say that kind of evasiveness is bordering on dishonest and deception. Because additional grants were in fact paid for the purpose of helping the Ninette people operate a school smaller than what was considered a viable size.

And then of course we have another problem in the northern area. I can't think offhand of the --(Interjection)-- Yes, I believe it was Camperville. And a problem erupted, which was really not a financial problem although it erupted in an area that has very serious financial problems, and the Minister said, well in that case you need additional grants, and he again came to the rescue. We'll feed you Xnumber of teacher grants, or this here, or that there.

And then the next one in line is Sprague, Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we've heard of that place before. So they come in to see the Minister and the Minister hangs on and he says, well we'll look into it, and so on. And I have a sneaking suspicion that if the election is called in June we should have an announcement soon that maybe Sprague will be eligible as well for a few additional grants.

But what have we done in the process. What we have done, Mr. Speaker, is recognize that there is a problem and say to the rest of Manitoba, we don't care to do anything about it, and that I place the responsibility at the foot of the Minister. He has a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to update the kind of Foundation Program to equalize educational opportunities in Manitoba, and to see to it that the students of the remote, isolated, low-assessed areas have the same opportunity of education as elsewhere, as much as can be provided by money. That was the philosophy of the past Conservative government in education but it isn't the philosophy of the present government in education. And I'm suggesting to you that this business of bringing politics into the administration of school affairs is unfortunate. We can talk about inequalities of opportunity; we speak in Winnipeg about day care centres, and we speak about pre-kindergarten and we think of funding possibly the youngsters who are in Grade 4, but in most rural communities kindergarten is impossible, kindergarten's impossible. And we say, well Winnipeg has \$925.00 per pupil to spend, and I ask the Minister, and I asked the Minister at one time, why is it that we can afford \$925.00 in Winnipeg and we can only afford \$650.00 in the rural communities? His answer was, Winnipeg has some special problems, you know, and I recognize that Winnipeg has some special problems. The problems they have are just as special, just as common as those of the rural community. The only problem, if we want to be honest about it, the only problem is the fact that Winnipeg has the finances to look after the special problems and the rest of Manitoba doesn't.

A MEMBER: Amen.

MR. GIRARD: And therefore we have inequality and we have a Minister who seems to be not the least bit interested in equalizing opportunity of students across the province.

Let me talk a bit about the administration of the government vis-a-vis the Department of Education. We have a lot of people in the Department of Education, whom I congratulate for doing very excellent work, but I would suggest to you, as I suggested last year, that the morale in the Department of Education has never been as low as it is now to my knowledge. And when I pointed out this to the past Minister, he denied it vehemently, and I say it again, I say that the morale of the civil servants, and especially the senior civil servants, at the Department of Education has never been this low. And you ask, why? Why is it this way? And I suggest to you that it is because the government has seen fit to select and appoint from outside of the civil

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) service people whom they could identify as "their" people, place them at the Department of Education, ignored seniority, placed those people in areas of importance, and ignored the structure that was. I have to take with a grain of salt, Mr. Speaker, the Minister's suggestion that everybody in Planning and Priorities is a professional. I challenge your statement. I challenge your statement, Sir, because I do not agree that everyone in Planning and Priorities, and I challenge that statement. --(Interjection)-- Well again I'll admit that many of them are professionals possibly outside of the field of education. I suggest to you -- my challenge is that some of them are not professionals. However I see it amusing, I see it amusing, Mr. Speaker, that the proportion of non-teachers in Planning and Priorities is quite surprising. You find people who are not at all related to the area of teaching making some pretty important decisions to the academic community. --(Interjection)-- And I suggest again --(Interjection)-- Yes, and let me talk a little more of planning and research. Let me talk about the projects that you were so eagerly displaying a while ago, and did you read the report? I read the report. I'm a little familiar with some of the programs. Let me talk a little bit about your success with the IMPACT Program, and I tried hard to get answers from both the Ministers on the IMPACT Program, and the Minister's refused to give any meaningful answers. You know, we'll tell you in the due course of time, sort of answer. The IMPACT Program is designed to service a segment of our community, granted that should be serviced, using as much as possible people who are trained to teach to those particular ethnic people, those minority groups, and from that point of view I would encourage you. I think it is fine to find native people as teachers; it's essential that we get those people. But what I don't like, what I don't like, Mr. Speaker, is to find that in that very program where we wanted to do something that was right, we flouted what used to be respected as the teaching profession. Because what we have done was chosen, we have chosen people with a Grade 9 for example, and we said, we are going to make teachers out of this particular person because of his background. And I suggest to you that that is not quite enough. That is not enough, and it is not surprising that the Winnipeg Teachers' Association was not very helpful or co-operative in organizing that particular program, because I wouldn't have either. I think it shows a lack of confidence in what teachers should be.

Now having said that, I must admit that I realize that I was really talking to the wrong minister but I wanted to say that at this point because it is related to that one point I asked the question, and we didn't seem to know who was in charge of certification, and these people might well be under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Universities and Colleges, but the Minister of Education is in charge of certification and he'll be providing them with a teaching certificate at the end of that particular training program, and I doubt, I doubt that we will see a special kind of certificate - it will be the common certificate.

Let me talk about further administration at the department level. It used to be when I was superintendent of schools, that we had a system by which we planned additions to the schools, we planned new buildings, and so on, and we got some very concrete suggestions and sound advice from what was known as the Education Finance Committee, as well as the Building Committee, but I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, and surely the Minister can clarify it for me, I have a feeling that those committees have by and large lost their authority. I suggest to you that by now Planning and Research are basing their suggestions of where buildings and expansions will take place far more on population trends. As a matter of fact, there was even a suggestion that towns with less than X number of population will not warrant additional buildings. That I thought was an acknowledgment of the depopulation of the rural community, without wanting to do anything about it. Something that is not strange. If you would like to do something worthwhile in the area of education that would be applauded, I'm sure, I would like to see one group being recognized and granted for in our schools that have not been granted yet, and that is the librarian. It is rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that we see fit in our system, we see fit to establish a school with 500 or 600 or 800 students but we don't think that there ought to be a librarian - I sometimes wonder if we think there should be a library. We haven't increased library grants for probably the past 15 years. We haven't seen fit to recognize that a school should have a librarian, and yet, you know, we are the clear thinkers, the innovators in the area of education. --(Interjection)-- Yes I will.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would like to ask the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, in his professional capacity as an administrator, would he recommend teacher librarians or library technicians?

CONCURRENCE

MR. GIRARD: I would recommend first of all - let's clarify - I would recommend first of all librarians, and by that I don't mean teachers. I am not recommending that what we need is a teacher, necessarily doing - but we must have librarians. However, I think that we have to recognize one other factor. We talk about that as sheer academic qualifications but you recognize, I'm sure, as well as I, that whoever is going to be a librarian in a school must have more than academic qualifications because she will have to handle, or she will have to supervise, or deal with students on a day-long basis, and that's where a person would be ideally suited if she had both.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to chastise the Minister, to some degree at least, in his dealing with the Teachers Retirement Pension Bill. I have stood in the House and asked about that bill some five or ten times. When will it be introduced? Will it be introduced? And in his same arrogant way, he continually said, in the due course of time, maybe we'll see, but while that is going on there are teachers in our school divisions who are scratching their head and wondering, now, will that teacher be with us next year or won't she be? Should I teach next year or should I retire? The Minister in a callous way seems to have totally forgotten that there are people involved who are dependent on that legislation, and for his own, I don't know - for his own glory, I suppose, he seems to want to sit on that kind of answer until he arouses everybody and says well we're waiting on you, Sir, then he might give us the answer. And I suggest to you that it's your own shortcomings if - it's the Minister's own shortcoming if he is going to administer it that way. I think that there should either be a good reason why it isn't done, or else it should have been done.

We are going in a direction that is a little bit different in our school financing, as I mentioned awhile ago. We have now gone to a system which recognizes per student grants, and I see some advantages, Mr. Speaker, in going in that direction, and I said that some years ago, but I suggest that if we go too far in that direction that you might as well forget the Foundation Program completely and go to straight per student grant, because there comes a time when the other areas funded by the Foundation Program lag so far behind that the Foundation Program itself is not meaningful. And I would urge the Minister to tread carefully when he changes the way of financing because he'll have to make his mind up at some point whether he respects the Foundation Program or whether he wishes to emasculate it totally as it is partially done already.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've been wanting to mention a few things on education for some time and I have regretted that the Minister had an excuse for not answering the question. He and I both knew full well that his estimates would never hit the floor of this House. I am sure that he was as convinced as I was, and yet he used that as an excuse for not answering the question. I am sorry that we haven't had a chance to look at the department carefully because we would have certainly cared to scrutinize it much more thoroughly. Yes, whose fault is it, Mr. Speaker? It might well be my fault as well as anybody else but the fact remains that we both knew it, and you hid behind it, and I didn't think that that was fair. I think it's a sign of a lack of confidence in administration, and I think it's regrettable that a Minister feels that he has to do that kind of thing. I know full well that the Minister of Mines and Resources would have answered the question as he saw fit whether his estimates were coming up or not, and so I can only say that in my view it's another area of competency that seems to show a little short coming.

Again with those remarks and the regret that we didn't have a chance to look at the estimates in full, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed.

MR. GREEN: Have we passed the resolution Mr. Speaker, so that there's no misunderstanding.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, when I start reading a second resolution we've gone past.

MR. GREEN: Thank you for your instruction, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Saturday)

CONCURRENCE

MR. GIRARD: I would recommend first of all - let's clarify - I would recommend first of all librarians, and by that I don't mean teachers. I am not recommending that what we need is a teacher, necessarily doing - but we must have librarians. However, I think that we have to recognize one other factor. We talk about that as sheer academic qualifications but you recognize, I'm sure, as well as I, that whoever is going to be a librarian in a school must have more than academic qualifications because she will have to handle, or she will have to supervise, or deal with students on a day-long basis, and that's where a person would be ideally suited if she had both.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to chastise the Minister, to some degree at least, in his dealing with the Teachers Retirement Pension Bill. I have stood in the House and asked about that bill some five or ten times. When will it be introduced? Will it be introduced? And in his same arrogant way, he continually said, in the due course of time, maybe we'll see, but while that is going on there are teachers in our school divisions who are scratching their head and wondering, now, will that teacher be with us next year or won't she be? Should I teach next year or should I retire? The Minister in a callous way seems to have totally forgotten that there are people involved who are dependent on that legislation, and for his own, I don't know - for his own glory, I suppose, he seems to want to sit on that kind of answer until he arouses everybody and says well we're waiting on you, Sir, then he might give us the answer. And I suggest to you that it's your own shortcomings if - it's the Minister's own shortcoming if he is going to administer it that way. I think that there should either be a good reason why it isn't done, or else it should have been done.

We are going in a direction that is a little bit different in our school financing, as I mentioned awhile ago. We have now gone to a system which recognizes per student grants, and I see some advantages, Mr. Speaker, in going in that direction, and I said that some years ago, but I suggest that if we go too far in that direction that you might as well forget the Foundation Program completely and go to straight per student grant, because there comes a time when the other areas funded by the Foundation Program lag so far behind that the Foundation Program itself is not meaningful. And I would urge the Minister to tread carefully when he changes the way of financing because he'll have to make his mind up at some point whether he respects the Foundation Program or whether he wishes to emasculate it totally as it is partially done already.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've been wanting to mention a few things on education for some time and I have regretted that the Minister had an excuse for not answering the question. He and I both knew full well that his estimates would never hit the floor of this House. I am sure that he was as convinced as I was, and yet he used that as an excuse for not answering the question. I am sorry that we haven't had a chance to look at the department carefully because we would have certainly cared to scrutinize it much more thoroughly. Yes, whose fault is it, Mr. Speaker? It might well be my fault as well as anybody else but the fact remains that we both knew it, and you hid behind it, and I didn't think that that was fair. I think it's a sign of a lack of confidence in administration, and I think it's regrettable that a Minister feels that he has to do that kind of thing. I know full well that the Minister of Mines and Resources would have answered the question as he saw fit whether his estimates were coming up or not, and so I can only say that in my view it's another area of competency that seems to show a little short coming.

Again with those remarks and the regret that we didn't have a chance to look at the estimates in full, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed.

MR. GREEN: Have we passed the resolution Mr. Speaker, so that there's no misunderstanding.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, when I start reading a second resolution we've gone past.

MR. GREEN: Thank you for your instruction, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Saturday)