

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I should like to join the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) in entering, briefly, a caveat. As a matter of fact, it is because of the caveat that he has entered that I must do likewise.

The issue that is raised relates to the question of which hon. members have the right, under Standing Order 58, to file motions on non-confidence days. I might point out to Your Honour that in Standing Order 58(3) there is a reference to the fact that opposition motions may be moved only by members in opposition to the government, but there is no suggestion that those motions may be moved only by members of the official opposition. The hon. member for Peace River has just said that this is a traditional right. I am sure he would expect me to challenge that statement. As a matter of fact, over the years there have been many occasions when amendments to the motion to go into supply have been moved by members other than members of the official opposition. It is true that under this new rule we have never sorted things out, but I do not think we have had it long enough for it to have become a tradition.

In the last session, however, when we were unable to reach agreement on whether someone else should have one of these non-confidence motions, we have found a way to propose one of them. The fact is that there are six in the year under the rule as it stands. We do not think the official opposition has any prior right to have all six of these motions. We think that at the very least the other parties should have one each, and that if we cannot reach an agreement among ourselves, it will have to be resolved by making appropriate motions and bringing the issue before the Chair.

What happened today was that this was the final motion in the current semester, and during that time only one has been a non-confidence motion. Therefore, by default, our friends of the Ralliement Creditiste will have a vote on their motion tonight. I am glad the default has been in their favour, but I suggest that when the time comes to argue it out, it should be clear that the official opposition does not have a prior claim to all six of the non-confidence motions and that there should be a ruling accordingly.

**Mr. Speaker:** My understanding is that both hon. members have decided not to argue the case. In view of this, I will deliver a non-ruling. It may be that some day the rule will have to be clarified in some way, and I hope I will not be placed in the position of having to determine who has a non-confidence motion and who has not. I think that it would be preferable if this were done by the terms of the Standing Order but, as the hon. member for Peace River suggested, it may well be that the Procedure Committee could look at this difficulty in due course.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, in recent decades, the latest in particular, successive governments have based their economic policies on two broad principles. Even provincial governments have followed suit. Those principles are specialization and increased productivity.

#### *Employment of Graduate Students*

In their enthusiasm, because they thought they had found a magic solution, governments were hypnotized by the value of diplomas; they were forever speaking of "education" and "specialization". We now know the price of that enthusiasm.

When our fathers were young, instead of fidgeting at their desks in the classroom, they rushed to the woods in order to earn some money on which to live. They were jacks-of-all-trades and the only diploma of which they could boast was one in resourcefulness.

Our fathers experienced hard times. Indeed, their generation went through a succession of economic crises and wars, which left them no respite.

Today, governments are again driving those people to the wall, telling them they must have education, diplomas or some special skill.

Our governments have therefore invested billions of dollars in the construction of schools, in comprehensive schools, school renovation, recruitment and training of teachers. That was the period of Parent reports, Operation 55 and many other projects of both provincial and federal governments. There, Mr. Speaker, the federal government did not take a back seat.

However, the movement should not have stopped there. Once our governments had found the solution, which was education, they should have applied it thoroughly. It had indeed been sorely lacking.

That is why the federal government is in turn taking the lead and setting up adult education programs through its Manpower Training Centres.

Fathers and mothers as well who as children only got distant glimpses and dreams of school, are now being paid the equivalent of a salary by the government to make up for lost time. They are being offered an elementary course, then a secondary course and finally, to crown it all, vocational training. However, after that, there is no job.

• (3:10 p.m.)

This is tremendous for our puppet governments. In fact, those who otherwise would live in poverty are now living on hope. They are getting paid and, in any case, they would probably be getting welfare. Furthermore, these programs suit the government because it is normal to do everything so that these people may have the chance to get an education.

It is a political play to get votes.

Finally, while they are studying these people are not looked on as unemployed. So they are not adding to the already frightening unemployment figures which are further evidence of the government's inefficiency. This is what counts most for the latter.

The situation is quickly outlined, Mr. Speaker: everybody in school! The slogan is the following: Education will save you. It is the solution to our problems of poverty, economic injustice and wealth distribution, that is production distribution.