

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 26 June, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

Your Committee met on June 24th and 26th, 1980, and heard representations with respect to the bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill No. 13 - An Act to amend The Defamation Act.
Mr. Knox Foster, Winnipeg Free Press.

Bill No. 39 - An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act.

Mr. Patrick Riley, Private Citizen.

Mr. Garth Erickson, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

Sheila Rogers, Private Citizen.

Bill No. 49 - An Act to amend The Ombudsman Act.

Mr. Dolan, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

Bill No. 70 - The Blood Test Act.

Mr. Knox Foster, Manitoba Medical Association.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 13 - An Act to amend The Defamation Act.

Bill No. 34 - An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act.

Bill No. 42 - An Act to amend The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act.

Bill No. 50 - The Manitoba-Saskatchewan Boundary Act (1980).

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill No. 20 - An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement that will be available in a few minutes. I wonder if I could have leave later on when it is available, to make it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement to revert to Ministerial Statements later on? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this particular time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Speaker's gallery, where we have the Honourable P. C. Amadike, Federal Minister for Social Development, Youth, Sports and Culture, from Nigeria. The Honourable Mr. Amadike is accompanied by Dr. F. A. O. Owosina, an official from his department.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend, as well, best wishes to our visitors from Nigeria, and pose my question to the Minister of Agriculture, to whom I understand has just returned from negotiations with Ottawa, and we hopefully look forward to some positive results from Ottawa in that regard. I'd like to ask the Minister whether or not in his discussions with Ottawa, he involved any discussions pertaining to debt moratorium legislation, as debt moratorium legislation, to be effective, would require both federal and provincial co-operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the statement I'm preparing will touch briefly on the other areas that we discussed with the federal Minister. I would have to say the whole business and the whole economics; that the difficulties that farmers are facing because of drought and the debt situation which some of them find themselves in was discussed with the federal Minister and the point that he raises, the debt moratorium, was discussed, but not at any great length, at this particular time, Mr. Speaker. But

those kinds of discussions will be ongoing as the conditions of the agricultural community stay the same or in fact, if the drought conditions remain, could worsen and we will be continuing discussions in this particular area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: M. l'orateur, donnant le fait que le Niger est un pays francophone, je pense qu'il n'y a aucune objection de dire en français aussi une bienvenue chaleureuse à nos invités du Niger, de montrer que le Canada est aussi un pays avec une langue officielle française.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Community Services dealing with the definition of financial resources in The Social Allowances Act and ask him whether it is more than just a coincidence that there is the introduction, the revision and the re-enactment of The Parents Maintenance Act provided in The Family Law Amendment Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Social Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the honourable member that it's coincidence because I'm not aware of the tie-in between the two, at the present time, that he is referring to.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since the amendment to The Family Law and Marital Property Act provides that every person is obligated to support his parent and the parent, or any person on behalf of the parent, may start proceedings for support, would the Minister then consider that moneys received as a result of that kind of an action would be a financial resource and, namely, income from any other source received by the applicant under Social Allowances?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the honourable member's question as notice and get back to him with the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and it refers back to a question that I asked him on the 17th of June. This was in reference to a statement by the Milk Control Board that it was going to conduct a review into means by which fluid milk could be made available at a lower cost. Now the Minister on that date said he had asked the Milk Control Board to report back on what the proposed review is and under what authority they have to make that kind of review. Could the Minister now advise the House please whether he has received an answer from the Board and whether review will in fact be undertaken?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to go into any detail on the report that I did receive from the Milk Control Board; I noticed that I did receive a letter from them. The urgency that I have been dealing with has been one of getting feed supplies to the dairy cattle of this province so that there would be any milk at all available to the consumers of Manitoba. I would have to indicate to the honourable member that has been my number one concern, and we'll deal with the review of the milk pricing for special groups at some time in the very immediate future, but I would say that my time has been spent in working to alleviate the immediate difficulties that are before the dairy producers of this province.

MRS. WESTBURY: Surely my question was not an implication of criticism, Mr. Speaker. I'm surprised that the Minister would have taken it as such.

Mr. Speaker, may I then address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General?

A MEMBER: If it's nice.

MRS. WESTBURY: It's nice. This refers to my question of the 20th of June in which the Minister assured me that he would advise me and the staff at the Youth Centre the names of the three limited jurisdiction magistrates who are on call. Before the weekend we would like to have that information, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): I'd be happy, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to obtain that information for the Member for Fort Rouge before the weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister in charge of flood compensation just how it is that the province finds itself paying flood compensation to people who have waived those rights in 1974 and whether or not there is any means, in his opinion, of remedying that situation at this point in time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, replying to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, I do express my concern about the incident that the member refers to. I've asked the Chairman of the Flood Compensation Board, Mr. Elswood Bole, to investigate fully the situation. He has advised me that there are not many other cases, as appear to be the case indicated in the article that the honourable member refers to, but I will be in a position to report to the House more specifically in a day or two.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied. If the Minister wishes to report back, we can pursue it at that time. I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture or Resources, or both, as to whether or not hay and grazing permits are being allocated in the Netley

Marsh area and on what basis is the property apportioned to individuals who wish to either make hay or graze their cattle in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the reference to the Netley Marsh as a specific area, I would have to have someone look up within my department unless the Minister of Natural Resources has that information firsthand. I would ask him to respond if he has more information at this time but I would have to take the question as notice if he doesn't have it.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that the Minister of Agriculture has returned from Ottawa, could he indicate whether today he is prepared to make a statement that the Minister of Finance took as notice with respect to the financial position that the hog producers face in Manitoba with the drought conditions making grain supplies in short supply for the producers, and as well, the depressed market prices that they have faced for the last number of months, as well, Manitoba being the odd man out in providing assistance to the producers versus the rest of the country?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, we have over the past few weeks been discussing with the hog producers of the province. They've been bringing to my attention the concerns that they have, particularly with Manitoba being the only province, as he has indicated, not having a provincial stabilization program. I again go back and refresh the member's attention to the fact that we, as a province, took the position that on nationally-produced commodities that stabilization programs should be in fact the responsibility of the federal government; that, in fact, when you see provincial governments introducing provincial programs, it distorts the natural advantage that any province has. We feel that Manitoba have had a natural advantage but, unfortunately, we've seen other provinces introduce programs that have distorted the efficiencies that the agricultural community have enjoyed in western Canada.

I have assessed different programs and we are in the process of now looking at, because of some of the feed grain problems the producers are facing and in light of some of the other programs we've had to announce, we are further discussing, as a government, what we may do to alleviate some of the difficulties that the hog producers are having. Let me assure you, Mr. Producer or Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the members opposite recognize the fact that you truly are an agricultural producer, so when I am speaking to you I can speak in the form of both an Honourable Speaker and the person representing the farm communities; so I make no apologies for making reference to what I think is the tremendous people in the province, that's the producers of agricultural goods. I would just like to further add that, as far as the hog producers are concerned, I am and have been concerned about the difficulties that they are

facing and have been putting together what I think has been alternative programs that we may be able to discuss with them in the future.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't agree more, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the government's position but, notwithstanding that position, with respect to national marketing schemes, is the Minister — and he's had ample time to look at various programs and various alternatives that he can assist hog producers — not now in a position to make an announcement or is he going to wait till more barns close up, more farmers leave the land and allow more expansion by Cargill into the hog industry in this province? Or is he going to allow assistance to producers, as he says that he agrees that they are in trouble? When can he make that announcement?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, I think that we've all realized the conditions that the farm community are facing. The extended drought period is one more thing that the hog producers have had to face in combination with the depressed market prices that they have been facing. Again, I would like to say that we are doing the best things that we can, or the things we can that are most available to us, to react to those demands and I say that is still in the process of being discussed.

I requested earlier, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity to have leave of the House for a statement. I wonder if I could have leave at this time. Well, if the members don't want to hear it then I will yield the floor to the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any problem by members on this side on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister to have his statement. We can either wait till the end of the question period or revert back to Ministerial Statements, whatever is your desire, sir. We can do it at the end of the question period and that probably would be the more advisable time.

Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary question to the Minister dealing with the hay imports from Ontario. It's been reported that there is a possibility of some of the hay being infested, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister is quoted as saying that he is monitoring the situation. Can he indicate to the House what system he has set up, in terms of checking the quality of hay, to assure that the insect infestation is not imported into the province of Manitoba, which has caused problems in the east over the last number of years?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, if I'd been given an opportunity to make my statement I think I could have cleared some of the air but I would like to respond to it in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that following my meeting on Tuesday with the Federal Minister of Agriculture, letting him know the problems that were in Manitoba, because it appeared that he wasn't understanding the severity of the conditions, I met with the Provincial Minister of Agriculture in Ontario yesterday morning, the Honourable Lorne Henderson, who said that they would co-operate fully

in any way that they could help us as provincial producers with our hay problems.

The member refers to a problem with a beetle, a beetle problem that was not known to a lot of people in the agricultural industry in Ontario. The federal government have responded, in fact, responded when I was meeting with the federal Minister, that it was not a problem, it wasn't a difficulty, that we could import new hay because that's, in fact, what the beetle was affecting — would be living in the new hay. They've suspended or allowed hay to move in saying that it wouldn't create a difficulty at this particular time, the quality and the quantity of hay. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I was in the hay fields of Ontario yesterday afternoon meeting with the producers of hay, the farmers, and they assured me, and I saw, Mr. Speaker, adequate supplies of top quality hay at reasonable prices for the province of Manitoba. They assured me, Mr. Speaker, as producers, that they did not want to take advantage of the producers of Manitoba, they wanted a reasonable return for their hay and would expect to sell it to them at those prices.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. There seems to be an awful lot of private conversation going on which makes it somewhat difficult to hear the questions and the answers given.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister, now that he has returned from his visit with his counterpart, the federal Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, if he might inform the House as to the accuracy of newspaper reports whereby the federal authorities were critical of the Manitoba Assistance Program for drought-stricken areas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that such articles hit the headlines because, Mr. Speaker, I have a telex from the federal Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Order please. If the members want to carry on private conversations, I suggest they do it either in a very low voice so that it's possible to hear the questions and the replies.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, it's unfortunate that such inaccurate articles hit the papers and I want to read a telex, and I'll table it, that was sent to me from the federal Minister following that particular article in the Winnipeg paper.

"Article in Winnipeg Tribune, June 25th, 1980 was inaccurate. Our meeting with you was very positive. I agree hay transportation and green feed program proposals are very good. I appreciate the urgency of situation and did not", repeat, did not "criticize Manitoba. Prior discussions that have been helpful . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: I'll just ask your guidance, Mr. Speaker. Isn't there some rule about responding to newspaper articles in that vein?

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

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, we had a series of questions and answers based on that same article yesterday. They were placed by the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Elmwood is one where I think it's the responsibility of those asking the questions to assure themselves of the accuracy of the newspaper clipping. We're finding the Minister is now proving that was an inaccurate report.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in finishing the communique from the federal Minister again, he said, "I appreciate the urgency of situation and did not", repeat, did not, "criticize Manitoba. Prior discussions would have been helpful but", repeat, "Manitoba proposals favourably received by me. Signed, Eugene Whelan."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether in his preparations for supplementary estimates whether he will include in those estimates provisions for a subsidy to Manitoba pork producers this year.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I intend to table supplementary supply later today and it will cover primarily the drought items. There will be no provision in Supplementary Supply for the question of subsidies that may not be related to the drought.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the question of the Minister of Agriculture since a moment ago he indicated that he was going to soon consider the proposals from the hog producers of this province with respect to any subsidies that might be provided by the government of Manitoba, in light of the fact that other provinces are all providing subsidies west of Manitoba, certainly in a few east of Manitoba. So if the Minister of Finance is not in a position to include those costs in his supplementary estimates that he's introducing today, I ask the Minister of Agriculture where he intends to get the money from if he is going to approve such a request?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Member for Lac du Bonnet has been associated with government long enough to know some of the processes that take place and I'm sure that, having the understanding government that we have of the agricultural community, when such action has to be taken — if it has to be taken and when it has to be

taken — it will be taken through the necessary process.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture suggested there is a forum beyond this one where those decisions are going to be made and where the House will not have an opportunity to debate the expenditures. I ask the Minister of Finance if he intends to add additional expenditures by special warrant after this House prorogues, Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the request of the Minister of Agriculture. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Finance whether he has any intentions of providing subsidies to pork producers in Manitoba this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that of course would require a government decision and would have to be announced by the government. If that were taken, of course, the mechanisms are there to do the financing, if required, either by Supplementary Supply or by Special Warrant in the event that the Legislature is not sitting. What I did indicate to the member was, and I felt it necessary to indicate, the question was whether we would be providing it in the Sup. Supply and since the Sup. Supply is coming in today, I felt I should tell him that it's not contained in this Sup. Supply. But again, to repeat what the Minister of Agriculture has said, if the government does undertake that program there are mechanisms for the purposes of the financing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Highways. In view of the fact that a woman was killed today when she fell off her motorcycle on Norwood Bridge and struck her head against the curb, causing massive brain injuries, leading to her death, can the Minister indicate whether that person who died was wearing a helmet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: Can I ask the Minister if he would investigate this case and also investigate how many fatalities have arisen with people involved in motorcycle accidents, who were not wearing safety helmets? Could the Minister please look into that matter, as we have had a great number of deaths over the last two years because people were not wearing safety helmets and they were involved in accidents leading to unnecessary deaths? Would the Minister investigate that, please?

MR. ORCHARD: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture and in view of the comments I've heard on the other side of the serious problems that hog producers face in the province of Manitoba and whereby oil seeds do not have any duty going from the United States into Canada, I'm wondering if the Minister of Agriculture then, because of the serious shortage of supplies of oats and barley in the province of Manitoba, as to whether or not the Minister has had any communication with the federal government whereby he might consider removing the duties on barley and oats coming from the United States into Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should indicate to the Honourable Member for Rock Lake in his concerns for the farmers in Manitoba that we did request to the federal Senator responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board in June to relieve or to allow permits to be put in place to provide feed grains to come in from the United States, and that has been granted and is now proceeding to take place.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, and I will be speaking on it briefly on it in my statement, there is also a request and we've asked the federal Minister of Agriculture to alleviate or to help the farmers in allowing feed pellets or alfalfa pellets to come in from the United States without having duty charged on them, as well as feed grain tariffs. So, Mr. Speaker, we have put that request through and will expect a response very shortly from the federal Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Manpower in Manitoba. I would ask him if he has received a copy of the recent Indian Affairs Report which indicates the deteriorating social and economic conditions with respect to Indian people living on and off reserves in Manitoba. This is a report which has recently been released by the Department of Indian Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker. I think I've read the same press release as the Member for Rupertsland has and I'm looking forward to getting the report and reviewing it.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, in view of the conditions which obviously exist in the native communities, not only the Indian reserves but the non-status native communities as well, which force people to migrate to the urban centres in increasing numbers, can the Minister indicate if there are any

programs in place at the provincial government level, or at least in the planning stages, to deal with the special problems of migrating native people? And I speak especially of programs to deal with housing, employment and training, all of which are desperately needed by people who are migrating in increasing numbers.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there are a good number of things taking place. The member is aware of the relocation programs that are in place in northern Manitoba, supported in fact by our government. We have a factor taking place in the mining communities which I raised, I think, with the same member during my estimates, that being that the relocation programs are certainly assisting people in coming into the northern mining communities but it's having a very good spin-off effect for an awful lot of other young people who are coming in from the communities, both Metis and Treaty, and are following up on the examples that are being set by their friends and their brothers by establishing themselves in the communities. There are a large number of institutional training-type programs, industrial training, apprenticeship programs. If the member would like a list of them, I think he was paying reasonable attention when I went through my estimates but if he would like me to give him an updated list of the number of northerners who are actively involved in some of those programs, I'd be more than willing to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a final supplementary.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary deals with the same issue and I would ask the Minister, in view of the conditions which are obvious to everyone and which have been reported in this report and many other reports, why the provincial government has reduced the programs that deal with the unemployment situation of native people in the city of Winnipeg? And I speak especially of the inner city employment program which was in effect and which they have reduced. I ask the Minister, if in view of the reduction of this program, if he is planning to replace it with anything else, in view of the fact that there are large numbers of unemployed people in the urban inner core of Winnipeg and, according to recent reports of the Winnipeg School Division, in surveys that have been taken, the numbers of unemployed people are increasing and, Mr. Speaker, the present government appears to be doing nothing at the present time to deal with this situation and there appears to be nothing even in the planning stages to deal with it?

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask my question to the Deputy Premier. Is the government ready now to recognize, in view of the statement made by the President of the Health Sciences Centre that they will have the largest deficit ever, is the government now ready to recognize that in dealing with hospital budgets its policy of restraint has been a dismal

failure because they have been unrealistic, and will the government now back away from its stubborn and ridiculous contention that hospitals can stay within the announced budgets and that will have no marked effect on the quality of care and health services here in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there are about four questions contained in that question and with regard to the main question, of course, the budgets will be stretched for the institutions that have come under the recent settlement, there's no doubt about that, and there will have to be some provision made. Beyond that, I'll pass on the members questions to the Minister of Health for examination.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if the budget will be stretched — and this has nothing to do with the budget of this year but if the deficit will be picked up — what is the purpose and what good is achieved by the government announcing very sternly that the hospitals will have to stay within the budget and, if the deficits are picked up by the Manitoba Health Services Commission, what is the purpose, what have you achieved?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the mechanisms, of course, are the same as those that have always been in place. The institutions strike their budgets and the institutions, of course, in striking their budgets are influenced, of course, by the government's provision of supply to them and primarily from that source, almost exclusively from that source, and as a result our influence, of course, in their negotiations and other things, in their other undertakings by that; when they go over and they go over substantially, provision has to be made. It has been made in the past and, Mr. Speaker, when the system comes up and the government comes up and the Legislature comes up with a better overall management mechanism for the health institutions and other institutions in this province then, Mr. Speaker, we'll see a changeover to that. But at the present time there is no evidence of a better system in sight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface with a final supplementary.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, then are we to understand that the Minister is saying that the hospitals should then disregard the stern announcement from this government, should go along with their business and the government will keep on pretending that they have a certain policy of making statements that will be ridiculous, meaningless and that will not be observed?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the member knows. He went through almost the same type of experience at one time when he was the Minister of Health when there were various settlements from negotiation that were well over and above what had been provided for, for the institutions at that time. I suppose if he's taking that position now, you could ask the question as to why then was that position

not taken by the government of the day at that time? These are the things that happen. But as long as the system remains where you try and provide autonomy of operation of these institutions, that's about as good as you can do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it is a point of privilege because the member keeps referring to strike and I haven't even mentioned the word "strike" once. In fact, we could talk about strike because they were —(Interjection)— . . . that's nothing to do with the strike.

MR. GREEN: He said strike off a budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. It's customary when a member raises a point of privilege that he also brings forward a substantive motion to support it. Since there was no substantive motion, the point of privilege is denied.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the Member for Fort Rouge earlier on in question period, the names of the three duty magistrates are Mr. Ed Sharkey, Ms. Dianne Bodiou and Mrs. Bernice Hudson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Honourable, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs respecting the termination of rent controls as of July 1st, as now indicated in the legislation tabled in the House. Can the Minister indicate to the House whether his staff has conducted any surveys or provided any estimates to him of the amount of rent increases that will take place now in the city of Brandon and the city of Winnipeg, inasmuch as those are the only two areas in the province that will be affected by this decontrol legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. WARNER J. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, there have been ongoing surveys or monitoring of apartments and blocks that have been decontrolled in the past and we do have fairly complete figures as to the extent to which those increases have taken place. I do not have them with me here today but the department does have those figures.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I received a communication from one tenant indicating a 28 percent increase, amounting to an increase of 62 per month, and I'd like to ask the Minister whether he considers this type of increase to be exorbitant. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, this degree of increase affects all of 100 suites in one particular building and they've been notified that the increase will now take place three months hence, October 1st, which is the period of time of course that landlords must give

tenants. So my question to the Minister: Does the Minister not believe that this type of an increase of 62 a month is exorbitant and possibly could be a hardship on many people who would be affected by such an increase?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, whether or not I consider that to be exorbitant, I rather think, is beside the point. I know that a lot of tenants feel that rate of increase is exorbitant and are hopeful that the legislation that is being provided for them will give them an opportunity to give expression to their views with respect to rent increases and they can be dealt with under the terms of the legislation that is now proposed before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister understands, not everyone can easily move out of their particular apartment, for various reasons. The Minister is indicating I believe, Mr. Speaker, to the House that there is a mechanism whereby people might appeal against an exorbitant rent increase. I may not have understood him because of the noise in the Legislature but I'd like to ask the Minister if he and his department will make a point of advising tenants, of advising the public that there are clear mechanisms or procedures whereby the office of the Rentalsman, or whatever the name of the board is involved, that such an agency exists and such assistance is available to such tenants if they believe that they may be facing an exorbitant rent increase.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the office of the Rentalsman will be functioning as it has for the past number of years, and that has always been the first point of contact for any tenant who wishes to register a complaint. That process will continue.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier referred to the settlement on wages. Does the Minister realize that the deficit is caused partly by this and also because of the increase in medical and surgical supplies, and also in the drug costs that we had mentioned certainly during the debate of the estimates of the Department of Health, and say that the increase was not adequate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Member for St. Boniface is quoting from a newspaper story in this regard. If something comes officially to the government from the, I guess it's the Health Sciences Centre on this matter, we'll have a look at it and I will refer it to the Minister of Health who, undoubtedly, has already probably been advised if it has now been publicly reported in the media. While I can't substantiate the proportions of over-run that may be caused by these various items, certainly the

major one would be the settlement coming out of the negotiations recently.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is saying that they will not enquire but they'll wait till there are complaints or something comes to them, does the Minister condone the action of the President of the Health Sciences Centre, who would prevent people from the public questioning the President of the Health Science Centre on some of the reports that he's made at an annual meeting? Is that the idea, that the people should be kept in the dark and not ask any questions?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the details of the article which the Member for St. Boniface is referring to and until it has been reviewed or the Minister of Health has had an opportunity to look into it, I don't think there is further I can add.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he could advise why the rent decontrol legislation that he tabled in this House yesterday did not contain a mechanism guaranteeing tenants rights to appeal exorbitant rent increases?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is asking a question about a legislation that is to be debated. He will have ample opportunity to express those opinions and ask those questions during the course and consideration of that particular bill.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are about to go into Speed-Up and obviously the legislation will be debated only after the rent increases, in many cases, go into effect, and I remind the Minister that notices are going out now in pursuance of The Landlord and Tenant Act, I would ask whether he wouldn't agree that it would be of some utility to advise the members of the House, at this juncture, why some appropriate mechanism wasn't provided in the legislation and provide his opinion as to what redress could be obtained by tenants who are facing these sorts of increases.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, obviously my honourable friend has not read the legislation because such a mechanism is provided for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington with a final supplementary.

MR. CORRIN: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation clearly stipulates that a landlord . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order allowed the Member for Wellington to ask two questions without questioning it, but the bill has not yet even been introduced for second reading by the Minister. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is completely inappropriate for the questions to be asked of the Minister in question period before he has an opportunity to introduce the bill for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, if the government would agree not to debate the bill and to make announcements in the paper in respect to the bill, then there would be no questions in this House on it. The point that my colleague for Wellington raised is very valid, Sir, he, first of all, asked a question in respect to safeguards; the Minister said there was none. The second time when he answered, he said there are. So what kind of a game is he playing? That's the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Let's have some realistic debate in this House about what we're doing, about the procedures.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The time for debate on bills is not during the question period. If the honourable member is seeking information I would hope he poses his question.
The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, again, in view of the fact that, as of July 1st, the rent control provisions of The Rent Stabilization Act will be terminated, and in view of the fact that it's fairly obvious that we will not have completed debate on the Minister's Landlord and Tenant Act amendments prior to July 1st, we would ask what mechanism the Minister will be providing, what form the Minister will be providing, to assure tenants who are affected by exorbitant rent increases resulting from de-control in the interim period, what mechanism will the government be providing to address itself to this problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: I suggest to my honourable friend that he has not read the legislation and that the provisions of The Landlord and Tenant Act remain in existence and there has always been an appeal mechanism to the Rentalsman's office. That continues.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired, proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of

Manitoba transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, estimates of further sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that the said message, together with the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. FOX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the question period, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture asked leave in order to make a statement. I would suggest that we give him that leave now.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have copies of the statement which I would like to distribute to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement to the House on my recent trip to Ottawa to discuss with the federal government support for Manitoba's agriculture drought assistance programs, and simply to point out to the federal government the severity of the drought and its future implications.

Mr. Speaker, following discussions with the federal Agriculture Minister, I am satisfied that our drought programs will be supported and that we can expect Ottawa's help in financing them for Manitoba farmers. Mr. Speaker, I have made it clear to the federal Minister our farm community needed immediate action which was contained in a five-point drought program in Brandon, announced by Premier Sterling Lyon on Monday. I would like to take this opportunity to say that our government will continue to monitor the agriculture credit and cash flow situation and take action if necessary. There has been agreement that there should be further discussions on these matters.

Further to that, I have suggested that income from the sale of cattle should be deferred to next year, which will alleviate some of the economic hardship for those producers having to sell cattle. There is some work being done with regard to the income deferral by the proper authorities and I expect there should be some announcement very shortly. There have been some fears that Ontario hay might be infested by a cereal leaf beetle which could be harmful to the crops in the west. However, there is no apparent danger of bringing the beetle into the province at this time. This problem will continue to be monitored by both levels of government. In the meantime, the federal government has agreed to lift

the quarantine on hay moving into Manitoba for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, I also received assurances from Mr. Whelan, that he will be discussing with the federal Minister of Finance, temporary suspension of duty charges on alfalfa pellets and feed grains imported from the U.S. This is further to an announcement by the Canadian Wheat Board made recently that it will allow producers to apply for permits enabling them to bring feed grains in from the U.S. We are pleased with these steps that the federal government has taken.

Mr. Speaker, other items which we discussed, including making available federal parks for grazing or hay, and the possibility of the Wheat Board maintaining feed grain supplies on the prairies. There also had been general consensus that all levels of government should be united in their efforts to assist the producers. Ottawa is in agreement with us in that there must be co-ordination and co-operation in the moving ahead with additional drought assistance.

Further to my meeting in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, I had a very positive meeting with the Ontario Agriculture Minister of Agriculture and Food, the Honourable Lorne Henderson in Toronto. Mr. Henderson has offered Manitoba his department's full support and co-operation in identifying and co-ordinating movement of hay from Ontario. Mr. Speaker, I also toured some hay-producing areas in Ontario and spoke to farmers who have assured me that they will continue to make hay supplies available at fair market prices. They are fully aware of the problems facing our producers and want to assure us that they will co-operate in all ways possible. Mr. Speaker, I also met with the manager of the Union Stock Yards in Toronto. He assured me that the livestock market has remained firm and producers can be assured that the demand for livestock should remain stable. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that our government will continue to take necessary action to assist producers. We have indicated to Ottawa the seriousness of our situation and we can only hope that the federal government will co-operate with us and support us in our efforts to help the farmers of Manitoba.

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

MR. URUSKI: I thank the Minister for his statement, Mr. Speaker, with respect to his discussions with Ottawa. I'd like to indicate, firstly, that on our part I believe there was never any doubt that Ottawa would not contribute to the programs. I think Ottawa is probably following its historical precedence that they have set before when we were in dire need in this province. We announced programs and subsequently Ottawa normally contributed to the program. So, contrary to the reports that have been made and statements made, we believe that, no doubt, there was never any doubt that Ottawa would contribute to the programs.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Minister's statement with the contamination of hay. There seems to be some contradiction with respect to his statement and that of staff in the federal Department of Agriculture that I had heard today that they were concerned about the infestation, infested hay coming

into the province. So I would hope that the Minister and his staff doubly check and make sure that all precautions necessary are taken so that we are not faced with a long-term problem as a result of some short-term need with respect to infested hay. Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that the Minister, in making his statement, that he would have indicated his discussions with the federal minister about the possibility of the moratorium of debts, whether or not Ottawa intends to put some legislation forward, or whether or not he, on behalf of his government, is intending to put forward moratorium legislation dealing with the debts, not only of farmers, Mr. Speaker, but as the First Minister indicated previously, it is a problem of all people of Manitoba. Small business in Manitoba is faced with very very severe cash shortages along with the farmers with respect to the present economic conditions in this province.

Mr. Speaker, as well, in the Minister's statement he spoke about grazing lands and grazing permits. I would hope that the Minister will be able to assure farmers that the announcements that have been given out by his department, and the Department of Resources, dealing with Crown lands, that they will allow farmers to graze their lands beyond the eight weeks that they have been limited by his department. Because, Mr. Speaker, that is going to place a very severe hardship on some farmers. It takes at least two or three weeks to fence some of that land and the department has given them eight weeks, that cattle have to be out by September the 1st, out of these Crown lands. The Minister has not indicated that he will give that assurance that the farmers will be able to graze longer in case the situation continues as it appears to be. Although he indicated he has discussed grazing and had hoped that the federal government will allow the grazing of the federal parks in Manitoba, his department certainly hasn't given farmers an adequate opportunity to graze the Crown lands — and that's not even the Crown lands, Mr. Speaker that are within management areas. I would hope that he would rescind some of those announcements that his department and other departments have made.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I would hope that the province is not intending to put and shift responsibility on the local municipalities with respect to the programs that they have announced. It appears that there is some impression that has been left in the minds of rural people that in order to obtain cash and credit and assistance in the purchasing of hay, farmers have to go to municipalities. I hope that is not the case, that there is no shift of responsibility from the province to the municipalities.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has announced that today, in questioning, that he will be shortly bringing in assistance for hog producers. It was not included in his statement and I would hope that his government moves very shortly in terms of the plight that they're facing with respect to the drought.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I want a point of clarification, earlier today I indicated we were

working on what may be done as far as hog producers are concerned. I did not say that we were . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ORDER PLEASE. The Minister had an opportunity to make his statement. The Honourable Member for St. George should have the same opportunity to reply. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of privilege.

MR. DOWNEY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I indicated earlier that we had received submissions from the hog producers. We have been discussing with them programs that we were looking at that the government, through the process, if it was to make that decision it would be made at an appropriate time and announced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just about five minutes ago, you indicated that if a member was rising on a matter of privilege, he had to have a substantive motion.

MR. SPEAKER: That's right.

MR. FOX: This time you allowed the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to go without any substantive motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ORDER PLEASE. Differences of opinion occur from time to time. The point of privilege raised by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture was not a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I do rise on a point of privilege. I distinctly heard the First Minister of this province call me a liar. Mr. Speaker, the statement that I made with respect to an announcement, with respect to hog producers, I interpreted the Minister's remarks that he would be making an announcement shortly with respect to assistance. He agreed that the hog producers were in trouble and now the First Minister at that time was not in the House, and to, from his Chair, Mr. Speaker, call the member — and he spoke to the member who was speaking — a liar. I presume, I was the only member that was speaking, that I am the liar, Mr. Speaker, and I ask him to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to respond to the honourable member's misinterpretation. What I said was that lies have the right to be corrected in the House. It was corrected. Thank you, Sir.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, that is not satisfactory. The Premier is saying himself, he said from his seat that lies should be corrected after a statement. That is accusing somebody of lying. He has now stood up and said lies were made, lies were

corrected and you shouldn't allow that. If that is the way, that's the way everybody is going to play the game.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. The question before the House is whether or not we got into Committee of Supply.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The question before the House is somebody that accused members of lying is going to withdraw, or is that going to be allowed to remain.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The question that was raised on the point of privilege was the one that was raised by the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable First Minister replied to that.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 31?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, if that's impartiality I've seen everything. There's rules for one and rules for the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. ORDER please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the remarks just uttered by the Member for St. Boniface are clearly unparliamentary, reflect adversely on the impartiality of the Chair and he should be asked to withdraw them immediately or he should be named, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I will withdraw those remarks when we play by the same rules, not before.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that remark just exacerbates his previous remarks. It clearly reflects on the rulings of the Chair and should be withdrawn or the member should be named.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would concur with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. If we're going to have rules they should be dealt with equally by you in respect to every member of this Chamber. I would suggest to you, Sir, that the Honourable First Minister didn't retract, all he did was compound what he had said from his seat. To begin with, he should not have said it from his seat because I think, if we play by these rules, we're not supposed to interject when members have the floor, so he wasn't even being parliamentary to begin with, and if you're going to allow, Sir, that one member can get away with saying something, and compound it later on by making it official after you recognize him, then I think you'll have to rule equally on the other side as well. I think that the House Leader is wrong in asking for a

retraction from something that was said on this side in the heat of debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. ORDER please. The Honourable Member for St. George raised a point of privilege. The Honourable First Minister responded to him. The Honourable Member for St. George apparently was satisfied with the explanation. The Honourable Member for St. George raised no objection to the reply. I assumed that fulfilled the request that he made. As far as I was able to ascertain the Honourable Member for St. George was completely satisfied with the reply that he received. Other members then interjected in the affairs of the House and I suggest to honourable members that interjections by other members are equally as offensive at this particular time.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how you got that opinion. I asked, Mr. Speaker, for the First Minister to retract. To be called a liar once and then to be called a liar, twice with respect to a statement that I made, I did not even have a chance to respond because other members, Mr. Speaker, saw the severity of the statement and took up my cause, Mr. Speaker, in terms of it. The Member for St. Boniface arose immediately. Mr. Speaker, certainly if you would be satisfied to be called a liar twice then you can, well, Mr. Speaker, you can rule on that basis, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The remark that I heard from the First Minister was one that indicated he did not use the term "liar". If that is the case, I will wait until I check Hansard to make sure.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just on that point, I think it's quite clear what the First Minister said. He said that lies had to be corrected as soon as possible, or, right at that moment. That is what he said. He inferred in so doing, that the Member for St. George had in fact told a lie and I believe that he should be asked to retract that statement and when he does, I am sure the Member for St. Boniface will then retract what he said.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, when you check Hansard, I think you will notice that I did not interject, that I spoke immediately on the same point of order, that you recognized me. I said that we were not satisfied with the Premier repeating that the member had been a liar, that we asked him to withdraw, and you ignored that completely. That is when I made my statement, and only then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, while we're engaged in the latter days of this session in this kind of specious argument may I say, first of all, by way of explanation to the House, that the word "lie" is not a

parliamentary word, and to the extent that it was used by me it should not have been used. Misinterpretation has always the right to be corrected in this House by way of a point of privilege or a point of order. Some of us choose to reflect upon the fact that sometimes misinterpretations are drawn a bit further. As Churchill once said of another honourable member, and it's not being applied to any of my lily-livered friends opposite, their statements and the truth seldom coincided; thereby he avoided the use of the word "lie". I merely say that the word "lie" should not be used. I apologize when I used the word "lie" from my seat. Misinterpretations have always the right to be corrected, always will, so long as this government sits on this side of the House, my honourable friends need not think that they will get away with it.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: We welcome that, Mr. Speaker, as long as when this side, as so often they do, want to misrepresent things, that we also have the right to correct this misrepresentation. We don't ask anything that we are not ready to give you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 31?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 31 — THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 31, second reading. The Honourable Member for Burrows. I believe, and I'd better check, I think he has 12 minutes.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I was speaking on this bill as we were approaching 4:30, Private Members' Hour, I did express my concern about the fact that in the provisions of the bill dealing with the use of languages, other than English, as languages of instruction, that there is no distinction made between the official languages and the languages of culture, and they all seem to be put into one basket.

Secondly, as I indicated to the Minister last year, and nothing is forthcoming to this point, and that is regulations governing the implementation of the use of other languages than the official language as languages of instruction.

And thirdly, in the estimates there is no indication of any increased level of funding to make it possible for school divisions to implement these portions of the bill, other than what the Minister had indicated that in the pilot programs, which he designated and not the school divisions, because you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the present legislation it is up to the school divisions to determine what languages, if any, other than either or both of the official languages they will use as language of instruction. But in the pilot projects that he designated, he did indicate that

his department is picking up the tab for the cost of the teachers. But you realize, of course, that there is also need for materials and other expenses involved, which the Minister has given no indication where the funding is to come from.

What I find even more offensive in the bill, and the Minister might say, well, but that section was in the previous law, but the fact that it was in the previous Act doesn't necessarily mean that it shouldn't be reviewed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If members want to carry on private conversations, I hope they don't interfere with the speaker who is attempting to give his short time to the subject matter at hand.

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, I can assure you, the chattering from the other side wasn't interfering at all.

The fact that something may have been contained in previous legislation does not necessarily mean that it ought not be reviewed. There is a provision within the bill, Mr. Speaker, that gives the Minister the authority to designate the language for the administration of schools. In fact, it specifically states that the administration and operation of a public school shall be carried out in the English or the French language, as the Minister may, by regulation, provide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps as we're becoming more and more conscious of a move toward bilingualism and the desire for bilingualism, we probably look at legislation of this kind a bit more closely.

Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of that portion of the bill would make it an offence to speak in an official language, if it happens to be an official language not designated by the Minister. In other words, if the Minister should designate the language of administration and the operation of schools in the St. Boniface School Division as French and if you were to attempt to conduct business with the school division speaking English, then you are committing an offence because the Minister says that the official language must be French, or vice versa. If the Minister should designate the official language of administration in the Turtle River School Division as English and if my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, would go to Laurier and wish to conduct business with the teachers, with the staff of the Laurier school, in the French language, he would be committing an offence because the law says that the official language must be English.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is the intent of the concept of bilingualism that in establishing an official language that it must be only one or the other. I was always of the belief that in our move toward bilingualism that we wanted to make it possible to use both languages, or to move from one language to the other. In fact, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening in the day-to-day operations of the school divisions.

I would think that, for example, in the St. Boniface School Division, if you were to enter their office today you would probably hear French spoken, to some degree you would hear English spoken, and it

would depend on the circumstances as to what language they would use; they would use that language in which they could communicate most effectively. But here's a law which states that one language, and one only, must be designated as the language of administration and I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this portion of the bill were to be tested in the courts, I think that the courts would rule that this is exceeding the powers that the Minister has. I would urge the Minister to take a close look at this section and see whether he wants to retain it there or not, and I would suggest to him, before we get too far into the debate, that he do give this matter some consideration.

Over the past few days that we've debated this bill, Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed that the only participation in debate has been from this side of the House. It's interesting now that the Minister of Labour wishes to enter the debate, I think, or he's going away but I heard some muttering from him. It probably wasn't worth listening to anyway, as most of his mutterings aren't worth listening to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of privilege.

MR. MacMASTER: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate for me to stand up, pick up my papers and leave the House without having sarcasm dripping from the mouth of the Member for Burrows. I just simply stood up to pick up my papers and he's naming me as doing something offensive. Maybe this is somewhat out of order, I think that's corrective, and I ask him to withdraw his reference to anything I said. I made no reference to him; I was picking up my papers. I don't know what's happening at this time of day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting day today. I believe I heard the Minister for Labour say, and I'll quote what I heard him say, after the Member for Burrows said, we've heard nothing from members on that side, only from this side, and I think I heard him say, "And not much of that." Now, let him tell me I did not hear him correctly but I don't think he was just gathering his papers, I believe he was responding to a statement made by the Member for Burrows. If he said he didn't say, "And not much of that", or something to that effect, then of course, Mr. Speaker, he may have a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, on the same matter of privilege. I wish to remind you that you had reminded the House, some time ago, that every matter of privilege raised by an honourable member should end with substantive motion, which we failed to hear from the Honourable Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I asked you specifically if you would have the Member for Burrows withdraw his comments, as they related to me. I was making no reference to him, I was picking up my papers.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reassure the Minister that I have no intention of withdrawing the comment that I made that the Honourable Minister muttered, because he did; he was not speaking; you did not recognize him at the time. Nor was he speaking in a, you know, a loud voice, he was muttering, of course he was, and I repeat that again. But the muttering was heard by some sitting closer to him than I am. So I have nothing to retract, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour raised a point of order and I understand that from time to time there is some more sensitivity than other times. I don't think that muttering is an offensive remark about one member from another and I would have to rule the Minister of Labour did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I was in the process of attempting to point out to you that during the course of the debate of this bill, the only participation was from this side of the House and absolutely none, other than the Minister's introduction of the bill for second reading, from that side of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, we thought that this was a piece of legislation that side of the House is really excited about, something that they would go to the people with come the next election and wave that and run for re-election on the strength of it. But I don't think that they will. I think that this legislation embarrasses them. Either it embarrasses them or they were muzzled by the puppeteers sitting in the front seat, in the centre desk of the front row

...

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . either that or the puppeteer sitting in the centre seat of the front row hasn't pulled the strings to signal the puppets in the back row, in the back bench who should speak and when. —(Interjection)— Oh, that always happens, it's very obvious when he does that, when the signals are given as to who is to speak, and when and what to say. So we'd be most interested to hear from the backbench. I know that the Honourable Member for Roblin always shows tremendous interest in educational matters and we'd like to hear from the Honourable Member for Roblin, what his views are on education. I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Wolesey has certain views to express on this bill and we'd like to hear them. Of course the Honourable Member for Springfield who — wait a minute, the Honourable Member for Springfield, is he not the Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Education — yes. So surely being as close to the education scene as he is, he has some comments to make and of course, the Honourable Member for River Heights, he is very interested in education and

he, too, we would love to hear his views on this bill. Surely the Minister isn't standing alone. Oh yes, and the Member for Crescentwood . . .

MR. DOERN: Before he gets defeated.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Before he gets defeated. Surely the Minister isn't standing alone. He must have some support from the backbench on this legislation. — (Interjection)— I believe he says lots of support? Lots of support. Well, Mr. Speaker, we would like to hear it and after the number of speakers that we've had, surely the Honourable Member for Roblin or the Honourable Member for Springfield, or Wolseley, or Crescentwood are prepared to make their contribution to the debate of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to speak at length on Bill 31 except I want to express my disgust in the way this bill was introduced to this House. It was brought in last year, as you will recall a bill was brought in and then withdrawn. I believe the intent was to try and bring in this kind of legislation, a major change, a major fundamental change, in our society, that is the education of the province of Manitoba. I believe the Minister was trying to bring in this legislation through the back door and because of complaints that were extended by the opposition last year, when the original bill was introduced, and by other people outside of this House, other groups, that the Minister, under pressure, withdrew his bill last year.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there were hearings held but I also understand that the hearings were held only in Winnipeg; that there were no hearings held in the rural parts of Manitoba — and if I'm incorrect on that, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly retract my remarks but I do not recall that there was any hearings out in the rural areas. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that we're all aware that the rural people have difficulty in coming into Winnipeg to make representations to any legislation and I would think that on a major piece of legislation, such as we have before us now, that the government would have gone out and had extensive hearings all over the province, to have input by the people. It never was the intention of this government to have any input by groups and people in rural Manitoba; that this was going to be brought in in Winnipeg without representations, by the way, because last year we had a bill before us that had never received any hearings at all, no communication with the people, it was just brought in and here's what you're going to have whether you like it or not.

But I want to express my grave concern on the way and the manner that the Minister has chosen to bring this bill in. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has not received sufficient hearing. It has not received sufficient hearing in the rural areas of this province because people are not going to come in even though it's a very important piece of legislation. There will be some groups who will come into Law Amendments and suggest changes, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to me that this is a closed government. We've had very very little hearings with the people, very little discussion with the people on any

legislation. Any major legislation has not been given a thorough airing out in the rural areas and I want to express my disappointment that the Minister has chosen to do that.

Also the Member for Burrows has mentioned that we haven't heard any comments from the backbenchers on the government side and again we wonder, what is the problem? What is the problem? Are they afraid, Mr. Speaker, to get up and defend this piece of legislation? Or is it indefensible? Is that the reason why they are not standing up and expressing their views? There are members from the rural areas, Mr. Speaker, I hope that they will stand up and that we will hear their views about this piece of legislation. But certainly up to this point in time we have heard no one speak from the government side.

I believe there is a lot lacking in this legislation and we haven't had any hearings, as I said, we should have been out there to hear the views of the municipalities. Is that the reason why they would not have hearings? Was the government afraid that if they went out into the rural areas that the probing questions that they would be asked in regard to taxation, the cost of education and the method and the way tax money is raised for education? Is that what they were afraid of, Mr. Speaker? I suggest to you that perhaps this was one of the reasons why they would not go out in the rural areas because the questions that would be thrown at them, Mr. Speaker, would be the cost of education and why the province was not contributing a greater portion to the cost of education. I'm suggesting this is one of the main reasons that they were not prepared to go out and take the flak and the comments that would have been directed at the government on the cost of education.

I believe that the legislation doesn't go far enough to satisfy the francophones of this province and I believe that I did mention to the Minister, when we spoke on the translation from English to French, I did comment what the French speaking people would like to see insofar as education was concerned. It seems to me that the Minister would have had an opportunity, he had an opportunity now to indicate how the cost of education was going to be done; what changes were going to be made insofar as raising funds for education. He has not come to grips with the problems that the French-speaking people of our province feel they have in regard to education. I know that it's a difficult problem but I did mention, in this House previously, that where there are total French schools that the French people would like to have some autonomy over those French schools. They want to have the autonomy to administer the schools and also to decide on curricula, Mr. Speaker. They want to be also associated with the local school divisions. It seems to me that we should be able to come up with some legislation that would satisfy the French-speaking people of this province.

Now it seems that what they would like to see, I believe, is to be associated with the local school divisions but they do want to have more autonomy on what is going on in those French schools. The Minister has not addressed himself to that particular problem. At least they are not satisfied, and I know that they are not satisfied because they have expressed that dissatisfaction to me and I hope that we will hear some of them speak to the bill. I know

that there were some French groups in when the hearings were held and I expect that probably some of them will be in at Law Amendments but we will hear again, Mr. Speaker, those people who live in the vicinity of Winnipeg. We will hear very little views from the rural areas because it's just too far to come in and it's costly and it doesn't give those people the equal opportunity to appear before a group of legislators to express their views. So I say the Minister has missed an opportunity to satisfy a large percentage of our population, and that is the French speaking people.

There's other items in the bill, Mr. Speaker, concerns that have been raised to me in regard to the bill itself; and there appears to be some concern on the part of the teachers in regard to how this bill will affect the teachers and that is the appeal mechanism. There is concern by the teachers that the rights of the teacher is not fully protected and that it leaves much to be desired.

The concern was expressed to me by a number of people on the powers that will be given to the field representative, Mr. Speaker. This has been brought up by some of my colleagues but I intend to also indicate that I have received a number of complaints of concern on the awesome powers, actually gestapo-like powers, Mr. Speaker, that will be given to a civil servant, a person who is not responsible to the public, a person who is not answerable to the public. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most repugnant sections of this bill; it's unacceptable. The Member for Logan indicated that it was astounding that these kind of powers would be given to a civil servant. It's astounding, Mr. Speaker, but it's not surprising. I'm not surprised that this Minister and this government would bring in this kind of legislation and give those kinds of powers to a particular individual who is not answerable to the public but answerable to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. It's not surprising. It is astounding but it's not surprising.

The teachers have expressed concern about tenure, Mr. Speaker, and due process. The bill indicates that a teacher must have at least 20 months of paid service, but the legislation does not define what a paid month of service really is. That is left now up to regulation. This will be done by regulation, Mr. Speaker, by the Cabinet. It is not in the legislation and the bill does not define what a teaching month is as was in the previous legislation. So we wonder, Mr. Speaker, when the bill suggests that a teacher must have at least 20 months of paid service or whether or not they are trying to discriminate against those teachers who would have to take maternity leave. We're wondering whether or not there is something being brought in here to discriminate against teachers that would have to take maternity leave. So the spelling out of what actually is a month of paid services, not defined in the bill and that, I believe, is to be done by regulation and the Minister should clarify those points for us.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would have a better mechanism to come to grips with problems that we've seen recently such as happened in Winnipegosis. The reluctance, on the part of the Minister, to use his good office and his leadership, which he indicated some weeks ago that he had. He

said that I shouldn't question his leadership until I saw what happened at Winnipegosis. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen there is the splitting up of the area so badly. We have the community of Camperville and Winnipegosis and Fork River up in arms and there should be some mechanism whereby the Minister could — and I believe it is in the legislation for him to do — that he could appoint a conciliator or an arbitrator to go in there and evaluate what the problem is and try to put to rest what has happened there because it is very serious, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to you that parts of that school division will be requesting the Minister to withdraw from the Duck Mountain School Division if this is not resolved. It seems to me that the legislation is there, the Minister could avail himself to it.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I understand that he has received requests, both written and verbally. My understanding is that the Minister, yesterday he denied that he had received two requests but I understand that he has received two requests. I'm not going to question his honesty on it; he suggests that he has only received one. But I understand — (Interjection)— oh, he says now that it has arrived today. Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that he had received one request from the board and there was also a telephone call and a letter to follow. In other words, he received two requests from the school board to send an evaluator there, and an independent person to review the dispute. He has also received a letter from this teacher's society. The Minister refused to do that. Yesterday, he said he had no intention to do it at this time and it seems to me that we have to have some mechanism there where we can resolve these kinds of disputes, Mr. Speaker.

I understand that there is a school that you wish to introduce, Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member. At this time I would like to introduce to the Legislature two schools, one from Notre Dame de Lourdes, and they are hosting a school from New Brunswick under the direction of Mr. Cenerini. Notre Dame School is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I think that with those few comments that I've made, I want to draw those points to the attention of the Minister and I hope that he will take them into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, one of the major disappointments to those of us on this side of the House was the introduction of these government bills and Bill No. 31 in Education, in particular. I remember very clearly sitting here with my colleague for St. Vital and my colleague for Rossmere with bated breath listening to

the Minister as he introduced one of the new major milestones in the history of Manitoba and in the history of education in the province. Bill 31, the Public Schools Act, I mean we waited — what? Nine years, was it? How long has this thing been in the making? —(Interjection)— A long time, a long time and this Minister, who has the sole responsibility — we burned our Ministers out, they did a lot. We burned them up, used them up, replaced them. This Minister is as good as new. He's as good as new, Mr. Speaker, hasn't done a thing, still showing a lot of promise. He certainly has a lot of polish and he's 'swaive' as one of the backbenchers said. —(Interjection)— Or suave, no, we were thinking of 'swaive', we were not thinking of suave. So we waited for the Minister, he rose in his place and I can remember sitting there with a pad of paper and a pen poised waiting for these new innovations. I remember after the introduction I happened to speak to the Member for Rossmere and both of us had only taken down three or four words because . . .

MR. GARY FILMON (River Heights): You were overwhelmed.

MR. DOERN: . . . we were underwhelmed by the Minister. Isn't there a saying about he laboured and gave forth a mouse. There's one expression like that. As I said, it reminds me of Immanuel Kant but the parallel is only partly right. Where a Kant wrote his great work and said that it fell stillborn from the press. Well, this is certainly the same thing, Mr. Speaker. This is not a best-seller. Very few people are going to read this bill in the sense that those who read it will be disappointed and the majority will recognize that Bill 31 is, in effect, simply a few, old regulations that have been brought forth by the Minister. But then in terms of the problems of education and the challenges of the 1980s and the 1990s it has, in fact, fell stillborn from the press. And, similarly, the Minister at the end of the Education Debate, which was a long debate and an arduous debate, at the end of that he gave a summary of his accomplishments as Minister. First of all, he said Bill 31; secondly, he said there was a finance study going on. Then he went on, it got weaker and weaker and it started out pretty weak. —(Interjection)— It was a long list and as he kept reading it got thinner and thinner. Mr. Speaker, to say that this was the crowning achievement of his administration doesn't say very much. To say that he's going to study the finance problem, that he has to allow the Member for St. Matthews, who is so weak in this House that he's moving over to another riding for fear of having to accept the challenge of my colleague for Wellington, that I think does, in fact, indicate something. So I'm saying that this bill is, putting it in the vernacular, is no big deal, it's a big zero. And if the Minister suddenly said to me that he is going to stay with the old bill, I don't know if that would be anything to be concerned about. I mean, I don't care for the old bill, it's out of date but the new bill, as has been said by my colleagues, takes us into the 1950s. Well, that's not bad; jumping into the '50s. I mean I'm a man of the '50s myself, Mr. Speaker, that's my era but the Member for River Heights, he's from the '60s or the '70s. He's one of the younger fellows in the Chamber, but I

remember the '50s. He was born in the '50s — no, born in the late '40s. I'm simply saying that if we're going to bring in legislation that is no better than existing legislation, let's just leave it alone and let's not bother. We may as well have the old Act.

Now, let's look at some of the changes. Let's look at some of the 'improvements' introduced at great expense by the Minister of Education. Every day when he drives in from Stonewall to Winnipeg he's been thinking about this bill. Mr. Speaker, I hope it's not a reflection of the ability of the man because I think he has a lot more ability but he certainly has struck out when it comes to Bill 31. Some of the changes, however, that he has brought in, Mr. Speaker, some of these so-called improvements are really not ones that I, for one, can support.

I want to read to you, Mr. Speaker, a brief summary of the major changes because I look here to the MAST Association news letter. I think they can be regarded as an objective organization in the province. Here it says, here is the major changes. No. 1, Private Schools: School boards will no longer be asked to channel funds from the provincial government to private schools; payment will be made directly by the government. That's major change, No. 1. No. 2. Special Needs, and I'll read this one long paragraph, Mr. Speaker. "Formally the Act said that, 'wherever practicable and possible' boards shall provide or make provision for the education of special needs students". This section has been eliminated in Bill 31 and the Minister of Education has been quoted as saying that this means school boards must make no distinction between the handicapped and other school children. "It's obligatory for school boards to offer programs to all kinds of children". I guess that's a quote from the Act, or the Minister, I assume that's the Act. The revised Act does, however, permit a school division or district to send handicapped students to other divisions, rather than establish the special programs itself. The division would then pay the residual costs of education. Well, there's a lot to be desired, a lot lacking, nevertheless, in that section, Mr. Chairman. Now the rest is hardly worth mentioning, I mean, it's of interest. Wards, rep. by pop., that's another change that's noted by MAST and then sick leave, changing the maximum to 75, that's of interest to people in the profession, and something about tenure, clarification about tenure achieved after an aggregate of 20 teaching months of paid service.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is this major revision; I mean what is this new Act that we have been waiting for? It boils down to a direct payment of aid to private and parochial schools and it boils down to a reference to special needs. It doesn't tackle special needs. I want to deal with that specifically, and then the rest are simply some revision, some slight improvement in sick leave and tenure and something about awards. I mean, you call this a major piece of legislation? Is this one of the new thrusts of the Conservative administration that we have been promised? Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a big zero in terms of impact on education.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about special needs children and I also want to, at the same time, send out a warning and a caveat to the Minister and to other members in the Chamber about some of the dangers of going too far in this

direction. This is a direction I believe we must move in. I believe there has to be an evolutionary process in terms of special needs children. But when you go that route, Mr. Speaker, you also go an expensive and a costly route and therefore, I think, we have to be cautious but nevertheless we must be progressive.

So I say that, although Progressive Conservatives, but remember, Mr. Speaker, that the progressive did not refer to progressive thinking, it referred to the progressive party, which was a farmer's party and in fact, when I look at some of those smiling faces on the other side, I realize that it still is a farmer's party. It is a farmer's party. It still is the old southwest Manitoba block. The Member for Rock Lake and his people are still in fact the basis, the philosophical and practical foundation of the party. — (Interjection)— Well, I have to remind the honourable members that in Minnesota they have a farmer labour party, that's a very powerful party. — (Interjection)— Well, you know, there are going to be some members leaving your caucus but it's not going to be before the next election. But it's when the election is called, that's when we're going to see some new faces. — (Interjection)— That's right, the Member for Fort Rouge, she has no problem in caucus whatsoever.

But, Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention in passing that when we talk about new faces and old faces that I think that all of us can relax in the Chamber. There will not be an election this year. There definitely will not be an election in October. — (Interjection)— Because I understand that the Conservative polls are very shocking and that the polling that has been taken has indicated quite clearly ten to twelve members of the caucus would disappear in the NDP onslaught that would occur. The juggernaut that will take place from now on in that the people are obviously shaken; shaken, Mr. Speaker. I know you're not. I know you're solid and beloved in your area, as well as on occasion, Sir, bewitched, bothered and bewildered. But we all suffer from that as well.

I just want to say that I gather than ten to twelve Tories will bite the dust where the new west begins and that, therefore, they're going to be a little reluctant to call an election. — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some support in Pilot Mound. I'm big on the mound. — (Interjection)— No, I have been there; I have been there. The member is wrong. The Member for Rock Lake will recall when I came out there and spoke in Pilot Mound. In fact, I want to tell the Member for Pilot Mound, who's an old friend of mine, that during the leadership campaign, when I ran a close third, that I told the story of my appearance in Pilot Mound and the unfortunate accident that I had there, where I ripped my trousers and had to have repairs made there, Mr. Speaker, at a local tailor.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the speech that I intended to make, as opposed to the one that I'm making, I wanted to say — (Interjection)— I apologize to the Member for Fort Rouge for making that potentially sexist remark. I hope she — (Interjection)— I see, well she's right, sexist and sexual are not the same thing. — (Interjection)— Quite so, quite so.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister, in a serious vein, that we on this side have argued for and fought for an improvement and an enrichment of special needs in the school system. I want to say at the beginning that this government's record in that area is dismal, and I want to give you a specific example, Mr. Speaker. They can pay all the lip service they want on the bill but when they have been put to the test by the city of Winnipeg, who has gone to them and asked for several million dollars to pay for what they are in fact implementing: Namely, they are not talking about special needs; they are not thinking about special needs; they are in fact doing something about it. They are dealing with problems of language; they are dealing with underprivileged children; they are dealing with the children of welfare families; with transients; with the whole host of problems that one could imagine.

The Winnipeg School Division is doing something about it and they have gone back to this Minister, for three years. In the first two years he didn't give them a thing. He smiled at them. He told them he was monitoring the situation. — (Interjection)— Yes, he's much better than the Minister of Economic Development. He's a much more amenable and friendly fellow, but the result is the same. The result is the same. Whereas the Minister of Education smiles and shakes hands and the Minister of Economic Development frowns and will not shake hands, the result is the same.

So I'm just saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative record in education in Manitoba in special needs is dismal, not a penny for Winnipeg for two-and-a-half years, not an increase, not a dollar and not a percentage increase. Mr. Speaker, I simply say that is something that their record is already poor. I want to say, however, that although we must move in this direction and I encourage the Minister to move in this direction, that he must do so with some caution because of the expensive nature of this type of a program; that when one brings handicapped people into the mainstream of our educational system, that you have to then supply some very expensive revisions and some expensive renovations to the schools. For example, if you're going to put wheelchair ramps into the schools, that costs money; if you're going to put elevators in because of the fact that you may have students who have to go to a second or a third floor in a building, or if you have to have special washrooms, this is all very expensive. Then if you want to talk about the cost of teachers to devote extra attention to these students, people with learning disabilities and you want enrichment, you'll have to pay more for that kind of education. So I say, let's move in this direction but let's move in full recognition of the costs and the fact that the bills will have to be paid for by the taxpayers.

I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I have a feeling and I don't know if the Minister shares this or whether this has ever occurred to him, but I think that part of the drive to bring special needs students into the public school system is because of the fact that there is a declining enrollment. I think some people are desperate to keep the enrollment high and will do almost anything to bring more people in. And if it means bringing in people who have greater handicaps of any kind, there is an element in society

and in the profession who desperately want to keep those numbers up. So they will do this but I say again, Mr. Speaker, that this will be at considerable financial expense and then later on we will have the problem of skyrocketing costs and further criticism and further cutbacks, and so on. So I want to simply mention that to the Minister of Education, that he should keep one eye on special needs students and the other eye on the expensive nature of providing that kind of education.

The other thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker, along those lines, is this: There has been so much attention paid to special needs students in the past number of years as a new area, that I really am worried about the average student, the normal child who is in our educational system. He seems to be the forgotten one. He seems to be the person who is in danger of losing out. You have at one end the bright and the gifted exceptional child and we have tried to pay special attention to them. At the bottom end, in a sense, or at the other end of the spectrum perhaps would be better, you have people who are handicapped in a variety of ways, with learning skills, physically handicapped, the whole business, and we're paying special attention to them. But I'm worried about those people in between, who are maybe 80 percent of the educational system. They seem to be in danger of being overlooked or not being given a sufficient amount of attention. So let's not lose sight of the normal child and the average child, which is the overwhelming bulk of the people in our public school system.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to be debating very shortly the speed-up motion. I may speak on that tomorrow, and I want to point out very clearly that we are aware of the fact that the Minister of Education deliberately had these bills delayed. He could have introduced this legislation, I think, a couple of months ago, at least two months ago and obviously what was done was he deliberately had them stalled and introduced — I'm now looking at the Attorney-General, who may the villain in the piece, although I don't like to call him that — but those bills were deliberately stalled and brought in at the exact same moment as the estimates were introduced. So instead of giving the Opposition an opportunity of debating those bills separately, they tried to bury them together or they tried to bring them in together and then put pressure on the Opposition to debate the bills, which is really unfair and I think it was a stalling tactic which was well calculated. Now they're saying to us, you guys are holding up these bills; you're holding up these bills for weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks. And yet not a word, Mr. Speaker, not a peep, from a government backbencher, not a word from another Minister in support of this legislation. — (Interjection)— Well, I can see they're not too excited about the positive aspects of this legislation. But let not one member of that side say to one member of this side, you held up the education bills. All that we did, Mr. Speaker, was we, in effect, delayed them till the passage of the Education estimates. Now we know that shortly, hopefully, given co-operation on both sides, that these bills will probably be before the public in about a week's time.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask how much time I have.

MR. SPEAKER: Thirteen minutes.

MR. DOERN: Thank you. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, no, I won't respond to that. I would like to deal in the latter part of my remarks . . . The Member for Crescentwood, as I say, we don't have any problems with the Member for Crescentwood. Muriel Smith almost knocked him off; she came within 45 votes and I don't know whether she's going to run against him next time or not, but . . .

MR. STEEN: She moved over to Osborne.

MR. DOERN: She moved over. Well, we gather, Mr. Speaker, I hate to raise this question again, we gather all the Ministers are moving farther out. They're all moving from the centre of the city towards the suburbs because they're hoping that the opportunities are richer and some are moving out of the province, along with the other citizens.

Mr. Speaker, on the section on private and parochial schools, I want to say as well that I asked a lot of questions of the Minister, as did my colleagues, during estimates. We asked for facts and figures. We never did get a lot of those answers. I have to tell you that I have asked questions throughout this session that were taken as notice and, in a lot of cases, they are never answered, they are forgotten. Some people are conscientious in this regard and they do provide answers at a later date, but I asked for all sorts of facts and figures about private and parochial schools and students and teachers and so on; I never got them.

But I'll tell you what is obvious, what is obvious is that the enrolment in the private schools is going up, that the number of teachers is going up, and that the amount of funding is going up. On the other side, Mr. Speaker, it is also clear that the enrolment in the public school system is going down, that the number of teachers is going down, and that the funding, well, you know, the dollars are going up but in terms of the percentages or vis-a-vis the rate of inflation, I don't know, I'm not so sure, we may be going the other way.

My colleague from St. Vital, I take his word for it that in taking inflation out, that we're not keeping pace. In terms of higher education we know this to be a fact, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that in terms of the public school system it's true. So what are we faced with? We really have a problem here. We have a declining public school system and we have a growing private and parochial school system. I'm not sure I have all the figures. I think I have some of them here, but I know that in the Winnipeg School Division there are some 3,700 private and parochial school students, and that in terms of teachers certification in the province that there are some 639 certified teachers, if my figures are correct — I believe these came from the Minister — certified teachers in private and shared services schools, in addition to 146 uncertified, for a total of 785.

Mr. Speaker, one of my concerns is that although this bill does not make provision for capital, that when we look at the record of this Minister and this government in terms of private and parochial schools, we see one of further enrichment. We have seen some extension in the field of bursaries to private and parochial school students. We have

moved from shared services to indirect aid and now we move to direct aid, and all this has been accomplished in the last short while.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to, for a minute or two, disagree with my colleague from St. Boniface. I want to say to him that he and I have been debating this question since 1966. I recall in 1967 in my riding I debated the Member for St. Boniface, who was at that time a member of the Liberal Party, in my riding, in a major church, with 400 people from all over Winnipeg, on the question of aid to private and parochial schools. Well, that was a long time ago. We became the government, we became colleagues, we became friends but, Mr. Speaker, we still do not agree on that question. I have just said, I don't know if the member heard me, for 14 years he and I have disagreed on that question, and we will undoubtedly continue to disagree on that question.

Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with the observations that the member made on the public school system and I certainly don't agree because he painted what to me was a sort of a darker picture, and I also don't agree with the bright picture that he painted about the value and the worth and the great job that is being done by private and parochial schools in our province. I think it's a good thing, an excellent thing, that there are private and parochial schools. I think it's a good thing that people have the right to establish a school because of their religious beliefs or because of a different system of education, more discipline, less discipline, more progressive, less progressive. You name it; there's a million possibilities. But I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the public has an obligation to fund that kind of a program or that the people have a right to demand funding for that kind of program.

We all support a public school system and we all may or may not access it. That is our right and our privilege. But if somebody decides to send their child to a private school because they want to have connections with the right kind of people, or they want more discipline, or they want a more traditional form of education, or they want to send their kids to schools in Ontario, or they want to send their children to Harvard University or to Michigan or somewhere else, or to Switzerland to a finishing school, let them, that's their right, but I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that they have a right to ask the taxpayers of Manitoba to provide them with funding for that purpose.

So I'm worried; I'm worried about the trend and the tendency of this government to begin direct aid to private and parochial schools. I know that at this time there is no capital given but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, as sure as we're all here today, that is next. I tell you that although there is only a portion of the costs of education for private and parochial schools being funded at present, that will surely increase. I predict that there will be growing enrollments and that as the enrollment grows it will tend to feed upon itself and grow at a greater degree, and that as more and more people put their children into the private and parochial system, those same people who are taxpayers will be less inclined to support programs for the public school system. They will be more likely to oppose greater funding and greater enrichment of the public school system and I think that is self-evident. I don't even think it has to be explained or

questioned. That will surely happen. And if there is — and I hope that there isn't — but if there is any deterioration of the public school system, then some of that blame has to be laid at the door of this Minister and this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we, I think, can say without equivocation that our administration will do everything in its power to prevent any further slippage. We are attempting to do that in opposition. We are attempting to stop the Minister from ignoring the needs of the public school system, and we also say to him that he should stop worrying about the needs of the private and the parochial system. His mandate and his responsibility is to provide proper funding and proper programming in the public school system, and if he's not prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker, then I can give you an unequivocal guarantee that our administration and our Minister of Education will defend the public school system and will provide it with the proper funding that it requires.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and defeated.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's been moved by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan that debate be adjourned.

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

YEAS

ADAM	BARROW
BOSTROM	BOYCE
CHERNIACK	CORRIN
COWAN	DESJARDINS
DOERN	EVANS
FOX	GREEN
HANUSCHAK	JENKINS
MALINOWSKI	MILLER
SCHROEDER	URUSKI
USKIW	WALDING
WESTBURY	

NAYS

ANDERSON	BANMAN
----------	--------

BLAKE	BROWN
COSENS	CRAIK
DOMINO	DOWNEY
DRIEDGER	EINARSON
ENNS	FERGUSON
FILMON	GALBRAITH
GOURLAY	HYDE
JOHNSTON	JORGENSON
KOVNATS	LYON
MacMASTER	McGILL
McGREGOR	McKENZIE
MERCIER	MINAKER
ORCHARD	PRICE
RANSOM	STEEN
WILSON	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 21, Mays 31.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: I am interrupting proceedings now at this time for Private Members' Hour. On Thursdays the first item of business on Private Members' Hour is Public Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The first bill on the Order Paper is Bill No. 40 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved that the matter stand. Is that agreed? All those in favour of the matter standing please say Aye. Those opposed please say Nay.

In my opinion the Nays have it.

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the Private Members' Hour. If the government is going to impose its will in respect to the procedures of Private Members' Hour then I feel that there is no longer going to be any consensus in respect to procedures of this House. If the government believes it has to be arrogant in the way it conducts the business of this House, that the private members do not have any choice as to how they conduct their particular

resolutions and bills during this hour, then I say this is a very arrogant government and we no longer have parliamentary rule. We have rule by a majority which is creating a dictatorship which is not parliamentary in the true sense. My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that we should have the opportunity to stand bills if we're not prepared to speak on them at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I might be allowed a word on that point of order. The consensus of the House, about which my honourable friend speaks so fondly, is something that we all desire to have. A consensus that we desire to have usually, in all sessions that I have been in since 1958, at this time of the session, is to get on with the public business of the House. There is public business before us. As I understand it the bill, upon which the House Leader suggested that the Member for Brandon East move, is a public bill, moved by a private member. It's of course moved in Private Members' Hour but for my honourable friend, the former Speaker of this House, to make the exaggerated and unfounded remarks that he made is, of course, silly coming from a senior member such as him.

But I do say to my honourable friend this, that we will proceed with the public business of the House. It will be concluded; it will be concluded in good order, whether or not we have the willingness of my honourable friends to get down to business or not, and I can assure him, as the Leader of the Government, that that will be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on the point of order.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Again we see the arrogance of the government and the First Minister in that he didn't really give any reasons why this bill had to proceed at this time. All he did was attack my character and that's typical of him. — (Interjections)— You know, I tried to indicate that we should act as parliamentarians in here. I never abused a single member in my point of order but the Honourable First Minister didn't have that courtesy. He had to indicate that what I proposed was stupid. This is the integrity that he has and this is the kind of arrogance that he indicates and that's also the arrogance of all of the members over there who support him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I find that the point of order that was raised by the Honourable Member for Kildonan and the point of order that was spoken to by the Honourable First Minister and replied to, again by the Member for Kildonan was, in fact, not a point of order. The members of the House had expressed their wish that we proceed with Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on a point of order. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the

government's feelings have been hurt because of the vote just held. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that can happen and we get carried away with emotion. I don't believe that the members opposite caucused a position that they would not allow a standing of a measure under Private Members' Hour. I don't believe that they have done that, Mr. Speaker. I appeal to the government to reappraise that situation and not set this kind of a precedent where we don't allow flexibility during Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am but the servant of this Chamber. The Assembly has indicated to me that they want to proceed with Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act. It is presently standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In respect to the motion that we now speak on this bill, I would request the yeas and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I believe the vote has been taken. If the Yeas and Nays were required they should have been required at the time the voice vote was taken. We have proceeded with points of order in the meantime and I would suggest that a recorded vote at this time would be improper.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, you have indicated that a voice vote was taken, I concur. I have raised a point of order. That was discussed and debated and your ruling was made on that. Now I request a Standing Vote on the motion that I raised a point of order on and I am entitled to have the Yeas and Nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. I believe that a vote cannot even be interrupted for a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. FOX: You are the servant of this House and you were the one who accepted the point of order. I still maintain I have a right to call for the Yeas and Nays. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. There's a motion before the House by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the House do now adjourn.

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

YEAS

ADAM

BOSTROM

BOYCE	CHERNIACK
CORRIN	COWAN
DOERN	EVANS
FOX	GREEN
HANUSCHAK	JENKINS
MALINOWSKI	MILLER
SCHROEDER	URUSKI
USKIW	WALDING
WESTBURY	

NAYS

ANDERSON	BANMAN
BLAKE	BROWN
COSENS	DOMINO
DRIEDGER	EINARSON
ENNS	FERGUSON
FILMON	GALBRAITH
GOURLAY	HYDE
JORGENSON	KOVNATS
MacMASTER	McGILL
McGREGOR	MERCIER
MINAKER	ORCHARD
PRICE	RANSOM
STEEN	WILSON

MR. CLERK: Yeas 19, Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Motion lost.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND
READING PUBLIC BILLS**

**BILL NO. 40 — AN ACT TO AMEND
THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: On the the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson, Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.
The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for my colleague, the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I had wanted to speak on this bill for more than five minutes today, but unfortunate circumstances have delayed my participation in the debate and there is barely enough time left today to put on the record very explicitly, very concretely and strongly as I can that the New Democratic Party Opposition will be voting against sending this bill in its present form to Second Reading.

We do not take that decision lightly. We have discussed the bill in some great length and we have discussed not only what this bill is and what this bill says, but we have discussed the implications of the bill and we have discussed what we believe to be some of the potential or possible results of this bill. I understand from conversations with members opposite that there may be amendments to this bill in committee, but we on this side cannot be assured as to what form those amendments will take and our reaction to those amendments until such a time as we are able to see them and therefore find ourselves in the position of voting against it to send it to Second Reading.

The bill itself, Mr. Speaker, is not what I would consider to be a major amendment to the Act onto itself, but what I do consider to be is a not so thin edge of a blunt wedge that is being driven into the labour legislation that could possibly result in the so-called right-to-work style legislation. That has been a fear of those on this side from the beginning of this session and also a fear of those within the labour movement from the time which this government was elected. We have not seen that sort of legislation yet. We have not seen major amendments to The Labour Relations Act yet. We were promised by the Minister of Labour earlier this year that there would be no major amendments to The Labour Relations Act this year, and this is after last year the Minister assuring us that there was an ongoing review of the existing Labour Relations Act, and that that review was intended to determine whether or not such amendments or such changes in The Labour Relations Act were in fact necessary.

The promise the Minister gave to us and to those in the labour movement earlier this year could only lead us to believe that those sorts of amendments were not necessary and that The Labour Relations Act that the New Democratic Party had put together and had passed through this House was in fact an appropriate Act, and notwithstanding the objections of the members opposite when that Act was introduced in this House, and not withstanding the comments of the members opposite in opposition to that Act when it was introduced in this House, they have found, after being on that side of the House and being in government, that the Act in fact is a workable Act, that the Act in fact is a fair Act and that the Act in fact, Mr. Speaker, is an appropriate Act for the province of Manitoba. So we greet it with great pleasure, the announcement that the Minister would not be bringing forward major changes to that Act, as had been anticipated.

Now that is not to say that they will never be brought forward, because governments, as they have, do from time to time change their minds. We

are wary of that possibility. We are wary that may happen. But the fact is, it was not brought before us during this session. But what was brought before us was this Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act, and the Minister of Labour has indicated that he has reviewed this and that he will be looking at it more closely in private. He has related this to me for the purpose of determining if it can't be made more equitable. We await to see if that in fact is the intention of the government, because the Minister is only one member of the government on the opposite side of the House. We wish him well in his efforts if he is determined to do so, but I do have to remind you that the Minister did have an opportunity to speak to this bill a while back. As a matter of fact, the debate was adjourned by his Whip, the government Whip, and when the government Whip was called upon to speak, he indicated he had adjourned it for the Minister and the Minister had decided not to speak on the bill. So we can only look forward to the Minister's comments during the committee hearing, which I am certain they will be forthcoming, and at that point we will have an opportunity to look over what he has indicated might be amendments to this particular bill.

I'd like to go into some detail as to why we are opposed to the bill in its present form.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock (tonight).