

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 16 July, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.**

**MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to table the Financial Report 1984-85.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I'm pleased to table the Annual Report of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985. Notices of Motion . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. J. STORIE** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 43, An Act to Amend The Teachers' Society Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des enseignants du Manitoba.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Manitoba Lotteries Commission Report

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd begin by thanking the Premier for prevailing upon the Minister responsible for Lotteries to share the report of the Miller Commission with our critic on this side of the House.

#### Brandon University - Perkins' settlement

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question for the Premier is: Has he received a response from the Board of Governors of Brandon University with respect to the

request to make public the settlement between former President Perkins and the University?

#### Manitoba Lotteries Commission Report

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, first I would like to correct the comment by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister responsible for Lotteries required no prevailing; the document was released on her authority to honourable members subsequent to the meeting of Cabinet this morning.

#### Brandon University - Perkins' settlement

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, in addition, in respect to the letter which I forwarded to the Brandon University, I understand that that letter was received today and I anticipate, as I indicated yesterday, that the proper action will be taken in the next several days.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Premier can indicate whether or not, given the responses that he had given earlier yesterday to my questions, whether or not the Premier is receiving resistance to his call for the making public of the settlement from his Minister of Education.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I have received no resistance. My letter just has been received this morning, I gather, by the appropriate people at Brandon University. I expect them to do that which is right within the next few days.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education.

Did the Premier consult with the Minister of Education prior to writing his letter on Friday to the Board of Governors of Brandon University?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has made some rather silly remarks with respect to my position and the Premier's position on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I have said from Day One that I indicated to the Board of Governors that I felt this information probably should be made public. They indicated that there were legal reasons and I have indicated to members opposite that the legal reasons for not making it public were confirmed by the Board of Governor's lawyer, so any insinuation that I had suggested, or the Premier had not wanted this information public, is foolish and pretentious and silly.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, given that yesterday in question period the Minister of Education gave many reasons why the report could not be made public, did

the Premier consult with him prior to sending his letter to the Board of Governors of Brandon University requesting that it be made public?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, I was attempting to show the irresponsibility of the Opposition in this persistent questioning.

Madam Speaker, I have indicated to the members the reasons the Board of Governors had given me, the reason their legal staff had given me. Madam Speaker, I indicated many times, and I did so to the chairman of the Board of Governors, that I did not feel that the policy that they had adopted with respect to the divulging of the details of that settlement was going to be acceptable. Both the Premier and I have maintained that from Day One.

The Board of Governors made the decision to relieve Mr. Perkins of his responsibility; the Board of Governors made the decision to negotiate a settlement; the Board of Governors made the decision to finalize a solution to a longstanding problem.

Madam Speaker, I had assumed that the members opposite would take some responsibility for allowing Brandon University to get back on to an even keel and to continue with the work that the community wants the university to accomplish.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, if it's irresponsible to have asked to have the settlement made public, then we're in good company, because the Premier has now asked for that settlement to be made public as well.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Education is: Has he received a copy of the letter which the Premier sent to the Board of Governors of Brandon University?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, yes, I have received a copy. I am perfectly aware of what the Premier had requested, and as I have indicated on many occasions, it is consistent.

Madam Speaker, I categorically reject the insinuation made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to either of our positions - the Premier's or myself - or this government's position with respect to openness. We have indicated from Day One that the university is an autonomous body and make their own decisions. I have indicated on a number of occasions the rationale the Board of Governors supplied to myself with respect to their desire to not release information because, Madam Speaker, all it does, quite frankly, is lead to questions about whether there was justification in the initial instance for the removal of the president.

Madam Speaker, that question has been debated in Brandon, unfortunately, from many people's perspective, for too long; the settlement ends that speculation; the hue and cry from members opposite, when they knew essentially the details, has only acted to prolong that problem.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, the Minister now knows why we want it to be made public, so that we can remove all the innuendos and all the debate, obviously.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is: In view of the fact that in the past he has tabled

correspondence that he has sent to Ministers in the Federal Government and other public figures, will he table the letter that he has sent to the Board of Governors of Brandon University requesting that Perkins' settlement be made public?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I see no difficulty in that.

### Indian Affairs - cutback in funding

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a couple of questions to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

As a result of disapproval of allotment to the five Indian bands, in the Federal Department of Indian Affairs, even if the budget has already been approved, there has been a shortfall of \$123 million over a period of five years, my question to the Minister is whether or not he is making representation to his federal counterpart in order to address this problem.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

**HON. E. HARPER:** Yes, I believe the shortfall is \$125 million that have been short-changed to the five northern bands. I think it's shocking and it's shameful that the Federal Government allows this to happen and it's creating a lot of chaos and concern among community members. It reflects on the leaders in the community, which is the fault of the Department of Indian Affairs of mishandling and short-changing the bands.

I intend to follow this and I may indicate that many of the bands in the North have this problem and it is something that has to be addressed from the leadership of the communities and also by the Federal Indian Affairs Minister, and I intend to follow this through.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Will the Honourable Minister also be meeting with the Indian Chiefs and band councils in order to discuss the implications of this shortfall with respect to their resources, their economic development, their health and social services?

**HON. E. HARPER:** Yes, I will be following through with the chiefs, and I have had indication that some of the leaders want to talk to me in the areas of mismanagement and also the shortfalls. I have had meetings last week with some of the tribal council directors in terms of addressing the issue in terms of the audit that was presented to the standing committee and also that was commissioned by the Minister of Indian Affairs. It's a very serious issue.

I may indicate that there is some feeling among the Indian leadership that the Indian Affairs is tightening their books, and it has a reflection on the distribution of dollars to the bands, and it is causing some concern in the community.

### Tripartite Program re beef

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Last spring during the election period the contract holders in the Beef Commission and the cattlemen across this province were misinformed regarding the comparison between the Manitoba Beef Stabilization Plan and the Federal Tripartite Program. Will he now reconsider the position of this province regarding Federal Tripartite and reopen negotiations?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his question, but I totally reject his premise.

If the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has information about presentations that were made at the public meetings that were held by the Manitoba Beef Commission, and in fact — (Interjections) — Obviously, some members, Madam Speaker, do not wish to hear the answer and it's unfortunate that the Member for Arthur, who's a cattle producer, doesn't want to hear what went on.

Madam Speaker, in fact it was members of the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association who attended those meetings of the Beef Commission and essentially indicated support; not only support, but an unbiased approach that the department took in presenting the information dealing with the federal plan.

Quite frankly, Madam Speaker, I have said before many times that the federal program should have been explained, not by the Province of Manitoba because of the lack of information; it should have been the Federal Government who had gone around and at least explained their program to the producers. It should not have been the responsibility of the province.

We did feel, Madam Speaker, that there was a lack of information. The media, over the months previous, either found it too difficult to explain or just did not take it upon themselves to explain the program, so we felt it would be, because we wanted the information from producers as to the program, and as a result I have no intention of reopening the issue. If the producers want to reopen it, they will certainly contact us.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. Could I remind Honourable Ministers that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, a new question, in light of the answer that I just received.

The Minister stated that the Cattlemens' Association in this province were complimenting the one particular person who presented an unbiased opinion, but why were they denied the opportunity to present the Tripartite Program at those meetings?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, any organization, a producer organization, if the Manitoba Cattle

Producers' Association wished to take the role representing the Federal Government, they are always free to set up their own set of meetings to explain the plan, and in fact the federal plan was announced several months before the Commission and the department undertook those meetings.

Quite frankly, Madam Speaker, anyone, any party was free to set up their own set of meetings if they wished to support the plan and go around and say, this is the plan that producers should buy. Madam Speaker, I don't know what the honourable member wishes us now to say. We will take any group on this side or that side of the situation and, in fact, supply information of another level of government that should have undertaken that information themselves.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, the Minister just makes my case that all the facts were not put before the farmers of the province at that time. Manitoba cattle producers wanted to be part of those meetings. My question to the Minister . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order, order please.

Does the honourable member have a supplementary?

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, I have a question.

My question, will the Minister, in light of the facts that we have just brought forward today that are apparently new to him, reconsider the July 31 deadline and let the farmers and the cattlemen across the province, whether they are contract holders or not, have the opportunity to reconsider the tripartite plan with all the facts in front of them?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, I'm hopeful that honourable members opposite will convince their members of Parliament and their Ministers in the federal House to go around and explain the federal plan if they wish farmers to join.

Madam Speaker, this matter was raised last week by the Member for Virden insofar as the misinformation that he provided to the House as to the level of support. I want to advise my honourable friend from Ste. Rose that notwithstanding the options that are put forward to the producers of Manitoba, either to increase the premiums or, in fact, lower the support, the options and the difference in support between the federal program and the provincial program even in the first quarter, we only know the results of the first quarter under the federal plan.

There is a difference, Madam Speaker, and here we will show the honourable members the adjusted support level, as of the first quarter of 1986, that's taking away the premiums that producers pay in Manitoba. The support level is \$86.78 per hundred pounds of beef under the provincial program and \$71.46 a pound under the federal program. Madam Speaker, if producers wish to join the federal program, they will be pleased, I'm sure, that they will correspond and say, change your mind and we want to opt into the federal program, Madam Speaker, and we certainly will want to hear their proposals. Madam Speaker, the vast majority of producers who attended the meetings certainly overwhelmingly rejected the federal plan.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Government Services.

Before that, I'd just like to indicate to the Minister of Finance my appreciation for sending a copy of a letter indicating where he is requesting a Provincial Auditor to do an audit on the Department of Natural Resources and I appreciate that.

### **Flooding - compensation for damages**

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister of Government Services is based on the deadline of May 31 where individuals and municipalities can make applications for flood damage. I wonder if the Minister could indicate the amount of claims that have come in and the amount that has been applied for at this time.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, I believe the deadline was extended to the end of June. There were about 20 municipalities for public sector damages who made application and hundreds of individuals from all of those affected areas who made application and inspections were carried out. I could give all of the information. Perhaps it would be better to just hand the individual a copy of the latest report that I had from the Disaster Assistance Board with regard to not only the public sector applications, but the various municipal governments, as well as the private individuals who applied. So I will provide all that information to him for his information.

Most of the inspections have been done. Once they have been completed, the Disaster Assistance Board will be coming forward with a request for payment for those who qualify under the guidelines. That has not been done as yet. They're assessing all of the applications following inspection.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** To the same Minister, can the Minister indicate the time frame that is going to be involved until the applicants or claimants will get settlement?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I expect that I will be getting a recommendation from the board within the next couple of weeks, so I will be able to take it to Cabinet for consideration of payment on the recommendations that are made.

I think that will mean then about a two, two-and-a-half month period from the time that the flooding occurred to the actual decision on payment, which is comparatively quick compared to other situations that have occurred in previous years, even during the time when the previous government was in office when there was major flooding that took place. It took, many times, more than a year, to complete the settlements.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** A final supplementary to the same Minister.

Could the Minister assure the claimants that they will get the same consideration that the Peguis and Fisher River Reserves have gotten in terms of having their claims dealt with and the money being forwarded to them?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Certainly the same guidelines apply, Madam Speaker, except that, in the case of the Reserves, the Federal Government is 100 percent responsible for the payments of those damages, both for private sector and for Band-incurred costs and flood-fighting during the flood.

In the case of the municipalities and the individuals who qualify under the Disaster Assistance Program, the same guidelines for assessment of the damages and payment will be in place as were in place for the reserves.

### **Child and Family Services - apprehension of 12-year-old**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services.

Last evening, a 12-year-old was apprehended by the police, because Child and Family Services were either unable or unwilling to act. Can the Minister tell the House if the child is now in the care of Child and Family Services?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I'm happy to report that the child is in a receiving home with the Child and Family Services.

But the facts, as reported to me, differ from the report that occurred in the newspaper. The agency was phoned at 9:30. The child was not in immediate danger, and the plan that was put in place was carried out within two hours. The agency was arranging to pick up the child when the complainant phoned the police and the newspaper. They did attempt to call her back and explain what steps had been taken, but she hung up the phone on them so it was difficult for them to communicate the plan. But I'm happy to say the youngster is in care and being looked after.

### **University of Winnipeg**

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Madam Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Education.

Since June of 1967, one of our universities in this province, the University of Winnipeg, has been working on Order-in-Council which makes it less than a full-fledged university. Can we count on 1986 being the magic year by which the University of Winnipeg is afforded full rights?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, to my knowledge, there are no intentions to bring such legislation into

the current Session. However, I have been apprised of the situation and have spoken with the president of the University of Winnipeg about the issue and we'll be taking it under consideration for the coming year.

### Crop Insurance

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Sunday evening, many Southwest Manitoba farmers were hit with a second devastating hailstorm. One of those individuals is depending on crop insurance settlements and claim adjustments to be carried out so that they can receive their payments. Will the Minister of Agriculture put all resources available through the crop insurance to make sure that there is an immediate adjustment and funds forthcoming for those individuals?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Arthur for raising this matter. In fact, he did raise it with me a day or so ago.

I've asked for a full report from the Crop Insurance Corporation on this matter and I'm assuming that all available staff, in terms of adjusters, are in the area to make those adjustments and we will endeavour to make sure that the claims flow as smoothly as possible. I have not received a report back on the matter and as soon as I have the report, I'll be pleased to make it available to my honourable friend.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I, Madam Speaker, through you, thank the Minister of Agriculture for that comment.

### Tripartite Program re beef

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** To the same question, following on my colleague from Ste. Rose, I would like to know if the Minister of Agriculture will have a meeting with cattle producers and with the individuals who are involved in the Beef Stabilization Program. Will he carry out a meeting to project what the third quarter and the fourth quarter, the kind of cash position it will put them in for the coming months, and may be beneficial for him and the cattle producers to take a look at the federal option? Will he carry out that request and put all the facts on the table that was very well put by my colleague from Ste. Rose? Will he give the facts to the producers and let them make their decisions up so they know where they're going as far as their future and their incomes are concerned?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, the analysis that I gave to the Member for Ste. Rose in terms of comparison and the difference in the support levels was based on the new support level as of September 1 under our plan and the actual support level that was made under the federal plan in the first quarter of 1986, because one can't project what the federal plan will be. For example, the second quarter support level under the federal plan will not be out until the end of July.

Madam Speaker, the honourable member knows as well as I do as to the results of the meetings that were held with our department and the Beef Commission throughout the year. If, in fact, producers themselves wish to now say we want to be involved in tripartite, I am sure that they will be making their views known and will want the Federal Government to explain what the support levels are and, in fact, it may be the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association or some other association wishes to take the federal proposals again out in the field, they're free to do so, Madam Speaker. We've done it once, Madam Speaker, and producers responded to us and I will respond accordingly when producers make their views known if they are so inclined to change their mind.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Will the Minister of Agriculture screw up his courage, Madam Speaker, and meet with the farmer and tell them how he deceived them prior to the election of March 18 and tell them the truth?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

I'm sure the honourable member was not accusing a Minister of being deceitful.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, Madam Speaker.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, I want to indicate to my honourable friend that, not like the Conservative Party who went around and hid from the farmers of Manitoba until the year of the election that they thought they would consult members on this side and, in fact, the Beef Commission and members of the staff consulted with the farmers on this issue during the election and not before the election. This consultation process was in place during the election this year, Madam Speaker, and producers rejected the federal plan out of hand. That's really the results.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, I would like to table the letter which I agreed to table just a few moments ago.

### Barrows Lagoon

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs with regard to the Barrows Lagoon which has been identified as a problem for a long time. Given that the original contractor of the Barrows Lagoon under construction was not fully paid for his contract even though the work met and surpassed mineral compaction standards, and given that McLean Construction was hired to redo the work at a cost in excess of \$100,000, can the Minister tell the House whether or not monies were withheld from McLean Construction, because after they completed their work, there was still leaking of

that lagoon, and if monies were fully paid to McLean Construction, why funds were withheld from Zander Construction?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** I believe that the member must be referring to the lagoons at Barrows which were completed last year, and presently this is before the courts, so I don't think it would be proper for me to be commenting on a subject that is before the courts.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Well, Madam Speaker, can the Minister tell the House why it has become necessary for companies having contracts with this government to sue the government in order to have their contract monies received, and can he tell the House what the contract was for M.M. Dillon and why funds were withheld from them and why was it necessary for them to take the government to court?

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Yes, Madam Speaker, obviously there was a difference of opinion between the Department of Natural Resources and the contractor on the Barrows case and that is presently before the courts to resolve that.

With M.M. Dillon there were some additional works that were taken on by M.M. Dillon because of the estimates given in the first place; there was some greater works required. There was further works required on behalf of M.M. Dillon and discrepancy was in the amount that they felt they should be getting for the service they performed. There was a difference of opinion that was negotiated. We settled in negotiations how much difference there should be paid.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Will the Minister tell the House what specific steps are being taken to rectify the problem of the Barrows Lagoon which is still leaking?

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** The engineering staff have been into Barrows. They visited lagoons. The lagoon is functioning and there is no problem with the lagoon presently. It is functioning as it was designed to function.

### **Manitoba Telephone System - service for rural Manitobans**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. G. ROCH:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Given the fact that MTS has seen fit to continue pouring millions of dollars into its money-losing Saudi Arabian MTX operations, would the Minister inform the House as to whether he would be kind enough to consider using portions of those monies to allow greater toll-free access for rural Manitobans to the Winnipeg Exchange?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question.

The honourable member does a disservice to the work of the Honourable Member for Pembina who has been making these kind of allegations not only before the committee but in the press, and I don't think the Member for Springfield has put the case as vehemently as the Member for Pembina.

There's no question but that this matter is still before a committee, and I expect that before the committee we will be able to establish, notwithstanding the allegations that have been made, that the investments that the telephone corporation has made through MTX are not unwise or imprudent but, over the long haul, will provide the corporation with real benefit.

In respect to the question that he asked, well, Madam Speaker, he both made a statement and a question. In respect to the question he asked, this government has under active consideration proposals to look at the improvement of long distance communication services in the province pursuant to the recommendations made by the very active former Member for Springfield who implored on this Minister several good suggestions about changes in telephone services. Certainly, we are looking at that whole question, and when those policy considerations have reached their stage of conclusion, I'll be reporting to this House.

**MR. G. ROCH:** Yes, Madam Speaker, seeing as the Minister is expecting many benefits from the MTX operations, would he then consider reducing the cost of FX service to rural customers?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I didn't hear the question. The speaker didn't enunciate very clearly.

**MR. G. ROCH:** The Minister stated that he is expecting a lot of benefits from the MTX operations. Would he then use some of those benefits to help to reduce the cost of FX service to rural customers who are being charged ridiculously high prices?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I thought that I had answered that question. It sounded to me like it was a repetition of the first question. I could give the same answer.

**MR. G. ROCH:** Madam Speaker, FX service is a completely different type of service. What I asked was: Will he be looking at reducing the cost of FX service to rural customers?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Madam Speaker, I don't understand. The honourable member is suggesting, I suppose, that investments that are being made by the telephone corporation to further its operation should not be made and the monies diverted to reducing or improving services in Manitoba.

If that's his question, I would like to point out to the honourable member that we should look with pride upon the operations of our corporation which has the lowest telephone rates in North America.

I would also like to point out that a responsible board of directors has made recommendations to government,

not only this government but the previous government, in respect to the outreach of the corporation, using its expertise and its high technology to the benefit not only of the corporation itself but to other parts of Canada and other parts of the world. Not only this administration made that decision, a previous administration had made that decision as well.

So I don't think that the honourable member will want to reflect on the ability or the integrity or the success of this corporation in Manitoba in the kind of disparaging way he does.

**MR. G. ROCH:** A final question, Madam Speaker. I'm just wondering if the Minister is more concerned about the citizens of Saudi Arabia or those of Manitoba.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please. That question is out of order.

### Portage la Prairie - dump, clean up

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

To the Minister of Natural Resources: Last summer, in a legal dump, toxic residue was discovered seven kilometres upstream from the Portage la Prairie Water Treatment Plant. The city was not notified of the serious potential hazard to its water supply, nor did the province move to clean up this dump. I've been unable to obtain information as to what the province is doing to resolve this hazard.

Will the Minister inform this House what action the department is taking to prevent contamination of the Assiniboine River, and why did the Minister muzzle his staff?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I assume the member is referring to the legal dump to which reference was made in the newspapers perhaps a month ago, which is located some six kilometres west of Portage la Prairie. If that is indeed the one he's referring to, I can assure the member there was no muzzling of anybody, no muzzling on my behalf and in regard to staff, nor vice versa.

Madam Speaker, the information that I can provide has already been provided in the press; indeed, the reference was made to that last summer, I believe. Letters were sent to the municipality, unknowing that this was in the municipality rather than in the city. It is indeed located in the municipality and as a result that's with whom communications took place; but in effect, and having done so, it was assumed that the municipality would in turn be in touch with the City of Portage la Prairie and that I believe did not happen. The inspection of that dump could not take place because of weather conditions until this spring. This dump I believe is either now cleaned up or in the process of being cleaned up.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Huzzled-muzzled Minister, Madam Speaker, he didn't give us a definite answer; it maybe is in . . .

Can the Minister definitely tell us that action is being taken right now on cleaning up that dump and, if it is, when will it be cleaned up?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** I can get the definite details for the member in terms of whether it is cleaned up now or in the process of being cleaned up. For a lengthy period of time there was a question as to who the owner of the property really is, whether it's Crown land, which was our belief, or whether it was, as claimed by one of the individuals who actually carries on activities on that land, whether it really belonged to him, and, in that case, whether there could be charges laid in this particular instance. I don't know if that has been completely resolved, but I will get the particular details and bring them back to the House.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY HOUSE BUSINESS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On a matter of House business, I would just like to indicate that through discussions with the Opposition House Leader it's been determined that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will meet on Tuesday, July 22 and Thursday, July 24, if required, to consider the report of Manitoba Forestry Resources Corporation.

For today's business, Madam Speaker, I would ask that you would call Second Readings as they are listed on Page 4 of the Order Paper in the order in which they are listed and, following that, if you would call Adjourned Debate on Second Readings, starting with Bill No. 4 on Page 2 and carrying on through to Bill No. 33, if time permits, on Page 3, in the order in which they are listed on the Order Paper.

### SECOND READING BILL NO. 15 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

**HON. J. PLOHMAN** presented, by leave, Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to present for Second Reading these amendments to The Highway Traffic Act today.

Many of the amendments have been made so that The Manitoba Highway Traffic Act is consistent with federal legislation, brought in last December by the Federal Government, which imposes tougher penalties

on those individuals convicted of impaired driving. The federal legislation supports provincial initiatives that have been developed here in Manitoba regarding offences involving alcohol and drugs. We welcomed many of the changes that were introduced by the Federal Minister last December.

Previously, The Manitoba Highway Traffic Act only made provision for suspension of licences, Madam Speaker. In the case of suspension, an individual's driver's licence is taken away but, if there are grounds for appeal, reinstatement of driving privileges can be made through the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. We are now including in the act prohibition from driving, in order to reflect the federal legislation.

I would like to point out that anyone convicted of impaired driving on a first offence is prohibited from driving for at least three months under the federal legislation. The length of prohibition varies depending on the severity of the offence, but it means the individual cannot appeal the prohibition.

It was necessary to make these amendments because of the federal legislation, but I want to emphasize to the House that we do have reservations about the complete prohibition which may cost some people their jobs where they require a driver's licence for work purposes because they cannot appeal for three months. We have voiced these concerns, Madam Speaker, on many occasions to the Federal Ministers, but the changes went ahead anyway. So we have had to make changes to The Highway Traffic Act now to be consistent with the federal act.

Also under the amended Manitoba Highway Traffic Act, persons suffering from an alcohol or drug-related problem may not be issued a driver's licence until these people meet the standards reflected in the regulations. The amended legislation recognizes the obvious danger of allowing drivers under the influence of any drug on the road.

As well, if the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has reason to believe a person has an alcohol or drug-related problem, he or she may be required under this act to produce a report from any recognized agency engaged in the diagnosis or treatment of persons suffering from alcoholism or drug addiction. Previously, the act referred only to people with an alcohol-related problem.

We have also added a new clause to the act to help educate those people convicted of impaired driving, and to also help prevent further offences. Under the new clause, the Registrar may require any person convicted of impaired driving to complete an Impaired Driver's Course. This is an educational program provided by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. In cases where an individual fails to complete the required Impaired Driver's Course, there will be provisions in this act that would ensure that they would not be issued a driver's licence.

Amendments have also been made to the act so that terms and references conform to federal legislation, as I mentioned. For example, the section previously titled, "Driving while licence suspended" has now been renamed to read, "Driving while disqualified or prohibited."

We have also made several other amendments, including one dealing with vehicle inspection and the safety of motorists. In this section of the act, we have replaced the term "motor vehicle" with the broader

term "vehicle." The act will now allow us to introduce the compulsory Commercial Vehicle Inspection Program. The department's Vehicle Inspection Program will be realigned to include tractors and semi-trailers. Vehicle inspection is now concentrated on cars and light trucks. Commercial vehicles have a greater potential for serious injury, since they travel on the highway more frequently and for longer distances. For this reason, they should also be subject to inspection. The Commercial Vehicle Inspection Program, which will be implemented early next year, will have vehicles inspected regularly at private shops, which have been government-certified in accordance with government safety standards.

Amendments have also been made to the act concerning towing of trailers. My department and myself, personally, have received requests to permit the hauling of two trailers behind one vehicle, particularly for recreational purposes. I'm sure many members are aware that, as an example, requests come forward from individuals who have recreational vehicles that are equipped with a fifth-wheel type of hitch, who would also like to pull a boat trailer behind. The amendments to the act will now allow the towing of a camper trailer and a boat trailer, if the towing vehicle is equipped with a fifth-wheel type of hitch. Ontario and Saskatchewan already have provisions allowing for this kind of towing, and I believe this will be a welcome amendment, especially for tourists in Manitoba.

In the existing legislation, the definition of "axle group" is rather rigid and, if enforced to the letter, would eliminate the use of most tag axles in the province. The Manitoba Government has, in practice, exercised moderate flexibility by allowing tag axles to be added to single-axle trucks. This allows them to carry the weight limits which are restricted to double-axle trucks, providing the weight maximums for either axle are not exceeded.

The current practice will now be reflected in amended legislation. However, those tag axles which can be raised or lowered from within the cab will be strictly prohibited by this legislation, which will prevent cheating insofar as those vehicles that are overweight. This has been a problem many times in the past, particularly where people are entering the scales along the highways.

The amendments also provide for restrictions concerning operation of mobility vehicles. These vehicles will not be allowed to operate on provincial trunk highways, which have a maximum speed limit of more than 80 kilometres per hour. There were amendments brought in by myself a couple of years ago, dealing with mobility vehicles. However, we had overlooked at that time this particular amendment, so the speed restriction was only issued to mopeds, and did not include mobility vehicles. Now, of course, they will be consistent, as was envisaged originally when the legislation regarding mobility vehicles was introduced.

As well, requirements for posting of speed signs will change. It will no longer be necessary to post highway and road signs indicating the end of a speed zone. Instead, signs will indicate to motorists the maximum speed allowed for the zone they are entering, which is the current practice in fact.

A clearer definition for highway classifications will be provided in the amended act. This will be achieved



through revised definitions for all five highway classifications. Currently, only three classifications are mentioned in the act. The remaining two are stated in the regulations. My department will soon be proceeding with necessary changes to the regulation, so that it will conform with definitions provided in the amended act that I am introducing here today for Second Reading. Under the amended act, each type of highway in the province will have one basic classification, with provision to reclassify to any other classification.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

There are also changes to the clause covering payment of vehicle registration and insurance premiums. As many members are aware, many people take advantage of the Time Payment Plan offered by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. We have made changes to this section of the act to provide people using the Time Payment Plan with a clearer definition of their responsibilities and the penalties imposed for nonpayment of insurance premiums. Although the existing clause covers drivers when they apply for the Time Payment Plan, the courts have ruled recently that suspension action cannot be taken for people who fail to pay their second time payment, as they cannot be considered applicants. Therefore, we propose to include registration holders in the act as well as registration applicants, to give effect to the original intent.

Currently, private vehicle owners who move into Manitoba are given three months to register their cars. It is becoming more common to see light trucks being driven for private use and, for this reason, the Manitoba Government has chosen to provide a three-month period to new residents who drive light trucks for private use. At present, trucks must be registered immediately, even if they are small light trucks for private use and this would allow them the three-month grace period, the same as other motor vehicles.

We have made extensive amendments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to The Highway Traffic Act. Many of these focus on safety and protection of lives. Since safety is a key concern, as has been indicated and illustrated by this government over the last number of years, we are very pleased that the amendments reflect this concern, these amendments that I'm introducing on The Highway Traffic Act.

Thank you very much.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I might ask questions for clarification, I gather that there's nothing required in the act to provide for changes in the speed zones throughout the province. I see nothing in there that the Minister indicated earlier was going to regularize some of the speed zones throughout the province, from 90 kilometres to 100, where the roads are intertwining. I wonder if he is still considering that, or is it required to be in the act.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, that does not deal with the amendments that I have put forward in The Highway Traffic Act. But to deal with the question, these are set by regulation by the Highway Traffic Board and there's no specific legislative changes that have

to be made to The Highway Traffic Act to give effect to change speed limits.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for St. Vital.

**MR. J. WALDING:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the motion to the House, I wonder if I might ask a question of the Honourable Minister for clarification of his introduction.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with regard to the proposed wording change having to do with the inspection of motor vehicles, the Minister is proposing to change it from motor vehicles to vehicles. Would this permit the Minister to inspect bicycles which are vehicles but are not motor vehicles.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I don't believe that would be the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As envisaged under The Highway Traffic Act, bicycles are not classified as vehicles under the act, so therefore it would not apply to this amendment in The Highway Traffic Act.

**QUESTION put; MOTION carried.**

## BILL NO. 26 - THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT

**HON. R. PENNER** presented, by leave, Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le curateur public, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, these amendments to The Public Trustee Act are designed to strengthen the role of the public trustee acting as the guardian of infants and persons with respect to whom court orders have been made under The Public Trustee Act or The Mental Health Act.

In the past, some medical practitioners have refused to provide medical information to the Public Trustee without a court order and without formal permission of the parents or legal guardian. In many cases, however, such permission is not feasible. In fact, the Public Trustee only acts in cases in which the child is without parents or a legal guardian.

Under one of the proposed amendments in this bill, the Public Trustee will be able to request medical information without the expense and time consuming procedure of obtaining a court order.

A further amendment allows the court to make an order at the instance of the Public Trustee without the formality of the trustee issuing a statement of claim.

In most cases, infant claims are settled before commencement of an action and this amendment will

allow the court to approve such settlements without the issuance of a formal statement of claim. It would still have to be done by the court, but not by means of a statement of claim.

A further amendment gives the Public Trustee a right of appeal in circumstances where no such right presently exists. In particular, a court might approve a settlement on behalf of an infant. In such cases, the Public Trustee should be able to appeal a court order to the Court of Appeal. This, if the Public Trustee feels that the best interest of the infant aren't being met. This amendment will give the trustee the status to do so.

Another amendment will allow the Public Trustee to file caveats in the Land Titles Office to prevent unauthorized dealings — or unconscionable dealings — with the land of trustees' wards.

At present, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you well know, there is nothing in the legislation to prevent the ward of the Public Trustee from making a land transaction. Such a transaction would likely be found binding if the other party to the transaction, purchaser or mortgagor, had no notice of the mental incapacity of the ward and there was consideration for the transaction.

This amendment accordingly is a protective device to protect the real property assets of the wards of the trustee against unconscionable transactions.

A further amendment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will allow the public trustee to delegate to a responsible person his or her authority, as the case may be, to give medical consent in certain instances. This practice is already in existence in that the medical directors of the provincial facilities in Brandon, Selkirk and Portage have been functioning under the trustees delegation for a considerable period of time. However, the act does not have any statutory provision authorizing the Public Trustee to delegate in that way.

In order to avoid any possible challenge to the existing practice, it is felt necessary to grant such authority in the act. I am advised by the Public Trustee that the delegation is only with respect to routine and non-controversial medical treatment. Anything beyond that must be handled specifically by the trustee himself or herself.

I commend this bill to the House.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 32 - THE PENSIONS BENEFITS ACT**

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented, by leave, Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I have a copy of my notes and a copy of what I call a spread sheet of the amendments for the Opposition Critic.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to share with honourable members and the people of Manitoba, some general observations about Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Pensions Benefits Act.

Manitobans have a tradition of caring for ordinary men and women in our society, men and women who work hard for their living and who look forward to a secure retirement when they might enjoy the fruits of a lifetime of work and sacrifice.

It is fair that their financial security for retirement plans be protected to the greatest extent possible. In too many countries, retirement means privation and exclusion from the mainstream of living, a gloomy existence in the twilight of life.

The Government of Manitoba has actively encouraged and promoted the creation of meaningful private-sector pension plans, supported by realistic levels of funding. There has been some measure of success in attaining this goal.

The Pension Commission of Manitoba has laboured hard since it was established more than a decade ago to promote the establishment, extension, and improvement of pension plans throughout Manitoba, reciprocity between pension plans, and the further protection of rights under pension plans.

The amendments my government has put before the House for consideration address the very heart and essence of Manitoba's pursuit of fairness and security for ordinary Manitobans, men and women who have laboured hard for a decent living, both now and after retirement. Increasingly, fair-minded individuals and institutions are recognizing the fundamental principle that pension funds are deferred income and monies that are set aside for the workers who belong to a pension plan.

Pension funds are wages set aside during the productive years to provide security in retirement. It is essential and fair that those funds are protected for their rightful use, sheltered from those who would use them for a purpose quite different from what they were intended. I'm sure that honourable members will agree with me when I say that most employers act in a responsible manner and have a genuine concern for the welfare of their employees, both now and in their retirement years.

In recent years, a particularly odious practice has surfaced and it is becoming a more popular tool for a small number of employers, opportunists concerned only about their personal gain. There are a number of employers that act in a predatory manner, gaining access to healthy pension funds and using whatever amount is considered to be surplus money, for purposes other than pension fund development. This minority of employers is undermining the future financial security of the men and women who are depending on these pension funds to ensure a decent standard of living at some point in the future.

The retirement income for ordinary working men and women must be protected. In the years 1969 to 1979, there were no refunds of surplus pension funds in Manitoba. Since 1980, 13 pension plans have been terminated and surplus funds have been paid out of 14 others which are still active.

What is the cost to ordinary working men and women who depend on pensions for a secure retirement? Nearly \$17.25 million. These figures do not include withdrawals of funds from plans Manitoba workers contribute to, but are registered in other provinces.

You may recall one such withdrawal by International Nickel Company of Canada that amounted to \$100 million, money that should be working on behalf of the employees that depend on it for retirement security.

Bill 32 is designed to protect the interests of those workers who contribute to pension plans registered in Manitoba, and ensure that refunds of surplus pension funds are in their best interests and not merely to facilitate the gain of others.

In general, Bill 32 is designed to ensure fairness and security for the workers of Manitoba. The Manitoba Pension Commission's authority to approve or deny requests for the refund of pension monies will be enhanced to ensure that the best interests of Manitoba's workers are served.

In order to enable the Pension Commission to review this matter and determine if recommendations for further action should be considered, current applications for surplus funds withdrawal will be frozen, pending the results of that review.

Manitoba intends to actively pursue the establishment of uniform legislation and regulations across this country, so that the 4.5 million ordinary Canadians covered by provincial and federal pension benefits legislation will enjoy the security and peace of mind that Bill 32 is designed to bring to workers in this province.

This effort is a reflection of the spirit that is fast growing in Canada in response to the increased requests for pension fund refunds. In recent years, courts in Ontario and British Columbia have supported the principle that employers can't initiate fundamental changes to employer-sponsored pension plans that would allow the withdrawal of surplus funds against the wishes of the beneficiaries.

There is support for Manitoba's position on this matter and it is reflected by the concern about this problem that is being expressed in other jurisdictions at this time. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my belief that these amendments are timely, necessary and fair and, further, that they will enjoy the unqualified support of those members who have a concern for pension security for the workers of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wholeheartedly recommend the provisions of Bill 32 to this House.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL 34 — THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS ACT**

**HON. R. PENNER** presented, by leave, Bill No. 34, The Constitutional Questions Act; Loi sur les questions constitutionnelles, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, The Constitutional Questions Act replaces and strengthens provisions presently in the existing Constitutional Questions Act and in The Queen's Bench Rules, combines these with respect to constitutional challenges.

At present, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the process by which the government becomes alerted to constitutional challenges to its legislation is unsatisfactory. Cases have been argued and decided in the Court of Appeal which have a constitutional component to them arising from the application of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, without notice having been given to the Attorney-General and, it follows, without the Attorney-General having had the opportunity to be represented on that particular issue in order to argue in favour of provincial legislation.

The comprehensive statutory scheme being proposed here will ensure the integrity of the challenged legislation until such time as the Attorney-General can be heard in response to that challenge. The proposed act will have the immediate effect of alerting both the Bench and the Bar to their particular responsibilities with respect to constitutional matters.

In addition, the proposed act clears up the question of standing. The Court of Appeal or the Court of Queen's Bench may direct that any persons interested, or any one of a class of persons interested, be notified of the constitutional hearing and those persons are entitled to be heard.

In addition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where any interest affected is not represented by counsel, either the Court of Appeal or the Court of Queen's Bench, as the case may be, may in its discretion request an appointment of counsel to argue the case and, in such event, reasonable expenses of such counsel are to be paid by the Minister of Finance.

I commend this bill to the House.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL 35 — THE INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION ACT**

**HON. R. PENNER** presented, by leave, Bill No. 35, The International Commercial Arbitration Act, Loi sur l'arbitrage commercial international, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, this legislation will enable Canada to implement the United Nations

Wednesday, 16 July, 1986

Convention on the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards, known as the "New York Convention." That convention, Sir, was adopted by the United Nations Conference on international commercial arbitrations in 1958.

As of January 1, 1986, 69 States were parties to the convention. Canada alone, of the industrialized states, is not a party. This legislation, together with similar legislation now being enacted by other provinces and by the Federal Government, will enable Canada to become a party to this convention. The convention will enter into force for Canada 90 days after accession, and that involves filing with the U.N. documents indicating Canada's intention to be a party to the convention.

In order to implement the convention, Sir, and to ensure that Canada can meet its international obligations upon accession, it is necessary for the provinces and territories to enact legislation to implement the convention with respect to property and civil rights in the provinces; that is, matters which fall by reasons of The Constitutional Act within provincial jurisdiction.

To date, the Federal Government, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and the Yukon have passed the legislation; Quebec, Prince Edward Island and the Northwest Territories have reached at least Second Reading stage. So that by October it is anticipated, Sir, that all of the provinces and territories and the Federal Government will have passed this standard bill.

The New York Convention provides a means by which arbitral awards made in one state may be readily enforced in another. It applies, Sir, to commercial matters. It affects arbitral awards and arbitration agreements concluded before or after the coming into force of The Foreign Arbitral Awards Convention Act.

At the present time, as you well know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, enforcing an arbitral award in Canada, in a common-law province, involves a time consuming process and, indeed, I'm advised that the same holds true in the civil law of the Province of Quebec. That process involves bringing an action before a court.

Under the New York Convention, recognition and enforcement of such awards is simplified. In essence, they are recognized and enforced by the simple expedience of filing them in a court of competent jurisdiction in which enforcement is sought. There are and still will be grounds for refusing to enforce an award which can be brought to the attention of a court such as improper notice of proceedings, legal incapacity of a party, and if it would be contrary to the public policy of the jurisdiction to enforce the award. These grounds are listed in Article V of the New York Convention.

As you well know, arbitration has many advantages over litigation and the resolution of commercial disputes, especially where they involve parties from different states. Canadian business persons will not be in a strong position to request arbitration agreements in their international contracts until they can assure their business partners that foreign arbitral awards will be readily recognized and enforced in Canada.

In this connection, I might note that this legislation has received the strong endorsement of the Canadian, Manitoba and Winnipeg Chambers of Commerce, and I commend it to the House.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL 36 — THE REAL PROPERTY ACT AND VARIOUS OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT ACT**

**HON. R. PENNER** presented, by leave, Bill No. 36, The Real Property Act and Various Other Acts Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels et diverses autres lois, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** The proposed amendments to The Real Property Act and Various Other Acts Amendment Act are specifically technical in nature. In the main, they are an essential precondition to the introduction and implementation of a computerized and modernized system to replace an outdated land titles system.

The proposed amendments will revise the terms and definitions used throughout The Real Property Act and Various Other Acts Amendment Act in order to be consistent with computerization; for example, to allow for printouts for instruments and titles, to abolish the seal which cannot be used on computerized printouts, and provide for the technological acceptance of titles and data storage retrieval and recording by means of electronic media.

Other of the proposed changes relate to and are in response to increasing volumes of land title business and some systems related to improvements designed to simplify forms and eliminate antiquated language used in parts of the existing act. For example, various amendments are proposed to the definition section of The Real Property Act to make the present act, which is related to a manual paper handling system nearly a century old, consistent with a mixed manual and computer operation.

Most of these amendments do not make any substantial change in the province's real property law. These amendments are extensive and, in the main, technical in nature, as I've said. Accordingly, rather than attempt to cover them all in these remarks, which would take one or two hours, I have had officials in the Land Titles Office prepare a summary which I am now sending over. I've just sent it over to the Opposition, to the Opposition Critic, together with a copy of the Land Titles Office proposed instruction booklet for the proposed new forms and a booklet of the new forms which will be used following passage of this bill.

These amendments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been discussed with the Real Property Section of the Manitoba Bar, the real property teachers at the Faculty of Law, the Western Bar Association, the Manitoba Mortgage Lenders Association; and many suggestions for change made by these groups have been incorporated in the bill as drafted and presented.

I commend this bill to the House.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL 41 — THE PRIVATE TRADE-SCHOOLS ACT**

**HON. J. STORIE** presented, by leave, Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Private Trade-Schools Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles de métiers privées, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. J. STORIE:** I'm pleased to be able to provide some remarks on Second Reading of this bill. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it brings forward some timely amendments, both in terms of the experience that the Department of Education has had and perhaps individual members have had with respect to the activities of private trade schools in the Province of Manitoba over the recent past.

As I will be indicating in my remarks, it is also timely in that there have been significant changes over the last couple of years, in particular, with respect to the offerings available to individual Manitobans through private trade schools or what have been termed private trade schools. One of the things that I hope this bill will do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to provide some uniformity, some assurance to the consumers of Manitoba, the consumers of courses offered by private vocational schools in a very direct, concrete, and understandable way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this act allows the government, among other things, to monitor the operations of private trade schools in the province. It ensures that course fees are reasonable, and that qualified instructors offer quality training and adequate security to students enrolled in private trade schools.

We are proposing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a revised act, because the existing act is approximately 50 years old. The existing act is very limited in scope. There is a great deal of ambiguity in the current wording, which makes it unclear as to whether a particular school is covered by the act. Moreover, discussions with the Attorney-General have indicated that, in many instances, they would have difficulty supporting the department's application of the act because of the vagueness of the wording. So part of the intent in redrafting and providing these amendments is to make more clear those sections which have been reviewed, and have been cause for concern over the intervening years.

Additionally the act, currently at least, does not lend itself to easy application or interpretation. Many small businesspeople are frustrated by what they perceive to be excessive bureaucracy and uncertainty as to the scope of the act.

Also, with the emergence of the Canadian Job Strategy, we anticipate that there will be a significant increase in the number of private companies offering training over the next few years. The limited scope of the current act makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for the department to require these new operators to adhere to the legislation. It makes it equally difficult, I suppose, for students, those enrolling in private training courses, to be assured of the quality of the instruction; to be assured of the security of their investment; to be assured that any time, effort and money that they put into a course is going to end in gainful employment. The proposed new act, Mr. Deputy Speaker, contains changes to remove most of these problems.

The new act clarifies and expands the scope of the act to ensure that all schools offering training leading to employment are covered. A major change is the clarification of "vocation," as the present wording tends to restrict the act to trades training, as opposed to vocational training.

A second change, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a reduction in the need for ministerial approval, in many cases. The new act tends towards a monitoring role by the department and its staff, which should allow for quicker response time in dealing with requirements of the act, as well as removing some of the current restraints.

The new act ensures a higher quality of training is offered by private trade schools, through improved regulations for monitoring of schools.

Fourthly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new act provides for improvement in the level of instructor training. The present act is inadequate in this respect, and the concern obviously is that, when there is a contract for training, implied or otherwise, both the quality of the material, the timing, and the quality of the instruction be of such quality that an individual can be assured that the end result again will be both satisfactory training and gainful employment.

Fifthly, the new act clarifies the Minister's authority to exclude certain schools from the act, where desirable. As members may know, there are other professions, other bodies which operate under terms enacted in this Legislature, which traditionally and I believe logically should be excluded. Provisions are provided in the act to allow the Minister of Education that latitude.

Finally, and perhaps of most importance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new act provides for greater student protection through the clarification of regulations for the establishment of schools, the bonding of instructors, and stronger instructor qualification requirements.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new act is being amended so that The Private Trade School Act is up-to-date; that it reflects much more realistically the realities of today, the expectations of parents, the expectations of students. We believe that the amended act will meet the requirements and ensure that Manitoba students receive quality vocational training.

Those are my remarks, Madam Speaker. I understand that my colleague from Fort Garry would like a copy of my remarks, and I will make those available to him now.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, a question for clarification, I note in the definition, there would appear to be an

expansion of the definition of what a private vocational school is. It seems to have broadened the net as to what is being caught by the new definition. I can appreciate that the thrust is to try and deal with those courses of training that deal with the technical training of an individual, in other words, what is needed that you have to take before you can get a job.

The question I pose to the Minister for clarification is whether or not those types of courses that one takes while in a job, such as a real estate agent or a life insurance agent must take to continually upgrade themselves for professional development, is it the intention that type of training, skills, and programs be included in this bill or is it to be excluded?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, there are two aspects to the question raised by the Member for Fort Garry. One is, and I believe I said in my remarks, that there is an intention to exempt those bodies which operate private vocational schools which operate under legislation, the Manitoba Chartered Accountants or the Canadian Chartered Accountants. I'm not sure if I've got the title right, but those that operate under acts of the Legislature.

Secondly, I can give the member assurance that there is no intention to monitor or register those training components operated by a company for its own employees. I believe that was the question being asked.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The only question that the Minister didn't answer is whether or not the professional or paraprofessionals, such as computer programmers — they are not covered, I believe, by any particular statute which would be exempted according to the Minister, and it might entail more than some employees for one company. In other words, you might get a group organization of computer programmers offering upgrading courses for themselves. Is it the intention that they would be exempted as well? I would think they would be, but I just would like clarification.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, I'm not clear on the member's questions. I believe the intention is that, if a course is being offered for which there is payment, the individual taking such a course is not an employee. But if you're suggesting a scenario where three or four companies get together, their employees are taking training for their own particular purposes but there is no course, no contract between student and vocational school, then those would be exempt. I assume that's the kind of thing. There is no intention that employees, who are not of their own volition and with their own resources taking training, be covered.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I move, seconded by the Member for St. Norbert, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND  
READING  
BILL NO. 4 — THE FAMILY FARM  
PROTECTION ACT**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased that I can enter into the debate on this particular bill.

I had hoped, when the bill was introduced, that possibly it could be one bill that the present Minister of Agriculture could be introducing from time to time that I could sort of sympathize with and feel comfortable with. But unfortunately, that is not the case. It is my intention to oppose, along with my colleagues, this bill, and I want to give some reasons for that kind of a position.

What I find most interesting and frustrating, I suppose, with the Minister is that this seems to have been an election promise and sort of a reaction to some of the problems in the farm community. He feels that, by bringing in this kind of legislation, he is solving the problem for the agricultural community.

As has happened in the past with this Minister, once he brings in the bill, the reaction starts and he finally realizes — and I think he will again in this case — and must be realizing now that this bill is not a popular bill. It's not popular with the lending institutions, and it's not popular with the farm community. Sometimes as happens with these bills, it takes a little while until sort of the feedback gets to the people and they understand what it's all about, realize the implications of it. Then the reaction starts. I'm sure that this Minister of Agriculture must already be getting that kind of reaction.

We were just discussing this before lunch. This Minister's been here for a long time. I think he's from the class of '69 or something like that. I would think that possibly he should have a better grasp and perception of what is required in the farm community, instead of always working on the knee-jerk reaction to some kind of a problem. That's basically what he's doing and he's done this before, Madam Speaker. He did that with The Farm Lands Protection Act, and he's come up with another dandy again. Well I shouldn't call it "dandy"; I think it's a frustrating bill.

Initially, Madam Speaker, our caucus took some time dealing with this, and our very capable Critic of Agriculture, the Member for Virden, spent quite a lot of time agonizing over this bill, looking at the implications, what was the purpose of it and what it would do. Ultimately, we had various discussions in our caucus about it.

I know there was some concern by the media to some degree, indicating why we did not come out with our response sooner. Well I think most of us that represent rural areas wanted to make very sure that there was something in there that we could support, and I think the Member for Virden indicated the various problems we had with the bill.

I found it most interesting the other day, after the Member for Lakeside had spoken to the bill, the Member for St. James in his usual fashion got up and started wailing about his knowledge of the whole affair and fed-bashing involved in this and protection. What I found most interesting was his position about the Conservative caucus protecting their backs. That's sort of a normal reaction that I expect from the Member for St. James. I find that ludicrous really, you know,

the kind of approach he used on the whole thing without really knowing what it was about. But I think after the tongue-lashing that the Minister of Agriculture got from the Member for Lakeside, a reaction had to come from somebody, and the Member for St. James is very popular in doing that.

Madam Speaker, I've had the opportunity to farm pretty well all of my life, with the exception of two years when I lived in the city. When I started off farming, it was in pretty tough times. I come from a family of seven and I was the second-oldest, the oldest boy in the family, and things were pretty tough. To get into the farm business at that time was a major undertaking.

Anyway I was fortunate enough, after I had worked in the city for a few years, to go back and work an arrangement with my dad in terms of setting up an expanded dairy operation. The one thing at that time, credit was tough. It was hard to get somebody to borrow money for building of a big barn, buying the additional cattle. What we did at that time, Madam Speaker, we went to the banker. We needed financial commitments or borrowings, pretty substantial. We went to the local banker, explained the situation as a father and son to him, had a good discussion, and he helped us with our planning to some degree, and we started farming.

In subsequent years, it worked well. When we had difficulties from time to time, we could go back and explain the situation, and always got a good reception. I want to re-emphasize, Madam Speaker, I am not talking in defence of the banks, because they can look after themselves. When I borrow money from them or anybody else, they expect it to be paid back. They tell you beforehand what the interest rates are going to be and, given circumstances are normal, it happens that way.

Later on, we ran into some financial difficulties because we went into an expanded beef program, and our capital requirements were substantial. This was at the time when the Government of the Day had said, we'd never catch up with the beef industry. So we jumped, based on that information, and we ended up with approximately 300 breeding cows. Our investment was substantial and most of it was borrowed money. Then the market crashed, and we were caught in dire straits. I suppose, if the same circumstances would have applied today, possibly the bank would have foreclosed on us. I don't know.

However what did at that time — my dad had now retired from the business, I was in it with my brother. We went back to the banker and said, give us some rope. Give us a chance; let us work this out. We'll liquidate some assets. Anyway, Madam Speaker, we managed to work out an arrangement and, subsequently, managed to stay in business and continued our farming practice.

Why I raise that, Madam Speaker, is just to illustrate that, at the present time, the one thing I have found, if you have financial difficulties, even if you have financial difficulties where you've borrowed from one of your suppliers either for fertilizer, fuel, stuff of that nature, if you go back and you communicate and talk to the people, explain the circumstances, your desire to try and do your best, in most cases they will give you the opportunity to work your way out of it.

What bothers me is when we have to come forward with legislation, as this Minister has now done, and

feels that we're going to legislate goodwill with the banks and with the credit unions and with the suppliers. Well exactly the opposite is going to happen.

I read an article, and I'm sure that the Agriculture Minister must get to read *The Cooperator* as well. The one dated July 10 indicated where the banks are sort of putting their position forward. As I say, I think it is appropriate that we should address that, because I have always had a good working relationship with the bank. Madam Speaker, I've always owed them money, and I've always tried to pay my payments as well as my interest.

But the people from the banking institution have indicated here: "It is a common practice now, where cooperation is received by our clients and where the faintest glimmer of hope of survival exists to waive principal payments in their entirety for a year at a time and/or suspend interest payments indefinitely in order to accommodate the situation." This is a banker speaking on how they're trying to address the problem of farm financial difficulties.

On other occasions it indicates: "We have actually set aside loans, charging no interest or principal payments in the hopes of some recovery of the overall situation if the obligations to the bank were removed. We have done this on a voluntary basis, and the emphasis here is on the word 'voluntary.' It has been a negotiated settlement where the Royal Bank, in this case, continues to deal with the client in a pre-arranged way that is mutually satisfactory to both sides, in lieu of the consequences which would be disastrous."

We have a prime example of exactly what the Minister, I suppose, is trying to do with the bill and forcing somebody to do that. The moment you try and force borrowing institutions to do this kind of thing, they'll react negatively, and that's exactly what's happening. I know that the Minister of Agriculture is already getting pressure from the credit unions. I don't know what he considers pressure from the banks, but certainly they have major concerns about something like this.

Not only that, Madam Speaker, there are many farmers who are in financial difficulty right now who look at this bill and have said to me personally, and I met with some in the Legislature that said, this is not solving the problem. There must be other ways to solve the dilemma of the agricultural community, the financial straits they're in. But this kind of legislation certainly is not the answer, and I think the Minister realizes that. It's window dressing.

Basically it's, as I indicated before, a reaction to a promise made that sounded good during the election. The Minister must be wincing inside, with the kind of response that he's getting. Mind you, he's got a pretty thick skin, Madam Speaker. I have realized that over the years. They can jump on him pretty hard, and he still goes on in his one-track mind. But I just wanted to illustrate some of the problems that are developing because of this bill.

I want to continue on this article and I feel that, especially after the Member for St. James said we were supporting the banks, I'd still like to put some of these concerns on here. The banker in this particular case is talking about the pending legislation which was not finalized yet. He makes reference: "Should this be the case, subject to the Manitoba Farm Financial Review Panel's decision, it is also possible that, in addition to

disallowing lenders the right to foreclose, farmers may also have their contracts adjusted in a court of law. Admittedly, this is the worst scenario. However, we have been led to believe nothing else and, until further clarification has been provided, the bank should gear itself to expect the worst.

"Should the aforementioned legislation take place, a number of reactions by lenders and trade creditors are likely to occur, both in the short run and longer term. In the short run, federally chartered banks would likely try to test the legislation in a court of law." I don't know whether the Minister has thought of that, especially in view of the fact that we now have federal legislation in place which basically solves the problem that the farmers were looking at. They are happy with that. They know that they will not get the kind of reaction that I'm going to be illustrating in here a little further.

"In the short-run . . ." — you see, Madam Speaker, they indicate here that, if the federal banks take this to court, it might be as long as two years before this will be resolved. What the Minister is going to do in the interim about the problems, I'm not quite sure. "In the long run," it says, "more serious implications exist in agriculture for those who continue to farm in this province and form the large silent majority. Unquestionably, increased premiums over prime will be charged to offset the additional losses expected as a result of the legislation."

That is what every one of our speakers has already indicated, and I want to repeat that. "Increased premiums over prime will be charged to offset the additional losses expected as a result of this legislation. This will be especially true with those accounts where the financial stability is anything less than totally desirable. It will also be increasingly more difficult to obtain credit, as no lending institution will want to place itself at any risk of having to contemplate foreclosure, much less expose themselves to the legislation and the resulting possibility of curtailment of seizure of assets and rewriting of contracts.

"Margin requirements will increase substantially and, in case of mortgages where a double impact takes place, we refer you to The Manitoba Farm Lands Ownership Act. It will be necessary for loans to be margined at no more than 60 percent of the purchase price or the appraised value, whichever is less, rather than the 75 percent which is allowable under The Bank Act."

That is sort of the long and short of it, Madam Speaker. The Minister denies that there's going to be any impact on the general farm community, and we have the banking people indicating right here that they will be wanting more interest and that they will require more equity to finance any operations. It also indicates here: "This would have the impact of further reducing farm land prices, which will in turn further aggravate an already serious land asset value situation."

Now, Madam Speaker, if I came up with these kinds of statements, you know, everybody would say, well what does he know about it. But these are the people that are actually going to be involved directly, the lending institutions that are making these kinds of statements. The Minister of Agriculture fails to accept that statement. As I indicated before, he sometimes has a hearing problem and, if he hears, maybe he has an impact problem, because certainly these are very serious statements that are made.

He's looking at helping possibly — I don't know what the percentage is. I think some of my colleagues indicated the percentage of the people that would be helped. But what's going to be the result of this thing is that every farmer is going to be paid substantially more. If this Minister thinks that he can take the banks to task, he's sadly mistaken. Madam Speaker, they are a big operation. The banks will always look after themselves. They need nobody else to look after them. I can't foresee us doing any harm to the banks. Madam Speaker, we can legislate all we want. If they feel that they cannot make money at this, whatever they're borrowing on, let's say in the farm community, they just won't borrow the money. If they do, it would be at such an interest rate that they still make money. So where does this Minister get off feeling that he is going to be helping the farmers in financial trouble?

Further on in this article here, it indicates: "The Royal Bank feels that there are still some positive alternatives that would serve Manitoba better than blanket legislation or, if you will, the shotgun approach. We would much rather prefer to use a rifle, and address those issues and specifics or those farmers that are in financial difficulty. The use of Farm Financial Review Panels is an acceptable one to us, provided that they become a real player in the situation rather than an adjudicator that takes no responsibility monetarily for any actions that they may impose on either party."

Madam Speaker, they make some suggestions here. "With this in mind, it is our suggestion that Farm Financial Review Panels be empowered with authority to either lend directly into the situation or to the guarantee loan or to guarantee loans for other lenders. Moreover, the bank is prepared to voluntarily set aside loans in an appropriate amount, provided that the government is prepared to guarantee the amount of this set-aside, should it be desirable as determined by a Farm Financial Review Panel to sustain the farming operation by this method."

Now, Madam Speaker, that is a suggestion that I would certainly endorse, because there used to be a time — and I indicated before, when I started into farming, the financial difficulties we had. We had a Farm — what was it called? — the Farm Improvement Loan, which was guaranteed by government, and the banks felt very comfortable using that approach. They looked at the program that the farmer presented, and made the loan under The Farm Improvement Loan Act. It was guaranteed by government. It worked well, but that is not being used anymore. But this is what the banks themselves are suggesting would be a proper approach, instead of using what we have.

"The emphasis on this type of action, by necessity, must be on a voluntary basis between the lender, the farmer and the Farm Review Panel, rather than imposed by way of legislation." That is where the reaction comes from the people, and it's been slow coming, Madam Speaker, but it is coming.

This is not a good bill. It is going to aggravate a situation between many friendly lenders. Madam Speaker, I'm not saying there isn't the odd banker who possibly has a bit of a hard hand, but the majority of them, in their self-interest and the interests of the banks, are prepared to discuss these things and they have outlined this very specifically here.

Why this Minister is not prepared to take them back off and consult with them rather than take an



aggravated situation that is going to be unhealthy for both the farmer and the lender, I can't understand. That is why, in my opening remarks, I indicated, Madam Speaker, that it's a knee-jerk reaction type of legislation that he is bringing forward. He's done this in the past. And when the pressure starts coming down from the general public, from the people affected, why he will not then reconsider his position, I cannot understand.

We have the same thing with this very same Minister. In May of this year, he turned down the Tripartite Beef Stabilization Program. He did it at a time when he had not probably done his research properly. He did not foresee what was happening in the future, and as a result now the cycle has turned again and there is a lot of pressure to change his position in that regard. Invariably, this Minister always ends up in trouble where he starts off with something and he has to reverse his position. I just hope, not for the sake of a political victory, Madam Speaker, but for the sake of the farmers, that the Minister will reconsider his position because it is a very sensitive one out there and it's just starting to boil.

I can indicate to you, Madam Speaker, that this bill will be getting a lot of attention before it's going to be passed in Second Reading because many of my colleagues have major concerns that they want to express, and even if we have to repeat them many times, maybe eventually this Minister will start to listen to some of the concerns.

I just want to continue with some of the articles in here. Making reference to the panels and the kind of suggestions that they have come forward with, it indicates it allows for involvement of government in a real way even if it is determined that the guarantee method be used rather than direct lending and hence government leverage of its limited funds would be considerable. The government would not have to put out the bucks if they worked on the guarantee system.

As a result, you'd be helping many of the people who are looking right now to try and sort of amalgamate their loans, be able to refinance, set up on a situation and redevelop their program. That would be the route to both. Instead, the Minister comes up and he says we'll have Farm Start, Farm Aid. He's going to pump millions of dollars into there. In many cases, it's going to be operations that cannot be saved anyway.

I think the farmers are the first ones to realize that they can't all be saved. You can't save all the businesses, you can't save all the marriages, you can't save all the farms no matter how much legislation you pass, and that is a thing that I think we have to accept here. I hope that the Minister would accept that.

It indicates here that it is politically acceptable to the vast majority of farmers who are not in financial difficulty and can perceive that the proposed legislation will cost them significantly more. That's the final statement on the article that it was quoting from.

Madam Speaker, I don't know. We've had many times legislation being presented by various Ministers, and then they've gone out and they've gotten a reaction from the people. They try and meet with various groups. I don't know whether any of our colleagues can indicate that this Minister, before presenting this kind of legislation, met with various farm groups, people who would be affected and explain what would happen. If the Minister has met with these groups, I'd certainly

like to know who he met with and how he explained this situation, but I suspect that this has not been the case, that this Minister has come up with a poor judgment again.

Madam Speaker, I hope that as long as we keep debating this bill here and bringing forward the concerns of the farm people that we all represent, that finally this Minister will take and swallow some of his pride maybe and maybe consider the fact that there is federal legislation in place. He's getting himself into a box with dual legislation. Which one is going to have the authority: the federal or the provincial legislation? He's got himself into a jackpot where he himself does not really know what is going to happen.

I don't think he's got the legal advice at this stage yet to indicate where his position is with his bill, and I would suggest to this Minister that he quietly withdraw this bill, swallow some of his pride, indicate his support for the federal position and then there would be no problems.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Arthur, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I understand that in my absence from the House the Minister of Education introduced for Second Reading Bill 41, An Act to amend The Private Trade-Schools Act. In view of the fact that my family and I have a direct pecuniary interest in a private trade school known as Success/Angus Business College, which I understand will be regulated by this particular piece of legislation, I want to inform members of the House that I will not be participating in any discussion or deliberation with respect to the bill and will absent myself from such discussion and any vote that takes place on that bill.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I'm not sure whether that was a point of order, but . . .

## **BILL NO. 5 — THE TRADE PRACTICES INQUIRY ACT**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 5, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Riel.

**MR. G. DUCHARME:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief.

It's a pleasure to rise on this bill on the Trade Practices Inquiry Act. Our leader, on Friday last, gave the Opposition's views and their viewpoints and did it well.

I also personally have problems with this bill, and I'll use the words of the Honourable Minister who introduced it — I believe the honourable member does a disservice to the Manitobans — it seems to be a word that he uses every other day.

This government, and I can understand their problem, their sensitivity, about its inability to carry out a First Minister's statement during a campaign and, very specifically, a promise to reduce the price of gasoline by I believe 9.5 cents a litre. The government, however, cannot make the promise go away. The Premier was quite specific on the subject and received considerable publicity because of it, and many people listened to him with regard to this statement when it's coming from a First Minister.

My concerns at this point are not to defend the oil companies; they can take care of themselves. However, because of this type of legislation, and the people's concerns seem to be focusing on the oil industry, I cannot avoid using them as my example. Any research I have done in the last couple of days has stressed the oil companies.

However, this bill is being used, I believe, Madam Speaker, as a sledge in affecting the marketplace, using a sledge where I believe a hammer will do. As admitted by the Minister, he has the power to do this under the existing bill. He has the power to do it with the four people coming forward to ask the inquiry and I think this power is as strong as he would require.

One of the questions I'll ask is: Even with its own purchasing, the Province of Manitoba, on \$125 million that they do each year, will they not have a conflict in probably controlling the prices of the purchases that they obtained during the course of the year?

A similar type of legislation, Madam Speaker, was proclaimed in Nova Scotia in 1934. It was replaced by a similar bill in 1950. This particular bill has many, many problems. It does not give the incentive to lower the prices. Individuals do not know when the marketplace changes. The area in gas prices has stayed very constant in Nova Scotia; however, consistently high. That was specified in an article in the Sun on April 26 after the Minister had been giving a press conference on what he was going to do in regard to the report that was ordered.

In that article, it mentioned that Halifax was one of the highest at the time at 50.1 cents a litre and our own in Winnipeg was 45.4. Some of the problems in Nova Scotia that they've been having problems with in this legislation — and theirs is a little broader than ours. It controls when they open; it controls the days; it controls the square footage of filling stations; it goes on and on and on. I won't get into it at this point, but they're finding that the gasoline problems, the maximum margin has become fixed. Consumers definitely pay higher prices over that certain period of time.

Marginal dealers, they survive, and they survive by cutting service and hours, and they do so. Little incentive for price differential, based on service. They have found that a smaller dealer cannot offer the extra service, even if customers are willing to pay.

Some promotions, for instance, that are offered across Canada that seem to be part of the oil industry, and probably of many, many other industries are withheld from that particular area. They're not allowed. Consumers lose some value in that particular

marketplace. It protects the inefficient and the ineffective people. Wholesalers depend on retailer viability for success. Little downward pressure at the retail level, and why would they? Wholesalers are hesitant to move downward.

A recent report also mentions that while Montreal and Ottawa showed substantial price variations, in Halifax, would you believe that 96.5 percent of the retailers, 137 of the 142, were at the same price. The remaining five stations priced marginally below the market. Halifax probably in there, realize it really is a one-price town.

The report also noted that almost all dealers in the Halifax area, that same 96 percent, charged the maximum price permitted by the Public Utilities Board with retail margins at approximately 3.9 cents per litre. In contrast, at the time of the report, average retail margins in Toronto were below the 3 cents per litre.

In a paper delivered to the Halifax Board of Trade in 1979, and this paper was delivered by a former member who sat on the Public Utilities Board, by the name of Mr. J. L. Kirby. After sitting on the board and seeing the damaging effects of this particular legislation, he strongly advocated deregulation, based on his experience. Mr. Kirby concluded in his statement and is as follows, and it's right to the point, very clear. "Two major studies, the Renouf and Dalhousie Reports, have concluded that Nova Scotia's unique regulatory system leads to significant insufficiency in the marketing of gasoline inefficiencies, which lead to a redistribution of income from tens of thousands of consumers to a few hundred dealers.

"In addition, regulation restricts the range of choices open to customers, in terms of type of facility from which they can get gas and it afford the dealers a degree of protection given to no other segment of the retail industry in the province."

Madam Speaker, I emphasize, I use the oil industry as an example, not to stick up for the oil industries. I use that because it seems to be the one that the most research has gone through in the last couple of years that have been carried out by the Federal Government on the many, many means and regulations put forward.

All I say to the Minister is McDonald's, watch out. This is a typical Socialist-type of bill. When you can't govern by simple regulation and you can't buy them, then you govern it to death. I will have more questions when it gets to the committee level, after the public realizes the seriousness of such legislation, controlling the marketplace, and as previously mentioned by the member earlier in his speech, when the public is aware. A lot of the public aren't even aware we're sitting here, so how can they be aware of these bills until they come forward and it's told to the public?

I, like my leader, and our members will not support it. I will not allow myself to be part of establishing a broad-brush approach to a bill, without looking at alternatives, just to save the embarrassment of the First Minister's ridiculous statements, and to show how ridiculous that statement was, a month later, in April after the election — and this is coming from a lawyer — quote in The Sun, Winnipeg, April 16, 1986: "I think it (the Act) needs more teeth so that we can avoid the legal challenges that might take place." Why did the Minister not think of this before he made such a statement during the election period?

Another political statement that was made was the Minister of Finance with the idea of setting up gas pumps in the 12 cities in Manitoba. The only thing they would have effect on would be to compete with the small business dealers. I can hardly wait for the reaction on the next increases, for instance, on the coffee from Brazil. Will the Minister then become involved and maybe take up the act of storing the coffee in freezers, the same as he wanted to do with the gas pumps?

This government has several alternatives that will probably be discussed at the time of committee and also at the third reading and I will leave them till then. This is a short bill, however a very dangerous bill and, I repeat, "dangerous." The presence of this bill that will affect, as previously mentioned, a now existing deteriorating relationship between this government and the very concerned independent business in this province today.

I look forward to the continuous discussions at committee and at third reading. I thank you for this opportunity.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Arthur, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## **BILL 11 — THE PLANNING ACT**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 11, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to make a few comments on Bill No. 11, Madam Speaker. One has to appreciate that it is a fairly extensive number of changes that the Minister is proposing. The first question I would have to ask of the Minister, in view of the fact that he has not been in that department for very many weeks or months, if he has taken a very careful look at it, as a Minister, as a policy maker, to make sure that he is in full agreement with what the bureaucracy has brought forward.

I don't think, Madam Speaker, that in the short period of time that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has sat in that capacity as Minister, that he has had an opportunity to look at the department, look at The Planning Act, and say all these things are wrong with it or all these things are right with it, and I'm going to produce for the Legislative Assembly for this Session a massive change to the legislation in The Planning Act.

I ask him those questions because it's my concern, Madam Speaker, and it has been a concern with planning from Day One, that what we are basically doing is taking some of the decision-making away from those individuals who are elected at the local municipal level and putting it in the hands of the bureaucracy and out of the reach of those people who are elected to look after local community affairs.

It's been a concern of mine from Day One; it continues to be a concern, Madam Speaker, and I want to talk just briefly about that because I think when people are elected to the local municipal council as reeves, as councillors, as mayors, as alder people, they in fact have a major responsibility. Yes, Madam Speaker, I believe they need guidelines, but there is no point of putting guidelines in a democratic system; putting people in place, giving them guidelines, giving them the opportunity or the responsibility of carrying out that job, and then bringing in a whole list of bureaucratic regulations that stops them from making the decisions that are in the best interests of the economics of the lifestyle of those communities that they're representing. I'm going to give you an example in a few minutes of an experience that I have had when I was a Minister and some of the problems that can develop.

As well, in talking to some my colleagues, it has been pointed out, and the Minister has it in his notes of explanation, that he is removing the ability for one municipality to form a planning district. There's no longer an opportunity for one municipality to do that. Well, Madam Speaker, the reasoning for that is that no municipality has requested it up to this particular point. Now is that a substantial reason to make the change, because it hasn't happened up to this point? I think, Madam Speaker, the Minister should rethink this. I would hope that he would check with the different municipal authorities to make sure that they are truly supportive of what he is doing.

Another area of concern that has been brought to my attention or that I want to point out is that they are removing the responsibility of the Municipal Board from having to consult with municipalities affected, to give the Municipal Board the discretion as to whether or not they want to. You know, for a government that has been making a lot of noise about this great consultative process and great agreement with everybody and making sure everything was in proper discussion or had been properly discussed, why would the Minister of Municipal Affairs proceed to take that out of The Planning Act? I don't think, Madam Speaker, that there is any pressing need to take out the necessity to consult with municipalities. That is a principle, and that's what we're debating on Second Reading is more the principle than the specifics.

Again, for a government that is so high on their own record or pretend to be so high on the record of consultation, why would they remove that very important element from this piece of legislation? I would ask the Minister to be prepared to respond. I think that, when he's introducing such a massive piece of legislation, he would have done a little bit better in giving us a clarifying statement in this regard.

The major question though is the one of removing the authority or some of the responsibility from local councils. Why not leave with them the maximum ability to make the decisions for the people that they're elected to represent within their jurisdiction? I know the Minister of Northern Affairs and I'm sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs doesn't want the Federal Government imposing on their responsibilities. I don't think they want them getting involved in the jurisdiction which is the provincial jurisdiction. I'm sure they don't. So why would they want the imposition on local municipal councils when it comes to the jurisdiction which they

are elected to represent? I think, Madam Speaker, the whole question of the municipal planning, the whole question of municipal authority has to be looked at and looked at carefully.

I'm sure, as I said earlier in my opening remarks, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs hasn't had the opportunity since the 18th of March to get a complete handle on what the bureaucracy is presenting him to present to this House to impose on the people of Manitoba. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that I am certainly going to have some reservations, because of the magnitude of the changes that he's proposing, and not going to give him a blanket endorsement here to go to committee with. There is going to be a lot more discussion take place with the municipal councils and with the Union of Municipalities.

I'll tell you why. I said earlier in my comments that I would relate a specific experience that I had when I was the Minister of Agriculture. I also want to talk briefly about, when it's in the Provincial Government's interest and when it's got economic benefits to the NDP and their government, how quickly certain decisions can be made.

Madam Speaker, when I was a Minister of Agriculture, The Planning Act was in place to protect farm land and to make sure that there wasn't an abuse of rural Manitoba. If you were going to build something, you had to go through the steps.

Well, Madam Speaker, the Member for Rhineland came to visit me one time, my colleague from Rhineland, in my office. He said, Mr. Minister, there seems to be a problem with your department and The Planning Act. I asked him to explain what it was, and the situation was this. There were three small communities in his constituency that were deciding in which community to build the school. There was going to be a new school built, and they were having some disagreement as to which town would get that school. It was a political problem for him, but it was a problem for those people because they felt that, when a school was built in their community, it meant the long-term viability of that community, and they were somewhat correct. Each one of them had the responsibility to make sure that the economic viability was there, that the school was there, and the traffic was there. So they did come up with what most reasonable people will do in small towns and rural communities in Manitoba. They decided on a compromise. They would build it approximately equidistant between the three communities, which to me made a pretty reasonable and sound recommendation, and one I was able to accept.

But you know what happened? Under The Planning Act, Madam Speaker, the Department of Agriculture said, you can't do that. You can't build a school in the middle of three communities to serve those communities. I said to them, why. Well we were going to use agricultural land to build a school on, Madam Speaker. What do they think they were going to build it on if they were building it close to one of the other communities? It's all pretty productive land, even though it's in the town limits, whether it be for gardening or whatever it be for that community. But it was going to, in fact, use a small acreage of agricultural land for the education of our children.

Madam Speaker, it didn't take me two minutes to make the decision that the Department of Agriculture

was in error in prohibiting those three communities from agreeing on building a school that would accommodate the education, accommodate all their feelings in support of that school, and assist the Member for Rhineland. It wasn't a political decision, Madam Speaker. It was a common-sense decision.

When we have legislation on the books in the Manitoba Legislature that prohibits common sense from being carried out by local elected officials, then we have to look pretty darned hard at it, Madam Speaker. I'm not satisfied that this Minister of Municipal Affairs to this point has taken a look at it. I'm not so sure, if he did look at it, how much common sense would be applied, but I'm not so sure that he's even looked at it.

So I would ask that the Minister give pretty serious consideration to the changes that I have talked about, Madam Speaker. I would ask that he not let the bureaucracy run him and the department; that a major review to make sure that the objectives of the department or the people of Manitoba are being carried out under their duly elected municipal officials. Too much regulation, too much intervention can only cause a lot of problems.

Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, as I said on the record the other day, it doesn't take this government long to approve the drilling of an oil well on a piece of valuable farm land, because there's going to be revenue come from it. It doesn't take them long to flood another acre of the northern part of Manitoba, if it means a political benefit and what they perceive as a benefit in hydro development. It doesn't take them long to disregard the needs of the Native communities that are going to be flooded out.

You see, they've got a double set of standards, Madam Speaker, so I don't care what piece of legislation they've passed. We have to watch it very carefully and scrutinize it, because it always hasn't been and never always will be, under them, in the best interests of Manitoba.

So, Madam Speaker, those are my comments, and I will reserve the further comments till we get to committee.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, my comments regarding this bill will be very short, but I have one specific area that I'd like to bring to the Minister's attention. That is the area that was alluded to by my colleague a minute ago. I would like to give an example of where I believe that this may cause some problems with the changing in the regulations as he has outlined them, the changing of the opportunity for a single municipality to become part of a planning organization or implement a planning act of their own.

I would give an example, in the community at the south end of my constituency where two rural municipalities and one larger town were in a planning act, and were preparing to put in force their zoning by-laws. At that point, as the Minister I'm sure is well aware, was when concerns became very apparent on the part of the rural municipalities. That is where the concerns were laid out regarding the problems that

people in the outlying parts of the municipalities had in being attached to the larger town in terms of the planning act.

It's my understanding, as was stated in the explanatory remarks, that the bureaucracy has been able to, and I assume, through the approval of the Minister, the bureaucracy has been able to not put any single municipality planning districts in place at this point and has not allowed them to go that route. There may reasons of cost that I'm sure enter into the equation.

My concern is, very simply, that there are communities out there of substance that are expanding. You can look at the communities of 3,000 to 4,000 population where they need planning; where they need the opportunity to implement zoning by-laws. Yet, if they are encumbered by the fact that some of the areas surrounding them may, in fact, be not at any particular stage of development yet and are not concerned with being restricted to a great extent that, in fact, we are doing a disservice to the communities that are caught in this position.

First of all, in order to accommodate some of the concerns that may be part of the rural or outlying areas surrounding the communities, the zoning by-laws may have to be watered down considerably. This in itself should give the department some concern when they considered changing this particular regulation. It seems to me that if we left this particular part of the act intact and allowed some discretion on the part of the department, I think there are cases that are probably in the works right now where some discretion can be used and the planning process in the rural parts of Manitoba could go forward more smoothly.

We can look at the area to the west of my constituency and the constituency of Minnedosa, where there are municipalities surrounding the town — which will probably be in a growth situation in the next few years — who are going to have to go through a considerable amount of discussion before a complete area can be planned. If I could look at the experiences of some of the other towns where they have gone through a considerable amount of uncontrolled development around their fringes prior to planning and zoning being put in place, I suggest that some of that problem may have been brought about by the fact that they needed an agreement with the surrounding municipalities in order to implement that.

I would encourage the Minister to take a second look at this part of the bill and see if there perhaps is not a case here of where we are justifying what has been practice, rather than changing the bill and keeping it so that it is practical in its implication, rather than simply changing it in order to justify what has been going on.

A concern that I would also like to express is on behalf of a municipality that is within my constituency where they are not able to persuade their ratepayers that they are in a stage of growth and development, that they should be part of the planning process. But I can assure the Minister that, in my opinion, it won't be too many years down the road when that situation may change.

I think that the Minister would agree with me that the willingness of the people in the communities involved, the willingness of those people to become part of the plan and accept the plan is not something

that can be easily legislated; that it has to be approved of by the majority of the people within the areas affected. If they have these planning and zoning areas foisted upon them, they will eventually get their backs up and will not be reasonable in their approach if they feel that they are being pushed to the wall for a reason that is not necessarily directly related to them.

Therefore I see, in that particular example, a situation where in the future, they may very well, because of the uniqueness, because of the combination of several very small communities within their boundaries which may in the future require planning and zoning regulations, may in the future wish to become a one-municipality planning area. I would suggest that this area be given some serious reconsideration.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The hour being 4:30 p.m., I am interrupting the honourable member. When this item is again before the House, he will have 34 minutes remaining.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

#### RES. NO. 19 - FUNDING FOR INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Private Members Business on the Proposed Resolution No. 19 — the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa, that

WHEREAS the independent school system has played a long and important part of the educational history of Manitoba; and

WHEREAS many Manitobans have chosen to educate their children in independent schools; and

WHEREAS the demise of the independent school system would increase funding required by the provincial public school system and the local taxpayer by millions of dollars; and

WHEREAS the present provincial funding formula is inadequate and discriminates against the users of the independent school system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of entering into an agreement with the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools to provide funding of 50 percent of the public school level for the 1986/87 fiscal year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of continuing discussions with the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools to develop a financing formula for the long-term benefit of the schools and the province; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of initiating discussions with the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools to develop effective means of cooperation and affiliation to ensure the entire educational system becomes more efficient and responsive to the needs of the community, without unnecessary duplication or competition with the public school system.

**MOTION presented.**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

First I would like to make a couple of preliminary remarks before I get into the merits of the proposed resolution. The one deals with a question of system. In my drafting I referred to the independent school system and this causes some concern to the Independent School Federation because they advise, and I agree, that they are not a system; they are a group of parts. It was never intended to portray the independent schools to be something more than they actually are not. I hope that this does not affect the debate on this particular issue because it is not, nor was it intended to give them a status in which they don't have or don't wish to have.

In general, we are speaking on the resolution dealing with the annual provincial grants given by the Department of Education for support of each student in the public school system which represents approximately 80 percent of the operating costs of education in the province.

I'd like to advise the Assembly that I and my family are a consumer of this particular service. My children go to a school which has its roots going back to the early history of Manitoba. The school first started in 1820 and it was established to provide educational services to the Selkirk settlers and to those of the Hudson Bay Company. In those days, there was no public school system as we know it. In fact, it was a privately-funded system attempting to give education to those people who were in the west.

In time, as the province grew and the needs of education grew, the system of public financing of education came into force. The private schools continued, but received no support from the public purse. However, throughout that time, since the beginning of the 18th century, the school system of independent schools has continued to survive and flourish, because it's been attempting to provide a service and function for parents of children who wish to provide a different type of education for their children.

As I said, in the early parts of the 18th century, almost 100 percent of the children attended so-called private or independent schools. Today, that is only about 5 percent of the population and it has been fairly constant over the last few years.

In 1959, there was a report of the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education, otherwise known as the McFarlane Report, and it identified some 9,000 students going to private or parochial schools, but since that time the number has diminished and it's now been at a constant number of approximately 9,000 (sic) for the past several years.

The whole question of funding of private schools or independent schools was raised and dealt with in the report on the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education in 1959. It was one of the mandates given to it by the then Provincial Government, and its reviews and recommendations can be found at Chapter 11 dealing with a section called Private Schools.

It makes some rather interesting findings that I think they're quoting from. The first, on Page 179, states:

"The Commission therefore recommends that wherever minorities, religious or other, can be provided with the kind of education they wish for their own children, this should be done."

Then, on Page 180, in paragraph No. 13, it states: "If private and parochial schools are given some public support, as the Commission recommends they should, then we would seek to give it upon such terms as it is thought would most benefit not only for the private and parochial schools, but also the public school system. The Commission believes that to this end, it is essential to give these alternative schools the greatest freedom possible to experiment and to challenge the methods, achievements, attitudes and standards in the public system. For this reason, the Commission recommends no more regulation of these schools than is necessary to ensure that the education afforded them is upon a general standard to the public schools."

None of my resolution that I'm urging upon the House deals with trying to eliminate or downgrade the current standards that are put in place to regulate the public school system or independent schools. I am merely addressing the issue of the funding formula that is presently in place.

Their finding was that the public system would not be hurt by independent schools. In its continuation for approximately 180 years, the private schools have not, in fact, hurt the public schools. In fact, they have been allowed to develop and evolve in their own particular way, whether they be for religious or non-religious reasons. They have changed over a period of time. I believe at one time they were probably all religious, but today you have a wide variety of independent schools offering different bases for their schools.

The funding started for independent schools in approximately 1974. There had been a movement for shared services, but in 1974, I believe it was, there was a commitment of public monies to the private schools. That system of funding recognized the principle of independent schools. That funding has varied from approximately 20 percent to 50 percent since that time to the present, dealing with the funding of private schools.

As I indicated, in 1974, there was a recognition by this Legislature and the people of Manitoba that the principle of public funds going to independent schools was granted and accepted by the public. In more recent times, the amount of annual grants given to private schools has matched the grant given to the public school system on a per pupil basis. So we now have, at least in the last short while, a recognition of equality between those students in the independent schools and those children who are in the public schools. The only missing link to make the circle complete is to put a formula in place that grants equal status to those children in independent schools with the public schools.

Madam Speaker, I am recommending the current 50 percent funding formula to take place immediately. Should the children of independent schools be forced to attend because their system would be closed, it would add a great deal of financial burden on the public taxpayer. Eighty percent of that grant would have to be paid by the Province of Manitoba to the public school system where each of these independent school students would now be attending. The local taxpayer would have to pay an additional 20 percent for each

child to get the full funding formula. By attending private schools, there is some saving to the public taxpayer.

The key is that the present school system operated by most of the independent schools are having some financial trouble. In fact, some are in real financial crisis. It is important to give them an immediate relief; that is why the recommendation of 50 percent funding of the public school grant be given to them immediately; then, not to impose either this Legislature's desires or wishes to ensure that there is in place a funding formula that is fair and equitable to all, especially to the users and providers of independent schools; that the Department of Education and the Government of Manitoba sit down with the independent schools and work out a funding formula that will be acceptable to the province and to the independent schools.

Whether it be the identical one to the one now being offered to the public school system, or should it be varied to meet their specific needs, I don't wish to dictate. I'd merely say that people who are providing these services and would be funding these should sit down and work it out because then it would remove the uncertainty for those who are attempting to provide the independent school system of financial planning that they will know from year to year where their funds are coming from.

As it is now, each grant, on each year, is given on an ad hoc basis. They may get a \$25 increase one year, \$130 the next. It is very difficult to plan in any substantial way to provide education when there is no formula in place that they can rely on with any degree of certainty.

I also recommend, because the resources used for all parts of public life are scarce and must be used wisely, that a cooperative effect take place, and it's already started with the shared services, that you get the opportunity to sit down between the independent school and the local school board to make sure that you're not duplicating services. In fact, there may be some services offered in an independent school that may be of benefit to the local public school system.

Why shouldn't the children in the public school system, for example, if there are a number of students that wish to take Latin and it's being offered in the local independent school, why shouldn't they be allowed to attend? Why should you have to hire two Latin students to teach a few students that particular course? Also, when it comes to the building of particular facilities, again it's an attempt to make a close cooperation and interrelationship of those people who are in the educational field to provide and deliver the best service that you can for the dollar that you're being given.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would suggest that all that is needed is the final step. Parents believe in the freedom of choice on how to raise and educate their children. Some wish to use the independent school system. That system has not hurt; in fact, it has enhanced the public school system. There is the principle of granting monies from the public to the independent schools. There is the principle of matching grants now. All we need is to fill in that little shortfall to put the independent schools on an equal basis of those children going to the public school to give them the true opportunity that their parents need.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to discuss this resolution and I urge its adoption by this House.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to be able to rise on this occasion and join the debate on this resolution, an important resolution. I say important, Madam Speaker, because the issue of funding to private or independent schools is one that has long been with us, a question that has arisen from time to time through a period of many years and over a number of administrations.

The issue is one which I suppose, if one were to canvass this Legislature, very much reflects the views and the differing views that exist within the provincial community generally. I think it's quite clear that within the province, within our respective caucuses, there are differing views about the role of the Provincial Government with respect to private schools, the role of the Provincial Government in providing funding to those schools. Some obviously, Madam Speaker, would say that the government and the province should do more for private schools. Others, with equally sincere respect for the importance of education, would say that the government's first and primary responsibility is to the public school system.

Certainly there is no unanimity on this issue in principle, Madam Speaker. However, I think it goes without saying that members on all sides and the public in general do not want to jeopardize the public school system.

Madam Speaker, as noted in the introductory clauses of this resolution, private schools still retain the support of a small but significant number of people within our society. While the numbers of children attending private schools has not changed dramatically over the last decade, there has been, as was noted earlier, a recognition on the part of governments of the need to deal with their concerns and their issues in a fair way.

This government, Madam Speaker, has made every effort to ensure that there is an element of fairness in the funding that's been made available to private schools. Let me remind everyone of the record of the last few years. For the past three years, private schools indeed have received the same dollar increase per pupil as public schools. In 1986, the per pupil grant to private schools increased from \$662 per pupil to \$792 per pupil, an increase of approximately 20 percent.

This government has arranged shared-service agreements with the public school system to provide access to home economics and industrial arts instruction. School divisions which provide courses of instruction to private school students receive provincial grants on the same basis as those provided to public school students.

Also, Madam Speaker, private school students are included in the enrolment of local school divisions in the calculation of grants for clinician services for students with special needs.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this government has made student aid available to high school students attending private institutions.

So I think it's clear, if one considers the direct grants, the textbook grants, the grants for shared services and

transportation, the assistance provided through student aid, that we have recognized in a very real way some of the outstanding concerns that have been raised.

The total funding to private schools in 1986 was approximately \$7.1 million. I think, if you compare that to what it was in 1980, it reflects in a real way some of the changes that have occurred.

Madam Speaker, I should say that figure I quoted of 7.1 million does not include money that has been made available to 19 independent schools under the auspices of the Manitoba Community Education Association. If we add that on as a contribution from the Province of Manitoba to the funding to private schools, that means another \$278 per student is added.

So, Madam Speaker, with a direct funding increase from 1982 to 1986 of approximately 72 percent, I think the minimum that can be said is that we have dealt fairly and equitably with the needs of the private schools in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I have met and I will be meeting with the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools to discuss the funding relationship that exists between the Province of Manitoba and that organization and its members. All I can promise is, as has been the case and as I believe our record reflects, those discussions will be honest and frank and, if our record says anything, they will be productive.

But, Madam Speaker, as Minister of Education, I have another responsibility, and I believe the last resolve in this Private Members' Resolution alludes to that responsibility. Madam Speaker, I have a responsibility and the government has a responsibility to the 95 percent of students who attend the public school system. Madam Speaker, the last Resolved asked that the government initiate discussions with the Manitoba Association of School Trustees to ensure that the educational system remains efficient and avoids duplication. The member introduces, I suppose, the legitimate concern that duplication will cause the concern that competition with the public school system may cause or is perceived to be causing.

Madam Speaker, I don't have to point out the long-standing position of both the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, a body that represents the many, many community school districts in this province, and the Manitoba Teachers' Society. I don't have to point out their positions with respect to aid to private schools. Madam Speaker, I believe their position is and has been for some time that they are concerned about the duplication, about the competition, and about the need for the public school system to have primacy.

I'm somewhat surprised that the education critic and the individual who assumes some responsibility for reviewing the proceedings of the Department of Education and the public school system is the one bringing this particular resolution to the House.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the concerns expressed by proponents of private schools, and the concern they have with respect to funding. I do point out that school divisions from across this province are concerned about adequate funding for public schools in their areas. I don't have to point out to members opposite the concerns that they, individually, have raised with me, with previous Ministers of Education, about the need for additional funding, additional support in so many areas in the public school system.

Madam Speaker, the public school system in the Province of Manitoba is undoubtedly one of the best in the world. We — and when I speak of we, I mean the Provincial Government — local school boards and all of those trustees, teachers and parents and students are working to provide each child in the province with the opportunity to develop to the fullest possible extent. We are trying, Madam Speaker, to meet the needs of individual students; to meet the needs of those with exceptional needs; to meet the needs of the handicapped, the disadvantaged.

Madam Speaker, the member who introduced the resolution spoke about the possibility of sharing services for Latin. Madam Speaker, there are too many students in this province who need to experience the ability to speak and write English to talk about that as a serious contribution. We are struggling — and I say, we, again talking about all of those who are involved in the educational system from Churchill to Emerson. We are all struggling to make our system more accessible, to make it more successful. That's our goal, and that's our primary objective. Many would argue and I believe many members opposite would argue that has to be the priority.

The GSE, the Government Support to Education Program, introduced in 1985 said that funding to our education system should be based on four principles: the principle that all children should have equal access to education; the principle that all children are guaranteed an adequate education regardless of the wealth of the division in which they live; that all divisions despite the size of their local tax base receive the funding they require to maintain programs, that there be less reliance on property taxes to fund education.

Madam Speaker, I have said that, in general, we have reason to be proud of the public system of education we have in the province; yet, Madam Speaker, we have many challenges to face. We need to maintain and improve our system to enhance the quality of education that we offer. Not everyone, Madam Speaker, comes through our system unscathed, although I say with a great deal of confidence and I believe can provide demonstrable facts to the effect that we are doing a better job now than we have ever done before.

There needs to be improvements to the public school system. No one can argue to the contrary. But, Madam Speaker, because we have so many needs to be met, the needs of Native students, the needs of those whose English is a second language, the needs of our small schools in rural and Northern Manitoba, the need to increase accessibility. The members opposite may not appreciate the fact that today, in 1986, there are still students who are 13 and 14 years old who have to go to a residential school to receive their secondary education.

Madam Speaker, we need to do more to identify the learning difficulties and the special problems that exist as children enter the educational system. So, Madam Speaker, for many in this House, many members opposite, for many Manitobans, the priority of the government has to be with the public school system.

Madam Speaker, the public school system serves us all. It binds us together regardless of our race or our religion or our ethnic background. It binds us together as citizens of a community, of a province. It is a shared experience, Madam Speaker, that many Manitobans



find irreplaceable. It is a vehicle for personal growth and development. It builds our foundation for our careers, our work and our contribution to the community and our province.

Madam Speaker, like most here, I have a profound respect and a belief in our education system. In fact, in a world context, Madam Speaker, the system has served us well.

Having said that, I hope our actions in terms of the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools, in terms of its members, in terms of the students that it serves, I believe that we have dealt in a fair, equitable and reasonable manner with the requirements that they have, the needs that they have expressed to us and I believe that we understand and appreciate their needs and their aspirations as well as any government has.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** I, perhaps, think I have a position of being perhaps better to judge the independent schools than most here in this room. As a student, I went to school at both public schools and private schools. As a teacher, I have taught in public schools here in Manitoba, in separate or Catholic schools in Alberta, in private schools in Massachusetts and in Manitoba. As a parent, I have sent my children to public schools and for short periods of time to private schools and have returned them to the public schools. So I think perhaps I can judge the benefit to our society of an independent school system, an independent school system that is properly funded.

What is our private or independent school system and who goes there? I think that is critical to the discussion today. Oh yes, there are some who will go because of the old school tie and there are some who will go because they feel that their children will achieve some prestige because of their presence in that particular school. The percentage, however, of those parents in any school in Manitoba is very, very small.

There are many parents, however, who choose to send their children to private school or independent school because their child is gifted and there is not a program available to that child in the public school system. They may send their child to an independent school because of the need for additional support, either emotional or academic. They may send their children to a school primarily in this province because of the need to instruct that child, in the minds of the parents, in their particular religious and cultural way of life.

The majority of our children in independent schools in Manitoba are, in fact, Catholic children. I think it is important for us to look at those children in the Canadian historical scene. Canada has never had and never will have the same kind of concept of the separation of church and state that exists in the nation to the south of us.

If one looks at the history, for example, in the evolution of schools in Canada, one will see that the earliest schools in almost all of Eastern Canada were Catholic in nature.

In the Province of Quebec, for example, the public school system is the Catholic school system. It is the

Protestant school system that is the separate school system.

Halifax would not in fact have schools developing at the point they did in the early 1800's if it had not been for the Irish Christian brothers and the Catholic schools of Halifax, and that is why in that city both school systems coexist together and both receive 100 percent funding.

When Alberta and Saskatchewan entered Confederation in 1905, they entered it with a clear provision that 100 percent funding be provided to both Catholic and public schools.

Despite the hue and cry that we often hear about how that separates children and how it divides a society, that in fact has not occurred. Even in the Province of Ontario, children received Catholic school education at 100 percent funding until Grade 8, very early in the foundation of that province. It was gradually moved to Grade 10, and many people don't realize that the reason it moved to Grade 10 was that was also coincidentally the year the children turned 16 and that was the leaving age for children as it still is. Although there was some controversy in its movement in the past year from Grade 10 to Grade 12, I think perhaps the major component of that controversy was that funding was only going to Catholic schools and not to all independent schools.

(Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, M. Dolin, in the Chair.)

I would not like to see Manitoba put itself in a situation where it funded Catholic schools, but did not fund Mennonite schools or did not fund Jewish schools or did not fund schools that were independent but had no religious affiliation, because I think that is contrary to the spirit of ecumenism and contrary to the spirit of the Charter in Canada.

If we look at our present school funding formula in Manitoba, we have seen, as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry said earlier, a high point where 35 percent of funding was provided by the Provincial Government. In the past year, that went as low as 19 percent, and because of an ensuing election, crept up to 22 percent. But, in fact, 22 percent is woefully inadequate and we have many schools that in fact are finding it very difficult to function. Many of those schools do not charge tuition fees for many of the children who go to those schools, simply because the parental income is not adequate to charge a fee. So they are educating our children at their costs and the costs of the members of their religious group or non-denominational group and are saving the taxpayers of Manitoba large sums of money.

The Minister of Education said that our public school system must remain our primary focus. It will always be our primary focus simply because 95 percent of all of our students go there. We are only speaking of 5 percent of the remaining children, but those 5 percent who remain are still Manitoba children and they deserve our help and our support in exactly the same proportion as that is received by children who do not go to the public school system.

What we are facing now in Manitoba is a crisis which this government must recognize. The Catholic schools have, in fact, petitioned for a reinstatement of an Order-in-Council that was issued by the Privy Council in 1895. We had great fights in this province, tragically, over Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Section 22 of The Manitoba Act provides for 100 percent funding of Catholic schools. There may be some disagreement as

to how that should be enforced, the same kind of disagreement, I might add, that we thought we had on Section 23.

We learned that there was no controversy on Section 23. The courts dealt with it in much the way that everyone who read it clearly understood they would interpret it. I think that is likewise possible on Section 22.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** They've already moved.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** They have not moved. It hasn't appeared to them yet, Mr. Scott.

What we have in a situation is that this particular action will ultimately, if we do not act, again find Manitoba before the Supreme Court of Canada. It will again divide this province because we will allow those who do not understand the situation, as they did not understand it before in the French language issue, to stir up and to discover controversies that do in fact not exist. I think that it is imperative that this government act now.

The Independent School Trustees, primarily made up of the Catholic school trustees, have in fact said that they would accept 80 percent funding. That is their accommodation, because they believe, in a spirit of ecumenism, that is the way to go. Catholic school trustees do not believe that their school system is the only one indeed that should be supported. So despite the fact that there is good legal judgment for thinking that they could in fact obtain 100 percent funding, they have said, we will accept 80 percent funding, provided that schools of other religious and non-religious backgrounds who are supporting independent schools are also funded.

I believe that we must move in this direction before we once again divide the population of Manitoba. Manitoba is the province that is out of step with the rest of the country. Manitoba is the province that is inadequately funding its independent school system. But most of all, we must remember that the children who go to independent schools are Manitoba children. They live here. They are worthy of our support. Their parents are worthy of an appreciation of the values which they wish to impart to their children. It's imparting those values through their selected school that, I feel, they will achieve the maximum potential of that child and that family.

So I believe that this resolution should be supported although, unlike the Member for Fort Garry, I would not in fact settle for 50 percent funding, but would recommend that we move immediately to 80 percent funding.

Thank you.

**MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I speak on this resolution. All kinds of things have happened, but never have I had the help of this unit in front of me in the past.

I think that most people some time during their life have a main cause, a priority cause, something that

they feel is very important. Sometimes to them, it is a question of conscience, maybe not to others, but to them it is a question of conscience. They might be motivated strongly enough to maybe seek political office, to join a certain party, to maybe leave a certain party, to change their political affiliation, to promote this cause. They are ready to suffer the abuse at times and the critics, Mr. Speaker.

Aid to private schools is that kind of cause to me. It is my cause. It is the reason why I entered politics 27 years ago. I must say that I haven't been very successful. I've had, as I said, many, many speeches on this. I've tried to convince the people of the fairness of how right I was. Mr. Speaker, I tried everything. I implored; I begged; I threatened; I was melodramatic; I was polite; I was insulting. I tried everything, but to no avail. Nothing happened. Later, I crossed the floor, and joined another party with the promise that finally we would obtain something for private schools. That wasn't the case.

It seems that everything was against us, not only the speaker, but everything was against us. I remember one time, with the members opposite, many of them were favouring private schools, but it was their chance to unseat Schreyer and take over the leadership, because they figured they could take over the government. They beat Green, but they couldn't beat Schreyer. So they all to a man, except the one person there who never ran after that, Gabe Girard, voted against it. That was once, I think, that we could have gained.

Now today we see the members of this side — and I disagree with my colleague, the Minister of Education. I think it is proper that the official critic for the party on Education should bring this resolution in. I certainly wouldn't reproach him at all.

Now why do I believe so strongly? I might say, first of all, that nobody is arguing about the public schools, that we need a strong public school system. I would be the first one to say, forget the private schools. Close them, if they're going to do any damage to the public school system. This is not an issue here. Nobody has ever said that. I take exception with my honourable friend, a person that I think very highly of, but in this case I disagree with him that he should take this stand in the words that he said that this might be divisive. Well, let's make damn sure we're not hypocrites and, if they're divisive schools or the wrong schools, close the schools. It doesn't matter who finances them. If they are doing harm to the people of Manitoba, close those schools.

If not, are we second-class citizens? Are we going to save money on the schools so we can give more to public schools? That was what was said today. Is that what we do with the handicapped? We save money on them because they're a minority, so we can give more in health care to the normal people, to the majority of people? I don't intend to be a second-class citizen nor my children nor my grandchildren, Mr. Speaker.

(Madam Speaker, in the Chair)

I would be ready to bring in a safeguard to make sure that not everybody starts a new separate school. I think that is imperative; I think that is important. I have less reason to fight for some of the schools that some of us might consider finishing schools, because I think these people can afford them. I'm talking about

the people, not only who wants a better education, rightly or wrongly — that's not the case. We're supposed to have freedom in this country, and it's a case of conscience. They cannot attend any other schools. You can't change that, unless you dictate to them how they should worship and we forget about this freedom in this world and in this province. This is what they do. These people want an education. They feel that this is the only education. Maybe they're wrong. Who knows?

I'm not too sure that I would send my children to private schools for all their years. My children did attend private schools, and I always attended private schools. I don't think I'm any less of a Canadian or a Manitoban. I did my share during the war; I did my share for the community. I'm not any better; I'm not any worse than most of the people in this House. I don't think there has been that question of division that I can't be a good Canadian or a good Manitoban, Madam Speaker.

Why do I believe so strongly that this right that has been perpetuated for so long should be rectified now? Why do I think that these people have got to stop, to have them come, cap in hand, to beg for their fair share?

I'm with a party here that corrected many, many of these wrongs that we have. Look at the women's issues. Although some of them are not satisfied, more was accomplished in four years in this government than with all the governments in Canada in all the previous years. They were lucky; you, Madam Speaker, got that in four short years. I've been here for 27 years; I haven't won anything yet, nothing at all.

What about the Native people? We are trying to correct that. The Labour force. I've supported all that and I will continue to support that. What about the fishermen, the farmers? Every day there is a minority group. We don't say give less to the fishermen, there'll be more for the farmers because they are a bigger majority. That's not the name of the game at all.

This is a government that prides itself in fair play and fairness, and I disagree with the Minister of Education when he says that we have been treating them with fairness and that it's adequate. What is adequate? We are paying double taxes. Sure, I have a right; some members will say you have a right to your schools. When? When I've paid for somebody else's schools. You know, you can buy all the rye you want but you have to buy a bottle of scotch before that. That's freedom? That's the rights that have been enshrined in the Constitution? This is what we want for our country, for our people? I don't believe in that at all.

If there was at least some consolation that we were away from those days, those that opposed it — it was over my dead body — like the Greens and the Doerns and those people, we're away from that. But now it's the excuse that there is no money. All the things that we corrected, Madam Speaker, they cost money. We spent a hell of a lot of money on providing better facilities for abortion and that comes from the Consolidated Fund. That comes from everybody, even those that don't believe in it. They are paying for that; it's an insured service.

Madam Speaker, I feel very strongly on that, and I don't feel that I am letting anybody down by that. I don't intend to be used as somebody to appease a certain group. I've seen the example of people that

had fought the last four years for something they believed and they gave me a real lecture. They fought and they're never satisfied until they achieve what they want for the people that they represent. I'm not worthy of coming in this House and representing the people of St. Boniface who have had confidence in me for 27 years, my constituents, if I'm not going to try to do something for fairness before I leave this House.

Madam Speaker, I think the right is there to receive the same kind of money 100 percent for everybody. But I would be satisfied, in fact I would hope that we're not going to pay 100 percent because I've seen when things are too easy, you forget them. I remember when I was a kid we used to have to clean our hockey rinks before we played and everybody wanted to play. I don't believe in that. I think that sacrifice is not a bad thing. I think that they should go around with 70-75 percent, though.

But not to study again and to talk and talk. The McFarlane Commission, when I started in politics in 1959, there was a report, shortly after the election, of the McFarlane Commission which was unanimous in its recommendation in favour of aid to private schools.

The courts decide that we have the right — now we're going to the court again. I don't admire the people on this side and what they've done with the French issues, not at all, and you're going to pay, your conscience is going to bother you. I see there even in committee where the people are asking questions that were never asked before. We have made progress in that.

Now for what? Just for expediency, for political expediency? Let's knock the French people — things that we've never asked for — I'm caught in the middle of that. I've never asked for translation of things that I don't give a damn about. I've asked for a little bit of fairness; that's what I asked for. We're not enlisting an army to take over Manitoba with our 5 percent or 6 percent; we're not dangerous. We just want a little bit of fairness. I'm not going to shove anything down your throat either.

I hope that this is not going to be an issue, the same thing, that this will be division. I'm a little tired of being caught in the middle. All I want is my fair share and the fair share for my children and my grandchildren. I want to be treated like a Manitoban. — (Interjection) — I'm speaking to all of you. I'm speaking to all of us and I'm speaking to myself.

I think yes, that my colleagues did improve the situation. They've improved the situation quite a bit; there was very little before. They've been the first ones to do anything, it was very little at the time, but Duff Roblin when he introduced shared services, that was the first thing, and there's been some improvement.

But aren't we tired of having people beg? Do we relish that to see people on their knees begging, wanting to know, or they can budget? I can't accept that. No. Give them the minimum. They should be very happy with this because our main responsibility is through the school divisions. Well, those schools, as I said before, are divisive, let's close them and let's take over at full pay and pay these people. Let's pay the money that we'll have to educate these people. It is not that at all.

Divisiveness is caused if the people don't agree but it's not uniformity that will unite us; that's not true. It

will make us rich if they aren't. Diversity is not the same thing, I think, as uniformity or caused by anything else but uniformity. I think that would be a sad day if everything was uniform and the same.

I think that the people have a chance. I believe in parental rights in education for one thing. Is there anybody in this House that can tell me that they don't believe in parental rights? Let them stand up and tell us that they don't. The state is supreme, the state takes over and the state tells us how you are going to educate your children. Isn't that a role of the parent?

What about equality of opportunity for all children? What about that? You might say that they can choose, they can go to that school, but some of them can't. I'm talking about the child now. What if his parents say you go to that school. You might not want to. But he's in that school. Is there equality of opportunity when they can't pay their teachers, when they can't get new equipment, when they can't get anything? Is that equality? That's not what we talked about when we were talking about the other minority groups that we were talking about. I don't think it would be the end of the world if we, once and for all, corrected that injustice and unite the people of Manitoba, not divide them.

I, for one, would support the principle. As the last speaker said, I don't think that 50 percent is right but I would certainly not insist on 100 percent. Even if we can't do it now, you know, we brought equity; that's another thing, because we wanted fairness. Equal pay for equal work, all those things that were fair, that I support. Why is it always this cause, dammit, that has to suffer? I don't want to be a loser all my life. I'd like to get out of here with one victory. We bugged up the French issue; let's not bugged up this one.

Madam Speaker, I could not be more sincere or more forceful. I wish to be as forceful as possible, but I hope that something will happen from this. I'm pleased to be given an occasion to speak on this. The principle that the motion gives us a chance to speak on that; the principle is let's develop together, let's develop a policy that we can enunciate, that we can tell the people so they can budget and work together on that to rectify the infamous school question of so many years, which was very infamous and then did not give Manitoba a good name. Then we can go ahead and work for other wrongs, to redress other wrongs that we've had in this community.

This government, I'm very pleased and very proud to say, have done a lot of that. Why stop now? I think this is one that should be done and it's high time. You can't go on forever, well be patient. You know, sometimes I think the province is buying lottery tickets. Maybe they'll win a big lottery and they'll be able to do it. There's never enough money. We'll wait forever on that and they've been waiting over 100 years. That's a lot of money.

We're told that we owe the Natives money for how we treated them in the past and we're talking about millions of dollars. Maybe that's what should be done; to see the money that wasn't paid for these people, to educate these people and the interest on that. I think we can thank our lucky stars that's not going to be the issue, but I would hope that this group will try not to be partisan on this and that we work together to rectify that.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, I know that the time is running short and I don't have too much time before the closure hour, but I want to take this opportunity of expressing my support of the resolution that has been presented today. If I don't get a chance today, I would imagine that it just might not take place before the House closes at the end of this Session.

So I am taking this opportunity, Madam Speaker, of expressing my support for the resolution with no reservation at all; my complete support. I want to just make a couple of remarks before I carry on.

The remarks are that I'm astounded at the Minister of Education on his remarks inasmuch as — you know, I have no doubt at all whether he is supporting or whether he is condemning the resolution. And his condemnation of the resolution upsets me to the point where I've just got to make public that I'm very, very displeased with the manner in which he went, contrary to the resolution. That's his choice and I guess it's government policy.

I've got to respect the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, for standing up and expressing his views which I strongly support. He made some remarks about the French language issue that I think were uncalled for because some of us support it and some of us didn't support it for different reasons. I think that my reasons are my reasons and I felt very badly that he would have brought it into the debate and I felt very badly that the Member for Fort Rouge, Fort Garry, River Heights, whatever it is, had brought it into the debate also. It's gone, it's finished and we've got a subject here that is of great importance. We are correcting an injustice that needs correcting.

For the Minister of Education to make remarks about how it's going to affect the public school system and how the public school system will suffer, or that there are so many things that money has to go into to correct in the public school system. Well, correct them. Correct them, but don't hold it against the private schools.

We're talking about some dollars. You can find the dollars when it comes to something important such as this. If you've got to improve the public school system, improve the public school system. I strongly support it and recommend that you do so. But I also strongly recommend and support that private schools be given the consideration that they deserve. We are talking about fairness.

I'm not talking about any conflict of interest on my part. I have attended public schools all my life; my children have attended public schools all their lives and I hope that my grandchildren will attend public schools when it comes time — when I get some grandchildren, Madam Speaker, actually I don't have any right now — but Madam Speaker, it is my intention to support public schools and private schools. But I want them to have the opportunity, like other Manitobans, of attending public or private schools at no additional cost to themselves. I want those schools to be available.

Really, there's no conflict at all on my part, Madam Speaker. There's no political conflict. I would hope that

Wednesday, 16 July, 1986

---

we all make a decision on this particular matter without bringing politics into it. Politics has no place in this particular resolution, Madam Speaker.

I look at the people who are condemning the resolution or who will not be supporting the resolution, and it's people of the background of public school teachers and people of that nature. Not all teachers, but in most cases, I think, if you took a vote in this particular location, Madam Speaker, you'll find that the teachers seem to stick together and are against the funding of private schools.

I think that we're not going to have the opportunity and I'm going to close right now because I know that the time — because we're not going to have the

opportunity because it won't come up again, but if it does, I know that it will be talked out and we won't take a vote. I would like it to be on the record that a vote will be taken and see how many people will be supporting or not supporting aid to private schools. I will be supporting aid to private schools, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30 p.m., when this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have ten minutes remaining. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).