



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Peter Fox



Vol. XXIII No. 44 10:00 a.m., Friday, March 19th, 1976. Third Session, 30th Legislature.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10 a.m., Friday, March 19, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students of High School standing of the Gordon Bell School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Domino. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this morning.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Committee reports indicate this morning that there are some five provinces raising the constitutional question re the jurisdiction of the Anti-Inflation Board. Can he confirm, is Manitoba among those five?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, it was late yesterday that I heard of this same story, presumably a Canadian press story, I am certainly puzzled as to the source and the purport of the story. If there is - perhaps I should put it this way, Sir, that I can only conclude that the story is written from a purely theoretical point of view. I am not aware of any province, certainly Manitoba would not be one of them, that would use public funds to pay for legal fees to challenge the constitutionality of a measure which has been agreed to by the provinces in advance. It would be purely an exercise in contradiction.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder by way of a supplementary question if indeed the Province of Manitoba finds itself in some way before the Supreme Court as an intervener, would he confirm. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Hypothetical.

MR. ENNS: . . . of the position of Manitoba being one of support of the Anti-Inflation Board measures.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that my first answer is also relevant to the second question, which is as you say, Sir, hypothetical. I hope it remains that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer of the First Minister, is he in a position now to at least indicate whether the government will have a watching brief when the matter is brought up before the Supreme Court?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I take it now that the Honourable Member for River Heights is referring not to the five-province news story but to the Ontario litigation, and in that regard I've discussed this with my colleague the Attorney-General. He was to have discussions within the department to see what the most practical way would be to have some form of watching brief, at least cost, I put it that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Some weeks ago he indicated to this Chamber as to the question of wire tapping involving a provincial judge, that no other people were involved, certainly no other profession people that are under his jurisdiction were involved, with respect to having their phones tapped. It would now appear from reports by the Attorney-General that in fact three other judges had their phones tapped. Can the Attorney-General, does he wish to modify that statement that he made two or three weeks ago in this Chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: If the honourable member would refer back to the statement, I think he will see it refers to investigation; that in fact the investigation related only to a provincial

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) judge and to nobody else within the community. No other individuals outside of the particular person were the subject of political surveillance, and so far as the tapping was concerned of the main trunk, there was no physical surveillance of any other conversation except that of provincial judge involved.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question to the Attorney-General. The specific question asked by the Member for Birtle-Russell at that time was: Were any other phones tapped? And the response was very specific, in the negative by the Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to examine the particular question and my answer at that time, but certainly insofar as political surveillance, wiring tapping which brought about political surveillance of any other individuals beside that of the provincial judge involved, there was no other physical surveillance. There was a period of time, as mentioned yesterday, a tapping of a main trunk line which gave way to the potential of physical surveillance of other provincial judges. This is an incident that certainly was ordered to be dismantled by our department as soon as we received information that had occurred. But there was no actual physical surveillance, so I am assured by the Winnipeg City Police Department, of any other conversation except that of the provincial judge involved.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the Attorney-General for the peace of mind or lack of peace of mind of other provincial judges, would he be prepared to indicate which judges had their phones tapped?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think first I should indicate to the honourable member that the order authorizing the tapping was broad enough - the order by the Judge of Queen's Bench was broad enough in order to permit (interfering noise) somebody's listening in now - was broad enough in order to permit the action that did take place, and I think this is regrettable, that the order was that broad. But I understand the trunk line that was involved was one that was used from time to time by all the provincial judges that were located at the Public Safety Building.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. It's with respect to Medicare. Does an opted out doctor, is he required to inform his patient before treatment that he has opted out?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to double check, but my recollection is that he is supposed to have a sign displayed in his office which is clearly seen by the patient once he's opted out. Maybe I should offer this added information, that is when he is actually opted out, not necessarily when he's advised that he wants to opt out, because there is a three-month period.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the doctor violating any agreement when he treats a patient while in the Medicare Plan but then later decides to and does opt out and then bills his patient after. Is that a violation of an agreement?

MR. DESJARDINS: I think my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, knows the answer as well as I. If he has not opted out he certainly is in violation if he's extra billing or billing somebody else. He could not do that if he's in the plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the other day an honourable member asked me a question - the honourable member recognized by you as leader but not by his party - regarding some question of a letter going out terminating employment of some of my staff, and at that time I responded to him that no letter of termination of employment went out. Last night during debate in committee that matter was brought up again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris state his point of order?

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I want to know if the Minister is responding to a question that was asked in this House, or is he making a statement? If he's making a statement there are opportunities for him to do that other than in the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)question period.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am quite aware of the rules of the House, and I am not rising to make a statement, we've past that point in the Orders of the Day - I'm rising to answer a question, at which time in response to the question I had indicated that no letter terminating anyone's employment went out. A letter did go out in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act, in particular Section 19, subsections (1) and (2), indicating that some employees may be subject to lay-off on certain conditions, which, Mr. Speaker, is not a letter terminating employment. I'm sure that anyone at all having any skill in the use of the 3Rs would know that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Corrections. I wonder if he can inform the House whether his department has compiled and computerized a list of names of Manitoba citizens who they consider as leaders in the community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HON. J.R.(Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, all the information which I have, for example, the published report of the municipal officials and all public documents of that kind that I have I have programmed in a computer, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister could confirm to the House the criteria that was used by his department for determining who and who was not a leader in Manitoba and what information exactly was fed into the computer.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, if the leader for Fort Rouge would like to go into some detail on that I would be glad to provide the information during my Estimates. For River Heights, I'm sorry, excuse me. Thank you. The criterion, as I said, were published documents.

MR. SPIVAK: Another question then to the Minister. I wonder if he can indicate what information exactly was put into the computer - was it the name, or was it additional information attached to the name?

MR. BOYCE: Name, address and position. For example: If it's, say a Sargeant is NCO in charge of an RCM Detachment, that is in the computer.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether any consideration was given to the compiling of this information and computerizing that there was the possibility of some invasion of privacy .

MR. BOYCE: As stated in this House on several occasions, I am very much concerned about the invasion of privacy by computers, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to rise on a matter of privilege pertaining back to the statement made by the Attorney-General concerning the questions on wiretaps. If I may, I just want to read from Hansard of February 26 when I asked a question concerning the numbers of authorizations for those who had wiretaps and the Attorney-General implied, yes, wiretaps were authorized insofar as others besides former Judge Pilutik. Those others were not involved in the administration of the justice system. I wonder if the Attorney-General could clarify which statement really is true and if he could explain that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little surprised it does not bear out the wording of the answer, it's very clear that where, Mr. Speaker, no wiretaps authorized by the Court of Queen's Bench insofar as any other individuals within the administration of justice was concerned, outside of Judge Pilutik, that is correct. So that in fact my answer of February 26th still holds in its entirety.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could raise a question related to that point. I wonder if the Attorney-General could indicate to us if he is taking any steps in his department to ensure that this kind of inadvertent accident where taps being placed on people for whom they're not intended can be prevented in the future, and that such direction would go forward both to the police and to others involved in wire-tapping.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, needless to say this incident does require a very

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . .thorough examination of the method by which this particular occurrence occurred. The guidelines that are used have been thoroughly reviewed in our department. I look forward to Estimate review to detailing those to the House.

Also insofar as the original judge's order which provided authority to wiretap phones that were used by the particular individual in question, the broad nature of that order, I think that we have to examine very closely sometimes the breadth of such orders, that the phones should be better specified in fact that are to be tapped. I think that there is a problem there that does have to be certainly examined. I want to just again emphasize that once advice was received by our department, which was sometime early July, that the trunkline had been subject of a wiretap, though only Judge Pilutik's phone was under actual physical surveillance, immediate action was taken by our department to instruct the Winnipeg City Police to dismantle the equipment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether any of the information or conversations that were recorded as a result of the inadvertant wiretaps has in fact been destroyed or in fact was not used for any other purpose or was not in any way applied to any other purpose by the police who had the taps on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have been assured that there are no transcripts of any conversations in existence because there was no physical surveillance of any conversations except for conversations in which the former Judge Pilutik was one of the participants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House regarding the strike presently under way at Simon Day Ltd, Simon Day being the manufacturer and distributor of grain cleaning equipment, 100 workers being on strike at this time. Could he indicate what action he intends to take?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour; Minister responsible for C.S. Act)(Transcona): The incident was drawn to my attention yesterday morning, Mr. Speaker. I believe they came out yesterday morning. It could have conceivably been on Tuesday that they came out on strike, I'm not positive. I'm sorry I have indicated that to my honourable friend that I'm not positive whether or not there is a conciliation officer in there. If there isn't - I'm sure there hasn't been a request as yet, but I will look over the information over the lunch hour and inform my honourable friend just as quickly as possible.

MR. WATT: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have a supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could indicate, in view of the fact that Simon Day has for 41 years been strike free and has had good relationship between labour and management, I wonder if he could indicate to the House or if he could find out for the House who possibly has incited the workers at Simon Day to go on strike - if the Minister could indicate who has incited the workers to go on strike at a crucial time when the farmers of the province of Manitoba are preparing for seeding operations, that they should go on strike at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Well really Mr. Speaker, the only answer to that, it is a sign of the times that we do have a considerable increase in strikes; some are incited by actions of management and some by disappointment of the work force and the conditions under which they're having to work today. It's a, it's a hard question to answer precisely because I feel as I indicated it's a hell of a year to be a Minister of Labour and sometimes you don't really get the basic reasons as to why there are withdrawals of service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a question posed of me by the Honourable Member from Wolseley yesterday in regards to a possible closure of the St. Charles Hotel. I would like to inform the honourable member that the St. Charles Hotel

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)has not been suspended; that in regards to the allegation of drug trafficking, that would be an infraction not under the Liquor Control Act but action could be taken by the Attorney-General and/or the Winnipeg Police.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General. I'd like to get back to what is known as the Pilutik affair. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if when international police forces are used for surveillance, are the costs charged back to the Province of Manitoba or are they borne by the police force or by the Federal Government?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if he can indicate whether the province is now in the process of completing negotiations or has made a commitment to the City of Winnipeg with respect to the purchase of the Playhouse Theatre and the approximately eight or nine premises around that for redevelopment and attachment to the Theatre Centre site.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Urban Affairs)(Seven Oaks): General discussions have been held in this regard but nothing concrete has yet taken place, and no set date for any of this has yet been determined.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether a commitment has been given by the province to be accepted by the city in this regard.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated this is a general discussion. Nothing has been finalized.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the most recent exercise by the Minister of Education in swallowing himself, I wonder if he could tell the House if a letter of notice of termination now can be described as not a letter of termination after all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I will try again to explain to the Honourable Member for Morris. I thought I had made it perfectly clear to him and other honourable members . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . on the opposite side of the House that a letter of termination was not sent. The matter was a warning sent, a letter advising a number of staff members that they may be subject to layoff as of a certain point in time, and also certain commitments on the part of government to assist them. That is not a letter of termination, that's quite different from telling an employee that as of a certain date his services will no longer be required. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member from Morris would be able to see the distinction. And I would also like to point out to the honourable member that as I have mentioned in my earlier response to the honourable member recognized by you as leader that that was in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and then we went beyond that. We went beyond that in the light of the service that these staff people offered to government, to the Department of Education, a recognition of the fact that despite the fact that the traditional function and role of school inspector may have differed and varied over the years, and recognition of the fact that they could be utilized in other ways making maximum use of their abilities and expertise . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. This is not a debating hour. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, we have now reached the height of confusion and that points out the difficulty, Sir, for those on the other side of the House who have not been educated under the new 3Rs. I'd --(Interjections)-- I'd like to ask the Minister now --(Interjections)-- if all of those people who were given letters of termination have been relocated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the members to the fact that I am in the Chair, and those who have a desire

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)to shout "Order" would they kindly take themselves out of this Chamber if they cannot contain themselves. If we're going to have more than one Chairman, then I shall resign. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I indeed have sympathy for those people who are so damn stupid and cannot distinguish the difference between a letter of termination and a letter indicating that they may be subject to layoff in the event that certain events occur or do not occur in the future.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. Could he indicate how many letters were sent out and how many people received those letters?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can indicate that. Every staff person whose position had become redundant or where it was felt that they could be better deployed in other ways and means received such a letter.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I again ask the Minister if he would indicate the number of people who received the letters indicating that there may be a layoff?

MR. HANUSCHAK: There may have been a dozen or so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Viriden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Viriden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question either to the House Leader or indeed the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and it's to do with our annual junket to the Manitoba Royal Winter Fair at Brandon. It's a usual thing, and some of us rural members would like if you just planned a little bit in advance rather than five or ten days having notice that the House is going to shut down or not going to shut down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of an annual junket but I will consider the question as to whether the House will adjourn for some period during the Brandon Fair. I understand that the Fair takes place on Saturdays when the House is not . . . and that it also continues on Saturday. And I also understand that there are various other events that take place for which the House does not adjourn. However, we will consider it and I will discuss it with the House Leader of the Conservative Party.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 34 students of Grade 9 standing of the St. Norbert School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Richard Lemding. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. Oh behalf of the honourable members I welcome you here this morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day; Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, THAT an Order of the House do issue for return showing all expense accounts and travelling expenses rendered to the government and those paid by the government to the Minister of Highways, his Executive Assistant(s), the Deputy Minister of Highways and his Executive Assistant(s), for the years 1970, 1974 and 1975, and the names of all persons in these categories.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I think we can accept that Order for Return, except to tell the honourable member that these figures can be obtained or seen in Public Accounts, except of course maybe for the last year. But I believe if the honourable member wants the names, which do not show as I understand in the Public Accounts . . .and therefore we have no problem in accepting that order.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 34.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not present.

MR. GREEN: Do they want it to stand? Do you want 34 to stand? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable members would indicate if they want 34 to stand, otherwise . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: The Member for Riel has taken the adjournment on that particular debate and I presume he's taken it because he wants to speak on it and he unfortunately is not here today.

MR. GREEN: Then, Mr. Speaker, if he comes into the House I'll call it again and in the meantime I'll call Bill No. 14.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING
BILL NO. 14, AN ACT TO AMEND THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in view of some of the statements, that in view of some of the statements that the Minister of Labour has made with respect to employment standards and consideration being given to further changes in that area, that Bill 14 may be somewhat premature, Sir, and the exercise imposed upon the Chamber in dealing with it and attempting to act on it at the present time may be rather an academic exercise. That would be my main reservation with respect to the legislation at this point. The Minister has indicated that changes are being considered of a further nature where employment standards in Manitoba are concerned, not only with respect to the teaching profession but perhaps even to the extent that some consideration will be given a request by the Manitoba Government Employees Association that the Employment Standards Act be applied to employees of the Crown. In any event we have had the indication in the Minister's own words in introducing Bill 14 for second reading that there probably will be further amendments, further consideration given to modification of the bill itself. In introducing the bill for second reading on Monday of this week the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . in introducing the bill for second reading on Monday of this week the Minister said, Sir, that there is the possibility that there will be additional amendments to the Employment Standards Act introduced at a later date. So for those reasons I suggest that perhaps the attention we're being asked to give Bill 14 at this juncture is premature and that the proposed legislation in the form in which it's drafted is premature.

My initial reaction to the Minister's introduction of the bill at this point would be that it might be preferable to withdraw the bill and to incorporate in a new bill later in the Session all those changes that he is considering and that he has taken under advisement at the present time. Short of that, I would say if the Minister is not prepared to withdraw the bill and wait for a decision to be made on some of these other possible changes and if he wishes to proceed with it at this time in its present form, then I wish to assure him that we have no objection to proceeding with it at this point and I don't intend to delay passage of the bill through the Chamber and into Committee.

There are some aspects of the proposed legislation that I think raised questions in the minds of anyone interested in the particular subject at issue. The Minister's statement the other night in introducing the bill for second reading was relatively general and for the most part he took the tack that it was a housekeeping measure designed to resolve some anomalies that exist in this field of legislation at the present time because of changes that have already been made in very recent years to the Employment Standards Act. I recognize that there are a number of things of a housekeeping nature that are necessary here, but at the same time the bill itself raises some questions that I think are deserving of further examination and deeper explanation by the Minister and we would want to engage in that kind of a deeper examination at committee stage.

So at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to say that we are prepared to

BILL 14

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)see the bill move ahead through this stage and to committee but that we have some reservations about it and we are anxious to have some clarification on points that are at issue in our mind with the best interests of employers and employees in the province at the present time. So we'll look for that fuller explanation at committee stage, and on that note would be prepared to see it move through second reading, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I do believe it is a housekeeping type of bill. All it does is vary the working hours when an employee desires to establish a week, that's perhaps a four-day week. The only thing I would have expected from the Minister when he did introduce the bill, to provide us some kind of a report or research in the general area of industrial relations in respect to what kind of research has he done in the area of - and I would have liked to have seen a complete detailed investigation of a four-day work week in Manitoba, how it is functioning, what are the problems? Is it a benefit to most employees? What are the problems in that area? We did not have that kind of information. I think it is very important that we do have it because I know in some other jurisdictions there has been quite a few shops and quite a few unions that have gone into a four-day work week and longer hours, a four-day work week and longer hours, but at the same time it has created some problems.

In this area here with this bill I would have hoped that the Minister would have given us some findings and recommendations on specific problems in specific areas of industrial relations, because it is important that in order to have very harmonious relationship with management and labour the Minister has to conduct research or has to research continually in the field of labour-management relations. I would have liked to have heard from the Minister what is really happening in this area of reduction in the days of work and longer hours where we're going into four-day work week. I know that Hydro does it during the summer and I believe MTS to some extent has already and I would have liked to have heard from the Minister what other government departments. . . . But aside from the government departments, what other private - in other sections of our labour field, how many other shops have gone into a four-day as far as the bill itself. I agree with the Minister all it is is a housekeeping bill, but really I would have liked to have heard some report from the Minister, some findings, what are the problems in this area? There's going to be more shops going into the four-day work week, what are the problems in it? And I hope that the Minister when he closes the debate, and if he hasn't got any information perhaps we can adjourn the debate because I'm sure that his department must have done some research in this field, and I'm sure that we would all like to have the benefit of his findings.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Minister of Labour shall be closing debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent on me just to say a word or two. I thank the two honourable members who have spoken in regard to this bill. It is basically a housekeeping bill only containing one or two matters, one being the increase as I indicated in the percentage allowance for vacations in the construction industry. I think that was contained in there in different application, the question of the rights of Board now that we changed the standard work week from 44 to 40 hours, the authority of the Labour Board to take those matters into consideration.

My honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia raised some very interesting points, Mr. Speaker, in reference to a four-day work week. I don't think though that the mere introduction of housekeeping amendments to the Employment Standards Act is an open sesame for consideration of something that is not contained within the present Act. It's really a philocophical approach that is proceeding these days as to whether or not we have a four-day work week, whether we get away from the historic eight-hour day to a ten or twelve or sixteen-hour day, so that if we're working a 40-hour work week we can work 20 hours a day, 20 hours tomorrow and then have the rest of the week off providing we adhere to a 40-hour work week before payment of overtime.

We have the question then as to the relationship of the input by hours in the day.

BILL 14

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)I do say to him, and I'm sure that he would be well aware that this is a matter that has been researched with the people involved, the trade union movement, The Canadian Labour Congress, there is a difference of opinion between various organizations. I want to assure him however, that as far as the department is concerned it has been the subject matter of research.

We did have one or two pilot projects insofar as the Civil Service is concerned. As my honourable friend mentions, certain sections of the employees working for Manitoba Hydro have a system whereby they work extra hours in the wintertime and bank those hours so that they can have more leisurely time in the summer hours. The Joint Council under the Civil Service jurisdiction, the Joint Council being the co-operative Labour-Management Relations Committee of the government and its employees arrived at a basis of having adjustments in the hours of work for the benefit or at least convenience of our employees. As my honourable friend knows, that is under the Civil Service Act as against the Labour Relations Act, but we arrived at an agreement to apply a variation of the hours which I believe has worked out very well. As a matter of fact we have agreed to the extension of that basic principle and continuation of the pilot project.

My honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry of course raised many points dealing with the Employment Standards' amendments that are before us. I appreciate the fact that he's going to be generous enough to allow the bill that I proposed to go forward for consideration and routine handling, and I believe it is routine.

He raised the question as to whether or not in the proposed bill there should have been provisions for other matters such as the matters he has referred to that have been drawn to the attention of the Industrial Relations Committee by representatives of the Employees Association.

I guess maybe it is a good job, Mr. Speaker, that I did not consider the amendments that are now before us as being final, because as my honourable friend knows that only the other day the Court of Appeal declared that certain people were not covered under the Employment Standards Act and if we had finalized a consideration of the Employment Standards Act or had the whole kit and caboodle in this particular amendment, I may have had to draw another bill in any case. All I want to say to my honourable friend, I do appreciate the fact that he has raised some things that are not contained within the bill that should be given assurance. There have been changes in the Unemployment Insurance Act which has just become law that affects maternity leave and they may be worthy of considering and amending our own Employment Standards Act to bring about conformity with the new provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act.

As I indicated originally, Mr. Speaker, these were housekeeping points basically, and I think I said at that particular time that there was a likelihood of another bill dealing with Employment Standards and I would appreciate any comments or any suggestions from honourable members of the House prior to that time.

QUESTION put, motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 16 proposed by the Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (Stand)

BILL 17, AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, to move this bill along, which is basically a lot of housekeeping matters and minor amendments. . . I would have hoped that we could have had the in-House Committee report of the Liquor Commission which the Honourable Minister referred to when he introduced the bill, and as well, some expressions of the study by our honoured friend Judge Rhodes Smith. Because Mr. Speaker, while this legislation is before us I think it's quite in evidence today that our society is caught up in a boozing boom if I might be fair, and I wonder if in fact that we shouldn't be devoting more of our time to finding out what's going on in our province.

Very quickly, Mr. Speaker, if you look over the liquor sales in our province. In 1969 the sales were some \$25 million; today it's \$45 million some odd. And the trend,

BILL 17

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) Mr. Speaker, is not only in this province but the trend is worldwide of the increasing consumption of alcohol and it seems to cut across political lines, cultural lines. I know the world seems to be on a sort of a gigantic drinking spree and I just wonder while we're dealing with this legislation, if in fact we are devoting enough of our time to the Liquor Commission and the way it operates in our province.

The section there Mr. Speaker that deals with the Licensing Board, it allows the government by Order-in-Council I think to select any member of the Licensing Board as the Chairman of the Board. And if the Minister could advise - I think it's required due to the increased activity of the Licensing Board over the last few years, but and I'm wondering why this additional licensing and inspections are necessary. I notice in 1975, as an example, the total inspections of hotels in January, and this was in the Greater Winnipeg area, there was 33 inspections in January, and in December there was 337. In rural Manitoba there was 221 inspections in January then it increased all along, went up in June to 1,274 and finally in December there was some 2,201 inspections. Now I wonder, was there additional inspectors required as the staff got so big that now we do need additional help, or are the hotels causing the Minister and the Liquor Commission more concern? I don't know, and I hope the Minister when he does close the debate on the bill will maybe give me some answers on that.

Concerns are being expressed to me, Mr. Speaker, and others, that the licensing and inspection of the premises across the province have in many cases cost the licensee considerable anxiety. Some of the indications that I get seem to think that in the days in the past the Liquor Commission and its staff were generally more interested in helping the hotel man to build his business and develop it and give him the incentive and the help to make it a better industry. But in some cases at the present time, Mr. Speaker, they become the licensees or the inspectors make it very difficult for hotel people. I don't quarrel with any hotel that doesn't live up to the Act, but I would think that it may be possible that the inspection staff could in fact give the licensees more positive and constructive criticism than the types that in some cases are detrimental to their operations.

Mr. Speaker, then in the section there where the liquor in excess of quantity is permitted across the border, I think that is quite in order and we accept that.

There's one other thing in the licensing, Mr. Speaker, that came across. I was told that there are only two fishing lodges licensed at the present time, I think one is at God's Lake and the other I believe is at Carribou Lodge - or Cranberry is it? Apparently their food sales have to measure up to their liquor sales, they have to equal, and there seems to be a general opinion that it's just impossible for these lodges who operate basically during the tourist season to in fact be compared to say a hotel that's operating one of our larger rural centres, or in fact one of our larger operations in the city.

Regarding the Commission's operation, Mr. Speaker, I've had several questions raised to me. One as an example: Why don't they have public washrooms in the government liquor stores? Why don't they have refrigeration for some of the liquor in the liquor stores. Why is the Liquor Commission refusing to accept empty bottles but the industry are asked to and must I guess accept bottles. I think the way it was put to me was that the liquor stores who sell the beer should be at least responsible for those empties that went over their counter and the return of them.

I'm also wondering, Mr. Speaker, in the inspection of hotels, when an inspector does go into a hotel, do they inspect the hotel from top to bottom, do they check out the fire regulations? In some cases I understand there's all kinds of rooms, especially in rural hotels, that very seldom is liquor ever consumed in them, do all the rooms have to meet up to the standard of the ones that the operator could be using in case somebody wanted to consume some liquor.

The other question, Mr. Speaker, is the Chairman of the Commission, and I've never had it clarified for me: Is he responsible to the Minister, is he responsible to us in the Legislature, or should he in fact be held responsible just to the Commission itself? Maybe the Minister could explain those few things.

The other, Mr. Speaker, there is the section of the 18 year olds, the age of majority is mentioned, and it's basically housecleaning. I wonder sometime in the

BILL 17

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) debate maybe, if in fact it wouldn't be time to take a look. I'm not sure that we've gained anything or in fact maybe have lost something by reducing the age of majority under the Liquor Act. I hear concerns raised from time to time especially in some of our schools that - young people today are legally entitled to take a break during the noon hour and drop in at the corner pub and have a couple of beers and then return back to their classes in the afternoon. We've enjoyed the legislation of reducing the age to 18 for some time. I'm wondering, maybe the Minister would care to comment as to what the Liquor Commission and he as a Minister feels has been the experience of those years where the age of majority has been reduced to 18.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the bill would go to committee and we could get the legislation drafted to help the Minister and the Commission to operate more efficiently.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to state some of the reservations I have against this legislation, and while I will allow it to go to committee I will reserve my right to vote against the bill on third reading, Mr. Speaker. I see that instead of putting some damper on the control of sales of liquor and some control on advertising we're going into a pizza type operation of liquor under this bill, Mr. Speaker. What we're saying, that anyone can order by phone, and in many cases it may be youngsters that will be ordering wine that may not be of age and we'll have a delivery system what we have now in some of the food industries, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that there was a report just came out in Ontario that the Ontario Government had had, where it's indicated that there's some \$150 million car accidents as a result of direct drinking problems, and mostly with young people. There are other problems, it's been indicated, Statistics Canada reports that alcohol has been implicated in some 42 percent in drowning accidents and boating accidents, 42 percent, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot see why we have to open the liquor any more than we have at the present time, which in my opinion is completely uncontrolled. If it's controlled it's fine, I am for liberal liquor laws, but Mr. Speaker, the Minister and the government did not have a complete study in this area. They apparently are not aware of what's happening in many of our high schools. All they have to do is go and talk to some of the principals in this city and it's a serious problem, very serious problem. In fact, I've had school principals come and see me and said, you know we have a problem on Friday afternoons. And their opinion is that perhaps maybe the drinking age should be increased at least one year, because by that time most of the students would be at least out of high school. Well before we can agree to that or disagree, surely the Minister would have undertaken some kind of a study, a study that would have been done in conjunction with some of the high schools and see what problems they really have. When you have such statistics that are coming out of Ontario - and they had a study in Ontario this past year, it's just been released - perhaps the government would have been aware of what's really going on, what's happening.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there should be more stringent controls on sales of liquor, more stringent controls. But what are we doing under this bill? We're saying anybody can order at any time of the night, just put an order in like you would order a pizza. I think that what will happen, it may be abused, Mr. Speaker, and we don't know. I would like to know. Has the Minister undertaken any studies, and what has happened? In my opinion I don't think he has.

Really what's happening here, I believe that he's caved in to the wine people, and what we should be doing is to discourage by having - to some extent I think the Attorney General has undertaken, where there's less advertising as far as liquor is concerned. And here we're going to a mail order operation, I think it's wrong, Mr. Speaker. I will allow the bill to go to Law Amendments and I hope that there will be representations. I reserve my judgment, I may vote against it, because I think that the Minister is going in the wrong direction as far as this legislation is concerned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): I move, seconded by the Member for Morris that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

BILL NO. 18 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped this morning that the House Leader would bring Bill 23 before the House for second reading, because, Mr. Speaker, it is pointless really to speak on Bill No. 18 . . . I don't think I need the advice from the Honourable Minister of Autopac, he's in enough trouble with Autopac now without giving me advice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WATT: I suggest that you try and get your Autopac straightened out. I'll . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable gentleman would address the Chair.

MR. WATT: . . . on pesticides and how they relate to you and your politics. What we should have is pesticides that will get rid of you and all your social . . . out of the House. If you want me to have a debate with you right now on that issue, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit it, let's go at it right now. Let's talk about pesticides as related to Socialists and Liberals that have become Socialists.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WATT: Okay, Mr. Speaker. Normally you find that big winds come from empty caves, and here is positive proof of it over here right now.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 18 which appears on the surface to be returning autonomy to the local authorities, would appear to me actually, Mr. Speaker, that this bill actually while it is not necessary really because insofar as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is concerned and through the Clean Environment Commission I don't think that the municipalities have ever paid very much attention to them in any case. I often wonder why we have a Clean Environment Commission, not only a Clean Environment Commission, but we also have an advisory board to that Clean Environment Commission who advises the Clean Environment Commission what to advise the government what to do, and I sometimes wonder what their real concern or purpose is insofar as the Clean Environment is concerned. But I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I really believe that rather than returning local autonomy in the case of the Clean Environment to the municipalities, that simply the Minister is unloading a steaming hot potato into the hands of the municipalities and saying to them, "Okay, it's your baby, it's your potato, you do what you want with mosquitoes." And since mosquitoes apparently have been the only thing that most of the members around this House have seen in this bill, there is more than mosquitoes involved, there is pesticides involved, insecticides. And now we find in Bill 23 that fertilizers are going to be involved.

So I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as Bill 18 is concerned I don't think there is any point in this bill going forward, that it should be held until we have time to deal with Bill 23. Because on the one hand the government or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is saying that the Provincial Government should be relieved of the responsibility of Clean Environment insofar as insecticides and pesticides are concerned, and on the other hand the Minister of Agriculture has a bill saying here that he is going to take complete control. It's spelled out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, in Bill 23. And if I may deal with Bill 23 for a moment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry we're on Bill 18.

MR. WATT: I'm out of order. That may be correct, Mr. Speaker, I am out of order, but how can you speak, Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 18 and not relate it directly to Bill 23 which is now on the Order Paper and has not come up, or is standing in the name of the Minister of Agriculture. Why that bill has not been brought forward to coincide with Bill No. 18, I don't know. I don't know what the motive behind it is, why this bill should be brought in many days later than Bill 18 and that it is apparent that the House Leader would like to deal with Bill 18 and get that cleaned up before Bill 23 is given second reading.

Mr. Speaker, I can see no point in further discussing Bill 18 until we get to Bill 23, and unless the government is prepared to hold this Bill No. 18 until we have thoroughly looked at Bill 23 and discussed it and debated it in the House, I have no

BILL 18

(MR. WATT cont'd) alternative, Mr. Speaker, but to vote against Bill No. 18, and Bill No. 23 when it comes up. That I intend to do, Mr. Speaker, and with reason.

If the Minister of Mines and Resources were in his chair at the moment he might give me some indication of why he is apparently trying to push Bill 18 through before we have an opportunity to discuss Bill 23, which I am not in order to speak on at the moment, Mr. Speaker, but which does indicate that the Minister of Agriculture is going to take over, not only the control of pesticides and insecticides but he's going to take over the control of fertilizers in the Province of Manitoba - complete control. He is going to take over the authority that has been designated by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to the municipalities, and he is going to direct the farmers in the municipalities in this province what they may use in pesticides in this area. Maybe they do need some direction, but I cannot possibly conceive of the Minister of Agriculture taking over the responsibility that is now being handed over from the government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member claims and admits he's out of order and he keeps on arguing about a bill that's not discussed at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is a point of order. I'm simply relating the Bill 23 to Bill No. 18. I am not speaking on Bill No. 23, I am speaking on Bill 18 and I am relating it to the coming legislation that we are going to be asked to pass. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have a legitimate right to say in this House that this Bill No. 18 cannot be dealt with until we have an opportunity to debate and to discuss with the Minister of Agriculture what we may expect that he is going to do in the way of commissions and boards and inspectors that I gather from the bill are going to be spread all over this province; where in fact the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is saying that he is designating this power to the municipalities and to others.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say again that until such time as we have had an opportunity to discuss both bills thoroughly, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against both.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 22, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Corrections. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

BILL NO. 22 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE
ALCOHOLISM FOUNDATION ACT

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have had the opportunity to look over Bill 22 and we as a party see no reason to delay this bill in any way. It's purely a bill to amend the old bill slightly and where the name "alcoholic" appears it's now "individuals" and that I think is an excellent move. And by virtue of incorporating that terminology it extends the efforts of the department to cover drugs and other items and makes their job just that much easier to accomplish. So without any further ado, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased on behalf of our party to allow this bill to go forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 25, proposed by the Minister of Highways. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Can I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand please?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 28, proposed by the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

BILL NO. 28 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE
WHEAT BOARD MONEY TRUST ACT

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I'd indicated earlier to the Minister that I wouldn't deal with it, not knowing then that I would be able to deal with it now. The bill as it's explained is very brief. The amendment to this Act, the Wheat Board Money Trust Act are in order as far as we are concerned on this side of the House. I think it's a tidying up and probably is giving the same opportunities for credit unions, caisse populaire, as it is with banks, and so far as the other sections that the Minister points out to the House, we are in agreement on this side and prepared to let it go to committee, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 29, proposed by the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34, proposed by the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Riel, the Leader of the Opposition. Stand.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, with leave may I speak to the bill if the gentleman holding the adjournment is not here?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on Bill 34.

BILL NO. 34 - CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill 34 because I think the timing of the issue that I want to address is important and I think that it's a matter that really can't be left unattended much further. I want to really speak on what I consider to be almost the major betrayal of the Province of Manitoba in relation to the educational requirements of the City of Winnipeg, that we in this House, I guess for the past two years or so have had to endure the confusion, chaos, cacophony and convolutions of the Minister of Education, and I suppose everyone has simply ended up in part being a victim of that kind of lack of cohesion as to what's going on in education. That it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that something is becoming clear at last, and that is that there is a line of policy that is being developed, there is a direction that is being formulated, and that is that there is a very clear discriminatory position against the schools of the City of Winnipeg. That that becomes clear, primarily in terms of the financial position that they take, but it expands beyond that of course in terms of the lack of attention to the needs of the schools of the city, the changing requirements that are very apparent and the lack of response to the requests and importunings and various kinds of questions that are being asked about the quality of education that exists in the city.

I think I mentioned when we were debating the Department of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Winnipeg seems to be seen by members of the government as a great monolith of wealth and perhaps even of evil, that they treat it in terms of - I think what the Premier is saying is that he's just a son of a farmer or something in parallel. And that attitude tends to premeate, which is very strange considering the fact that most of their elected members come from city ridings, or a good proportion of them do; that you would think that under those circumstances there would be a much stronger emphasis upon the needs of what's happening inside the City of Winnipeg. And yet the government, to its credit perhaps, have provided a stronger emphasis about what's going on in rural areas; they've established the stay option program; it looks at equalization grants; it has a number of special programs in northern Manitoba in education in particular. But when it comes down to recognizing what's happening in this part of the world in which we sit, in the City of Winnipeg which includes now 600,000, there seems to be a cold eye and an indifferent glare, and it is no more apparent than in the field of education and particularly in the attitude of the Minister of Education. Because there have been major conditions arising which have not been dealt with, and when you begin to look at the kind of money that we're being asked to support in the way of Supply you simply see that the active discrimination is very severe and I think will simply result in a serious decline in the quality of education and in the ability of the city to respond to its particular needs.

BILL 34

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

Let me just mention a few of these kinds of conditions, Mr. Speaker. We, for example, in the City of Winnipeg absorb almost the total number of immigrant children who arrive in the Province of Manitoba. These are people who in fact are encouraged to come, by this government and by others, we want and welcome people from foreign lands to come and settle in Manitoba. They come in from, particularly now from Portugal and Italy, from the Philippines, a number of groups come in. They come in with very specific handicaps, language being a major one of those. They're coming in increasingly significant numbers, settling almost entirely inside the City of Winnipeg. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no assistance whatsoever provided by the Department of Education for the education of immigrant children in the City of Winnipeg. There is no assistance provided and yet here is a special kind of service in effect the city provides for the Province of Manitoba. We're being asked to educate the children of immigrants so that they can become full members of the society, that they can acquire language skills and others to be able to obtain employment and become regular practicing members of a community. They can't do that without these kinds of assistances and there is no assistance provided by the Department of Education to overcome these kinds of difficulties.

--(Interjection)--Well, the Premier from his seat is interjecting. He says neither does the Federal Government. But if he looks at the constitution carefully, which I know he does at times, he'll see that immigration is a dual responsibility, it is shared by both federal and provincial governments. The Federal Government has the responsibility in a sense of the immigration until it reaches the shores of Canada, then it becomes a provincial responsibility. That's very clear.--(Interjection)--Well, the constitution is very clear on that matter. It's a shared responsibility; the Federal Government under its Manpower programs attempts to provide relocation and other forms of assistance and - as I say I don't feel that I always have to be in a situation of defending what happens in Ottawa because I find myself as critical sometimes of what they're doing there as I do with the Provincial Government, but I still insist that I was elected as a member of a provincial constituency and therefore would devote my remarks to what the provincial responsibilities are in this field.

The point I'm making is that we attract a number of immigrants to the Province of Manitoba but they happen to settle in Winnipeg and therefore the Winnipeg school system must be the major vehicle by which they gain their access to our community. It would seem to me that constitutionally it's very clear where the responsibility lies and I think morally the responsibility is very clear, and yet for reasons that are I guess known only to inside Cabinet chambers we don't accept any responsibility translated into money. Therefore when we've got to deal with that particular problem, what do we do? The Minister says, I've asked for some special recommendation. But the fact of this matter is, you know, this Minister doesn't come across very straight very often, because the Province of Manitoba has yet to meet with the Winnipeg School Board about this issue. It's asked for some papers, so when he says, "We're dealing with it," how do you deal with it when you're not meeting with them? And how do you deal with it when you're not even prepared to set a meeting date or give some indication of when you're going to put a budget down? I just think that that, Mr. Speaker, is part of the betrayal that's going on, is that it's being approached from a point of view of how do we cover our backsides rather than how do we deal with the problem.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we can point to the same kind of difficulty that deals with that other large population group that moves to the City of Winnipeg, and that is native children who are coming in, again in increasing numbers and becoming a very major component of our own population. Again the kind of assistance that's being offered is almost minimal, that the province I think in the last year perhaps transferred one or two of its employees in the Department of Education to work in the Winnipeg School System. And again there is no major financial assistance to coping with what is a very serious problem. Let me give an indication of it, Mr. Speaker; that in something of the 18 or so some odd schools in the core area the transiency rate, that means the turnover rate, is around 60 or 70 or 80 percent, sometimes much higher than that. In other words the

BILL 34

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) schools are having to absorb a population that is moving into a strange environment without the ability to adapt, and again the province is washing its hands of it, standing away from the problem. And yet here it could be and now is one of the major social dilemmas of our own society, and what is our answer from the Provincial Government? Our answer is mañana. We're going to wait till tomorrow; we're going to put off the meetings, and rather than taking some initiative and getting into the thing and saying, let's see what we can do, the Minister of Education simply provides as he has in this House when questions are asked or points put forward to him, he simply goes into that act of kind of obtuse back pedalling, where you know, it's the classic pose of, 'I'll check it out', or whatever kind of flip or gratuitous answers he wants to provide. That is not what we're asking for, we're asking for some attention to this problem. We're asking for some ability to say, he shouldn't have to do that, he should know what the problems are; he should have the answers ready and he should be prepared to move into it.

Mr. Speaker, as well in the City of Winnipeg you have in the core area a large concentration of people on lower income. You have a concentration for example of single parent mothers. I believe that the round numbers that he gave, 700 or 800 within a mile radius of this building. Their children again have special responsibilities, special needs. The schools must adapt to that particular question, - it's there, it's a condition that must be met, and again there seems to be no forthcoming awareness. The Province of Manitoba does not provide any support for nursery schools, it does not provide any support for ways of amalgamating sort of community type school operations to insure that there is an integration of different kinds of services in the school buildings, there is no attempt to provide some innovative answers to these problems and in fact--(Interjection)-- Yes, certainly. By all means.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member confirm that on the point he is speaking of, immigration, that the incidence of immigration was far higher in Manitoba's history in the period 1949 to 1953, far higher than it is today or indeed all through the 1960s. And in the context of that period of high immigration, 1949 to 1953, could he advise if the City of Winnipeg received a red penny from the Province of Manitoba at that time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would love to satisfy the First Minister's curiosity, but about that time I was I think about 14 years old and not particularly aware of what the Provincial Government was able to accomplish in fact, so I don't feel that I bear the full responsibility for the action of government at that time and I feel that --(Interjection)--I would be very pleased, Mr. Speaker. I would only hope, Mr. Speaker, though in answer to that question, going back to 1949, let's say for sake of argument, and I'd be prepared to check it out, but there wasn't any money. But we could or should make progress, don't you think? Don't you think we should be able to identify changes and therefore be able to respond and say, well if the government at that time was not fulfilling its full responsibility that we as a province become more difficult. I would mention this, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister should very well know, the job market has changed very radically since 1949. There was a time when someone arriving from overseas or arriving from a rural point could find sort of unskilled labour and physical work without too much difficulty, but our society has become far more sophisticated and complicated in the kind of job requirements. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we have become far more adept at creating paper barriers for people to vault over in order to get jobs. We now need all kinds of credentials and licenses and diplomas and pieces of things that you can tape up on your wall and say that I now have my licence to do whatever it is. I mean, everybody is now a licensed professional of one kind or another, and that was not true in 1949. So as a result, the requirements for that paper credential is far more severe and you can only get it by obtaining usually an educational program and therefore you have to find out - in fact the requirement to provide proper schooling in those skills is even far more necessary now than it was then. And I guess in terms of trade-offs, going back to 1949 when the budget I expect was around \$60-some-odd million to where it is now,

BILL 34

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) a billion dollars today, one might have assumed that in that 100,000 percent rise we might have been able to include some attention to the problems of immigrant children settling in downtown Winnipeg.

But my point is this, whether you like it or not someone is having to pay for it, and I'll tell you who is paying for it. It is the City of Winnipeg taxpayers who are paying for it because they are not getting any assistance under the present programs for those kinds of special educational needs. So really as to the conditions, the fact is that it's not as if they're not being dealt with, someone is trying to cope with their problems. But there is no recognition whatsoever of that particular kind of requirement. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we continue to lay burden upon burden upon the taxpayers in this city.

Let me provide one example. The Minister got up in his full flower to announce the increase in school grants that would be available and said that on the average it was 10 or 12 percent. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you start to cut the figures down into their fine points - if I can beg the indulgence of the House to read them for a moment - that in the City of Winnipeg itself, that the increase in the per pupil grant from 1975 to 1976 is only \$1.7 million, not the 300,000 that they were talking about; that in 1975 the per pupil grant was 1.9; in 1976 it's estimated to rise to 3.6 which is only an increase of 1.7. The declining enrollment grant will be 303,000. The print and non print grant will rise from 456,000 to 595,000 which is an increase of 138,000. Therefore the total increase, financial increase to the City of Winnipeg on Education is 2.2 million which amounts to an increase of only 5.4 percent in provincial grants over last year. Now that, Mr. Speaker, sort of doesn't, you know, doesn't cover the cost of the basic - I guess it's about one-third of the estimated cost requirements of the Winnipeg School Division I estimated it required, a 5.4 increase in grants.

At the same time, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we also get into programs where - going back to 1972, the province when it brought in Unicity recognized that something had to be done to equalize school levies between the different parts of the city because there was going to be such a catch-up. As a result they established the so-called Greater Winnipeg levy which was to provide for some equalization. So here we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where the Greater Winnipeg school levy, which is not provincial money, it is a provincial loan that requires the Winnipeg taxpayers to raise an additional amount of mills to provide equalization to other school districts. And let me give you an indication of who gets those. Through the Greater Winnipeg school levy the City of Winnipeg taxpayers lose \$4.9 million that is taken from their pockets, and who does it go to? Well for example it goes to St. James-Assiniboia which gets \$686,000. Now I'm not against that, Mr. Speaker, but is St. James-Assiniboia really in a worse situation than the City of Winnipeg, and is it dealing with special educational needs? St. Boniface gets \$1.2 million. The River East School Division gets \$1.4 million of that extra levy. So in effect, Mr. Speaker, what is happening is that, particularly in the downtown portions of Winnipeg, the Winnipeg School Division is having to absorb or deal with more difficult problems because the nature of the population is much more mixed, and a lower income, has more difficult social conditions to cope with; they are older, they're younger; they're immigrants; they're natives; and yet what is happening is that we're taking money out to put in other school divisions.

It would seem to me that if the province wants to equalize in the City of Winnipeg that it should pay for that equalization, not ask the City of Winnipeg school payers to pay for it. If they want to equalize, I agree. That makes sense. Because Unicity was their creation, they had to provide for some levelling out, but it should be the Province of Manitoba through its income growth taxes that pay for it, not putting a special levy on the taxpayers who happen to reside within the old boundaries of the City of Winnipeg. Now that is the kind of discrimination that occurs, that's the kind of sleight of hand that takes place when we start dealing with school financing. In the meantime while you're trying to deal with a city that is increasingly coping with increased costs of all kinds, where education represents a large proportion of this budget, where it's being assumed or accepted that it will be the school division that undertakes dealing with the special problems of the Province of Manitoba, there is nothing at all being given to help it in that respect.

BILL 34

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, when I say that I think that it is a form of betrayal and perhaps discrimination, I think the case is very obvious, that we are not recognizing the conditions and changes that are going on, nor are we providing any financial assistance to assure that they are met. The incomprehensible part is why it comes from a government that derives a good deal of its support from the city itself. Is it because they figure that it's locked up and they can take it for granted? What is the reason? Because it confounds me that while the conditions are apparent and the needs are obvious, the response is non-existent.

The consequences, Mr. Speaker, of this increasing inattention or indifference or just lack of awareness of what's going on, is that there will be a severe decline in the services of the City of Winnipeg schools because they will simply no longer be able to afford them; that there will be an act of almost discrimination against low income groups because probably the first services that would be cut off, the first areas where the axe will have to cut will be in those special programs that are designed for special needs. That's where the history I guess across Canada - there is an article in one of the financial newspapers in eastern Canada pointing out that as the provinces are so-called getting tough with the municipalities, the programs that are being cut are those that most directly relate to the needs of lower income people or disadvantaged people. Those are the programs that are being cut out first. They don't - and I guess it's a commentary perhaps in a way - city government operates. It's not the hardware programs, not the transportation system or the fire departments or something that go, it's those special programs that have been developed to deal with the special needs of disadvantaged groups. Those are the programs that go first. So in a sense, Mr. Speaker, what we're setting up is that kind of condition. We're setting up a kind of condition that in fact discrimination will work particularly to the disadvantage of those who live in the downtown area, in the core area. And they are the ones who will suffer first.

There will be . . . --(Interjection)-- Yes, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member a question. I have been listening to him with extreme interest for the past while, but I am at a loss to know, Mr. Speaker - and he hasn't proposed anything yet - how he hopes to correct the problem that he is referring to by way of an Interim Supply bill.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable member to indicate we have in the gallery 60 students from Arborg High of Grade 9 standing under the direction of Mrs. Magnusson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George, the Minister in charge of the Public Insurance Corporation. On behalf of all the members I welcome you here this morning.

BILL 34 cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a funny position of having to advise the Minister of Education how things proceed, because he has been in the House longer. But I assume that on a bill of Interim Supply we are voting money for education. I am arguing the case as to how we should be voting it and how much we should be voting it for. That is the question of --(Interjection)-- We are talking of Bill 34, which is Supply for forthcoming . . . --(Interjection)-- That's right, that's right. We're just telling you what you should be doing.

I refer the Minister, in fact, Mr. Speaker, to the Order Paper where it says Bill 34, Supplement Supply March, 1977. Does that clarify the problem for the Minister? Can he now generate himself up to a response?

To continue, Mr. Speaker, just to take a look at some of the further figures, I think, that hammer the case home. If you look over the past eight-year period the education tax levies on the Winnipeg School Division have increased by 160 percent, provincial support by only 43 percent. The argument comes back, well the City of Winnipeg is, you

BILL 34

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) know, the centre of wealth, very heavy assessment, why shouldn't it be carrying a heavier burden than everyone else? Again if you look, between 1967 and 1975 the Winnipeg School Division's balanced assessment in 1967 was 33 percent, in 1975 it's fallen to 27 percent. So again the problem is coming down that there is less of a base to support that kind of program and again there has not been reaction or adaptation or response. I'm not surprised considering that the Minister doesn't even know what kind of a bill you're debating. I guess that maybe sort of illustrates the case.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the point of order was raised, the honourable member wishes to belabour it. The bill that is being debated is Interim Supply which is 25 percent of the Estimates and that is all that is being requested. As to whether that 25 percent should include more or less for Education, it is strictly speaking relevant on the Estimates of the department or when we are debating the amount that subsequently goes for Education. I am merely saying that because of the sarcastic remarks that are being made by the honourable member, I have no way of stopping him from speaking nor do I desire to do so. We know that we have to tolerate the speech but his sarcastic remarks as to the point of order are completely incorrect, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wants to start it, we'll be quite prepared to finish it. That's the way we work. --(Interjection)-- Oh, really. You'd be surprised, I say to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, your turn comes next. --(Interjection)-- For a Minister who has set a new standard for sarcasm and cheap shots then I wouldn't be one that would be talking.

Mr. Speaker, the point that we're trying to make on this is that the Winnipeg School Division, at the present time, because its budget was finalized two or three nights ago is simply at the quandry of what does it do now in terms of the programs it offers. So whether we're going 25 percent or a full amount, the fact of the matter is we're at a serious crossroads and the kind of decisions that are going to have to be made are being made in light of the absence of mind or the lack of attention or the lack of concern that's being expressed by this government about the conditions and concerns of people in the City of Winnipeg. That's the issue that we're debating right now and that is the feature that they have to face whether they want to tolerate it or not. That happens to be the facts; it happens to be the truth and the Minister of Mines and Resources is some time going to have to face up to that truth and that reality. Whether he wants to tolerate it or not is simply his business but he should face it. I think it deserves probably more than toleration; it probably deserves at some point some recognition that this government must do something soon to respond to that kind of problem.

Because if it doesn't happen, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of things that are going to happen, a decline of services will take place, the lack of attention to the special of the city itself and increasing the burden upon the property taxpayers which has a ripple effect throughout the whole financial system. It begins to set up a dissatisfaction and a disregard for the ability of local government to function. It creates that kind of turmoil that is being seen across the country and again it is all right for this government to say, well it's not our problem and walk from it. It is its problem and it itself is creating increased burdens and creates increased turmoil for local government and school divisions because they're the ones that have to bear the brunt of the heat. They're the ones that have to take the action and this government can kind of sit back in the rear echelons and kibitz from the sidelines when in fact it should be in the front trenches like everybody else dealing with that kind of issue and it's not, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Minister of Education says, well what do you propose? Again I suggest that he has a larger department to manage than I have but I am trying to suggest that there are ways of solving the problem, there are ways of dealing with it.

MR. GREEN: . . . question to the honourable member if he would accept a question.

MR. AXWORTHY: Sure, I'll accept a question.

BILL 34

MR. GREEN: The Minister of Education asked how the honourable member proposes to improve the question on a bill requesting Interim Supply. I wonder if he could answer that question because that is the question that was put. How he proposes to improve the question on a bill dealing with Interim Supply?

MR. AXWORTHY: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to that question should be, whatever. We're debating a principle of the kind of Interim Supply that the Province of Manitoba is supplying.

MR. GREEN: No.

MR. AXWORTHY: Oh yes. Well if the Minister wants to, you know, he can sort of mire himself in the technicalities if he wants. The fact of the matter that we're dealing with is how do you deal with that particular problem of the education and on the Interim Supply, the issue that we should be dealing with is a revision of the formula both in terms of the kind of assessments and grants that are given . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it should be fairly simple for even a novice parliamentarian to bring himself into relevance on a bill of Interim Supply. But when the honourable member insists that the Interim Supply bill is a basis for saying how you should better spend money in Education, then he is taking himself out of the relevance provision. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, he could, and if I will help him, say that we shouldn't be voting Interim Supply to this government because it hasn't been behaving well in the field of education, if he wants to do that. But to suggest that the Interim Supply bill is there for the purpose of giving him the opportunity of saying what better should be done in education is himself taking him outside of the provision of relevance and I would ask the Speaker to so advise him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We all appreciate the Minister's interventions from time to time and I think the question of relevancy is one that you would have to judge and I accept your decision as it is expressed in your silence on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Now the honourable member is out of order. He's reflecting on a decision which has not been stated or not been made and I wish he would learn that at least. I have made no decision and that is what I do not wish to be reflected upon, whether it's good or bad or otherwise. When I do make a decision the honourable member will hear it. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't mean to cast aspersions on your judgments just on the comments made by other members of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling as to whether the basis upon which the honourable member declared his relevancy is relevant to the debate on Interim Supply. I submit that it is not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to sit here and watch the Minister of Mines and Resources and the House Leader maneuver you into a position that would be very difficult for you, Sir. In the past, my recollection is that in the past the debate on Interim Supply is a pretty far-reaching and a wide-ranging one. I don't know on any occasion when there have been any types of restrictions or limitations placed on that particular debate. I fail to see the fine line that the Minister of Mines and Resources is attempting to draw in this instance. It's a wide-ranging debate and it encompasses all of the departments of government which in effect makes it very much the same as the Throne Speech Debate. For him to try to draw that line today to me is attempting to do something that he knows is not correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I regret that the point is even being discussed because I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that on a debate of Interim Supply it is very easy to bring oneself

BILL 34

(MR. GREEN cont'd) into relevancy. What I was pointing out is that the honourable member specifically tried to bring himself out of relevancy by suggesting that the Interim Supply debate was there for the purpose of debating the general principles of education and how much money is being given. I suggested that if he was using the debate for the purpose of saying that Interim Supply, in being granted to this government, raises certain questions as to what is being done that he is perfectly at liberty to do so. But that is not what the member said. I believe that the debate could be in order and should proceed. But it should proceed on the basis of relevance and not on the basis that on Interim Supply one is entitled to debate anything.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their contribution. The Chair is not going to get itself involved in whether we're 25 percent on principle or 100 percent on principle. I would ask for the co-operation of the honourable members to conduct themselves with decorum, all of them, especially in debate. There should be no personal aspersions or anything else when debate is taking place. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we can return to the topic at hand which is the failure of the government to deal adequately with the financial needs of the City of Winnipeg School Division and the particular problems it faces then I would be glad to limit my relevancy to that particular issue which was raised in the first place, and which I believe has been the major tone and conduct of my remarks until, Mr. Speaker, it was introduced otherwise by the Minister.

The issue still is: is there ways in which the province should be responding? Is it so locked in to this rigid Foundation formula which year by year goes more obsolescent and anachronistic as a way of financing, or are there ways by which the Province of Manitoba could adapt itself. I suppose in immediate terms because the problem is of a very immediate nature, the Province of Manitoba could be dealing specifically with a special grant program to cope with those particular needs of the core area. But if it's going to do it, Mr. Speaker, it should be doing it now. It shouldn't be waiting, it shouldn't be procrastinating. The budgets are being established at the present moment; the property tax levies are being set and the programs are left hanging until we get some identification of the kind of support, if any, that the province is prepared to provide.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, they have not been made unaware of the problems. They've been addressed to that problem months ago by the school board, by citizen organizations from the area who have tried to approach them but have not received a hearing. They have tried to make their case so the problem is obvious in there. In the short term I believe that this province could provide, even in its Interim Supply, the kind of assistance that's available to at least enable those programs to continue and to indicate its preparedness to support the special educational requirements of the city and to relieve some of the burden of taxpayers.

In the longer term, Mr. Speaker, I think it is not enough simply to deal with the problem in an ad hoc way. It must be dealt with in a basic revision of the way that we provide for grants for schools. I would indicate again that there have been mechanics tried to deal that kind of situation through. In the City of Montreal and in other cities in North American built into the formula for school grants and pupil grants is an income criteria grant on special regions. So that in the City of Montreal in fact additional funds are given for special programs by a formula basis. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the same thing holds true in the City of Toronto, that they recognize that they have special problems of a core area and they respond to it in a different kind of way.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if you recall that in the debate on Educational Estimates last year a specific request was made to the Minister of Education that he instruct his officials to come forward with a series of studies and proposals on reorganizing the Foundation grant in particular to take care of this problem. They've had advisory group meetings over a period of time; a report was issued last fall; it would have assumed that that kind of report would of then been a first priority and passed through the system as quickly as possible so that something could have been done at this session. Again the machinery has bogged down; there has been no action. That advisory group

BILL 34

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) is sitting there and nothing has been done. So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that even going back a full year to the Educational Estimates debate, when that request was made and in fact acceded to, one would have thought that within a year's time some action might have been taken. But again it hasn't and again we are waiting and while we're waiting the problem grows worse and the confusion compounds.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the issue that really must be faced - and I think the problem of supportive education is only a reflection of a wider syndrome of problems of the way in which the city is treated by this Provincial Government. It is not treated well; it is treated more in a passive, responsive way than it is in a way of taking some initiative, working out solutions to problems and recognizing that the city itself is changing. It is no longer what it was back in 1949 as the First Minister indicated. We have, you know, grown up a little bit since then and the society itself has changed remarkably since then. We must cope with those problems, we must meet them and we must meet them in a joint way. You can't simply put the onus on a school division or city council or private organizations. The province itself must take the initiative and deal with the problem, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, they are not doing it and perhaps the field of education is the most blatant, obvious example where this city doesn't get a good deal.

. continued on next page

BILL 34

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few comments to make on the passing of Interim Supply at this time, Bill 34, that's before us. Mr. Speaker, it's a bill of course that generally has been accepted as being one of routine nature, that has however been used on different occasions by willful opposition parties to serve their ends. It's a necessary bill and there is, of course, no intention on the part of the opposition to prevent its passage and relatively speedy passage. But it seems to me that there are some remarks that could be directed at this particular time.

I recall Bill 34, an Interim Supply bill, being the topic of a heated debate in this Chamber just a few years ago and I suppose I should be thankful that the bill is before us anyway because the government at that time demonstrated that they were quite adept, if pushed, to simply signing an order-in-council and doing it in Cabinet and circumventing the debate here in this Chamber. So the Interim Supply measure bill although as described, a routine and necessary measure, has had its history and, Sir, for a brief moment it appeared as though it was going to make some history again today but I will try certainly to prevent any admonitions from the House Leader opposite and stay relevant to the question of Interim Supply.--(Interjection)--No, Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the House Leader. I don't believe it's hard because what I just briefly want to speak about is I think it's worthy to spend a few moments, to pause and reflect about how the passage of time has changed things.

We are being asked to approve the sum of \$282,403,300, roughly about a quarter, I believe, of the billion dollar plus budget. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the passage of ten years should be noted, that what we are being asked now in this Interim Supply bill was pretty well equivalent to the total budget of this province a mere ten years ago under the then Progressive Conservative administration. In fact I have the actual figure here, Expenditures Estimates of Manitoba fiscal year 1966-67. They were a grand total of \$301,800,000.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is, and what I wish to address my remarks to is that ten years have passed; the Interim Supply bill before us now which will cover roughly one-quarter of the spending Estimates of this government represented just ten years ago virtually the entire budget, out by some \$18 million, the difference between \$282 million and \$301 million. You know, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't find a better occasion than on this occasion to remind honourable members opposite, indeed it's something that I like to remind my constituents and the people of Manitoba of as I have occasion to speak to them from time to time. Because surely what has to be asked, you know, in not making the argument over-simplistic but nevertheless I think it can be put in simple terms, have our services provided by our governments increased fourfold in all walks of life? Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no difficulty in accepting and in doing some pretty fast arithmetic about those specific areas where indeed additional services have been rendered by the government as a result of their capacity to do so with this increased budget, with these increased tax revenues that they have.

The members opposite would be quick enough to point out such programs as Medicare, Pharmacare. They would point out such programs as additional moneys expended or an accelerated amount of dollars spent into public housing, as accelerated amount of spending in Northern Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, the central question still remains. 1967 happened to be one of those awful 100 years that the honourable members opposite always like to refer to but 1967 wasn't in the medieval ages, Mr. Speaker. In 1967 you know we had most of our road network in this province; in 1967 the three universities existed in this province and were demanding as they are demanding now proper funding and financing. In 1967, Mr. Speaker, most of the hospitals that now service Manitobans were in place. There are one or two notable exceptions. 1967, Mr. Speaker, senior citizens' homes were being built throughout this province; in 1967, Mr. Speaker, major capital works projects such as the Winnipeg Floodway, \$100 million - \$60 million, these kinds of works were being done. In 1967, our children, in fact, Mr. Speaker, a greater number of children than today, were graduating from our high schools and they were graduating reasonably well equipped I would tend to believe. In fact there seems to

BILL 34

(MR. ENNS cont'd) be a debate growing about the quality of the graduates of today. I will try to keep that aspect of my remarks out of these comments because then I would be sliding off into irrelevancy with respect to the Interim Supply measure. And I wouldn't want to encourage the wrath of the House Leader on this fine Friday morning.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is entirely relevant, what is entirely relevant is the fact that one-quarter of the total budget that the government now is asking for in this Interim Supply bill represented the total budget just ten years ago. Really that is the question that is going to be the one that weighs most heavily on this government when they face the electorate the next time. It is their management of those resources, the management of the tax revenues that they collect which have now surpassed the billion dollar mark and to what extent, how capably, how acceptably they are spending them on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba from whom they draw these tax dollars from. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of judgment will be made and when that judgment is made, they will be found wanting.

Mr. Speaker, the differenc, the quadrupling of services simply isn't there. In all too many fields, in all too many fields just the reverse is happening. Because of a fixation for centralization in different areas that this government exhibits so often, passage of Bill 36, the Unicity Bill, we now find and read in our reports daily about withdrawing of services rather than improvement of services. Snow can be left six inches deep on all sidewalks rather than being cleaned off; garbage collections are being reduced; other services are being reduced at the time that the city residents face their highest ever tax bills. So, Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not the services received for the taxes collected has improved four times is an argument that I would acknowledge, and will be attacked immediately by some as being overly simplistic, it doesn't take into account the rising costs as such, inflation, etc. But the point of course that has to be made is to what extent does government spending and to what extent does this government spending contribute to that very inflationary syndrome that is covering this province and covering this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in suggesting to honourable members opposite that when I think back that ten years ago, an Interim Supply bill of this magnitude covered the entire expenses of the Province of Manitoba, ten years later this Interim Supply bill will cover only roughly one-fourth of the expenditures of this province and it's my judgment that the people are getting short-changed, that they're not getting full service value for the dollars spent, that there has been a topsy turvy growth in government services in all departments and it's represented in the billion dollar-plus budget. It's represented as my honourable friend and deskmate, the Member for Riel, indicated I believe last night right here in this Chamber that in 1967 an eleven-man Cabinet managed the affairs of this province and now we have two rows of Cabinet Ministers with everybody else to some extent involved in some assisting capacity but always, always contributing to that billion dollar-plus budget.

Mr. Speaker, ten years ago a Conservative administration ran the province for the amount of money that this Interim Supply Bill is asking for. I don't mind being challenged about the levels of services provided ten years ago as compared to today. Yes, with notable exceptions, additional amounts of money would have to be added to them. The tax credit programs, the Medicare premium programs - as I said, Mr. Speaker, those can be totalled up. But I would suggest any objective totalling of these figures would find room for an awful lot of fat an awful lot of simple unmanageable growth that seems to be part of big government and government constantly getting bigger.

So Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to prolong the debate on Bill 34. It just seemed to be an ideal occasion to remind honourable members opposite the passing of ten years. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The bill will remain adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is any objection to me speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I'm sorry. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I too am not taking an unusual amount of time in this very

BILL 34

(MR. GREEN cont'd) interesting debate in which everything is relevant and which I will not disqualify myself. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that it's almost impossible to disqualify oneself from relevance on an Interim Supply bill and I was really marvelling at the capacity of the Member for Fort Rouge to have figured out a way in which he could show that he is not being relevant on the bill and I really seriously had no view that this would end the matter.

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside has given a very dramatic presentation about how in 1967 the total budget seven years ago was roughly \$301 million, just ten years ago. Government expenditures have increased fourfold in ten years. He says, now that's rather simplistic. There have been some inflationary changes and there's some additions to be added. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not the most serious of my honourable friend's problems. Because, Mr. Speaker, somebody could have stood up in 1968 and said, Mr. Speaker, ten years ago in 1958, the last Campbell budget was \$80 million and the Interim Supply bill in 1958 would be one-quarter of roughly \$301 million which would be roughly very close to \$80 million. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there would have been an almost identical, under less advantageous circumstances, there would have been almost an identical over four times increase in the budget from the time that the Conservatives entered power to 1968 when they delivered their budget some ten years later.

Mr. Speaker, now we are getting the argument, don't you think there was a change? Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been changes here too and one of the most important changes is that there wasn't the same devaluation of money between 1958 and 1968 as there has been between 1967 and 1976. There has been a much greater devaluation of money during that period and there have been differences, Mr. Speaker. Because it's true - the honourable member points them out. He himself is aware of some of the weaknesses of his argument because he points out that Medicare premiums were not included in the budget; hospital premiums were not included. There was hospital and they were not included in the budget because they had a secret way. They didn't collect taxes for hospital but they collected premiums. That made it all the easier and that budget was put over at the side. Now I may be wrong about that. That may be included in the 301 million.--(Interjection)--It was not included? Then, Mr. Speaker, it went up more. Then it went up more and the point, the heaviest point that the Member for Lakeside was making was not that there hasn't been increases in services because he tended to say that there was some increases in services, but the real solid fundamental point was that ten years ago the Interim Supply bill could run the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, exactly the same words could have been used and probably were used from the other Member for Lakeside. I'm sure they were. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that's where the Member for Lakeside got his speech. I'm sure that if we go back to 1968, I am positive that if we go back to 1967 and look for the Member for Lakeside, the same member, Mr. Speaker, the same day, the same speech. I hope that there is a Hansard, Mr. Speaker. It just occurred to me that there will have been a speech on Interim Supply by the Member for Lakeside, and you know maybe that is a sort of a domain that is reserved for members for Lakeside. If per chance, and you know I'm not making any predictions, if per chance there was a Conservative victory in some years, maybe 20 years from now or 10 years from now, and there is a New Democratic Party member elected in the opposition for Lakeside, I am sure that he will have to make that speech because it is a reservation of the Member for Lakeside. But the fact is that I'm sure that the Member for Lakeside in 1968 got up in his seat and said that in the last year of the Liberal progressive administration in this province, the budget was \$80 million. We ran the budget for the amount that is now being demanded of Interim Supply. That is the significant point that was being made.

Because the honourable member doesn't want to compare the services then I will concede, I'm going to concede readily that there was a change in thrust under the Progressive Conservative administration from the former Liberal administration and there has been a change in thrust under this administration as against the former Progressive Conservative administration. But more important than that, there has been a larger share

BILL 34

(MR. GREEN cont'd) of the budget which is devoted to transfer payments. If you take the transfer payments out of the budget, and that includes the rebate program; it includes the Medicare program; it includes the hospitalization program which were previously--(Interjection)--Pardon me? Personal care homes. Oh that's the regular budgetary - I'm talking about the straight transfer payments, the transfer payments to the municipalities, they went up more than four times, they went up five times. They went up from \$3.00 per capita to over \$17.00 per capita. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to delay the passage of Interim Supply either, but I do think that it is worthy of note that the big point, the dramatic point, the one that sounds astonishing isn't astonishing at all.

Mr. Speaker, there is a province to the right - let's say there's a province to the east of us, the Province of Ontario. The Province of Ontario is a province with roughly nine or ten million people. Eight million? Their budget is \$12 billion. Their spending per capita as a Progressive Conservative province is higher per capita than the Province of Manitoba. Their deficit, Mr. Speaker, if we're looking for just useless bits of dramatic information, let us call it useless bits of dramatic information, the deficit of the Ontario budget is higher than the total budget of the Province of Manitoba. Now that's just a useless bit of dramatic information. But it's kind of dramatic. I am sure that if they have a Member for Lakeside in the Ontario Legislature he is now saying, he is now saying at this point - he has a different problem. He has got to say that the Conservative administration of . . . he can't say, "The Liberal administration or the New Democrats of ten years ago ran this province on the same amount as your Interim Supply." He's got to use a little different act. He's got to say the Progressive Conservatives of 1968 were a much smarter, sounder government than the Davis administration because the Conservative administration of 1968 ran the province on the amount that the present administration is now seeking Interim Supply for.

So I want to categorize, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to uphold the debate. I will be fired if I do so. I want to categorize as in the area of useless dramatic bits of information: No. 1, that ten years ago the province was run on one-quarter of the budget under the Conservative administration; that ten years previously the province was run by one-quarter of the budget of the Conservative administration, by the Liberals, and is there another useless bit of information?

This is another useless piece of information. In Ontario they have a seat called Lakeshore and the member is a New Democrat. I think that it should be conveyed to him that on Interim Supply in the Ontario Legislature he should get up and bring to the attention of the Legislature that ten years ago the budget was run on one-quarter, and those are the figures and I brought them forward last year and I intend to bring them forward on budget debate again this year. Because you know all of this spending is attributed to us and I think that ten years ago the Federal Liberals, and that doesn't really do me any good with the Member for Lakeside, he just applauds when I say it, but that their budget has gone up at a much accelerated rate to the Province of Manitoba. They got me off the track. The categories of useless information but dramatic, useless but dramatic, that the budget went up four times in the last ten years, that it went four times in the previous ten years and that in the Province of Ontario the deficit, the deficit of the business oriented government of Ontario is higher than the total budget of the Province of Manitoba. All useless but dramatic information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion will remain adjourned for the Honourable Member for Riel. Bill No. 23.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I see you have gone through all the bills.

MR. SPEAKER: No, there's Bill 23 if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture wishes to introduce it.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS
BILL NO. 23 - THE PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZERS CONTROL ACT

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) presented Bill 23, The Pesticides and Fertilizers Control Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the proposed revisions of The Pesticides Control Act are designed to more effectively control the sale and use of pest control products in Manitoba and there are a number of areas that I think we should discuss in that context. Members opposite, especially those involved in rural activities, agricultural activities, would perhaps more so appreciate the need for the updating of the existing legislation. It's intended that the sale and use of pesticides, including insecticides, herbicides and fungicides would be covered under the new provisions, which they are not under the existing Act. The previous legislation regulated the sale and use of only agricultural insecticides so there is quite a change taking place.

All outlets, all retail outlets under the new provisions are going to be required to operate under a licensing system in the dispensing of any of these commodities. That, of course, is another major change that is taking place in that we now have many stores and vendors throughout the province that do not require to conform to any regulation other than, from time to time, whatever the environmental people bring upon them or when there are court cases that result in decisions being handed down through the Environmental Commission for subsequent regulatory action.

It is our hope that these will bring a better understanding and appreciation, however, of both the user and the seller of these commodities as to the dangers inherent in the uses of these products and the need to provide for the protection of the general public.

It's also necessary to provide for some regulation, this bill provides for that, of the custom applicators, through a licensing provision whether they be air applicators or ground applicators. I think that too often we have run into problems in the past because of the lack of proper regulatory control where people who were not knowledgeable in the handling of chemicals often cause problems not only to themselves but neighbouring communities, neighbouring farms, individuals and which certainly is not the best way in which to handle the application of these products.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I believe in the spraying of army worms, which is a somewhat hazardous job for the aerial applicators, both from the point of view of aerial application involving aircraft, power lines and so on that are always in their way, but also from the point of view of succumbing to the gases or whatever, from the chemical that they are using. Some of our applicators found themselves in hospitals as a result of too long an exposure without the proper protective devices in the custom application of these products. So it's hoped that we can prevent that kind of thing from recurring through the proper regulation, training and licensing system that is being proposed.

The proposed revisions would also bring the Province of Manitoba into line with the recently revised Pest Control Products Act of Canada. All pest control products sold in Canada must be registered under the Federal Act and all such products are placed in categories according to their toxicity as follows - and I think it's important to appreciate the distinction as between the three categories. In the restricted use under the federal legislation we have the highly toxic products to be used only by specially trained personnel. That of course is only common sense but too often we find that people who are not knowledgeable find their way into possession and use of these commodities and subsequently get themselves into a great deal of trouble.

We also have the commercial category which involves products which can be safely used by farmers and other commercial growers.

Then of course we have the domestic category under federal legislation which are products of low toxicity which can be safely used by homeowners. By regulation the sale and use of domestic products would be excluded. It's proposed that we not try to control those items under this legislation. Of course I think only further experience would probably bring about changes in that respect but we think that we can safely say that there is no need and by regulation certain commodities can be excluded.

The revisions in The Pesticide Controls Act would also complement the Clean

BILL 23

(MR. USKIW cont'd) Environment Act and regulations relating to pesticide use in Manitoba and would bring pesticide legislation into line with legislation in other provinces. Here again I think the Member for Arthur was trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he was somewhat confused as to the intent of the government in placing authority in the Department of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management and at the same time providing for legislation under the Department of Agriculture. For some reason or other he thought that that was rather a contradictory or confusing arrangement. But what bothered me more, Mr. Chairman, is that he indicated a concern, he was worried that the Minister of Agriculture would have too much power. I always had the impression, Mr. Chairman, that he would have been more concerned with the power of the Minister of Mines and now I find that he has now categorized myself in a similar vein to that of the Minister of Mines and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether that is a promotion in the mind of the Member for Arthur or whether it implies something else.--(Interjection)--. Well the Member for Fort Garry suggests that that is a double threat.

I think it's obvious that the rural community having so much utilization of these commodities or requiring so much utilization of these commodities, that it's properly housed in the Department of Agriculture. Certainly the environmentalists and the Environmental Branch are going to have their day because they too have a responsibility to protect the community as a whole and it is not intended that we not work together, that the two departments don't coordinate their efforts. As a matter of fact the legislation that we are now proposing was considered by both departments. It's not an effort that has not been caucused as between the two interests. So I'm pleased to say that we have unanimity on this particular piece of legislation as from the point of view of the environmental people and the point of view of agriculture.

I think it should be emphasized also, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a new piece of legislation. We have had an Act on the books since 1963 and this is really an updating of it based on the fact that we have gained a great deal of experience with chemicals, and in particular there have been new chemicals introduced into the marketplace which require a degree of surveillance and control.

The Member for Lakeside, I don't know, he's giving me a message, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether . . .--(Interjection)--Is he suggesting that I'm speaking too long, Mr. Chairman?--(Interjection)--Oh, I see.

I would hope that we do have an opportunity however in the passing of this bill and in the referring of this bill to Law Amendments Committee to hear, an opportunity to hear the views of those people who are going to be involved and affected by the legislation. To the extent that a case can be made for amendment, certainly we are prepared to bring about necessary amendments if it can be shown that they are needed and we would hope to receive the cooperation of the whole community in the control measures that we deem are so necessary at this point in time.

Mr. Chairman, those are the few comments that I have and I would recommend the measure to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

MR. WATT: Would the Minister permit to a question?

MR. SPEAKER: After. Not today anymore. The motion has been passed. I'm sorry. By leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the motion was to be put. Well I wonder then, by leave, then if I may ask the Minister of Agriculture why he did not mention fertilizers in his remarks introducing this bill as the bill does include fertilizers, control over fertilizers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, of course, that's very obvious, Mr. Chairman. That's one of the reasons for bringing the bill in and it's called The Pesticides and Fertilizers Control Act. So that I don't think that there's any need for elaboration other than fertilizers did not come under any legislation up until this point in time. It's desirable that legislatively they be housed somewhere in legislation here in Manitoba.

BILL 23

MR. GREEN: Will you call it 12:30?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you going into Committee in the afternoon or not?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, no. I would like to make the motion this afternoon at 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. Call it 12:30. I am now leaving the Chair to return at 2 p.m.