

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Saturday, 28 June, 1980

Time — 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

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

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Your Committee met on Friday, June 27, 1980 and considered:

Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act, and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

Your Committee met on Friday, June 27, 1980 and considered:

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee also considered:

Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Arbitration Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake that the reports of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission for the period ended March 31, 1980.

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be allowed to table Return under Section 66, of The Legislative Assembly Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney),** introduced Bill No. 103, The Wildlife Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Resources. In view of the vote which took place in the Senate yesterday pertaining to Garrison, and reports that the United States supporters in the Senate of the Garrison were able to misrepresent the Manitoba position, a position which has been communicated through notes and through telegrams. Can the Minister advise whether or not, at this stage, particularly in view of the fact that External Affairs has indicated that an all-party delegation would not be an unreasonable step, can the Minister of Resources advise whether or not it is the intention of the Manitoba government at this stage, prior to the receipt of the Garrison Bill by the House Senate Conference Committee, to request sanction of such an all-party delegation from Manitoba to initiate lobbying prior to the next step along the way?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have to say that misinterpretation of Canada's position is one of the risks that was run as people ran off to Washington to make representation there, aside from the ordinary and accepted channels of government. I think that this is perhaps a good indication that we should be following the accepted procedures rather than proceeding in the fashion that Mr. Sergeant and Mr. Axworthy have done. It's not to say that misrepresentation came about directly as a result of that, but that's a risk that is run when we take that kind of action.

I think that there are many features related to this vote that has taken place that would lead me to conclude that even though the vote has passed the Senate, that in fact we have made a substantial amount of progress in putting Canada and Manitoba's position forward, and that the appropriation of these funds certainly does not mean that the project is irrevocably going forward.

I can also say, Mr. Speaker, that there is one feature which has not been brought to public attention very much in recent days, and that is the fate of the efforts to get funding for the Garrison project through the House of Representatives Committee dealing with appropriations. That

committee declined to provide funding for Garrison and that is the ordinary traditional route of funding that would be followed. So that was a considerable step forward and a very positive move in respect to our interests, because the committee's report stated that one of the reasons they did not provide funds was the Canadian concern and the bill that is going through the Senate also makes reference in legislation to Canada's concern that those funds not be expended on a part of the project that would lead to the transfer of water into the Hudson Bay Drainage. So there have been some substantial steps made, Mr. Speaker, and I do not recommend an all-party group or delegation going to Washington at this time.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then I refer the Minister to a copy of a letter forwarded to External Affairs Minister MacGuigan, a copy to himself dated June 26th, from two Manitoba MP.s, Jack Murta and Terry Sargent advising that in view of the fact that Garrison is a non-partisan issue, that in fact a delegation of Members of Parliaments and members of the Manitoba Legislature would indeed be effective, asking for support of such a delegation to Washington a question to the Minister of Resources, has the government responded to the letter? And if so, is the Minister indicating that the response is negative to the request from the two federal Members of Parliament?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, part of the problem that we face here is that the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba are working very closely, hand in hand, in trying to deal with this question. We have information coming to us over the past week or two, on an almost hourly basis, and I must say that the well-meaning efforts of Mr. Sargent and Mr. Axworthy, and such, have not necessarily helped out in this situation. I believe that the best procedure is for us to take our lead from the Department of External Affairs — now in some cases we have made recommendations to the Department of External Affairs — and they have approved of them and have included them in their overall strategy for dealing with this situation. Perhaps the most useful thing that could be done, Mr. Speaker, would be to see that opposition MPs and MLAs, and indeed even Mr. Axworthy, should be kept better informed of what's going on.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Resources, the Minister of Resources referred frequently to the initiatives directly with the U.S. Congressmen and Senators by Members of Parliament from Ottawa. I ask the Minister of Resources if the telegrams and notes that have been forwarded from the Premier of this province, if not indeed as well have been direct communication with the U.S. Congress rather than proceeding through the IJC, that there have direct communication with the U.S. Senate, telegrams and notes, and would not

therefore at this point, the Minister accord the fact that person to person representations rather than notes and telegrams, would be a preferable way of proceeding.

**MR. RANSOM:** Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, and now I'm beginning to doubt whether the Leader of the Opposition understands what's happening. Last week he introduced a resolution into this House, which in part called for the House to support the actions of the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, within days he is backing off of the resolution that he introduced into the House and got unanimous support for it. He doesn't seem to understand the role of the International Joint Commission and the means of communication that the Government of Canada and the province of Manitoba has open to them, to communicate with the government of the United States.

The representations that were made by the Premier on a direct basis to senators and congressmen were approved by the Department of External Affairs. They were part and parcel of the strategy approved by the Department of External Affairs. There were in writing; they were very carefully worded; there was no opportunity for the misinterpretation of those communications. It's when people go down first-hand and start chatting about the problem at social functions and referring to the possibility of deals and negotiation and the requirement for further studies, that's when misinterpretation arises, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Resources, can the Minister advise whether or not he has been in contact then with the Department of External Affairs, and the statement which was made by the Department of External Affairs to the effect that such representations by way of a delegation would not be an unreasonable approach and method to deal with the Garrison at this stage?

**MR. RANSOM:** I don't know where the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has determined that that's the position of the Department of External Affairs. He asked whether we are in communication with the Department of External Affairs; I've been telling him a number of times that we're in communication with them on almost an hourly basis for the past week or two, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't seem to understand that. Some of the reported positions are not necessarily accurate, Mr. Speaker, and one has to be aware of the direct communications that are taking place in order to understand what the position of External Affairs is. At this time, they do not recommend a further delegation to Washington because they feel that it may do more harm than good.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** I thank the Minister for having in retrospect condemned the actions of Dan McKenzie and Sidney Spivak, both members of political House in this country, for things that they

were doing to undermine the position of Manitoba and Canada several years ago. May I ask the Minister whether it is not a fact that Canada's and Manitoba's position depend not on the internal votes of any Houses of Representation in the United States, but on the fulfillment of the United States of its treaty obligations, the enforcement of which lies between the Department of External Affairs of Canada and the appropriate department in the United States and whatever mechanisms are set up to enforce those treaty obligations which in this place includes the IGC, and regardless of any vote in the United States Senate or Congress, Canada will continue to rely on its treaty obligations?

**MR. RANSOM:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, as I recall — and my recollection could be inaccurate — some of the previous visits that were made to Washington occurred under circumstances of an interparliamentary exchange, and they were matters of general discussion, simply bringing the concern to Senators and Congressmen, and not dealing with specific appropriations. Now, if the honourable member says it's not true, I'd say, I'm speaking from recollection, in terms of the actual vote and ultimately the effect of the Boundary Waters Treaty, the vote simply is a means of recognizing or not recognizing the problem that Canada and Manitoba have with this project.

If the Senate and the Congress on their own recognize the seriousness of the Canadian problem and therefore refuse to vote the funds for the completion of that project, or they modify the project in such a way that no water is transferred into the Hudson Bay drainage, then of course we do not have to rely on the Boundary Waters Treaty and the mechanisms that are in place to see that it is enforced. So it's only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that we would attempt to use the first line of defence, which is trying to see that the money isn't allocated for this project. But if the money is allocated, then ultimately we rely upon The Boundary Waters Treat Act and the mechanisms are in place for its enforcement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, does not the Minister perceive it to be a danger for Canadian politicians to be trying to interfere in political, internal politics in the United States when their rights rest on a treaty obligation and not what votes are taken in Congress, or in the Senate, or in any of these bodies?

**MR. RANSOM:** I think it's very important, Mr. Speaker, that any representation not be interpreted as interference and not be open to interpretation as interference in the internal politics of the United States. The communications that this government has made have not been open to that type of interpretation.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance. Would the First Minister confirm that the 1977 budget actual deficit of 180 million — the Minister of Finance can perhaps listen to me

while he's getting to his seat — that the actual deficit of between 180 million and 190 million, and I won't defend it, included 100 million in capital, a 55 million shortfall of federal funds which he now concedes as possible under any circumstance and a 30 million appropriation under Supplementary Supply to deal with a drought of employment in the province of Manitoba which had to be dealt with by the provincial government. Would he not confirm that supplementary estimates, Mr. Speaker, in '77 came in, that the budget was balanced and there had to be a 30 million special appropriation for a drought of employment which the honourable members seem to laugh at and accuse us of dealing with the drought not seriously.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, in 1980-81 dollars, if the member wants to measure it 1980-81 dollars because he's now talking about the budget, the 1977-78 dollars in relation to this year would have put the 1977-78 deficit at about 250 million. But what's more important, Mr. Speaker, is that the former government would not tell the people what their deficit was. The former government told the people ten days before the election in October that they were headed for a current account deficit of 25 million and they were headed for a deficit of 125 million.

Mr. Speaker, that deficit didn't change in ten days. If they didn't know what it was, they should have known and they are to be condemned even more that misleading the people. They were asked openly, in a public forum ten days before October 11, 1977, "Is your deficit 25 million?" — the answer is as it was stated last spring, which was 25 million," that was the answer, the deficit at that point was 125 million on the current account.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fourth question.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that when in opposition, the present Minister of Finance, refused to concede that inflation has any effect on budgetary figures and insisted — I'm talking about budgetary figures in absolute terms — will the Minister answer my question, did the '77 actual budgetary deficit not include 100 million on capital account, a 55 million shortfall from the federal government and 25 million to 30 million in supplementary estimates, brought in under the same conditions as the Minister is now bringing in supplementary estimates, to deal with a drought involving employment in the province of Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. While the debate may be very interesting, I'm not to sure if there's too much information being sought under this type of questioning.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, if the member wants confirmation of actual numbers, he knows that the way to get it is to file an order for return, or, Mr. Speaker, to ask for it during the process of the estimates review. If he really wants to take five

minutes, why doesn't he dig up Public Accounts and find it out for himself.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Attorney-General. Will the Honourable Minister advise the House whether the staff at the Youth Centre have now been informed that they must advise children who are placed there over the weekend, or their counsel, or their parents, of the availability of the three magistrates, who the Attorney-General has assured the House, are available on a 24-hour basis?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that information is available to anyone who enquires.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister has stated that he believes this is available, but I have also told him that it has not been available as of a week ago. Would the Minister please ensure that the message is going out to the families and the counsel representing these children?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the advice I've received is that this information is available.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, on another matter to the Honourable Minister of Labour, the Minister announced that he had assigned an investigator to look into threats against nurses working at Concordia during the strike. Can he give any advice to the House on what has developed in that case, please?

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the word "threat" got into the situation. We dealt in the normal government way with the request by the Nurses' Association and we're still dealing with it. The Nurses' Association have asked us, in fact even before that they have taken another approach to deal with the situation which is quite acceptable within the Labour Relations actions and at this moment we are not further investigating it because of the nurses' action in the integrating period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Attorney-General and is relative to the resolution passed unaniously by this House on March 26th of last year dealing with freedom of Information access. We would ask the Honourable Attorney-General if he now can advise, Mr. Speaker, when the all-party committee that was to be struck in that regard will be convened for the purpose of considering the resolution and its contents.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I answered that question previously.

**MR. CORRIN:** Members on this side, Mr. Speaker, are not familiar or aware of any such reply and with respect to the Minister, we would like to know the answer. We've been waiting for some time and the Speed-up is about to commence, Mr. Speaker. We have to know when.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, he can check Hansard and if he has any questions arising out of what is in Hansard, he can follow up.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, I thank the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, for being so forthcoming in providing access of information to the opposition and members of the public.

Mr. Speaker, on the presumption that no answer is a negative answer, I would ask the Honourable Minister why the government refuses to convene the all-party committee to consider this very important matter.

**MR. MERCIER:** I believe that was covered in previous questions, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. I think all of us are delighted to learn that the Royal Winnipeg Ballet is now in a strong financial position. However, I must ask the Minister whether in view of the fact that they are now in a half-million dollar surplus position, which is largely the result of an original matching grant of 240,000 and now a newly-announced grant of 240,000, whether this is not in fact going a little overboard on the part of the government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, it's not the practice of my department to penalize people for good management and we encourage all the groups that we work with to take a positive stand and go out and fund raise and such and we're prepared to back them on it.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, my concern is more for the symphony, which is suffering a 700,000 deficit. I ask the Minister whether, in view of the parade of general managers, and now another threatened or implied resignation or hint of resignation, whether this doesn't show that the problem in the symphony may not, in fact, be in the position of general manager, but may lie elsewhere within the organization.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the Honourable Member for Elmwood the other day, I have had meetings. Of course, everything is done through the Manitoba Arts Council, as he can appreciate, but there are some things that are going

to be coming out in the next couple of weeks of which I am not at liberty to discuss, and when it comes out the Member for Elmwood will see why.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, a final question is, I wonder if the Minister can indicate how the attendance figures of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra have been over the past year or so. My impression would be that there has been a decline in attendance. I wonder whether she could comment on that.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I can't answer as to the attendance of the symphony orchestra but I read, as he has no doubt too, that this year their subscriptions are considerably up from last year.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. I wonder if the Minister of Health can advise whether or not he has the answer to the information requested last Monday dealing with the fatality at the Selkirk Institute for Mental Diseases.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly have some information, but I'm not sure that it's very much different than that that I've already given to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I can't advise him at this juncture whether in fact an inquest is being held. There may well be one being held. I would have to check on that, or the Leader of the Opposition could check with the Attorney-General on that point, Mr. Speaker. Insofar as the other questions were concerned, I have had reports from the Director of Nursing Services and the Medical Director at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre and they confirm the information that I conveyed to the Leader of the Opposition at the time he asked the question.

The patient in question was an adult female who had been in the institution for some time and was classified as a ward worker, in other words a patient who helps in chores around the ward, helps the nursing staff, and is afforded the privilege of privacy for personal matters.

There had not been any difficulty with that privacy and there had not been any difficulty with her that particular evening. She'd appeared in good spirits as late as 9:30 that evening when she had coffee with some of the nurses. At 10:30, a round of inspection of dormitories was carried out on that particular ward. Her bed was found not to have been slept in and she was found in the bathroom, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister referred to my question on this past Monday. The question was whether or not there were only two male attendants on duty on the ward at 10:30 that particular day.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I have that reference immediately in front of me, but there were two male orderlies on duty at the time of

the death and that is reported to me as being full staffing complement for that ward.

The information that was conveyed to me by the medical director through officials in my office was that the staffing complement was at full level. However, the staffing complement at that time on that ward does, I believe, consist only of two male orderlies, that's correct.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Is the Minister advising that that is a regular staffing on a ward of that size, a mixed ward of men and women patients, including periods of time in which privacy is required by patients but certainly follow-ups are required from time to time pertaining to what is taking place in the ward — two male attendants only?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, it depends entirely on what one is talking about in terms of staffing specifically assigned to duties such as making rounds and bed checks. Certainly there is nursing staff available, and, as I mentioned earlier, the deceased patient was at the nursing station at 9:30 that evening talking with nursing staff and was described as having been in a good mood, but in terms of making the bed checks and attending to various physical problems that might from time to time arise, the staffing complement is two male orderlies, yes, that's correct.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what supply the Department of Highways still has of the chemical 2,4,5-T, and whether or not it is the intention of the Minister to replenish that supply or order more of that supply for the next year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, I am not certain of what supplies we have on hand. We have completed our spraying program. I assume that our supply has been used up. I will make a check of the stocks on hand and respond to the member.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, my second part of the question was whether or not the Minister intends to replenish that supply or to order more of the chemical. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could tell us, in light of the fact that he has relied extensively or almost totally on the United Kingdom study of the use of 2,4,5-T, whether or not he could confirm that that study was completed before the information and the study came out of Oregon by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency of the United States, that 2,4,5-T was a cause of miscarriages and birth defects, whether he can confirm that that the U.K. study did not have that information and that the U.K. study recommended further studying is required; whether or not the Minister and this government is prepared to look at further studies; whether they are prepared to

conduct further studies, in the light of the fact that that U.K. study was incomplete and was done before new information became available.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, as we have said all along, that we are constantly availing ourselves of the most up-to-date scientific documented information available on 2,4,5-T. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Environment has indicated on several occasions that we are monitoring the current ongoing EPA investigation and hearings on 2,4,5-T; we are availing ourselves of every piece of scientific documented information.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas has not yet to date responded to a challenge I placed to members opposite, to provide me with the scientific documented information on 2,4,5-T. To date they haven't come up with any. Now certainly they object to anything that would indicate that there is no hazard to human or animal health with the use of 2,4,5-T such as indicated by the Great Britain study, but, Mr. Speaker, once again I would reiterate to the Member for The Pas, we always have and we always will look at any available scientific information. If the member has some, I would appreciate seeing it.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer, that he is now willing to look at other information besides that provided by Dow Chemical and besides the U.K. study that is now outdated.

I wonder if the Minister, Mr. Speaker, has had a chance to look at the studies in Oregon; whether or not the Minister of Highways has had a chance to look at the studies in northern California which show, Mr. Speaker, that 42 to 50 percent of pregnant women in areas where 2,4,5-T is used, have suffered from either miscarriages or there has been the case of deformed children being born.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Member for The Pas indicates that he's glad to see that I am now willing to look at any scientific study, and that this apparently, according to his limited understanding of what I've been saying for the past two months, is a new revelation.

Mr. Speaker, I have always said that we are willing to look at any information that is available. What I have said, and what I say again, is that the Member for The Pas and his colleagues have acted totally irresponsibly in this House, when he is quoting from theoretical scientific studies and refuses to provide them as evidence of the allegations they're making, and he's doing it again this morning. He's quoting a number of studies, none of which, Mr. Speaker, he has availed himself or availed those studies to myself. He has refused to give them to me. I asked him for them some month and a half ago, Mr. Speaker, and what do we see, we see nothing forthcoming except questions in the House and more allegations, more rhetoric and no fact, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister is referring to irresponsibility. Could the Minister confirm that it is his department that is spraying the chemical 2,4,5-T, and not myself, and not members on this side of the House that is acting in that irresponsible way? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the

Minister could tell us whether or not he has been in contact with Manitoba experts in the use of chemicals, for example, Professor LaBelle at the University of Manitoba, a pharmacologist, who has said that the U.K. study which the Minister is totally relying on, is in fact a whitewash job and is not in fact a scientific study but only a review of outdated information.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I wondered how long it would take the Member for The Pas to get around to Professor LaBelle's recent comments on the Great Britain study. As I mentioned to people from CBC, who asked me to comment on the statement made by Professor LaBelle that the Great Britain study was a whitewash. I indicated to both people in CBC that what they should do is, since Professor LaBelle is an accredited and reputable knowledgeable educated scientist, and is making statements to the effect that a report tabled after several years of study by a group of accredited reputable educated scientists, that what the CBC should do and what the Member for The Pas should do, is put Professor LaBelle in direct contact with one of the members of the scientific panel in Great Britain who have studied, undertaken probably several years of studies of 2,4,5-T, all of the implications of it, and have come up with the recommendations that they have made.

Now, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that might reveal some rather interesting anomalies in the whitewash job, as Professor LaBelle, one individual has said, of a study made by a group of scientists studying a certain product over a number of years, Mr. Speaker; it would make for a very interesting scientific discussion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas with a fifth question.

**MR. McBRYDE:** My question to the Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, is when will he and his government begin to do the work that the people of Manitoba voted him to do, instead of depending upon us on this side of the House to do their homework for them; instead of depending on the CBC to do their homework for them; does the Minister intend to do some work on his own and get his government and all the staff that they have to find out, Mr. Speaker, what that new case that he recommends that further study has to be made, that their evidence is now inconclusive because their study is out of date? Does this government intend to do a damn thing about the use of 2,4,5-T, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, once again — (Interjections)— we have seen that the Member for The Pas . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I appreciate all the gratuitous comments that are coming forward, but I would hope that one person at a time was recognized from the Chair.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again it becomes evident after a series of questioning that the Member for The Pas believes that sound and fury should overcome knowledgeable rationale. Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas is saying that our government should not rely on the opposition to do their homework for them and I can assure him that we certainly don't. Mr. Speaker, furthermore, I would reiterate what I said six weeks ago and what I said already this morning. We have availed ourselves on this side of the House of published scientific studies.

I have asked members opposite on several occasions, this being now the third time, that if they have documented scientific information, that I would appreciate having them bring it to my attention. If they have some allegations made by people which is not a result of a forum, a study by a panel of scientists, I would even like to see that. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the information that the Member for The Pas says is available and indicates the kind of consequences that he has been indicating to this House and to the people of Manitoba.

I would like to see that study, Mr. Speaker, because the study that we have most often referred to and he has referred to this morning is a study by a panel of reputable scientists, an independent study commissioned by a government. It's not, as the Member for The Pas indicates, the Dow Chemical studies. You know, the Member for The Pas is getting like the Member for Rupertsland there when he was talking about how we couldn't trust vinyl chloride . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I find it somewhat strange that the members should be referring to other members who are not part of this debate at all, and I would ask the member to confine his remarks purely to the subject that was asked of him.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Yes, I apologize for that inadvertent reference, Mr. Speaker, and what I really meant to do is that the Member for The Pas' attitude in reference to Dow and referring only to their study indicates their extreme distrust of anyone who is a corporate organization, and anything that they do of course has to be suspect.

Mr. Speaker, I once again challenge the Member for The Pas to produce the studies, the scientific studies that he has indicated, and I would appreciate seeing them. Now, if he cannot produce them, then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he is exercising his rights in the political forum. If he will not produce them, Mr. Speaker, then he is a totally irresponsible member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Time for question period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, will you please call second readings of Bills 56, 84, 93 and 94?

### SECOND READING

#### BILL NO. 56 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James)** presented Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, there are some changes in the handling of the court procedures in this bill that I will be providing to the honourable members afterwards the details of them and the information that we have. The basic change is that we are now proposing a passive registry that will be retained by the agency and the Director of Child Welfare and will provide information to the natural parents or the adoptive parents, or the adult adoptee, if the three parties agree to provide information. In the case that one of the parties would not provide the information, or say that we do not want to be known to the adoptive parents, or the adopted child to have the information, then this information will not be disclosed.

However, when the adoptee becomes an adult, should he or she wish to come into contact with her natural, or his natural parents, and the natural parents have agreed at the time of adoption to have this information available, then the adult adoptee will have the right to make contact with their natural parents.

That, primarily, is the one major change. The other change is that common-law parents will have the same rights as married parents, Mr. Speaker, that the common-law father or the common-law mother will have equal rights to the custody of the child. This is the other major change, in terms of principles.

Otherwise, the other changes within the bill are related to court procedures and basically do not deal in changes of principle, and I will make available to the members opposite the worksheets and the explanations of each change in the Act for them to have, so that they may be able to debate the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister, just for clarification, I didn't quite hear what he said. Did he say, and I'd like clarification, that when the adoptee becomes an adult, that the adoptee then has the right to make contact with the natural parents, whether the natural parent so desires, or whether the adoptive parent agrees or doesn't agree?

**MR. MINAKER:** I'm sorry I didn't explain that fully, Mr. Speaker. The natural parents would have to have indicated, and have on file in the registry that they do not object to having information of their identity made available to the adoptive parents or the child, the adult adoptee. However, the adoptive parents might not necessarily agree, or have on file, that they

would allow this information, but the principle behind it is, is it right to object to two adults wanting to make contact with one another, and that's the basic principle behind it, so that you could have, in actual fact, a situation where the adoptive parents may not have filed with the registry that they will allow their names to be known to the other parties. Well, naturally they would be known by the adopted child, but it could possibly object to the adult adoptee making contact. However, the way the bill is put forward is, if the natural parents have indicated that they are not objecting to their identity being known, then the adult adoptee could then make contact with them after he's an adult.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, we thank the Minister for his explanatory remarks with respect to the one section relative to adoption, but I was wondering, for clarification, whether he is going to provide us any explanation with the other two major sections of this bill, dealing with the important areas of child apprehension and guardianship? Is he going to do that now, Mr. Speaker, or are we going to get into an embarrassing debate after second reading, as we have on the Social Allowances Bill, where he didn't make his explanation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Was the Honourable Member for Wellington entering debate?

**MR. CORRIN:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, no, I was asking whether or not there were further explanatory notes with the other two major sections of the bill on apprehension and guardianship.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I will provide the honourable members opposite my critique with the information on all the different sections, even relating to the ones he indicated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## **BILL NO. 84 — THE LOTTERIES AND GAMING CONTROL ACT**

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye)** presented Bill No. 84, The Lotteries and Gaming Control Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, since the final report was submitted by The Manitoba Lotteries Review Committee, the government has implemented several of the main recommendations that the committee

suggested. The new act is a result of one of the main recommendations of the Review Committee. In this new act, the government is attempting to further increase public accountability of government-sponsored lotteries in two ways. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the act will give the government greater authority to monitor government-sponsored lotteries, and secondly, in the licensing of lotteries and gaming activities in the province, the act has now been drafted to better reflect the restrictions of the federal Criminal Code as it pertains to lotteries.

With the exception of these two points, the act is basically one which in general just clarifies the intent of many of the details of the present act, and also remedy some of the certain administrative problems that we have encountered which have either become redundant over the last couple of years, or were unclear in the present act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I think that it's rather anomalous that this bill should be before the Legislature in this year, and particularly, Mr. Speaker, before the Legislature in a year in which members of the government side, including the Minister and other people, have specifically indicated that what is now being proposed in this bill, they don't want to do. And I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Springfield and the Minister, because the Member for Springfield and the Minister both said, that insofar as lotteries are concerned, and insofar as the collection of public revenues by lotteries are concerned, they agree with the position that was put in the resolution No. 1 on the order paper this year. They both said, that as far as the government is concerned, the question of lotteries are a fact, which I have agreed with, Mr. Speaker, that lotteries cannot be outlawed, which I have agreed with; that lotteries are going to continue whether the government runs lotteries or not, which I have agreed with.

The point at which I differed with the previous administration and with the existing administration, is that this form of human activity should be used as a means of collecting consolidated revenue. The Minister got up and assured me, and the Member for Springfield got up and assured me, that although the previous government was doing that type of thing, that is not the intention of the existing government. The existing government merely wishes to regulate the lotteries that are being conducted by private organizations for the purpose of raising funds, and that, Mr. Speaker, will never be avoided, nor do I desire it to be avoided.

What I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, is that the use of this activity for the purpose of collecting consolidated revenues is both inefficient, counter-productive, and a wrong form of collection of revenue, because it does not in any way base consolidated revenue on ability to pay.

Let's ignore the last one for the moment. It is inefficient, because it is tremendously costly. The amount of effort that goes into collecting 1/20th of 1 percent of sales tax is horrendous. People are put to work in the most unusual way for the purpose of collecting the amount of tax would hardly be noticed



if it was added to any of the other indices of taxation under which the government collects money. But, Mr. Speaker, do we condone, and this is the worse feature of it, and especially for Conservatives, do we condone the government involving itself in advertising to the populace, Get Rich Quick, Buy A Dollar Ticket and You May Be A Millionaire, Wednesday is Winsday, I Am Next? Do we condone offering our citizens pie in the sky on the basis of collecting public revenues, because that is what it amounts to.

When I look at this bill, Mr. Speaker, the government has not taken itself out of it, it has confirmed it. If the Minister had now brought in a bill saying that this Commission is done for the purpose of regulating lotteries that are conducted by other people, then the Member for Springfield would be right, the Minister would be right. That is not what the bill says. The Commission may undertake lottery schemes for the government. Mr. Speaker, the words are not capable of two interpretations. I ask the Member for Springfield, who says that the government is not going to undertake lotteries, why you have an ad saying, "The Commission may undertake, organize, conduct, and manage lottery schemes for the government." For the government.

Now I don't mind them regulating them, but this Commission may undertake schemes, if they organize schemes; it may conduct and manage schemes for the government.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the next section says under Section 13, and I am not to deal with particular sections, except as to the principle of the act, and as the principle of the act, "The proceeds realized by the Commission from time to time from its operations, after providing the sums for the purpose of the Commission, shall be transferred to and held in trust in the Consolidated Fund to be used and applied as set out in subsection (2)," and then it is to be expended for cultural or recreational purposes. But it goes to the Consolidated Fund, Mr. Speaker, and then it is used for public purposes.

If the government, as was stated the intention by the Minister and by the other people who spoke, intended to get itself out of lotteries and was bringing a bill to the House, why does it bring in a bill which puts itself right into lotteries in most explicit terms? Because that is what the bill says, Mr. Speaker, and it is a complete negation of what the Minister said when he got up and spoke. The Minister, and the Member for Springfield in particular said, well, the Minister certainly said he doesn't like it, but it is there and he can't avoid and he can't get up, it has snowballed. But he was intending, and this, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that he said, that it was his intention merely to regulate existing lotteries, not to have government-sponsored lotteries, but the Commission may undertake, organize, conduct, and manage lottery schemes for the government. Not for somebody else, but for the government, and the moneys used from the conduct of that lottery shall go into consolidated revenue.

So when we are dealing with this question, Mr. Speaker, let's not dodge the issue as we dodged it on the resolution, because on the resolution it was suggested that the government is not going to be involved in lotteries; the government is going to regulate existing lotteries. But that is no longer, Mr.

Speaker, that can't be professed on the basis of this piece of legislation. This piece of legislation specifically recommits, I am not saying commits, recommits the government organization and operation of lotteries and the use of moneys from those lotteries for consolidated revenues.

This kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, is self-destructive. It is destructive of the morals of people in our society by the most highest organization in our society — I am not suggesting that it is immoral to conduct or buy a lottery ticket, or be involved in it. I am suggesting that setting out as a moral value, or a value to be sought within our society, Buy a Ticket and Get Rich Quick is not the kind of attitude that should be instilled through a government-organized and sponsored affair. There is freedom of other people to do it. It used to be a criminal offence, but the powers that be realized that there is no way in which you are going to prevent people from engaging in this type of activity, but it is not something which the government should take advantage of or should promote or sponsor on its behalf.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge the members to vote against this bill, particularly because the bill recommits the government to doing something which the government said it wouldn't do, on the basis of the debate that took place with respect to the resolution that was before the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 93 — THE DUTCH ELM DISEASE ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM** presented Bill No. 93, The Dutch Elm Disease Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, Dutch Elm Disease has been recognized as having the potential for a very serious effect upon the elm trees of the province for perhaps 15 years, but the existing legislation, the legislative power to combat the disease is found in The Plant Pests and Diseases Act, where an amendment was made in 1966 to provide simply, that where the Minister considers it necessary, he may require a municipality, at the expense of the municipality, to implement such programs and measures for controlling Dutch Elm Disease.

The actual disease was first discovered in the province in 1975 in Brandon, Selkirk and Winnipeg, with subsequent tree loss high in the town of Selkirk, and in native and planted stands adjacent to and in the City of Brandon. The identification of Dutch Elm Disease in Manitoba in 1975 resulted in increased sanitation and removal programs to try and control

the spread of the disease, but the experience here and in other jurisdictions has shown that the legislative powers contained in The Plant Pests and Diseases Act are inadequate and that Bill 93 proposes a separate piece of legislation dealing with the problem of Dutch Elm Disease.

One of the most serious problems facing us in controlling this disease is the spread of it through the removal of infected trees and the transporting of wood of infected trees from one part of the province to another.

Another aspect which must be dealt with, is the question of identifying elm status, or individual trees which may be in a weakened condition and susceptible to the disease or which are already infected with the disease. Programs of sanitation through spraying or tree pruning and programs of removal are urgently required in many parts of the province. I foresee that the province's municipalities will be spending more funds in the future on Dutch Elm Disease programs. This legislation provides the basis for spelling out provincial programs, or programs which the municipalities in the province can jointly carry out and cost-share.

In short, this legislation is an indication that the province is prepared to offer to municipalities strong leadership in the fight against Dutch Elm Disease, to work with municipalities or individual owners in the control and suppression of the disease throughout the province.

The disease has the potential for devastating what is perhaps the province's finest shade tree, and experience in Minneapolis-St. Paul has shown that this can happen with startling rapidity if inadequate programs are not in place. This bill is the basis for adequate programs, Mr. Speaker, and I recommend it to the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question. Could the Minister make his speaking notes available to us on this side of the House? The Minister nods, yes.

I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge, that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 94 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HEALTH SCIENCES ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 94 — The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN** presented Bill No. 94, An Act to Amend The Health Sciences Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 94 really represents Part III of a three-pronged initiative to regenerate and upgrade the Health Sciences Centre, the province's major health facility, one of its two major tertiary care and referral centres, bring it into line with the 1980s and the 1990s and the challenges

that will face it as a cornerstone of our health care system in the decades immediately ahead.

The other components of that three-sided approach, Mr. Speaker, are represented by the physical redevelopment plan which is already under way as members know, the first phase of which is a five-year phase of construction costing 75.6 million.

The second part of that three-sided initiative has to do with the restructuring of the management and administration capacity of the Health Sciences Centre so as to ensure that the mechanisms are in place not only to administer an annual operating budget of close to 90 million, but to administer that 138 million redevelopment program. And the third side of the initiative is legislation now before the House and proposed to the House to modernize the structure of the board, to modernize the legislation as it is constituted in the existing Health Sciences Centre Act by a series of amendments proposed here in Bill No. 94. The purpose is to provide not only the funding and the management capacity and capability for the Health Sciences Centre to meet its challenges in the years ahead, but to provide the legislative framework in terms of the act under which it operates for it to do likewise. This is the third component of that overall Health Sciences Centre initiative that has been embarked upon by the government and by the people of Manitoba through the steps that have been taken thus far, Mr. Speaker.

The bill contains a number of minor measures and changes of a housekeeping nature which simply bring it into line with existing reality insofar as the components and the makeup of the Health Sciences Centre are concerned. For example, Sir, The Winnipeg General Hospital Act of course is repealed and The Children's Hospital Act is repealed and there are amendments in the legislation proposed that deal with those changes. There are specific references to former components which are now absorbed into the Health Science Centre which have become anomalous and archaic in terms of the legislation, and there are a number of relevant housekeeping changes of that nature.

The major thrust of the legislation is to modernize and streamline the board structure and the recommendations which now find their form in this proposed legislation result in substantial degree from the recommendations of a management consulting study that was commissioned by the government and the Health Sciences Centre board and undertaken last fall at the Health Sciences Centre and the result also of continuing discussions between my office, the Health Services Commission, officials of my department, the board of the Health Sciences Centre and officials of the Centre itself vis-a-vis that desired objective, that being, Sir, a more workable, more efficient, more streamlined, more contemporary board structure.

Under the present legislation the board of the Health Sciences Centre consists of 27 board members and there is a broad representation from constituencies within the Health Sciences Centre spectrum which results in a considerable degree of fragmentation and sometimes a considerable degree of difficulty in pursuing objectives and in arriving at consensus. In addition to that, some of those constituencies that have been represented in the

past now no longer require that kind of representation on the board, and with their concurrence in consultation and discussion with them, the board has been reshaped and they are excluded henceforth under this legislation from specific membership. That does not mean to suggest for one moment that they don't have representation or direct communication through the representation that will be on the board. But, for example, it has been agreed with the Sanitorium Board of Manitoba that events have overtaken the legislation and it is anomalous now and totally unnecessary for the Sanitorium Board to be represented on the Board of the Health Sciences Centre. Up to this point in time it has had two board members on that board, Mr. Speaker.

The new board is proposed to be a body made up of 19 directors rather than 27, and all who have been consulted on the subject are of the opinion that it will make for more efficiency and more workability and should smooth the road to consensus in terms of the decision-making process. The board will consist, Mr. Speaker, of six statutory appointees. They will include the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Manitoba, and two persons appointed by the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba. They will include a specific appointee from the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, a specific person to speak for Children's Hospital appointed by the Children's Hospital Research Foundation, and the Chief of the Medical Staff of the Health Sciences Centre. Those are the six statutory appointees. The rest of the board will consist of 13 appointees, eight of whom are to be named by a nominating committee of the Board of the Health Sciences Centre, and five of whom are to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

It's believed, Sir, that this structure will make the decision-making machinery at the Health Sciences Centre more contemporary and provide it with a greater degree of flexibility and efficiency with which to deal with the major redevelopment program under way and the major issues and challenges that face it and us in the 1980s and 1990s. I would commend the legislation that's in front of us for second reading at this point to the earnest consideration of all members of the House, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister. I was trying to follow what he was saying. He indicated that there would be eight persons appointed by a committee of the board. Does the bill indicate how those eight will be chosen or what the mechanism is, or is this a self-perpetuating board which will simply rename itself year after year or from within an unknown method simply perpetuate itself indefinitely?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the bill indicates how they will be appointed. The appointments will be for three-year terms and a nominating committee of the board will propose names for those eight particular positions. The terms of office are specified and there is a limitation on the number of terms of office that can be served by directors. For example,

Mr. Speaker, there is a section in the bill that specifies that a person can be reappointed for a second and third term of office, but is not eligible for a fourth or subsequent term unless one full year has elapsed since the expiry of his or her previous term.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 31 — FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO NATIVE PEOPLE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said on Bill 31, many views expressed, unfortunately, all only from this side of the House. We have heard nothing from the other side of the House. One of the questions that has been raised from our side has been, what is the government's philosophy with regard to education, and the feeling here, by some members, is that the government hasn't one. I tend to disagree with that. I think the government does have a philosophy, and a very clear one. It may not be spelt out in the bill in the sense of stating it, but the very nature of the bill, the wording of the bill, its silence with regard to direction of education, indicates the direction that this government wants education to go.

And what we have is an educational system which is going to be very rigid, which is going to be restrictive. Probably the one aspect of the bill which sort of has been updated and highlighted is the attendance officer feature, the compulsory aspect of it, that children must attend, and their parents must send. And I find it sad, funny but sad, that we still kid ourselves into thinking that if you forcibly have a child attend in a classroom, that that is going to educate that child. We can't seem to accept that times have changed and you can't go back 20, 30, 40, 50 years ago; that the impacts on children today are far different than they were when I was going to school, or the Minister was going to school; that in television today you have a parallel educational system which has a far greater impact than the school system, and starts influencing the child at a much younger age than ever before.

To ignore that, and to simply think that for one moment, by having a child attend because the law says you must attend, and that that is somehow going to make that child into a thinking person, a mature person when the student grows up, a person who has learned how to evaluate, how to make decisions, is really nonsense. Unless a school, unless a classroom, can have a spirit about it where the child feels wanted, where the child feels that they are coming because they want to come, because they're enjoying their experience, then the idea that one will

force that child to acquire the attributes of future good citizenship simply by sitting and occupying a seat is just so much nonsense.

And yet all through this bill this is what we seem to get, at least that's the feeling I get, that we are laying down the law. The kids are unruly, they've got to be straightened out, and we're going to straighten them out, by gosh or by golly. Well, I have to say to the Minister, it ain't gonna work. The students of today are not the students of 30 and 40 years ago, or even 10 years ago. They have opinions, they have thoughts, they are perceiving a world far different than what we did through the access of TV and other media. They have a knowledge and a contact with an outside world which never occurred before. And you can't turn it off, you can't blank it out, you can't say, don't be influenced by it, you can't say ignore it, because it's with us. It's part of us, and it's part of them, day in and day out. And that influence is far greater than a system which simply says, you have to learn to read and you have to learn to write and you have to learn to do arithmetic, and that's basic. That you must learn, and we are going to pound it into you, no matter what. And that's the feeling I get out of this bill.

I say to the Minister that it's not going to wash. The students are not going to take it. They may be children, but you know, with all the criticism that we hear about the young people, the fact of the matter is, I firmly and honestly believe they are far more worldly than the Minister was at their age, far more worldly than I was when I was their age. And I'm talking about the 13 and the 14 and the 15-year-olds. They're far more mature, because they're exposed to so much more. And it isn't just the TV per se. They're exposed because of the ability of the marketing techniques which have learned how to reach young people and old people and everybody else. We're all products of our times, we may think we're not, but each and every one of us, whether we consciously listen to those TV programs or those jingles, it affects us in what we buy and how we measure our neighbourhood, our social contacts, how we view other people, we're all subject to it, and young people in particular are.

And so, unless there's a blending of the outside world as they perceive it and the school system, then you're going to find a very unhappy and a very dissatisfied and a very frustrated young student. Unless they become part of the system, then the system will suffer and will be under greater pressure, and the reaction of the adult community will be, well, as inevitably when things get tough or when things don't go according to plan, then they again tend to call for more order, for more discipline, for tougher and tougher methods. If we've learned anything over the years, surely it's that it won't work, that they won't take it, simply because they can no longer be told and will no longer be satisfied, do as I say, don't do as I do.

A school system really, is a mirror of the adult world around it. And if the adult world acts by certain norms, then the children will inevitably do the same, I don't care how many laws there are, how many times the teacher says, no, how many times the principal says, no, it doesn't matter. They won't take it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think this was mentioned before, but at the public hearings that took place last fall, a group known as the Manitoba Association of School Councils attended the hearings. This is an association of student councils called MASC which represents a considerable number of high schools, which do, I think, represent the vast majority of high school students, perhaps not the majority of the schools themselves, but from the point of view of enrolment, they do represent the majority, and they had a very simple proposition. We feel that we should be given certain rights, and we feel, and acknowledge, that with those rights come responsibilities. And we are prepared to accept those responsibilities. Because we feel, and I think they're right, that where the student body participates in the school administration, with the school administration, then there is less trouble in that school, because peer pressure will do more to prevent abuse, physical abuse of the school itself, vandalism, respect for the school itself, peer pressure will do more to achieve that than all the rules announced on the PA system by the principal or by the teacher — thou must bring a note from home, and if you don't, you lose certain privileges, or you must go see the principal. And I'm talking about high schools.

You know, a few years ago, it was decided by the adult world, the community, that Grade 11, which was at that time considered matriculation, wasn't enough, that our technology, the demands of our society were such that it was found desirable that we should increase that high school level from Grade 11 to Grade 12. I suspect that most here, maybe not, looking around there are some young people here, but most here, I think perhaps still only have Grade 11. They went on to University from Grade 11. At least that was the case in my day. But it was decided that Grade 12 should become part of the roots, and that's fine. But, you know, by Grade 12 you've got students who are 18 years of age. One day they're children, the next day they're adults. Bing.

And I say to you, that because in my opinion, the young people today mature faster, they're more worldly earlier, that students of 16, 17 and 18 are not children. And as such, they've got to be part of the system. It's inconceivable to me that you treat them as children who have no sense of responsibility, who must be told everything, who have to tow the line, and then expect, within a month after graduation, that they've got to become mature, responsible adults. That has to take place in the school, and it can take place in the school if they're part of the process.

Because the entire concept that while they're in school, they really must simply follow the dictates of a particular teacher, or the particular principal, with very little recourse. They have a recourse if they want to go to their parents, and their parents will go to the school board, but you're not dealing with little children. You're dealing with 16 and 17 and 18-year-olds, and it has been proven that where schools are reporting low vandalism rates, they also reported strong student councils. Strong. Not a paper student council, but a strong student council that was free to do what it wanted without the principal standing over them and saying, yes to this, no to that, no to that, no to something else.

In those schools where there's a shared responsibility, then the spirit of the school was good, there was less vandalism, there was less truancy, there was less acting up within the classroom by one or two individuals, who in their frustration, or for whatever reason, were trying to disrupt the work of the classroom, and this has been proven out. The school system is permissive, and by permissive I don't mean that anything goes, but is permissive in the sense that it responds to, it listens to, it will react to, and it will not treat the students as simply a captive audience to which somehow they must rule over, and if you take the pressure off the place will explode. I suspect that as you apply the pressure, the place then will explode, and that the students have to be, as I say, a part of the process.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister's response may point out, well, I am speaking of this, because I know something about the Manitoba Association of School Student Councils. I readily acknowledge that. My son is deeply involved in it, and so perhaps I know more about it than some. I studiously avoided sitting on that committee that met between sessions, and appearing or listening in on that committee, because I knew that my own son was involved and I didn't want to in any way inhibit him, nor in any way feel that my presence there might reflect on what he had to say.

But nonetheless I have had an opportunity to speak with these young people, and I have to tell you — I don't like to say it publicly, perhaps because I'm going to hear about it at home — but I can tell you that the high school students today are way ahead of the vast majority of people here when they were their age, way ahead. We are kidding ourselves, if we're not. But we're so obsessed with order, and we are so obsessed with a lockstep system — you go in and you have to fit in that mold. What are we trying to do? Are we trying to simply graduate or pass on into adulthood a bunch of cookies that are sort of compressed into a particular mold so they fit into the system as we know it? Surely not. Surely the purpose is to teach students to have respect for themselves, and if they have respect for themselves they likely will have respect for others. If you have self esteem and can be proud of yourself, you will treat people differently than if you have no self esteem. Surely that's what it's all about. Of course you have to teach them the basics, but I suspect you don't really need 12 years to teach them the basics, that it can be done in far less time.

Mr. Speaker, those are the few comments I want to make in that regard. There is another area that I have a concern about, and that is with regard to transportation. There is no change, as I understand it, within the transportation formula. It's still half a mile, I believe, within an urban area. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we have to address ourselves to this a little more carefully. There is a great deal of anxiety expressed about the need for new schools in new subdivisions that are being developed, whether in the city or elsewhere, and it's inevitable, when you have a new subdivision, and the new subdivisions are always — it's young people that move into them, and with young people come children, and it's inevitable that you are going to need schools, and there has been a suggestion that instead of building a school, let's transport the children to an existing school with

a reducing enrollment. If the city schools, to start with the city schools — this may apply in Brandon and other areas, if they could have a transportation system which was supported by a foundation program, then they could logically consider that there should be bussing, whether it's 10 blocks or 12 blocks, and not be limited by this half-mile, and maybe the savings in the construction of that school would be sufficient, to cover or be equivalent to what it would cost to bus.

On the other hand, I know that certainly most young families want, particularly the young, the primary school-aged children, the school to be within a walking distance of the house. They are sold a house on that basis. The real estate agency says to them, you see that empty lot, that's going to be a school. The fact that it turns out to be a shopping centre 10 years later is something else, but that's usually the pitch, and unfortunately people don't check their zoning and people don't check the plans at city hall.

Mr. Chairman, this is a dilemma, and it's not addressed in this legislation. The fact of the matter is, there is nothing in this legislation, has been indicated. We could go with what we have. We could live with it another year, two years, three years. All this is a pulling together of legislation which has been amended at least 100 times since 1890, and it's archaic, some of the wording that's used, some of the requirements that's used, the reference to hitching posts and the duties of a teacher in, I think, starting the fire half an hour before the children come to school.

These are all important issues, but they don't apply any more, and so I agree that these things have to be changed. But what I don't like about this bill is, that it's updated in that sense. A lot of things that have been developed over the years, when the present Minister of Finance was Minister of Education, when I was Minister of Education, we lived with the old bill and we knew that the system was ignoring parts of the old bill, because an educational system has to be, must be, a vibrant, living, changing, entity. It's got to move with the times.

Everybody in the system knew that the act as such was old, decrepid, and it was pretty well ignored, but here's what worries me now. Now by taking that decrepid old act, polishing it up, the wording, bringing it forward, changing a few titles, like Inspector, to whatever it's called now — field rep, bringing it forward now, there is going to be an impact out there in the field, Mr. Minister. Where as before people could feel with impunity that what they were doing was proper, it was reflecting the times, and although the act may not have been specific on it, or the old act really didn't spell out what they were doing, or didn't reflect what they were doing, it didn't matter, because everybody knew that the system had to be up to date.

But when you take an old archaic act and you modernize it in the sense of changing some of the words, and you bring it forward, and you say to the public at large, we the Legislature of Manitoba, I the Minister of Education, the Minister says, the Department of Education, have now developed a new act, and we now bring forward the same old act, but they give it a new title and a new number, and we

say it's 1980, then what will happen is that the teachers, administration, the school trustees, everybody, will suddenly be very conscious that they can't just treat this act as they did the other, that they have to assume that this has been thought out, that it has been debated, that the department has given it the weight of its judgment, and now by God, they'd better live by it. They can't start deviating, and they can't start fooling around, and they can't start trying to reflect 1980s instead of the 1950s.

As a result, it is in my opinion a tragedy that what we are coming up with, what we are giving to the public, is just an update, renumbering and a rewording of, and as the Minister I think indicated, is housekeeping. But when you go through the process of housekeeping, and you cloak it in the concept of a new act, a new approach to education, when in fact there is nothing new in it, except the only new parts are the restrictive parts, the parts where we're going back, the parts where we're trying to imply a greater rigidity in the school system, more regulations, then I fear that the public will misconstrue it. I'm sure the teachers will. There will be a fear now that they better do it just exactly as — according to Hoyle — that the idea that the teachers can use their own imagination to reach their students, to reach the children, to bring forward new ideas that will prepare that student for the 1990s and the year 2000, because that's when these students are going to graduate, the one's coming into the schools in the next couple of years. I think it's going to be a damper on the system. It is not going to help the system.

Mr. Speaker, there is one more point I want to mention, and that is with regard to the teachers. I have had my arguments with teachers and I've disagreed with teachers, the Manitoba Teachers' Society when they've come to see me in the past, but if I were a teacher I would be very put-out. This year we've been deluged by professional bills, and those professional bills give unto those professions a great deal, a one hell of a power, over their membership. But who has the power over teachers, one of the finest professions we have? Does the profession have those powers? No way, the Minister has the power, life or death. He gives them a certificate, nobody else. He withdraws a certificate or his field rep, or he suspends.

We talk about veterinarians. We talk about pharmacists. We talk about LPNs and RPNs and Registered Respiratory Technicians. We're going to give them recognition. They are going to set standards. They are going to discipline their members who don't live up to standards. They are going to be judges. The idea is that they will protect the public, and they will make sure that their members not only achieve certain standards, but live up to those standards. But with teachers, no way. The Minister, he's the guy, he says, this is what it shall be. The rights of the teachers — what are the rights of the teachers in this act. Nothing herein limits the right of a teacher to be a member of the society as provided in the Manitoba Teachers' Society Act, and to participate in the activities thereof. Isn't that terrific? He's allowing them to participate in the activities of the Manitoba Teachers' Society; terrific, what a freedom, what a right.

Honestly, it's something — you'd revolt if you didn't have that right, but that's it.

We are willing to give powers to technologists and to interior designers and to veterinarians to control, to limit, to oversee their profession, to set standards, qualifications. I think one of the members, when he introduced the bill, said this is to protect the public, the profession will undertake to do that, protect the public interest, but can the Teachers' Society protect the public interest in that way? No way. No, the Minister is protecting the public from the teachers, or maybe he's protecting the teachers from the public. I don't know. But all they are is a society, and he allows teachers the freedom to belong, it's nice of him, I don't think he could disallow them. Maybe he could. Of course, with the powers he's got, he could.

So, as I indicated, I have had my disagreements with teachers. But I tell you frankly that if I were a teacher in Manitoba, I would wonder why it is that a teacher, a profession which is recognized as a profession, is totally downgraded to simply be subject to the, I'd say the whim, but certainly to the direction of the Minister of Education as to what he wants them to do, in everything, in the sense that they have, all they can do is they can grieve, if the school board does something or other, they can grieve, as any union member can. Any union member can, that's part of the collective bargaining process.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few comments, I think I'll end — except on one point, there's been much said about aid to private schools. I supported the bill last year, and there is a feeling about that somehow if this bill doesn't pass, that the independent schools would not get funds. Well, of course, the Minister knows that's not so, because the present Acts would prevail, and therefore they would get it anyway. The only difference is, instead of getting it from the school division, this bill proposes they'll get it direct from the Public Schools Finance Board. That's the only difference.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not too happy with that. Because you know what I don't want to happen? Even though I supported that bill last year, I don't want the funding to disappear from view. I want the school divisions to know how much money is going to the private and independent schools in their school division. I want them to know it, because they are paying the cheque. And to argue that the school trustees say, we don't want to bother with this, don't encumber us, it's a lot of nuisance, now I don't feel sorry for the school trustees. What do they say when the municipal councillors come to government and say, we don't want to collect taxes for the school board. We have no say in what goes on there. We have no influence on the school board budget. All we know is, they come to us and say, give us 2 million, or give us 1 million, or give us a half-a-million, and we've got to send out the tax bills, and we've got to get all the flak. So frankly, when the school trustees complained last year and said, we don't want to bother handling this money, paying out, being a conduit, I had to laugh, because any members there know, talk to any municipal councillor, and the first thing on his agenda is, get the school boards to levy their own taxes. Get them off our backs.

I gather the Minister of Education, at a conference, did indicate that it's possible that maybe the councillors may be relieved of this, and maybe that's

in the works. I don't know. But really, the argument that the government is doing it in order to meet the protests of the school trustees, because they don't want to handle the money, and simply be a conduit to paying it out to private, independent schools, is just so much nonsense. The school trustees, as I say, really have no complaint, because councils have been doing it for school board budgets for years, and I doubt if that will change.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want the school boards to know exactly what's being paid to the independent schools. I don't want the amount to be hidden in a line within the Public Schools Finance Board appropriation. I want it visible, I want it there, I want people to know. As I say, I voted for that legislation last year. But I don't want it hidden, and it shouldn't be hidden. Because those who are opposed are very concerned that there may be a gradual increase in flow of funds to the independent schools at the expense of the public schools, and that must never happen. It must never happen. But the only way you're going to assure that it doesn't happen is if it's visible, and it will be visible if the school divisions know about it. Because let me tell you, they will make sure, if there's any increase which is not reflected in the financial flow of moneys to the public schools, the school divisions would be the first to realize it, know it and jump on it. It wouldn't have to depend on questions during estimates from this side of the House, from the opposition, who may or may not get the answers, or if they do get them they are a year after the fact, a year-and-a-half after the fact, and that's why I'm not too happy. So that's why, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all in saying that when this bill is called for Yeas and Nays, I will vote against it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Education will be closing debate.

The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on second reading of Bill 31, I have several comments that I would like to make, some of them of a general nature, and some quite specific.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I'm absolutely appalled, shocked, disappointed and disillusioned by what I have heard from the members opposite in their comments, debate, so-called research that they have done on this particular bill. In fact, Mr. Speaker, very few of their comments are even relative to the bill. Many of them have spent a great deal of time talking about education generally, and when they haven't anything else to talk about, they would like to get into the area of philosophy, because that's a nice, broad, fuzzy area for some people to move around in.

I've been particularly disappointed, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of one or two speakers, that they have not addressed really, any specific issues in the bill at all. And they cannot claim, Mr. Speaker, that they have not had time to address this bill because after all, unlike many of the other bills appearing before this House, this bill, with some minor modifications, with some changes, was before honourable members for one complete year. They have had the bill for a year. And of course I have re-

introduced it this particular spring, in May; I have given the honourable members opposite a list of all of the changes that have taken place between this bill and the previous bill; and the claim, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't had time to study it, we haven't had time to really take a close look at it, is not valid. This is probably the one bill presented in this Legislature this year that honourable members opposite have had more time to consider than any other. And, of course, many of their members have had the advantage of sitting on the committee that heard presentations on the bill. So I do not accept, Mr. Speaker, and I really don't think that they can put forward the argument that they haven't had the opportunity to consider the bill adequately at all.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a look at some of the comments of the honourable gentlemen opposite, and I would start with the Honourable Member for Logan, who I believe was one of the first speakers on that side, and his one significant point, the one that he certainly wanted to bring before us, he emphasized it, and the whole tenor of his remarks dealt with it, was this point that apparently, in his view, from his superficial reading of the bill, I would suggest, he made the statement that the old school inspectors didn't have powers that the new field representatives have.

Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely wrong. It only indicates that the Member for Logan hasn't looked at the old bill, nor has he looked at the new bill. Because I say to him that if he looks at the new bill, he will find that in fact, it is less explicit in the powers of field representatives than was the old bill, or the current Act that we are operating under today. And so the whole tenor of his remarks dealt with that one crucial, significant point, and he was wrong, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely wrong. And all he has to do is read the old Act and the new Act to see that that is true.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere, the education critic, Mr. Speaker, dealt with a number of areas, and of course, I am not quite sure how he approaches legislation, but he seems to infer that we should be operating under a written constitution that statutes of this House should include philosophy, government policy, that these should all be written out in great deal. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to the education critic, that I cannot find bills in this House that deal with statutes in that manner at all. And I even look at some of the Acts that were passed by the honourable gentlemen opposite.

The City of Winnipeg Act, that deals with half the population of this province — where is the philosophy there? Where is the great philosophical statement in The City of Winnipeg Act? Where is the philosophical statement in The Municipal Act, or in the Finance Administration Act, which of course was brought forward by the honourable gentlemen opposite when they were in government? Well, they aren't there, Mr. Speaker, because the statutes of this province form a framework to authorize government to operate within that framework and to bring in policies, and to operate within their particular philosophy, based on that framework of statutes. But honourable gentlemen somehow seem to feel that we should move to a different system within our statutes, and yet they didn't follow that themselves. And as I listen to the remarks, Mr.

Speaker, I almost think that they are implying that you can legislate morality, that you can legislate attitudes and you can legislate habits; and much more learned people than myself, or ourselves in this Chamber, have been prepared to tell us for many years that's not possible, Mr. Speaker.

Well, the Member for Elmwood, of course, entered the debate, and one of the most significant things in his remarks, Mr. Speaker, did not deal with education at all. He really didn't deal with education very much, we were treated to an account of how he ripped his pants in Pilot Mound or somewhere, and he went on at great length on significant things like that. Mr. Speaker, when I say I'm disappointed in the debate and the type of comments that came from the gentlemen opposite, I use that as an example of about the type of debate that these gentlemen saw as fit to put forward on this particular bill. I suggest it really indicates a lack of research and perhaps a lack of homework on their part.

The Member for Rossmere, the official education critic, addressed the particular section of the Act that deals with the teacher's right to due process, and in the existing Act, of course, that is a matter of some two years, and of course, in the new Act we are proposing that it become 20 teaching months. But the Member for Rossmere, the official education critic, came up with a new proposal, basing it on his experience, Mr. Speaker, as a fireman. And he said, I think teachers should be like firemen. It should be six months, not two years; and he didn't say no, it shouldn't be any months at all, it should be from day one, or it should be one year, he said, like the firemen, it should be six months.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm rather shocked at that type of proposal. Most teachers begin work in September of the year. Six months would bring them to February. Can you imagine a school system where people would be leaving the system as of February? It doesn't make sense. That is one of the very serious proposals that he brought forward in his remarks. And of course, I have heard ad nauseam from the gentlemen opposite on the business of the field representatives. They, I think, are trying to create something that is not there, Mr. Speaker. I have read The Manitoba Evidence Act, the same as the Member for Logan has, and I say to the Member for Logan, that if he looks at the old School Act we have been operating under, and if he looks at the new one, he will find that the field representatives have less explicit powers under this Act than they had under the old Act. But he obviously hasn't read it, Mr. Speaker.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentlemen opposite obviously have not bothered delving too deeply into to many of the clauses within this particular Act and they have attempted to stand up and speak on the old area of education rather than getting down to what is contained here.

The Member for Burrows — I won't use my colleague, the Attorney-General's phrase of exasperated or exacerbated — but he was exacerbated by the fact that the Minister was going to, may designate the language of administration in a particular school in the new bill. That really bothered him. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, he of all people should know, and he may have been brought in the regulation, it is Regulation P250-R12 that designates

that right now, and it was the regulation that he operated under when he was Minister of Education. But he then stands up and tells us, oh, I think this is a terrible thing. Mr. Speaker, it is probably a regulation that he brought in, in relation to the Act.

The Member for Ste. Rose, Mr. Speaker, placed a tremendous argument before us that there had been no chance for public representation on these bills, no chance at all. Mr. Speaker, we had some 60 presentations on this bill. We received briefs from all parts of this province and we heard these particular briefs. To say that, oh, there was no opportunity for representation is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Then he said, oh, but the municipal people haven't had their opportunity to make representation. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have attended almost every municipal annual meeting that has been held since we have been in office. They make their representation at that time. I have attended many of their regional meetings, as I have done this year; they make representation at that time. The municipal people certainly have had a great deal of input and have made their concerns very clear to us in that regard.

The members opposite have brought up some other points that they consider very important. I believe the Member for Churchill and the Member for St. Johns referred to Section 50, that says school boards may, may make mandatory retirement age at age 65. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, if they think that is terrible thing to have in the Act, it is interesting that we have heard nothing from the Teachers' Organization or the Trustees in that regard. There has been no presentation from either of those organizations, Mr. Speaker, to change that particular requirement. It has not been a great problem, not a great problem at all.

The other aspect I wanted to touch on, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry that I am short of time in this regard, but there is one thing that the Member for Seven Oaks touched on and I would like to emphasize, that this Act was not drafted by a few civil servants within my department. There has been a committee of teachers, of trustees, of superintendents, and of school business officials, that have worked on this particular revision, I am told, as far back as seven years, and this particular bill represents the particular efforts of that committee, and the views of that committee, with some few exceptions, of course. It is not an Act that is not relevant to those who will have to utilize it, those who will work with it in the school divisions; it is an Act that reflects those things that they consider are important and the things that we consider are important as a government, Mr. Speaker. I am quite pleased to see it come to this particular point in the legislative process. It has been well received by organizations who will be working with it in the community.

I could mention to the honourable members and show to them letters that I have received in recent weeks applauding the efforts that have been made in this regard.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**



**MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital):** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

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

### YEAS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Desjardins, Domino, Downey, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Gourlay, Hyde, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Steen, and Wilson.

### NAYS

Messrs. Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Doern, Fox, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Miller, Pawley, Uskiw, Walding, and Mrs. Westbury.

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas 28, Nays 13.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I firstly indicate that in view of the passing of Bill No. 31, the Committee on Privileges and Elections will meet on Wednesday evening at 8:00 o'clock to begin hearing public representations with respect to that bill.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader, if there is any disposition to deal with the Speed-up resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, we're not prepared to deal with Speed-up, but we are prepared to deal with Bill No. 19, briefly.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 19?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Logan.

### BILL NO. 19 — THE EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION ACT

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this bill are going to be very brief. I just want to say that the remarks that I made on Bill No. 31, pretty well can be applied to Bill No. 19. The major objection that I find to the bill exists in Bill No. 19, just as much as it does in Bill No. 31.

I know that the Minister didn't like my speech. He said I didn't read the old Public Schools Act, but the powers that the Honourable Minister is endowing upon the field representatives are much more severe than they are under the old Public Schools Act and the public school inspector.

It's a good thing that the Minister of Health is in this building and in this room today, because it was not too long ago when the Minister of Health, when he was sitting on this side of the House, referred to the muffled cadence of jack boots. Mr. Speaker, this is not the muffled cadence of jack boots, this is a steel shod jack boots resounding upon the cobblestones, marching into the 1980s. That is the kind of powers that the Minister of Education is giving to the field inspector.

As my colleague, the Member for St. Vital, referred to them as Cosen's cops. Well, they're not the keystone cops. The powers that these people are given are ones that the Minister who has said that he has read part five of The Manitoba Evidence Act. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the laws and the rules of this Chamber say that I must believe a Minister when he says something. You may be able to stop me from saying it publicly that I don't believe him, but in my own mind I know what I believe. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution that stands in my name.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The resolution of the Honourable Attorney-General standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I have a 40-minute speech, but I will make a one-minute introduction and simply say that I certainly oppose the measure in principle. I have always done so, I will continue to do so, and I will certainly vote against the Speed-up resolution. I want to cite as an example the fact that I don't totally want to deliver myself into the hands of my opponents, the unfortunate incident that happened in the Chamber only a few days ago, to emphasize, co-operation is what must be striven for at all times, and to say that I have been in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, for 14 years, but I have never before in my life seen a government deny a member of the opposition the right to adjourn or stand a bill in Private Members' Hour, right? No, never in fourteen years has that been done before, and it was done for the first time the other day because of the shenanigans of the First Minister who got himself into a jam. I believe he was being facetious. I believe he was taunting the opposition, but nevertheless he used some unparliamentary language, and as a result, we have what is too often apparent in the Chamber, that the government is sometimes not led by its mind but is let by its spleen, and that was to me a perfect example . . .

**Saturday, 28 June, 1980**

---

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, the hour being 12:30 — are there any directions? Is there a committee meeting at 10 o'clock on Wednesday?

**MR. MERCIER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Law Amendments Committee will meet at 10:00 o'clock on Wednesday, the House will meet at 2:00 o'clock.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 12:30, the House accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon.