

ISSN 0542-5492



**Fourth Session — Thirty-First Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

29 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXVIII No. 69 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 30 MAY, 1980**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty - First Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, A. R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANDERSON, Bob</b>	Springfield	PC
<b>BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BARROW, Tom</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>BLAKE, David</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BOSTROM, Harvey</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)</b>	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>CORRIN, Brian</b>	Wellington	NDP
<b>COSENS, Hon. Keith A.</b>	Gimli	PC
<b>COWAN, Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.</b>	Riel	PC
<b>DESJARDINS, Laurent L.</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOMINO, Len</b>	St. Matthews	PC
<b>DOWNEY, Hon. Jim</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>EINARSON, Henry J.</b>	Rock Lake	PC
<b>ENNS, Hon. Harry J.</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>FERGUSON, James R.</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>GALBRAITH, Jim</b>	Dauphin	PC
<b>GOURLAY, Hon. Doug</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.</b>	Birtle-Russell	PC
<b>GREEN, Q.C., Sidney</b>	Inkster	Ind
<b>HANUSCHAK, Ben</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd G.</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JENKINS, William</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>JORGENSON, Hon. Warner H.</b>	Morris	PC
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Radisson	PC
<b>LYON, Hon. Sterling R.</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MacMASTER, Hon. Ken</b>	Thompson	PC
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald</b>	Point Douglas	NDP
<b>McBRYDE, Ronald</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>McGILL, Hon. Edward</b>	Brandon West	PC
<b>McGREGOR, Morris</b>	Virden	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.</b>	Osborne	PC
<b>MILLER, Saul A.</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>MINAKER, Hon. George</b>	St. James	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Hon. Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PARASIUK, Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PRICE, Hon. Norma</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>RANSOM, Hon. Brian</b>	Souris-Killarney	PC
<b>SCHROEDER, Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	Crescentwood	PC
<b>URUSKI, Billie</b>	St. George	NDP
<b>USKIW, Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP
<b>WESTBURY, June</b>	Fort Rouge	Lib
<b>WILSON, Robert G.</b>	Wolseley	PC

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Friday, 30 May, 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 Radisson.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, the report of committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion.

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson)** introduced Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act. (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.)

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside)** introduced Bill 79, An Act to amend The Expropriation Act. (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.)

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN** introduced Bill 69, An Act to amend The Fatality Inquiries Act (2).

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before I proceed with Oral Questions, at this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 45 students of Grade 6 standing from the Lorette Elementary School, under the direction of Ms. Karen Hickman. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

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

We also have some other schools here and when I receive the official notification, if I may, I will interrupt at that time to introduce them.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** We will proceed with Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health advise whether or not, in view of the

nursing shortage in the province of Manitoba, any plans have been made to open any additional classes at the Red River Community College?

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, there are three upgrading courses that have been scheduled and put in place at Red River Community College, all of which have been fully subscribed and will produce in total some 60 upgraded nurses returning to the nursing field.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in addition to upgrading classes, will there be any other classes provided for new applicants to undertake nursing training at Red River Community College beyond that which presently exists?

**MR. SHERMAN:** If that's necessary, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that can be arranged. Most of the nursing schools are planning to expand their intake, depending on the applications and the response that they get, starting with the new academic training year. So that certainly is a matter that will be dealt with, adjusted, and expanded as the demand develops.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that indeed there are many applications that cannot be accepted at the present time due to a backlog of applications and due to the fact that additional classes have not been opened at Red River Community College this year?

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. The situation, as I have suggested, is one at the present time of providing upgrading courses to meet the demand for upgrading and it's tailored to meet that demand, adjust it upward as the demand goes upward. In terms of first-time applications for nursing schools, the directors of the nursing schools assure me that they are expanding their capacities to meet that demand. I can't go beyond that at this juncture because I'm not aware of any particular mathematical difficulties that the Leader of the Opposition may be aware of.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then by way of supplementary to the Minister, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that applicants are receiving letters from Red River Community College, advising them they have been placed on a waiting list due to the fact that classes have not been expanded. Would the Minister be prepared to investigate this and to report back?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Certainly, Mr. Speaker, but I would expect that is a procedure that is made necessary by the fact that planning and administrative changes and logistics have to be developed and are being developed before applications of that kind can be confirmed. All are being adjudicated in that context as the schools make their plans to expand to whatever is required

to meet responsibly the volume of applications that we hope will be coming in in the next few weeks.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the present negotiations taking place during the work stoppage vis-a-vis hospitals in Manitoba are being conducted by representatives of the employees who have right to bind the employees and people who have no authority to expend further public moneys because they are funded entirely by the province, could the Minister rectify this situation by conducting negotiations or by changing the negotiations so that the representatives of the people who are going to spend the money are meeting face to face with the employees.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would think that would be a highly unusual procedure. What the honourable member is asking is whether the government and the Department of Health get involved in direct negotiations on this matter. We don't feel that would either be productive or would be necessarily helpful in terms of the future, in terms of precedence and in terms of the collective bargaining process. I can't assure him that we would give serious consideration to that proposal, Sir.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Health, would be obtain advice on this from the Minister of Labour, consider it an unusual situation for those people who are paying and have the authority to pay or to pay more or to pay less, negotiate with those people who are seeking an increase in wages. Does he consider that an unusual situation?

**MR. SHERMAN:** In the context in which he presents the question to me, I do, Mr. Speaker. We do not run the hospitals, as he well knows. The hospital managements, through whatever agencies, individual or collective that they elect to employ, whether their own bargaining committees or the central table of the MHO, assume the responsibility for overseeing their own budgetary responsibilities. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that if they have concerns relative to the implications in his question, they would certainly be in touch with the Health Services Commission and through the Health Services Commission, with the government about it. That has not happened, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, have not certain hospital boards, to the knowledge of the Minister — and I would ask him to ask whether this is not the results of the conciliation procedures and the involvement of the Department of Labour as well — have not certain hospital boards said that they

cannot pay any more money because the province won't permit them to pay any more money than has already been included in their proposal. And, Mr. Speaker, in addition to answering that question, I want to know whether the Minister has any contingency plans for the maintenance of service to people in the province of Manitoba, other than legislation to compel people to work?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the honourable member's first question, it may be that certain hospital boards, in the comments that have been made with respect to the present negotiations, have used phraseology which suggests that they are facing budgetary limitations. I want to assure the Honourable Member for Inkster that no such specific edict or instruction of that kind, no such one has come from my office or from the Health Services Commission, and that the managers of the hospitals, the administrators of the hospitals, in the knowledge accumulated in operating their facilities in the health care system, meet responsibilities that they place upon themselves. If they feel that they have no manoeuvrability, I assure the Honourable Member for Inkster that I would hear from them to that effect. What I have told him —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Inkster has been involved in labour relations for a long time and he knows, Sir, that certain areas are practical in terms of comment on labour relations; certain other statements are indiscreet, and he's fully aware of that. The management side and the labour side both make their own positions for the sake of argument. They have not come to me about it.

On his second question, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure him that we are considering all forms and types of possible contingency plans.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If I may interrupt at this time. I notice we have 52 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing from Van Bellegham School under the direction of Miss Donna Wicks. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Finance. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this morning.

## ORAL QUESTIONS CONT'D

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

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Highways. Yesterday the Member for Churchill indicated that one of the government backbenchers should today ask a question on the Split Lake ferry. I would now like to direct that question to the Minister and ask him for an update on the ferry situation at Split Lake.

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

**HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Churchill was enquiring about the lack of service on Tuesday of this week, and that, Mr. Speaker, was a temporary situation caused by adverse weather conditions on Tuesday. But the

Friday, 30 May, 1980

Split Lake ferry, Mr. Speaker, has been in operation this year since May 19th and this is considerably in advance of the operating schedule in previous years. For instance, last year the ferry didn't begin operation until June 28 and not until June 15, 1978. The earlier opening date and provision of service by the Split Lake ferry of course, is indication of the kind of warm, dry spring weather that we've had and it's allowed the ferry schedule in general to operate much sooner this year than in previous years.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health. In view of the fact that he has just said that hospitals are not limited financially by any arbitrary edict by the provincial government, can he then assure these hospital administrators, many of whom have deficits this year, that they indeed can negotiate in good faith, knowing that this government will remove the arbitrary 8 percent ceiling for hospital operating costs it has announced formally, publicly to the legislation, to the public of Manitoba and then allow free collective bargaining to take place in good faith? Will he give them that assurance?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I've said before, and emphasize it and underpin it, and that is that the hospitals involved in the contract talks going on at the present time are negotiating in good faith, are bargaining in good faith. I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba, and all members of this Legislature on both sides and the people of Manitoba, owe a vote of thanks and a gesture of recognition to the nursing staffs, the medical staffs and the non-union people who have been working very hard to maintain patient care under very trying conditions, and to the union personnel who have been designated as essential workers and who are participating in that same difficult challenge. An enormous effort is being made by all those personnel and I want to recognize that in the House, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PARASIUK:** We on this side of the House as well would like to recognize the superhuman effort being exerted by all people in the health care field who are working very hard to fill the vacuum created by the government abdicating its responsibility in this matter.

I have a supplementary to the Minister. Since the Minister has an ex-officio member on the Manitoba Health Organizations negotiating team, can he confirm that yesterday at 5:00 p.m. the Manitoba Hospital Organizations unilaterally broke off negotiations with hospital support staff and that the MHO has said that these negotiations are broken off indefinitely? In the light of this, can he then say that negotiations are continuing in good faith?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. Undoubtedly the Honourable Member for Transcona has his own sources of information. I don't challenge them but I can't confirm that. I can tell him that all

efforts at maintaining negotiation and pursuing a solution are being maintained and are being intensified. I will be meeting with MHO representatives today and other personnel and representatives involved in the health care delivery system as I think is my responsibility, to maintain a check, a monitor and an overview on the quality of patient care available at the present time.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes. Given the urgency of the situation, I would hope that the Minister would keep himself apprised of hourly events through his observer on the negotiating team. I would ask the Minister, will the Minister when he meets with the Manitoba Hospital Organizations this morning ask them to get back to the negotiating table so that the Manitoba Health Organization will then try to collectively bargain in good faith, rather than trying to use some other method of possibly legislating people back to work? Would he ask the MHO to get back to the negotiating table? And would he then ensure them that they indeed will be able to negotiate, knowing that the 8 percent ceiling is taken off so that the MHO will not announce publicly that they have broken off negotiations unilaterally and indefinitely because of budgetary restraint?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question also is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I wonder first if he could answer my question of yesterday relative to Grace Hospital. And further, in view of the fact that all breast cancers, thyroid cancers and kidney cancers have been postponed indefinitely, and in view of the fact that the Honourable Minister told us yesterday that emergent surgery is all being transferred to St. Boniface where in fact the truth of the matter is that the patients or their doctors have to find surgeons who are affiliated with St. Boniface before that can be done. In other words, Mr. Speaker, you don't have the surgeon of your choice do the operation, you have to transfer to a surgeon who is affiliated with St. Boniface Hospital. At what point, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister intend to impose compulsory arbitration? The doctors are very very worried, Mr. Speaker, and they are telling me — they were phoning me last night at 11:30 and 11:45 after watching question period to tell me that we are not getting the whole truth from this Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I repeat that it is a very serious situation. It is a fluid situation. It contains within it the possibilities, the potential for extreme difficulty, virtually hourly. I can assure the honourable member that the government, my colleagues and I, have met on it continually. I am in continual touch with all factors of the health care delivery system on it, certainly with the doctors. I do not dispute what she is saying with respect to the concern expressed by a number of doctors and it is a very valid and legitimate concern. Sir, we are wrestling with the importance and the urgency of the issue on an hour-by-hour basis. We hope for a

Friday, 30 May, 1980

solution through collective bargaining. We are not going to gamble with patient life and safety.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My next question would be addressed to the Minister of Urban Affairs if he were here. I wonder if the Minister of Finance could possibly answer. It refers to the announcement by the federal Minister of Immigration and Employment this morning to the effect that the federal government is putting 2 million before next April into preparing for a 60 million input into redevelopment of the core area of Winnipeg. I'm wondering if any of the ministers can make an announcement. The Minister of Urban Affairs was present at that announcement. I wonder if the government front bench can tell us what they are prepared to contribute to this redevelopment, or what the next step will be for the provincial government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would thank the honourable member for her statement, but I suggest that it should probably not come during the question period.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, there was a question contained as to the whereabouts of the Minister of Urban Affairs. He is presently, I believe, at a press conference with the two federal ministers with regard to this question. I think that it was probably some advance indication given by the federal minister last night or earlier with regard to a 2 million support program for study in Winnipeg. The province and the city were advised of it this morning. We are pleased to hear of the interest.

I am more than pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear from the Member for Fort Rouge that the province and the city can expect 60 million. That will be very welcome. I trust that we can hold the Member for Fort Rouge to that statement and have her indicate to her federal friends that in fact that statement has been made in this House. We welcome 60 million, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that we have it. I think that there will be further information coming forth from the statement by the federal Ministers this morning — the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the Minister of Employment and Immigration. There is further information that may be provided by the Minister of Natural Resources with regard to a further agreement that I gather was also announced last night.

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

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my final question is to the —(Interjection)— I'm just learning the ropes, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. When will the Minister give an answer to the group of independent grocery stores and to the local developer who made proposals last August and September which would help to alleviate the serious need for a grocery store in the Broadway/Donald area? When can they expect an answer from this Minister, Mr. Speaker?

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

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. I wonder, can the Minister indicate whether a water management agreement was signed this morning with the federal government?

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** No, Mr. Speaker, it has not been signed as the Minister of Finance pointed out. The intention to sign the agreement was announced last night by the Minister of Immigration and Employment. We had expected to sign the agreement at 10:00 o'clock this morning and it had been my hope that I would be able to table that agreement in the House this morning and make a statement with respect to its contents, but to this time, Mr. Speaker, it has not been signed.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Member for St. Boniface stood before I did but since he's left the Chamber — he stood before many others, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that it is very unparliamentary to comment on the absence or presence of any member in this Chamber, and I would hope that senior members of this Assembly would know better.  
The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the question I would appreciate the citation on the unparliamentary aspect of commenting. I know it's not commonly done but it is also a question of the vein, the way in which it is put, and it was in no way intended to embarrass the Member for St. Boniface. So, Mr. Speaker, your point may be well taken but I'd very much like to hear the citation in that regard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member, I will look up the citation if you don't mind the interruptions.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm in no hurry.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health. In the light of questions he's already answered today and in the light of the statement he is reported to have made to the effect that if he feels that the public safety, public health is in danger as a result of the present strike action, that there will be government intervention, I would like to ask him if he will make a commitment to this House that before he brings any unusual, extraordinary legislation to this House, he will personally involve himself in the negotiations in an effort to effect a settlement and in that way be able to speak on behalf of the government, having had a personal involvement in the negotiations before he comes here with any

Friday, 30 May, 1980

extraordinary legislation. Can we have that undertaking from him?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns has been a member of the Treasury Benches and he knows full that decisions of this kind are Executive Council decisions, they are collective decisions, they are not unilateral decisions. The Cabinet, the Executive Council will make that decision. I can give him no such assurance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I wish to refer the Honourable Member for St. Johns to Citation 316(c) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank you both for recognizing me and for the citation.

A supplementary question to the Honourable the Minister of Health, who is a member of the Treasury Bench and would be involved in any decision that comes to this House from the Treasury Bench, whether as Minister of Health he will undertake that before any recommendation is made by him to the Treasury Bench relating to the strike action and unusual and extraordinary legislation, he will personally involve himself in negotiations to ensure that every effort has been made on behalf of the employers that there has been fair bargaining?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have asked for assurances that fair bargaining is going on. I am prepared to accept the assurances that I have received that fair bargaining is going on. I'm prepared to accept the assurances that I've received from all parties involved that all of us have certain responsibilities that obtain throughout the health care system that require compromise and that require co-operation. I think that we're working toward that kind of compromise and co-operation. The question, of course, and it's been put by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and others and certainly is uppermost in our minds, is whether the time frame has not become such that we now face other urgent imperatives.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in view — and I address the Minister of Health on a supplementary. In view of the fact that he has been accepting the word of others that there has been fair bargaining, fair negotiation going on, and in view of the fact that there is the possibility of his coming to this Legislature as spokesman for the Cabinet for extraordinary legislation, will he undertake that he himself will be able to certify, not as a reporter on behalf of others but he himself, that there has been bargaining in which he has participated? And that I believe is an important question that before there is anything asked of this Legislature, the Cabinet and the Minister take personal responsibility for the recommendation.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I will certainly assure my honourable friend and give him the undertaking that I will satisfy myself to the extent that I can

assure my colleagues in Cabinet and members of this House that there has been meaningful bargaining. I believe that has been the case up to now. I will reassure myself of that. I will not, at this point in time, obviously, provide him with an undertaking that it will be done by any one specific method but I certainly understand the import of his question. I have a responsibility as Minister of Health to ensure that that meaningful bargaining does take place and that the environment is such that it permits it to take place. I will assure the Honourable Member for St. Johns that yes, I will reassure myself, my colleagues and members of the House of that.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary to the questions posed by the Member for St. Johns. In view of the information that was provided by the Member for Transcona that indeed negotiations had broken down as of 5:00 o'clock yesterday afternoon involving the Manitoba Health Organizations and the unions involved, CUPE, and therefore it appearing that meaningful negotiations are not taking place at the present time and that there isn't this favourable bargaining process taking place, is the Minister under those circumstances prepared to enter into negotiations — since he is the Minister that is paying the moneys that are involved, and in view of the fact that negotiations apparently have broken down, is the Minister under those circumstances, prepared . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. The question is repetitive.

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honourable Minister without Portfolio accepted a question from the Member for Fort Rouge on my behalf in regard to utilization of the visual ear machine by young people in Manitoba, and I can report at this time that the Manitoba School for the Deaf has been using various types of teletype machines for some time since the early Seventies. At this time they are in the process of purchasing a portatel machine which is similar to the visual ear. It does the same function. The visual ear, I am informed, is a recent innovation on the scene and they have not had the opportunity to utilize it as yet.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services responsible for Emergency Measures Organization and ask him why was Jack Miller, the EMO director, fired on May 5th.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, no such action took place. Within the reorganization of Emergency Measures Organization, Mr. Miller, who has served

this province for many years in a very capable fashion, has always had a very strong belief, and I think we ourselves are aware of it, that particularly the training aspect as directed towards municipal officials to put them in a state of readiness, is of paramount importance. That has been Mr. Miller's strongly held views. Within the reorganization of Emergency Measures we intend to strengthen that part of Emergency Measures responsibilities, and Mr. Miller will be doing precisely that.

It has been found, also by experience, that in times of emergency it is extremely important that the different departments all pull together to respond to that emergency, and it was found by experience during last year's flood that in getting the necessary co-operation from all departments, it was perhaps more practical to work at the Deputy Minister's level; in that case, it's the Deputy Minister of Government Services that's involved, working directly under a sub-committee of Cabinet. The members of that sub-committee of Cabinet involved in emergency will change to accommodate the particular kind of emergency that we're dealing with. If it's water, the water resources people have a role to play; if it's a chemical or environmental matter, it will be environmental management. But, Sir, I am very happy to refute and take this opportunity to indicate to the House and to Manitobans that Mr. Miller's past contributions have certainly been acknowledged and appreciated, and his future contributions in this work can be expected by this government and the people of Manitoba.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I gather that he did such a good job that he lost his job. I want to ask the Minister how he can possibly make that statement of praise, or apparent praise, and yet remove the man from his position, especially at a time of emergency with fires and with drought. Is this the time to take a man like him out of the field, out of the action, and give him some other assignment when we could be making direct use of his expertise in a time of emergency?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I do wish the Honourable Member for Elmwood would do a little more careful research. It's not for me to report on some of the personal problems that Mr. Miller has had. He has had a very serious accident which just about lost him his hand, or portions of it; has been hospitalized for a good part of the past month; has only very recently been able to report back for active duty; and without any hesitation, was eagerly into this present emergency as a co-ordinator working out of the northern community of The Pas. But he has had some substantial time off work because of an accident that I understand happened with a skill saw or a power saw that involved his hands.

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

**MR. DOERN:** So the Minister is indicating, I gather, that this is not in any way a reflection of his performance during last year's emergency in regard to a flood threat.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, what I am indicating is, that we have recognized that it was within the structure of Emergency Measures that required a change. Emergency Measures organization has been a rather loose organization reporting from time to time to different Ministers, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, for instance, and of course we tend to forget about EMO when we have no emergency on our hands. When we do have an emergency on our hands, then it's very important that the position of the director, as it was known, has the necessary support of all departments. That was a flaw in our judgement within the structure of Emergency Measures Organization. The position of director is being done away with as such. There is a co-ordinating role directly responsible to a sub-committee of Cabinet that we have found worked very well during the flood, where a sub-committee of Cabinet meets on a daily basis with the particular Deputy Ministers, who, after all, have the full authority within their line departments to act with some urgency and to bring about the kind of emergency that is necessary. This, I can assure the honourable members of the House, does not reflect on Mr. Miller's past performance or his capabilities to continue to perform.

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

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder, could the Minister advise the House what progress has been made on the proposed sewage lagoon development in Manitoba, for the first time the effluentable use to irrigate farm land?

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, the project that the member is referring to is in Roblin, where they have had some difficulty over the past few years with lack of capacity for the holding of sewage effluent. At this particular time, there are plans in place to proceed with an irrigation project, and I would say it's progressing very well.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** I wonder if the Minister could advise the House, would it be considered as a pilot project, or are there other communities in rural Manitoba interested in using the effluent to irrigate farmlands?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, this particular project in Roblin is a pilot project. However there have been quite a few other communities that have shown interest in that particular project. It's one of the projects that fall within the terms of the AgroMan Agreement, which is a Canada-Manitoba agreement on value-added crops.

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

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Economic Development. I understand that, although as recently as several

Friday, 30 May, 1980

months ago, the CNR was hiring people for the car shops, that there was a layoff of 40 to 50 people last Friday, and there are some indications that there may be more substantial layoffs coming up shortly. Could the Minister advise as to whether this in fact is correct, and as to whether these jobs are being transferred to other points, or exactly what the situation is?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, on May 7th I posed three questions to the Minister of Highways in regard to the costs of the Poplar repairs to the Poplar Point Bridge in comparison to new construction. Also, if the Minister would consider cost-sharing with municipalities, should they wish to repair the bridge. The third question was whether or not the right-of-way acquisition for PR 260 had been completed. I wonder if the Minister has had sufficient time to obtain that information.

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose may be well aware, the subject matter of PR 260 was recently in the newspapers. It seems as if the condition of that particular PR had gone downhill considerably over the last 10, 12 years, to the stage where in protest one of the local residents and users of that road undertook a renovation program of that provincial road by using his plow to plow a furrow for approximately a mile-and-a-half down the road. That rather quickly drew the attention and the urgency of upgrading of PR 260 to our department and we are proceeding post-haste with right-of-way acquisition. We have not received to date, Mr. Speaker, a report detailed as to the advancement of that right-of-way acquisition. But, Mr. Speaker, it is fully anticipated that very shortly we will have the proper right-of-way acquired so that we can proceed with the upgrading of PR 260. Should we run into difficulty, Mr. Speaker, we do have a contingency plan in that we would split the contract on the grading of PR 260 and do that portion for which we have acquired the right-of-way so that at least we do provide some measure of relief for the users of PR 260, so that we don't incur at some future time the kind of frustrations that the local residents along that road experienced last year and led to the unfortunate incident that was reported in the newspapers.

In answer to the Member for Ste. Rose's questions regarding the Poplar Point bridge, I have not to date received specific costs on upgrading of the Poplar Point Bridge, the old Poplar Point Bridge. But the decision was made approximately a year-and-a-half ago, Mr. Speaker, to replace that bridge because the existing bridge which is some 50 to 60 years old was deemed by the engineers in the department to be

unrepairable, beyond repair. There are numerous structural problems with that bridge, Mr. Speaker, and those structural problems became so evident that approximately this time last spring, the bridge had to be closed completely, because it was not safe even for pedestrian traffic. It was only held in place, Mr. Speaker, by the support cables along the side of the bridge. Even the concrete piers, Mr. Speaker, are beyond repair. This led the department to proceed with replacement of that bridge by a new, wider, clear-span bridge which will better service the traffic needs in the area, accommodate the larger farm machinery in the area, and the plan which had been developed for some 8 to 10 years was implemented and is currently being undertaken. The new replacement bridge is well under way of construction and the grading of the road to that will be undertaken very shortly so that we will be able to provide, hopefully this fall, a complete access that has been lacking to the residents of Poplar Point for approximately 12 months now.

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

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, if I, first of all, could indicate with the completion of the Agricultural Estimates and at the request of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, on Monday Northern Affairs will start in Room 254, rather than Municipal Affairs.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Law Amendments Committee will meet on Tuesday morning at 10:00 a.m. and Thursday morning at 10:00 a.m.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with Orders of the Day, can I just, as a matter of courtesy, table the daily reports with respect to fire and other matters?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there agreement for that? (Agreed)

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call second readings on Bills No. 31, 19 and 33 in that order and the proceed to adjourn debates on second reading.

## BILL NO. 31 — THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Friday, 30 May, 1980

**MR. COSENS** presented Bill No. 31, the Public Schools Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce into this House revisions of The Public Schools Act and The Education Department Act. You will recall that during the previous session of the Legislature, I presented to you Bills 22 and 23, which represented the new Public Schools Act and The Education Department Act respectively. You will therefore recall that these bills were referred by this body to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections in order that interested organizations and individuals might appear before it. This standing committee met several times commencing October 22, 1979, and its Chairman, the Honourable Member for Roblin, presented to this Legislature on February 22, 1980, the report of the committee hearings, and in so doing recommended that the Minister of Education in drafting revised legislation for submission to the Legislature give consideration to the various matters which were brought to the attention of the committee. The presentations and recommendations have been carefully reviewed and studied and, as a result, a number of changes have been incorporated into the revised bills before you.

It is therefore with satisfaction that I now present to the House Bill 31 and subsequently Bill 19, representing a new revised Public Schools Act and a revised Education Administration Act. One of the continuing considerations, Mr. Speaker, was to update, condense, consolidate and clarify them. This we have done in a number of ways. When condensing and consolidating The Public Schools Act, you will note that all mention of school jurisdictions, with the exception of the school division and the school district, have been eliminated. A few of the latter still exist. Since they are no longer needed, we have omitted all those sections dealing with rural non-union school districts, union school districts, municipal school districts, school areas, special parts such as the one pertaining to Winnipeg School Division No. 1, rural consolidated school districts and city, town and village districts. All the rights, duties and privileges enjoyed by those school corporations have been given to a common authority which we have termed the school board, which is equally applicable to either division or district school corporations and to official trustees. This has immeasurably clarified the Act as you may well realize and without necessity for my mentioning specific examples to illustrate that point. I should like to point out that the existing Public Schools Act contains 541 sections. The revised Act contains 280 sections.

You will note that The School Attendance Act has been incorporated into The Public Schools Act to be found as a special part therein, therefore I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree that we have achieved a considerable amount of consolidation. In addition to updating, condensing, clarifying and consolidating the existing Act, other considerations in the revision

are a desire to develop a statute that is basically common to all types of school jurisdictions; gives the local authority, within limits, the freedom needed to deliver the educational program and conduct the administration thereof; continue to provide for all the general organization of and sense of direction in education and to assist in the provision of the necessary resources to the local authority when requested and/or found to be needed, and to keep only those controls which are needed to ensure that every pupil receives a level of education commensurate with his or her ability; that maximum benefit ensues from the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the philosophy of extending local autonomy, many of the specific procedural details have been placed within the power of schools boards, such as the conduct of school board meetings and duties of secretary-treasurers. Archaic and now non-existent sections such as those referring to the different school jurisdictions previously mentioned, municipal districts and union districts, have also been deleted.

If I can now mention some of the highlights of Bill 31, in the interpretation section, the 44 definitions in the existing Act have been reduced to 24 in the revised Act. Eighteen of the definitions are from the existing Act in either verbatim or revised form and six are now definitions of terms which have a common general and unmistakable meaning such as secretary-treasurer, or are defined in relation to special sections of the Act and have application only in those sections, such as private school, have been omitted from the interpretation section. Some new terms such as school division have been added to bring the Act up to current nomenclature.

In Part I which deals with formation, alteration and dissolution of school divisions and school districts and the establishment of school divisions and school districts, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the mechanisms for those purposes are found in the powers given to the board of reference, to alter the boundaries of existing school divisions; consolidate two or more of them; designate the number of wards therein; establish the boundaries of and fix the number of trustees who will represent the electors of an existing school division or of one formed through alteration or consolidation. To enable school boards to vary the terms of office of trustees, flexibility has been provided for all school boards outside of greater Winnipeg. The greater Winnipeg school boards continue to maintain a three-year term of office.

During the hearings of the committee on Privileges and Elections, a considerably number of citizens and organizations presented briefs with regard to those students with special needs and learning disabilities. In the bill before you, the duty of school boards to provide or make provision for the education of all persons for whom they are responsible is clearly enunciated. If a private or an independent school wishes to utilize facilities and services of a public school in the division, this will be done through an agreement with the division within which a private school is located. As a result of presentations to the committee, this bill provides that the government will pay directly to the administration of the private school rather than through the division grants under the regulations in respect of instruction and services

Friday, 30 May, 1980

that are offered by the private school to children enrolled in the private school, where the Minister is satisfied that children enrolled in the private school receive an education of a standard equivalent to that received by children in the public schools and that teachers teaching prescribed courses to children enrolled in the private school, hold valid and subsisting teaching certificates.

The main provision pertaining to languages of instruction has been retained. Modification occurs in the disestablishment of the English and French Advisory Committees and council which have been replaced by the Languages of Instruction Advisory Committee. The Languages of Instruction Advisory Committee has been given the power to consider, review and make recommendations on any matters pertaining to languages of instruction in the schools of the province which have been referred to it by the Minister.

Sick leave benefits to teachers has two important facets. First, the principle of earned cumulative sick leave is clarified; and secondly, the present minimum of 60 statutory days of sick leave have been brought up to 75 days in order to be in keeping with collective agreements and benefits accruing the school boards through present federal Unemployment Insurance Commission legislation.

As previously mentioned, Mr. Speaker, The School Attendance Act has been incorporated into The Public Schools Act. Changes relating to school attendance have to do with terminating compulsory attendance on a child's 16th birthday rather than at the end of the school term in which he or she becomes 16; putting the onus on the person or persons who have a child in his charge, care or custody to have him attend school regularly, and increasing the penalties for failure to comply with the attendance clauses of this Act — for example, a fine of 500 for anyone employing a child of compulsory school age during a time when the child is required to be in school.

These then, Mr. Speaker, are what I deem to be the highlights and important substantive changes in this particular Act, bill, that's in place before you.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am going to concentrate on only one feature of the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** No, Mr. Speaker, I wondered if I could ask the Minister one question following his remarks before the next member speaks. It's more of a request, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister provide us with the changes, both additions and deletions and any changes that appear in this bill different from the bill that he presented to the House last year and subsequently withdrew? It will make it easier for us to study the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I believe save some time.

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I'll make every effort to accommodate the request of the Member for St. Vital. I realize it is a lengthy bill and contains many sections and will be quite prepared to provide him with that information.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to limit my remarks to one feature of this bill which I believe the Minister will concede is different than what was in last year's bill, so that if the Member for St. Vital's question is answered with respect to this particular question, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he will find that this year's bill differs from last year's bill.

The feature of the bill that I wish to address my remarks to, Mr. Speaker, is that feature whereby the Minister has reversed and indeed negated the stated government intention that the use of public moneys to support private educational institutions would be at the local option of the school board. That, Mr. Speaker, was the stated intention of the government when they brought in legislation which said that a local school board could enter into an agreement with a private institution for the carrying on of educational activities within that school division.

The Minister has now said, Mr. Speaker, that the problems of Manitoba can enter into direct communication and agreement with a private educational institution for the use of public moneys to support these private educational institutions. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather long-standing dispute in the province of Manitoba, and a dispute, Mr. Speaker, whereby a series of statements to the non-intention, if I may use it, statements to the non-intention of doing so. Parliament, or the Legislature of the province of the Manitoba, has by a steady erosion of its own principles, and each time stating its own principles, has brought about a situation in the province of Manitoba where public moneys are being used and will continue to be used, Mr. Speaker. Each one of my predictions in this area has come true, and I'm going to make another one, that unless there is a strong opposition position on this question from somebody and a concerted opposition, one which seeks political support amongst the people of the province of Manitoba, will result, Mr. Speaker, I predict, in full funding to private educational institutions on the part of those parents who want to send their children to private educational institutions, that eventually they will be able to take their full education tax and designate it to a private educational institution. And it will be done each time, Mr. Speaker, with a pompous assertion on the part of the people who are doing it that this will never happen.

I want to trace, Mr. Speaker, what has been the history of this question, because every time there has been an encroachment in that direction, the people who have done it say, this won't happen. And the first encroachment, Mr. Speaker, was the so-called shared services program that was announced by the Honourable Duff Roblin in the early 60s. He said, this is not the use of public money to support private institutions. He said, Mr. Speaker, and said it quite clearly, that it will not be used in a private school. All

Friday, 30 May, 1980

we are going to do is permit people who are in private schools to use services that are in the public schools which they would be able to use if they were not in private schools. And he asserted flatly that this is not an intention on the part of the government to use public moneys to support these private educational institutions.

The next step, Mr. Speaker, the next step came about by both accident and subterfuge and I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, for those who want to point fingers, my own complicity, although it was a negative one, in it. Several school divisions and trustees requested the right of their divisions to advance or to have an agency within the division, to hire a private school to deliver public school services. And the school division had to be the one who requested it and had to enter into an agreement with the private school, making certain of its activities to public schools. Those agreements, Mr. Speaker, I am told and I am assured, started prior to 1969, that there was one signed prior to 1969, continued after 1969, at all times with the assertion on the part of the people involved that the government had no intention of financing private schools. Then, Mr. Speaker, the next step in this process was a resolution presented by the, as a private member, interestingly enough, by the Member for Rossmere, then the Premier of the province of Manitoba, presenting a resolution which, Mr. Speaker, was a real sorry resolution, because it asks for a committee to consider three ways of advancing money to private schools, one of which was by direct grants, one of which was by making them part of the public school system through an umbrella, knowing full well that the cheapest way would be, in the view of the committee, direct aid to the schools, thereby excluding any real intention to diversify the system. And, Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the province of Manitoba, by majority vote, rejected that resolution.

The next thing that happened, Mr. Speaker, is that agreements were continued. By the way, so that there be no misunderstanding, although I say that I was part of the government that did it, in 1972 I got up in the House and last year I read the speech, and I said that this process is being administratively done. I am powerless to avoid it; I cannot stop it; I will vote against any government resolution to give this aid, but I want the public of Manitoba and the members of the Chamber, to know that this device is being used. If members want me to repeat or to table what I said at that time, I will do it. I did it last year when I was accused of having taken two positions on this question. Not at all. I disclosed that the government was doing it. I indicated that I was powerless to stop it, that all I could do is that I get up in my seat and vote against that kind of thing.

But in each case, Mr. Speaker, it was protested on the part of those who are doing it but they are not giving aid to private schools. They are merely permitting a school division to say that we are going to hire an educational institution to do our job for us in an area where we think they should be doing it.

The next step, Mr. Speaker, was the election of the Conservative administrator. Mr. Speaker, there are certain circumstances — they are very few and far between — but where the Conservative administration would be the lesser of other evils. If

the New Democratic Party took positions that were absolutely unacceptable to me and if there was a series of them, (1) I could not vote for a party who said that they are going to use public moneys for the advancement of ideological schools and elite schools. I couldn't, Mr. Speaker, I think I made that very well known.

But the Conservative Party is the one, Mr. Speaker, that has come out full score on this question, because the election of the Conservatives, they came in and they said, Mr. Speaker — and they were given, I admit that they were given a tool — they said, now we don't have to fight, all we have to do is say that we are going to, and that's what the Minister protested, he said there was a question of legality with this agreement, that there was a question of legality and to overcome the question and for that reason only, not to advance public moneys to private schools but to overcome the question as to whether something or was not legal, the government was going to make it legal to advance public moneys to school divisions, Mr. Speaker, who wanted to enter into such agreements. And the Minister was quite explicit. The money would be advanced to the school division and he used the phrase, Mr. Speaker, it would be up to the school division to say whether the money should or should not be advanced and he believed that's the way it should be. Mr. Speaker, all of these things were done by sleight of hand because the Minister — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister fully intended that this would be an advance towards citizens who did not want to use the public school system, being able to withdraw their taxes from them and send their children to a private school and have the taxes applied to the private school. That has always been the Minister's intention and that is why he seized on those agreements, Mr. Speaker, and put them into law.

Now what happened, Mr. Speaker, the Minister clearly said that this is now a matter of local option. The school board can do it or not do it. What was the next sleight of hand, Mr. Speaker? It was the school boards. The Winnipeg School Board had consistently said that they would not enter into such agreements, that they did not believe the agreements to be valid and that furthermore there were majorities at that time at the school board who would not give such aid. What happened as a result — (Interjection)— Pardon me? I'm sorry I didn't hear. Mr. Speaker, the Minister said, the Communist. Mr. Speaker, how would he classify — (Interjection)—

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

**MR. MERCIER:** On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, I said the Communist singular.

**MR. GREEN:** It is the first time that I've ever heard that on a board of nine that one person is the one that controls the board. There must have been five votes. Is the Minister saying that the Communist vote was better than the other four that voted against it? It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, because that's the kind of insidious statement that is made. Now, Mr. Speaker, my position is obviously the Communist position, according to the Minister. Because I am taking this position and a Communist took it, it

---

Friday, 30 May, 1980

---

obviously, Mr. Speaker, means that the people who wish to maintain and to have in Manitoba a public school system which will not deteriorate in the face of an encroaching private schools system, who believe that the best avenue in our society for diversity is to have that diversity reflected in the public system, and that all children from all walks of life and all races, creeds and religions find a common public school system which reflects their diversity. That is Communism.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, I'm sure the Member for Inkster would want to know it . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the honourable member has a point of clarification he should raise it at the end of the debate.

**MR. MERCIER:** A matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

#### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of privilege.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, my comment was purely and simply that the Communist member of the Winnipeg School Board was one person who had voted against it, it was no implication against or suggestion of a political viewpoint against any other person who takes a similar position to the Member for Inkster.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** I fail to see how we can deal with a matter of privilege when the member is not speaking. Interjections are not supposed to occur to begin with and if the honourable member has a problem with a conscience in respect to his interjections, he can get up and make his own speech. I think it is very unfair to interrupt another member who is trying to make his speech and then to continue to keep interrupting on matters of privilege or clarifications which he's not entitled to have from the beginning because he should not have made an interjection.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. With the honourable member on the point of privilege. I want to thank the Honourable Member for Kildonan for raising some very valid points which I hope all members pay strict attention to. The Honourable Government House Leader did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

#### BILL NO. 31 — THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT (cont'd)

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable House Leader's interjection is far more revealing and more far more valuable to this House than most 40-minute speeches, that's the point, because as hard as he will

try to get out of it, he has now indicated that the reason that the Winnipeg School Board didn't want to approve of these agreements is not because the trustees felt a certain feeling about how a public school system was operated but because there was a Communist on the board.

Now I want to tell the honourable member that when Duff Roblin was the Premier of the province of Manitoba, the big resistance to him going ahead with public aid to private schools came from Fred Drove. Was he a Communist?

**A MEMBER:** Yes, he's a Communist.

**MR. GREEN:** Oh, he's a Communist. Mr. Speaker, he was the main opponent within that party. But let me say further, Mr. Speaker, a majority of Conservatives were against the provision of public aid to private schools, a majority of Conservatives. Was there, Mr. Speaker, one Communist in their ranks that put them all that way, is that what the member is saying? Well, Mr. Speaker, we heard what he said and we know the intention that he made the remark, the intention that he made the remark was to indicate that those people who are on this question opposed to it were Communists.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know, the member is going to have to explain himself as to what else the remark could mean. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to be deterred from my speech. The fact is that the Winnipeg School Board would not vote for these agreements. The interesting thing is that when the government changed the legislation, ostensibly not to provide public aid to private schools but simply to make it possible for a school division to hire a private school to do certain work within the system, the Winnipeg School Division at the very next meetings that it held — I don't know if it was the next one — but at subsequent meetings, they didn't say we have an option. Do you know what they said? People who had been voting against this question for years, they said, Mr. Speaker, and I say it was a cop-out but that's the way people behave, the government has now said we must do this. That's what they said. I read Mr. Slingsby's remarks in a newspaper. Mr. Slingsby, who for years as a school trustee, had taken the position that he would not do this. He said the government has required us to do it and we have no choice. That's the position that was taken. Now, Mr. Speaker, some of these school divisions obviously felt that the government was putting them in an unfair position. The Minister, yesterday, indicated that MAST, the group representing the trustees, came to him and said they don't want this responsibility. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, they did not feel that they wanted to vote money to these schools on their own responsibility and therefore the Minister's legislation was a failure.

Now if the Minister's legislation was a failure, and he said he wanted to provide an option and the people said that they didn't want the option, obviously the way of handling it would be to withdraw the legislation. Since his stated position was that he would not legislate in order pay money to private schools; since he wanted to give the school divisions an option, and the school divisions said they didn't want the option, he should have brought in a bill cancelling the previous option. But

that is not his intention, Mr. Speaker, and that's where the sleight of hand comes in. So this year there is a new sleight of hand. The Minister brings in a bill saying that the province can deal directly with the private schools, and in answer to questions as to whether this is a change, he says it's not a change, it's an administrative change. That's his answer, Mr. Speaker. More sleight of hand. It's not an administrative change; it is an indication that the provincial government will fund directly private schools. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we talking about when we're talking about the private school system, because I have never opposed the right of citizens in the province of Manitoba to say, that although there is a public service available, they choose to have a private service which they will pay for themselves. I have never opposed that in any area, and there are many areas in which it's used.

We have a public school system, Mr. Speaker, at the post-secondary level; we have a university system heavily subsidized, almost paid for by the state. I have never said, Mr. Speaker, that a person wishing to get a college degree has to go to the public system. I have said that if they want to set up a private system, they can do so, and if there is not one that they set up and they want to go to Harvard Law School, they can do so. It is quite a different thing saying that they can do so, as against saying that certain of their taxes go to support the post-secondary institutions, the university institutions. Since they are not using them, they would like to withdraw those taxes so that they could use them to pay to Harvard Law School. Because that's the issue, Mr. Speaker. There is absolutely no desire on my part to say that people cannot set up what they want as their own service, but they have full responsibility to maintain the public service. There is no incentive to reduce that responsibility by giving any kind of rebate or any kind of allowance out of public funds to those people who wish to use that system.

There are many of other areas, Mr. Speaker. We provide numerous recreational areas to the people of the province of Manitoba. We provide Assiniboine Park; we provide other areas. If a parent came in and said, Assiniboine Park is not to my liking, I don't like the ambience. I want to have an ambience which is related to my religion. I want to send my child all summer to a religious institution. Can I please have back that money that you have taxed me for recreational institutions in our society and give it back to me so I can use it to send my child to this institution?

Or, Mr. Speaker, let us say a citizen comes to the conclusion that the entire medical system is based on quackery, that he believes that there is a medical system — and indeed, Mr. Speaker, now I'm not talking hypothetically, Jehovah's Witnesses do not believe in blood transfusions; Christian Scientists do not believe in much more. Will we say that the Christian Scientists who believes that his medical needs are looked after within his church, and that the church needs money, will we say to him, that amount of money that you have spent for Medicare, since you are not going to use it and we want you to sign that you are not going to use it, take the money out of taxes that you are paying to Medicare and you can pay it to your Christian Science Church? Do we say that, Mr. Speaker? We certainly don't.

Mr. Speaker, we can have certain people who say that I promise never to use a highway, I don't believe in highways. Highways are no good; they kill people. I, as a matter of conscience, don't wish to use the highways, and I'm going to stay within my house and I'm not going to travel on the highways. And every year you tax me X dollars for highways. I will undertake not to use the highways. Can I have my X dollars back and pay it into my own living arrangements, where I can travel around on my section of land, rather than on the highways? That's where I choose to build highways to travel. Do we do it for anybody, Mr. Speaker? No, but the Minister and this bill is not the end of it, just as Mr. Roblin's statement is not the end of it. The end of it, Mr. Speaker, and the stated end of it by the people who are approaching him, the stated end, is the voucher system. The stated end is that for your taxation dollars, you will be given a voucher; you will be able to take that voucher and give it to any school that you want to. The school will turn in the voucher and the school will get paid that amount of money. That is the end of the system.

The Minister is smiling; he has no intention of going in that direction; without even leading us to believe, Mr. Speaker, he had no intention of going in the direction that the bill now is before us. He had no intention of going in the direction of last year's bill. We had no intention of giving public aid to private schools. Mr. Roblin had no intention of giving public aid to private schools. Every single one of these moves have been made with the stated intention that we are not going there; with the stated intention that we are going in a different direction. So when the Minister now smiles and says, that is not the direction, I smile and say, that's what was said every time they moved in this direction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I fully sympathize with people who do not wish to be bound to a public institution. I don't use every public institution, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that they have no right to demand to be relieved of the responsibility of that public institution. With regard to the school system, the potential danger is worse than anything that I have mentioned. Because what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, is the following: First of all, the major push on this issue 25 years ago, the major push, I suggest, and I'm only one person who gives his one opinion was with respect to the fact that there were French people in our community who largely attended French Catholic schools, because they were the only institutions in which you could really be educated in French, in your maternal language, and they felt quite aggrieved that the public system was financed and they were not financed. They felt every bit as much in French as being members of our society as the people who spoke English. The accident of it being associated with a Catholic school was something which is historical, because under the school system in Quebec, for instance, they never had a Minister of Education. There were only denominational schools in Quebec; there were no public schools. You either attended a Protestant school and a Catholic school, and the Roman Catholics, with all their generosity, said, if you are not a Catholic, you are a Protestant. That's what they said. Because they weren't going to set up a Jewish school system. So all of the Jews in Montreal

---

Friday, 30 May, 1980

---

were classified as Protestants for the purposes of school. Now they have changed that since, but there were only denominational schools. The same thing held true of Newfoundland. But, we, in Manitoba said we're going to set up a secular school system, and I will admit that no system is entirely secular. There is absolutely no such thing as complete neutrality of thought. I agree with that. But all I can do, Mr. Speaker, is try by saying that if there is various groups in our society, the closest that we will get to some kind of secularity, is by having all of those people within the school system. Mr. Speaker, it has worked. It has worked most dramatically with regard to the French language of instruction in the public schools.

I want to tell the Honourable Minister that my child attended a Winnipeg public school, totally in French, because the Winnipeg public school system decided that within the system they are going to have schools of diverse kinds. She went to school with Portuguese children, Italian children, Anglo-Saxon children, German children and French children, in the public schools at public expense. I paid my taxes, and that's the way it should be, that's the way it should be. But the Minister is going to promote a system, Mr. Speaker, which is going to see all of these diverse groups going to different schools. I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. They are going to eventually be forced to go there, because many of the people involved who are seeking that type of education are more sophisticated and will play a greater role in the quality of the school. What they will do, Mr. Speaker, is say, well, if the public system is not going to do this, I am forced to go to the private system. The private system will become more better and better, and the public school system, Mr. Speaker, will be more and more the repository of those people who have no power, who are less sophisticated, who have no influence and who, therefore, Mr. Speaker, are not as clearly concerned with the goals of the education as others, and I make no criticism of this. I say that is the way it will happen. The process will then become accumulative. The more that happens to the public system, the more people who will say, if my child is to get an education, I have to send him to the private system, the more the Minister will be pressured to take funds out of the public system and put them into the private system. The public system by this procedure will become the garbage can of education in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it; I want you to know I have heard it, I have heard the expression, I do not wish my children to go to school with Indians. Mr. Speaker, I wish my children to go to school with Indians, but I don't want it to be a secondary school system. When I have trustees on the Winnipeg School Division who make it their policy of taking money and sending it to the private schools and then denying the public schools, I know that the end result is to make the public school system the second-class school system in the province of Manitoba. Who are we going to now finance? We are going to finance, we are financing St. John's-Ravenscourt; we are financing Balmoral Hall; we are financing the Hebrew schools, Ramah, the Peretz School; we are financing the Mennonite school, all of which schools, Mr. Speaker, are good places, but they represent a more sophisticated clientele, a more

sophisticated parentage, who then lose interest in the public school system.

We will create, sure as God made little apples, we will create an elite system and then you can throw all your human rights' legislation out the window. They won't ask you what religion you are; they won't ask you what school did you go to. Are you going to prohibit an employer from asking a prospective employee what school they went to? I mean, is that the extent that you are prepared to go to with human rights' legislation? Never, and society will be put into two classes. Mr. Speaker, if there is ever any question which more pertains to the egalitarianism of our society, it's the question of the school system. It's my belief as I understand the word socialism — and everybody understands it differently — you can accomplish no socialism under a class school system. That is the antithesis of any move towards a socialist egalitarian society. And I, Mr. Speaker, regret very much that my New Democratic Party has had a significant role in this development. And the reasons for it are very complex but nevertheless we had a role.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make a proposal to the Minister and this really is the gist of my remarks. I suggest to the Minister he can prove that I am wrong; that he doesn't wish to set up an egalitarian system; that he doesn't wish to do these things; that he does not want it to go where I am going. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that any school that receives public funds not have any more money spent on its educational process than is spent within the public system. That once the school becomes elitest in terms of the amount of money that's spent within the system, that it receive no public funds whatsoever.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, that any school that receives public funds have a policy that it will be first-come, first-served; that there will be nobody rejected on the basis of the fact that the student is not desired because they wish to maintain higher levels or other levels.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, that there be full funding provided that there is no tuition fee to the person who wishes to attend the school. So that a person can walk up to those schools that the Minister is going to fund, say, I wish to go to this school; I wish to go to it on the same basis as I'm going to a public school; I wish to be treated equally to any other student; I wish to come in first-come, first-served. And that the parents — except, Mr. Speaker, you cannot control things such as teas, you cannot control small fund-raising efforts, but that there are no additional funds that go into that private school. Because right now, Mr. Speaker, that is not the situation. The private schools reserved the rights to accept a student or not to accept a student and yet they're getting public funds. The public schools can't do that. The public schools can't say, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourble member has four minutes.

**MR. GREEN:** The public schools can't say, well, we want to show that we are better schools, therefore we're going to keep out the slow, the retardates and the children with learning problems or the

emotionally disturbed. But the private schools can say it, and they're getting public funds. The private schools now charge a tuition fee. So that you set up a standard where it immediately becomes — even if it becomes the university-type of farce — that the poor pay for the education of the rich. Because we've paid 85 percent of post-secondary education, if not more — maybe 90 percent — but we put on as much of a tuition fee as to keep the poor out, which means that we use the poor people's taxes to subsidize those who can afford the tuition fee. That's what's going to happen with the private school system. There'll be a tuition fee and then public funds; the tuition fee to keep people out; the public funds to subsidize the rich. That's what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker. You will create the kind of elitism that I am talking about.

So I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, first of all that this bill, insofar as it relates to the public going in the direction in which it has always said that it is not going, be defeated; that either it be defeated on second reading or that it be defeated in committee. I am certainly prepared to defeat it on second reading even though the Minister will accuse me of voting against other good things, because the Minister can't say he won't bring in the other good things if this measure is defeated. So you cannot, Mr. Speaker, intimidate people by saying, well look what you're voting against. I am saying that you cannot make that kind of proposal and expect the members of the Legislature to be intimidated into voting for it. If it goes through committee, Mr. Speaker, then it certainly can be defeated, insofar as those particular sections are concerned, at committee.

I would call, Mr. Speaker, on members of the Legislative Assembly to direct their attention to what is happening here. It's one, Mr. Speaker, of those insidious things where you move without knowing that you are moving. I put it, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is standing on the corner of Portage and Main and he says that he is walking towards the Bank of Canada because he is facing the Bank of Canada, he is facing east; but he's walking backwards and he's going to Hudson's Bay and he keeps saying, look, I'm going to the Bank of Canada. Can't you see I'm looking at the Bank of Canada? But each minute he's getting closer to Hudson's Bay. That's what's happened with this legislation. We've been walking, Mr. Speaker, facing west and going east on the pretence that people don't know which way we are walking. I assure the Minister that whether he is looking west or not, he is travelling east; and whether he keeps on saying that he is not doing this, every change in direction that he takes, no matter which way he is looking or pretending to look, he is going in the direction that I am talking about, which is a dangerous direction, Mr. Speaker, and a wrong direction and will . . . Perhaps the Minister said other people are doing this. Yes, I suppose you can say, Mr. Speaker, that this province has no intention of trying to create something better, it merely wishes to go along.

When I went into politics it was on the basis that there are people out there who want something different, who want loyalty to everybody, not to the people who have most pressure over them. I've tried to maintain that loyalty, Mr. Speaker, and this may be presumptuous but I say that from my point of

view, if we go back and listen to the people who sent us here and are loyal to what they request, we would not be passing this type of provision.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak on this bill today but I do want to completely clear the record because I know the Member for Inkster does not believe what was perhaps . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. Is this a point of clarification?

**MR. MERCIER:** No. I'm speaking on the bill, Mr. Speaker. I didn't think I was entitled to three points of clarification, Mr. Speaker. I want to clearly indicate that simply because the Member for Inkster referred to a comment I made from my seat, which I should not have made, that a Communist member of the Winnipeg School Board had voted against approving a funding agreement with private schools, that I meant to imply in any way, shape or form that someone who opposes financial assistance to private schools is any way associated with a Communist party. I'm sure that, despite our government having brought forward the bills we have brought forward in past years, that I'm sure if you went out you could probably find a member of the Progressive Conservative Party who might disagree with the position our government has taken. I know you could find members of the Liberal Party who are divided in their views on this subject matter. Members opposite in the NDP Party have clearly evidenced their disagreement on this question in past votes, I believe in 1978 and '79, when there has been a divergence of viewpoints and votes taken with respect to the subject matter. So, Mr. Speaker, please let the record be clear that I, in no way, shape or form, meant to indicate that anybody who didn't support financial assistance for independent schools is in any way a communist.

Mr. Speaker, if I can make a few comments with respect to the subject matter raised by the Member for Inkster, I think it should be recognized that it is clear from the bill that independent schools must comply with the standards of the Department of Education; that the teachers employed in those schools must be qualified. What this does, as it does and has done under their government . . . — (Interjection)— What it does, Mr. Speaker, as it does in every other province in Canada, is allow for an alternative approach, an alternative school, an alternative opportunity for parents.

In effect, all this amendment does, Mr. Speaker, is, in view of the fact that all school boards during the past year or so under the previous amendment, have all simply passed on the money which our government was prepared to assist them with, and which the previous government was prepared to assist them with, has simply been approved by them and passed on to the individual school boards. So all that this amendment does is eliminate and clear up that administrative problem — not a problem, but a step in the procedure, because it was clear that the money was going to the school boards in any event. In this way it appears from past practice there's no

Friday, 30 May, 1980

necessity for the school boards to be involved unless there is a sharing of space, which comes under a different provision, so this simply cleans up the administration of the program of the previous government and which our government carried on.

Mr. Speaker, on another matter. The Member for Inkster refers to St. Johns Ravenscourt and Balmoral School. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that he would have been aware of a large number of independent schools in this city and I'm sure outside the city, who in no way, shape or form can be classified as schools for the privileged or schools for the rich. Other members can cite to him a number of smaller, in some cases the ones that I'm familiar with, are parochial schools. I think of our Lady of Victory, in not a rich area at all, Mr. Speaker, where people and their parents feel that it is worthwhile in their viewpoint to make a sacrifice, to pay a little extra to provide their children with the kind of education that is given in those schools. In many cases, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that is implied or explicitly made that children attend these schools for religious reasons is in my experience simply not correct. There are many parents in this province today, who feel that it is necessary that there be an alternative to the public school system. That, I suggest, is perhaps good for the public school system. —(Interjection)—

The fact of the matter is that many parents whom I have talked to send their children to an independent school because there is more discipline provided in some of those schools than there is in the public school system. If that's the case I think that's an opportunity that should be welcome, that they should be available to them if they wish. There are also many parents who feel, quite legitimately, that in some independent schools there's a greater emphasis, an accent placed on studies, that their experience has been that their children have not received in the public school system. Mr. Speaker, from an economical point of view it is simply apparent from the figures that it's cheaper from the public's point of view for a child to receive his education in an independent school rather than a public school. It simply doesn't cost the public as much money, if that is to be an argument advanced by the Member for Inkster or anyone else who agrees with his point of view.

He refers to it as an insidious program. Mr. Speaker, this insidious program is carried out in every other province in Canada that I'm aware of, and this is the last province in Canada — (Interjection)— Well, I stand to be corrected. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in a majority of the provinces then, that I am aware of, and we were the last province in Canada to provide any kind of funding arrangement to assist independent schools.

This is not in any way, shape, or form, an extravagant program. For the Member for Inkster to suggest that this is an insidious program, what are the effects of this insidious program that has been in affect in other provinces in Canada for so many years? I'm not aware of any and I don't think he can produce one iota of evidence to substantiate that allegation, Mr. Speaker, not one iota of evidence. I invite him, in fact, I challenge him, Mr. Speaker, to produce one iota of evidence that independent

schools in any other province of Canada have had an insidious effect, I welcome.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier I didn't come prepared to speak on this bill but I wanted to speak for the main purpose of clarifying my initial remark, a remark that was made from my seat. I hope that was made clear. I do want to, on this particular bill and the subject matter raised by the Member for Inkster, raise the opposite argument, Mr. Speaker, that what this program does is merely an administrative step firstly, to follow through with the same kind of program that the previous government was engaged in and to indicate that there are good and valid arguments, Mr. Speaker, for providing children in this province and parents in this province with an opportunity for an alternative system.

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. COSENS** presented Bill No. 19, The Education Administration Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, as an adjunct of the complete revision of the Acts relating to my department, it was necessary also to revise The Education Department Act, and I now refer to Bill No. 19 having to do with the new Education Administration Act and repeal of The Education Department Act.

The first significant change you will notice therefore is the change in title of The Education Department Act. It will now be known as The Education Administration Act. This is in keeping with The Executive Organization Act, which statute outlines the pattern for the administration of all the departments of government.

In the matter of definitions in this Act, we found it necessary to retain five of the six from the existing Act and add four more for clarity and precision. Substantive changes are as follows: as certification of teachers is part of the jurisdictional responsibility of the Minister, courses leading to such certification should be subject to his approval, and this has been ensured in the bill.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the prescriptive powers of the Minister have been changed to matters of approval, which is more in keeping with present trends toward greater flexibility and local autonomy in our public school system. A Certificate Review Committee replaces the Discipline Committee. The Certificate Review Committee, as suggested in its title, is a committee to review cases

where a teacher's right to continued certification is questioned.

The Text Book Bureau and the Advisory Board remain constituted and substantively the same as in the existing Act. Minor amendments have been made to update them to current practices. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that we have deleted from the existing Acts, sections relating to the boards of conciliation and arbitration, as these matters are dealt with under the appropriate sections of The Public Schools Act. These then, Mr. Speaker, are the highlights in my introductory comments on Bill 19.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last evening we had a considerable amount of discussion with respect to the matter of field representatives. That, of course, was a discussion with respect to their powers or lack of same under the old Act. We are now talking about the proposed powers of the field representatives. Last evening we were told that field representatives are not a judge of jury. We were told about the independence of the local school divisions and school boards. We were told that the field representatives are not people who are out there to judge the teachers, it's not a matter of teacher evaluation. And this bill, Bill 19, refers, first of all, it defines a field representative. It means, a member of the staff of the department charged with responsibilities as set out in this Act and The Public Schools Act.

We then go to Section 6(2) of this Act, and it states that a field representative may suspend the certificate of any teacher for various activities or inactivities, including the breach of any regulation made under The Public Schools Act or this Act — any regulation. That is the kind of power that these individuals are being given by this Act. These people would have the right, even though they are not the judge and jury, as said by the Minister, for any breach of regulation, to suspend teachers' certificates in this province. It seems to me incredible that in this day and age we would give that kind of power to any individual, especially when that individual's function is not to evaluate teachers. It just doesn't make any sense whatsoever and I would certainly hope that that be one matter that will be reviewed and eliminated before we go any further with this particular bill.

One of the difficulties with the manner in which these bills have come before us is that on the day that the Minister expected to start his estimates, he dropped these bills on our tables, knowing full well that we were preparing for the estimates, and knowing full well that we didn't have any chance whatsoever to come into any kind of a realistic assessment of bills which are about 150 pages in total in a matter of a day or two. These things should have been presented several months ago so that we could have been debating them during the session and becoming familiar with them in order that we could make a response and discuss the estimates of the Minister, knowing what kind of administrative framework the education system would be working under in this province during the balance of this year.

Again, on the field representatives and their powers, I suggest that they are far wider than is necessary and I would hope that will be changed during Law Amendments.

Thank you.

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 33 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT**

**MRS. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia)** presented Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, members will recall that I announced a study of the library funding last May, and the resulting report highlighted a disparity in the library services between Winnipeg and the rural areas. It documented the fact that the provincial contributions in financing were certainly not keeping pace with that of the municipalities. It also served as a reminder that the municipalities were not getting treated equitably in all cases. It underlined the inadequacy of an establishment grant that discouraged large regional libraries from being formed. In brief, Mr. Speaker, it indicated the need for substantial changes in the province's policy on libraries.

In response to that need, my colleagues in Cabinet agreed to the recommendations that were in the report and as a result of that, the library grants for the rural areas will be enhanced some 50 percent in 1980. The honourable members here should note that Bill 33 supports the changes that were recommended in the report. It repeals the former establishment grant. It endorses the concept that cost-sharing between the municipalities should be determined locally. It gives the province the power to ensure that library funds are spent for library purposes. It gives local government districts with elected local committees the power to elect their own library boards, just as other municipalities are doing.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make it clear that the fact that Bill 33 indicates my department's commitment to enhance the cultural life of Manitoba. It's a life that is greatly enriched by the public libraries.

Thank you.

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

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

**Friday, 30 May, 1980**

---

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I think the next order of the House was to call adjourned debates on second reading.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND  
READING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Adjourned debate on second reading of Bills Nos. 9 and 12, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)  
The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** I understand the Honourable Member for Inkster doesn't want to speak and we are not prepared to deal with any of the other bills this morning, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is that agreeable? (Agreed) All second readings stand adjourned.  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, there was mutual agreement that Private Members' Hour would not proceed. I would be prepared to move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that the House do now adjourn. Noting how quickly the Member for Kildonan resumed his seat, I assume it's agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

**MOTION presented and carried,** and the House accordingly adjourned until 2:00 o'clock on Monday afternoon.