

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Friday, June 6, 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 . . .

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden the report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time, I would like to introduce to the honourable members, 30 visitors of Grade 10 standing from Elton Collegiate, under the direction of Ms. Laurie Shewchuk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Yesterday, the Minister of Labour indicated in the House during the question period, I quote from an unedited version of Hansard: What is taking place is that the Health Science Centre are the group that both parties decided to use as a sample. Since neither the MHO or CUPE had confirmed this statement to us, in fact both groups have indicated to members on this side of the House that the Minister's statement is inaccurate, can the Minister indicate whether or not he has been attempting to impose pattern negotiation process upon the bargaining that is taking place between MHO and CUPE?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I also went on to say yesterday that that certainly appeared to have some validity from appearance sake, because that's where both sides seem to have established most of their action, if you wish, as far as negotiating went. The co-ordinators of

the CUPE, of course, are the same people, and it's pretty obvious from the public perception that when they are using all their attention and all their efforts in that particular area at that particular time, that it seems to be part of their strategy.

I would also suggest to the House that it's not my business what their strategy is, or the Leader of the Opposition what their strategy is, even though he seems to be trying to get involved in their strategy; suggested to the House a couple of days ago that he was in here speaking on behalf of them. Well, I haven't officially heard that that is the case, but he seems to be involving himself in their strategy to some degree.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, since the Manitoba Health Organization and CUPE are involved in some areas of negotiation which are quite different from the areas of negotiation involving the Health Sciences Centre and CUPE, for instance the area of contracting out, can the Minister indicate whether or not he is making any efforts whatsoever, to ensure there is a resumption of bargaining involving MHO and CUPE, that they are two separate matters involving some separate areas of disagreement, is the Minister responsible for industrial peace in the province of Manitoba making any efforts to ensure that there is some resumption of bargaining after the eight day lapse which has taken place between CUPE and the MHO?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it's not my position as Minister of Labour to establish the strategy that CUPE seems to want to use, or whatever strategy they wish to use. Maybe it was, as the Leader of the Opposition indicated part of their strategy for him to involve himself in this House. I think a gentleman called Eugene Kostyra showed a lot of people in Manitoba what he thought of this part of the strategy with the Leader of the Opposition, when he probably came to believe in the old proverb that you don't send a boy to do a man's job, so he came down here the other day to do his own job.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour by way of further supplementary. When is the Minister of Labour going to develop his own strategy in order to bring about some industrial peace in the province of Manitoba pertaining to the existing work stoppage? It's time for the Minister to continue to relate to the strategy of CUPE, the strategy of the Opposition in this House. The Minister is part of a government which is responsible for health care in the province, it has been his government's actions which have brought about the present impasse. When is the Minister going to get off his posterior and develop some of his own strategy pertaining to the present impasse in the province of Manitoba?

Friday, June 6, 1980

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party strategy is very clear, that's to allow the parties to negotiate in a process that they appreciate and that they live by, that they sort of enjoy. Both parties that I know of don't particularly appreciate interference from third parties. The problem with the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is very obvious. The only person on that side of the House that was in his party that understood any negotiation strategies or policies or philosophies is now sitting over here as an Independent. That's the problem with their party today. They don't have anybody left over there that understands the process.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister. The Minister referred to CUPE and its strategy and breaking off the negotiations. Would the Minister be able to confirm one fact to this House, that the negotiations indeed were broken off by MHO and not CUPE, a week plus one day ago?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult trying to communicate with the members opposite. During the negotiating process, for reasons known to either party, they may break off, and that I just want to repeat, for reasons known to both parties, not that I am part of that situation. It is up to them to establish their own strategy and whatever took place is their business. Now if the Leader of the Opposition has more questions —(Interjection)— If the Member for The Pas has some, he knows even less than the rest of them, Mr. Speaker. Who else? Maybe there is somebody else over there, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. I understand the First Minister will be meeting with his provincial counterparts and the Prime Minister of our country. I wonder whether the Minister can assure the House that the traditional position of Manitoba, namely that there will no restriction on our national government being able to participate as they have in the past in initiating health care programs throughout the country, hospitalization programs throughout the country, contributions to post-secondary education throughout the country, that the First Minister will not participate in any attempt to erode these national initiatives and the possibility of them taking place in any new constitutional changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I had occasion the other day to respond to a somewhat similar question from the Leader of the Opposition. I would refer my honourable friend to the response I made at that time, but with particular reference to the traditional positions of the various governments of Manitoba, I can assure my honourable friend that the present government of Manitoba will be in support of those traditional positions. We do believe, as we have stated on many occasions, in the continuing need for a strong central government in Canada, and in the continuing need at

the same time, having regard to the contemporary situation in this country for regional and provincial jurisdiction to be clarified in a number of areas, such as resource ownership, such as communications, such as direct and indirect taxation, areas that have to be clarified in the present Constitution.

I can assure my honourable friend that the government of Manitoba will be looking after the best long-term interests of the people of Manitoba, as I know he would want us to do.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister on a related point.

Respecting the concept of provincial ownership of resources, would the Minister also assure the people of the province of Manitoba that the national government will be able to protect all Canadians in the event of resource policies, which would ensure that all Canadians have some power with regard to the distribution of wealth resulting from some resources, whether it be hydro power or petroleum oil; and would the Minister also assure us that the national governments will still be able to protect all Canadians, particularly the citizens of Manitoba, where one province controls a commodity which is the life-blood of all of the other provinces and where that commodity is not subject to the free market control of prices?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first portion of my honourable friend's question having to do with, generally with the concept of equalization, my honourable friend will appreciate, of course, that that concept is not part of the written Constitution of Canada, has not been, and we are engaging shortly, the Minister of Finance in particular, in renewed discussions on the formula for equalization, which is, of course, Mr. Speaker, a principle that was agreed upon by the provinces and the federal government some 40-odd years ago, one of the principle exponents for that principle being one of my distinguishes predecessors, the Honourable John Bracken. The present incumbent of the Premier's Office is no less dedicated to the principle of equalization than were any of his predecessors.

With respect to the details of resource ownership, there are a number of matters that can be discussed, most of which are non-constitutional, because the arrangements at the present time as between the government of Canada and the government of Alberta with respect to the domestic pricing of oil has nothing really to do with the Constitution of Canada. So I daresay that constitutional and non-constitutional matters will be discussed from time to time over the course of the discussions that we can expect to take place.

But I would remind my honourable friend that the resource ownership question is one that Manitobans, and thoughtful Manitobans, including many members of this House, are aware that the knife cuts both ways, and when the federal government makes statements, or by implication suggests that it is prepared to place federal government export taxes upon natural resource exports, such as hydro-electric power from the province of Manitoba, I can assure my honourable friend that we will be very very careful to protect the interests of the people of the Manitoba who have paid for every nickel that has

Friday, June 6, 1980

gone into the development of Manitoba Hydro, that great resource we have in Manitoba Hydro now and in the future, and we want to protect that investment of the people of Manitoba from any casual marauding by the federal Treasury.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, one further question with regard to this matter. I would question whether the Honourable Minister is aware that the federal government has never attempted to place an export tax on something which is subject to the free market and which is not being sold far and above its cost of production. That is a red herring insofar as hydro power is concerned.

May I ask the Minister, since he indicates that there is nothing in the Constitution about some of the matters that I have referred to, which I quite agree, that present constitutional law permits these things to happen, which is the beauty and flexibility of our Constitution, will the Minister assure us that nothing is written into the Constitution which will prevent what the federal government has done to now protect all Canadians with respect to the issues previously referred to, and which certain provinces, notably Alberta and Quebec, are striving very hard to get changed so that the national government could not offer the protection which it constitutionally offers at the present time without anything being written down?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without accepting in any way any of the premises of my honourable friend's question, because one has to be at the table and to hear the positions as stated by provinces such as Quebec, such as Alberta and so on, and my honourable friend will realize that those positions change from time to time. I wish I could assure him that Manitoba could guarantee what was going to be written into the constitution, because if we could, it would be a very forward-looking progressive document, and there would not be too many substantive changes in a number of the areas under which The British North America Act has served us and served us very well over the past 113 years. So my honourable friend will realize that I can't give him that assurance. All I can give him is the assurance that Manitoba and the government of Manitoba will strive to ensure that the constitutional discussions are carried on with full respect to the traditions, with full respect to the practices that have grown up, which have been beneficial to all parts of Canada without in any way restricting the development and the flexibility that may be necessary to meet conditions that we can't anticipate at this moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the fact that he informed us yesterday that he had received an interim report of the Assessment Committee back in March of 1980, and in view of the fact that the Minister informed us as well that he is in the course of preparing legislation based on that interim report, and in view of the fact that he is not prepared to release that interim report; and in view of the fact that many citizens of this province have

appeared before that Assessment Committee between March, and not knowing that that committee has already made up its mind, will he now tell that Assessment Committee not to bother going up north, not to bother holding its hearing in Winnipeg, because it's already made up its mind, and the government has already prepared legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Rossmere?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the fact that we are in a position where a committee appointed by his government has made up its mind before it has heard all the evidence, is he now prepared to dismiss that committee? Mr. Speaker, if any judge in this province were to make a decision on a court case before he had heard all of the witnesses, that whole matter would be dismissed. The case would be quashed immediately and I would ask the Minister whether he's prepared to do that in this particular case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last night in estimates, the interim report does not affect the terms of reference of the Review Committee.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that anyone who has appeared before that committee between the end of March and now must feel somewhat upset because of the fact that he or she has been talking to a committee which has already made up its mind but the committee has not told that person what its decision was, and in view of the fact that this government has now prepared legislation based on that interim decision, while there is still evidence coming in, will he at least agree at this point to stop preparing the legislation until the people from the north have been heard; until the people from Winnipeg have been heard; and until a final decision has been made by this committee if that committee is capable of changing its mind after having already told the government what it believes should be in the legislation?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the question was but, as far as I'm concerned, it's a bunch of garbage I'm hearing from the Member for Rossmere.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health. Would the Minister please give the House an up to date report on surgery in this city and in this province? Is all emergency and urgent surgery, including biopsies, is it all being performed as

Friday, June 6, 1980

scheduled, Mr. Speaker, and is there any further buildup of delay in therapeutic abortions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the situation is that certainly emergency surgery is being performed at maximum volume and the elective surgery slates, in many cases, have been reinstated. Work procedures at the Manitoba Cancer Treatment Centre are operating at full capacity with no reduction or no impediment. Therapeutic abortions are being performed and, in general, the medical chiefs of staff at the urban hospitals report to me that emergency and urgent medical care is being provided at the scope necessary to meet need and demand at this time. That is not to say that categories below those prioritized levels are not experiencing delay and difficulty. I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. WESTBURY: On another matter, Mr. Speaker, but to the same Minister, I filed an Order for Return on April 9th. The Minister asked me to withdraw it and stated that he would give me the information privately. It is now June 6th, and a few weeks ago the Minister told me that it was on his desk and I would receive it within a couple of days. When can I expect to receive this information, please?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the information requested by the honourable member is being compiled and prepared for her. There were some additions that were being sought to the original amount of information that was compiled. I can assure her that it is being handled by my officials in my office and is virtually complete for presentation to her.

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

MRS. WESTBURY: This is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that he and his Deputy made a statement to HUDAM, the Housing and Urban Development Association of Manitoba, to the effect that changes to the terminology of The Landlord and Tenant Act could not be made, were not possible at this time because of the government's commitment to translate all new acts into French, would the Minister advise us how much of the government's work it is not possible to complete because of its commitment to translate previous Acts into French? Or would he tell us — I hope he will — that this is not in fact what he said?

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

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, when I am able to decipher what my honourable just stated, I will then make an effort to answer that convoluted question.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister for Municipal Affairs if he will undertake that, before he brings in the legislation which he says he's going to bring in, as a result of an interim report, that that interim report will be made public so that both the Members of the Legislature and the public, indeed, could have the benefit of the advice given in the Interim Report of the Weir Commission. Can we have that undertaking from him?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to table that, hopefully next week sometime.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour, to ask him what channels of information does he use in order to familiarize himself and be able to speak in a knowledgeable way about the current strike situation involving health services?

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): The normal channels used by any Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Labour, in view of the fact that he has stated on more than one occasion that he has not received any report from his conciliation officer, would he care to indicate to those members on this side, who don't know the normal channels of the Minister of Labour, just what those channels are?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say I hadn't received a report. I said there was no need — I think the precise words in answer to the Leader of the Opposition was there was no need for a written report. It's a written report that I said I hadn't received.

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I refer to yesterday's unedited version of Hansard wherein the question, or part of the question asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was, and I quote: I assume that the Minister is indicating to us that he is aware of the progress of those negotiations without a report from his conciliation officer. I would ask the Minister to confirm that that indeed is the implication of the answer which he provided just a few moments ago. The answer by the Minister of Labour: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can go back and find other instances where the Minister has stated in the House that he has not received a report from the conciliation officer. A moment ago, Mr. Speaker, he said there was not a written report, no need for a written report. Mr. Speaker, we have had several allegations about misleading the House and I am

Friday, June 6, 1980

inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of what I heard last week and what I just read to you what was said yesterday, that the Minister, by implication today, has suggested that he has been receiving reports of the conciliation officer, but not in writing. On that basis, I believe that he has been misleading us, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask you to check on that.

Mr. Speaker, may I also point out, while I am on my feet, and I'm the only one on my feet, that the First Minister is still trying to run the House from his chair

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We can only deal with one point of order at a time.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, is the Member for St. Johns on a point of order? I don't know what his point of order is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: I did make a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You recall, you told me that you could only deal with one at a time, so I left the first one as being the one for you to deal with, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the questioning from the Opposition was relating to — I believe it was the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Churchill and the Member for Transcona — they were talking about the 30-day written report, and I have said that was not necessary. That's a point that has been debated here in the House.

The Leader of the Opposition asked yesterday: I would ask the Minister whether he requested a report yet from the conciliation officer involved in negotiations. My answer was: There is no need to request a report from the conciliation officer. I am talking about a written report and I'm of the opinion there is no requirement by law that I have that written report, under the same sections that the members are using opposite.

Surely to goodness the members opposite aren't naive enough to believe that I'm not aware of what is going on in the particular set of negotiations.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Further on the point of order. The Minister has now said that the Act provides for a written report to be filed. I don't read that in Section 98. In Section 98, it says, and I take excerpts: Each conciliation officer shall, within 30 days, make a report to the Minister. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the Minister has left the impression with the House that he has not received any report from his conciliation officer, a statement which I was inclined to disbelieve until now, and now he has indicated that I was right in doubting his statement that he did not receive a report. If he thinks it means written report, may he clarify it, and in that case, Mr. Speaker, I make a

further point that Section 98 provides that, there shall be a report. The Minister has indicated that he has not had a report, a written report, he said. I say there is a difference of interpretation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think he owes it to the House to clarify the situation regarding the report so that we know full well that he is not misleading us because, Mr. Speaker, I again am under the impression, from what he said, that he has been misleading us this last period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have always had a great deal of difficulty in this Chamber in understanding, or misunderstanding, the words of one another. I believe the Minister has given an explanation to the Honourable Member for St. Johns and I think that should solve the point of order.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Highways whether he can confirm that because of an instruction issued by his office, or his department, that a number of truckers were asked to leave the site of the construction project on Highway 391, in the area of Wabowden, and return back to their home base in eastern Manitoba because of a discretionary decision made by his department that they would not hire or condone the hiring of truckers from outside of that immediate area?

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Lac du Bonnet asked if instructions were given by my department to run off truckers from his area, from a job on 291. Mr. Speaker, there was no such instruction issued to run off truckers from his area, by my department.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister then take as notice the question, because there were nine trucks involved on a project on Highway 391 at Wabowden who located themselves there for the purpose of construction on that highway and were only there for three days, after having spent a considerable amount of money in moving their operations from eastern Manitoba to Wabowden, who were told that they cannot continue to work on that project because of some preference in the hiring of truckers in the north on the part of the Department of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I might remind the Member for Lac du Bonnet that under the Western Northlands Agreement, which was undertaken whilst he was a member of government, that contracts for road work in northern Manitoba contained a clause of northern hiring preference. Mr. Speaker, the allegations that the Member for Lac du Bonnet have made are not correct, that southern truckers from his area were run off the job, and that is just entirely not correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a final supplementary.

Friday, June 6, 1980

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would confirm a section in the agreement which reads as follows: In the employment of persons on the project, preference shall be given to northern people in all positions in the work force of a contractor; and if he confirms that, Mr. Speaker, would he at least investigate to determine whether or not those truckers who were turned back after having located there for that construction project, whether those truckers were not prepared to employ local people to the northern area?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I can provide the member with possibly a little more information that he is so desirous of receiving. That particular contract is a contract on carryover, which was not completed last year. As happens often with contracts, the main contractor will subcontract certain parts of work. Last year, and during the fall months, the main contractor subcontracted the heavy rock haul to a group of truckers located in and about the Wabowden area. This spring, when the completion of the contract was undertaken, the general contractor, once again, subcontracted out, but this time to a different firm.

That firm was reminded, Mr. Speaker, by my department, of the northern hiring preference, because of complaints received by truckers in northern Manitoba desirous of continuing on the same job that they had worked on last year. My department people informed the subcontractor that there was a northern hiring preference clause in that, and Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, the same truckers who worked on that project last year, on what they indicated was the dirty work of the haul, the heavy rock haul, the rock haul that was tough on their equipment, and they objected, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the easier haul then went to southern truckers after their equipment had received the punishing job, or done the punishing job of the rock haul.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is that my department reminded the second subcontractor that there was a northern preference clause. And he offered, Mr. Speaker, to engage local truckers, and all truckers were employed. All truckers, including the southern truckers, were employed on the gravel haul. Now, currently, Mr. Speaker, none of the truckers are working because there is a rock crusher which has broken down and no material is available for haul. So no truckers are working right now, including the northern truckers that were added to the haul job.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister would explain, by what magic wand, nine truckers, or nine trucks from eastern Manitoba found their way to Wabowden to enter into that project? Was it by chance or by happenstance, or by contract, Mr. Speaker?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea how they happened upon from his area to Wabowden. Neither do I happen to know, Mr. Speaker, how they have ended up from Wabowden to Lac du Bonnet, other than the fact that there is no longer any gravel haul going on up there, and possibly they don't want

to sit up there with no work to do when there is work to do in their area at home.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I would like to make a non-political statement this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member agreement? (Agreed)

MR. MCKENZIE: The people of Roblin constituency are rejoicing this month because of two very special Manitoba citizens who will celebrate the 100th anniversary of their birth in the month of June, which is rather unique in the province. In fact, they both come from the same area. So I'm sure all the members of the House would like to join me and the people of Roblin in conveying Happy Birthday greetings to Mr. Alfred Dixon, a Boer War Veteran, who will celebrate his 100th birthday on the 9th of June, and a Mr. Joseph Belski at Ethelbert, who will celebrate his 100th birthday on the 20th of June.

Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister of Highways whether he is prepared to investigate into the allegations that have been made publicly by these particular truckers, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, and whether he would report back to the House as to the circumstances, and why it is that they had located themselves in that particular construction project on Highway 391, and why it was that they were turned back after three or four days of work activity, and who is going to pick up the expense of their location in northern Manitoba and relocation back to eastern Manitoba?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the allegations that the Member for Lac du Bonnet refers to. But is the Member for Lac du Bonnet suggesting that there was no work available for those truckers on that job site?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made the point that the truckers were told that they could not carry on on that project because of a government policy, which was to give the northerners some preference, and therefore, that they could not continue on that project, even though, Mr. Speaker, they had entered into a contract with the subcontractor of that project. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the nine trucks involved, involving some four or five trucking companies, had an arrangement, a contract with the subcontractor on that project, who subsequently advised them that

Friday, June 6, 1980

he could not keep them any longer because of a directive from the Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, there have been expenses involved here, in moving these trucks to Wabowden and moving them back to eastern Manitoba. I would like to ask the Minister whether he is now breaking the province up into regions, and whether or not, Mr. Speaker, truckers out of the region would not any longer be able to compete for projects from one region to another?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member for Lac du Bonnet, when he was a member of Treasury Bench under the NDP regime in this province, was not aware of the northern preference contract clause in the Western Northlands Agreement that his government put in place, and now he is accusing, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House of fragmenting the province? Mr. Speaker, the man knows not of what he speaks.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to advise my honourable friend, the Minister, that I am very much aware of the work preference for northerners on northern projects, and I just, Mr. Speaker, completed quoting from the agreement in question, where it provides for such preference with respect to labour input . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member a question?

MR. USKIW: I certainly have. I want to ask the Minister whether or not he doesn't appreciate the fact that the truckers involved from eastern Manitoba, were prepared to employ . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order please. Questions of appreciation are somewhat difficult to handle in the question period. I do understand that when a member has unanimous consent, he can bring in a message of appreciation. Would the honourable member care to rephrase his question?

MR. USKIW: I would like to ask the Minister whether or not, before that directive was issued, that these truckers must leave that project because of a preferential arrangement with respect to contracts in northern Manitoba, whether the Minister firstmm or his department, ascertained whether those truckers were prepared to employ northerners with those trucking operations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lac du Bonnet is having some difficulty with this issue, this alleged issue, this non-existing issue. Mr. Speaker, my department draws up contracts; they tender the contracts and once the low bidder or a contract is awarded to a construction firm, a contract is signed in which certain stipulations and modes of procedure are laid out. After that fact, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the contractor to live up to the onus, to the intent and to the full agreement that he has signed. It is not up to my department to say anything other than abide by what is in the contract.

That is what has taken place. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that obvious the sub-contractor may not have been aware of the northern hiring preference in the first place. But I'm sure that the Member for Lac du Bonnet is not suggest that northerners do not and shall not participate in work in northern Manitoba. I don't think he's saying that, Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The time for question period having expired, at this particular time I should like to introduce to the honourable members 23 students of Grades 4 to 5 standing from Green Valley School under the direction of Ms. Lucy Martens. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

We also have 27 students of Grade 4 standing from Whitemouth School under the direction of Mr. Craig. 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.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, would you call second reading of Bills No. 37 and 38 and then adjourned debates on second reading on the bills as they appear in the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I presume we let the Order for Return stand in the name of the Honourable Member for . . .

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 37 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT ACT

MR. ORCHARD presented Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Highways Department Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 37 is intended to amend the Highways Department Act and just basically the Highways Department Act is the Act which controls certain activities on and about our highways and their right-of-ways. From time to time, Mr. Speaker, there are certain areas of the Highway Department Act that need clarification and need amendments to make sure that they are more clearly identified, the objectives of the Act are more clearly identified. Such is the case with Bill 37, Mr. Speaker, wherein we are proposing a more definitive definition, if I may, of the word structure, so that we can better define what should and should not be within the right-of-way controls on our highways.

Friday, June 6, 1980

Another area that is dealt with in the Highways Department Act is an addition of a prohibition against discharge of liquids into ditches along Department of Highway roads. The intent of this amendment is to control the use from time to time that is made of departmental ditches by residential subdivisions which are developed juxtaposed to our highways system in which they attempt to use our Highway Department drainage system along the ditches for their storm sewer drainage. This can cause us problems in terms of not having adequate design in our ditch system, so we are assuring that does not take place by this amendment.

We are also strengthening up the provisions of when trees and shrubs, etc. may and may not be planted juxtaposed to our highways. This amendment provides a prohibition of planting any trees or shrubs which will overhang onto a departmental road or highway. The only time that planting within a 50-foot distance of the highway is permitted is by ministerial order and any trees that are planted without ministerial order within that 50-foot control zone can be removed, Mr. Speaker, with the provisions of this Act without compensation to the owner should he have planted same without permission from the Minister of the Department of Highways.

Those basically, Mr. Speaker, are the amendments and the intent of Bill 37. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to deal with the first two or three amendments to which the Honourable Minister referred, namely, the clarification of the definition of structure or the amendments which would give him greater power and authority over the use of ditches, and particularly the misuse of ditches, and so forth. But there is one significant principle involved in this bill, Mr. Speaker, which cannot be allowed to go by without comment. In the existing legislation the portion of the Act dealing with the regulation and control over the planting of trees, shrubs and erection of structures close to a highway, etc., there is a very clear indication that if anyone should violate this section that it would be dealt with by the courts and, after a decision of the courts, the Minister is allowed to take certain action toward the removal of the obstruction, the structure, the tree, the shrub, etc.

But here in this bill, Mr. Speaker, we have something which is very much in keeping with the general character of this government as has been demonstrated over the past two-and-a-half years, this autocratic, despotic attitude of theirs, that they're going to run the whole show and to hell with the courts. Because here the Minister, without going to the courts, he wants the right to remove anything that is planted, placed, any tree, shrub or hedge within the 50-foot limit, without any compensation for any loss that may have been suffered by the removal, without first going to the courts, Mr. Speaker, without giving the owner of the land an opportunity to plead his case.

If you examine the bill, Mr. Speaker, this refers not only to the trees or shrubs but it could refer to anything within the 50-foot limit of a highway. I'm

sure the Minister knows and many of the members of the backbench know, because the majority of them, or many of them, are members of rural ridings. There are many cemeteries within the 50-foot distance of a right-of-way, many cemeteries. I'm sure that in every riding there are at least five or six or more cemeteries, in a rural area, outside a city, town or village, that a portion of which would fall within the 50-foot limit.

Is the Minister suggesting that if someone has a family plot within that area and wishes to plant a tree to beautify the place of rest of his relatives, that he must go to the Minister for a permit to plant a tree or a shrub, or whatever? Is the Minister suggesting, if he interprets this bill literally . . . And I know the Minister may say that there is a similar restriction now, but just because it is in effect now doesn't make it right. Is the Minister suggesting that a person residing in a small community which is neither a city, town nor village but a hamlet, or whatever one wishes to call it, which does not have a municipal government of its own but is part of the administration of the rural municipality within which it is located, is the Minister suggesting that a person — and there are many such small hamlets alongside provincial trunk highways and alongside provincial roads, people living on 100-foot lots, landscaped right to the road right-of-way — is the Minister suggesting that a person living on such a lot cannot plant even a little rose bush in front of his livingroom window within the 50 feet abutting a provincial road? I would hope not.

Anyway, that is not really my main concern, the 50-foot restriction. My main concern is the manner in which the Minister proposes to administer this Act. The Minister is saying, the hell with the courts, I'm not going to rely on a decision of a judge because the judge may rule in favor of the property owner. The Minister wants a right to go on his own, whenever he feels like it, and pull up the trees, pull up the shrubs, go into the cemeteries and smash the bodies and remove them wherever he wants to, without going to the courts.

Is the Minister going to tell Old St. Andrew's Church — Old St. Andrew's Church, for the information of the Minister, because I don't think he is all that familiar with the geography of the province of Manitoba, other than the road between Carman and Winnipeg, Miami — which abutts upon a provincial road and is a historic site, is the Minister suggesting that if the management of the church and the cemetery wish to replace a tree that may have been knocked down by the wind, that they must go to the Minister on bended knee for a permit to replace that tree? Is that what the Minister is suggesting? And if they don't, then the Minister wants a right to go in there and yank that sapling out, without any notice to the owners, without any compensation, without any recourse to anyone. — (Interjection)— No, no, not this Minister.

I think that there is some truth to the fact that that little platform on the front steps, that that's there for a very definite purpose, not meant to be taken down. That's for the daily march past and so forth. In fact, it's going to be named — yes, it will be named after the nickname of your First Minister and it's going to become known as the Red Square out there with that little platform, you know, the saluting base and

Friday, June 6, 1980

so forth. Only I would suggest it be raised to the second storey, for two reasons: It gives you a better view and it's safer up there too; it gives us a better opportunity to duck.

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood, who is not in his seat, he's chirping about something or another, well, he'll have an opportunity.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, when we heard a comment about the muffled cadence of jack boots, it's the muffled cadence of jack boots that the people of Manitoba are hearing in this piece of legislation. To the Minister, it appears to be very very innocuous, but giving himself that right to march onto anybody's property with his tape measure and measure off a distance of 50 feet and if anything is planted there, yank it out, that the people object to.

Anyway, in a sense I'm glad. I'm glad that the Minister has come forth with legislation of this kind because, as the Honourable Member for St. Johns mentioned to me, they do it to people, so why shouldn't they do to plants? That's true, even before they became the government, they did it to people. So now they are simply continuing that practice and reaffirming their position and their attitude that what they have done to people and what they are doing to people, they are also prepared to do to plants.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Member for Burrows has touched upon the major points of this legislation. However, there is another section that I wonder if the Minister would be able to comment on, and that is in regard to the first section, which indicates that no structure and all things constructed along a highway, and I'm wondering how he would view a dugout along the road allowance, if that is not a construction of some sort. Perhaps it should be looked at.

But I brought to the attention of the Minister a construction that is now in place six miles south of Ste. Rose by, I believe, some brick company, that have a 40-foot — I'm told, I've never measured this construction — but there is a hole within less than 50 feet, I would say. It's right up against the ditch, in fact, and there is no bank at all between this construction and the ditch and the highway. There are banks on either side of this construction, but there is a hole that I am told is 35 to 40 feet deep and there is no protection whatsoever. I brought it to the attention of the Minister. Any vehicle that should leave the road and enter into that hole — and it's not a sloped or a gradual deepening of this construction, it is almost totally square — there would be absolutely nothing to protect any vehicle that would lose control, or if a driver lost control of such a vehicle, had a blowout or whatever and landed into this hole, it would be in the bottom of a hole that is approximately 35 to 40 feet deep.

I have asked the Minister to consider requesting the owner of this mine if they would not be able to erect some kind of a protection or fence, chainlink fence of some kind to show the danger. Even a motorcycle would be down in the bottom of this hole and it's a very dangerous situation that's been brought to my attention.

I would ask the Minister to consider the comments I've made in regard to the construction of dugouts and there are many such constructions, even by the highway themselves, and they go to a farmer and ask for a burrow pit to have material and in many cases this is very close to the road.

I would also ask the Minister, since there's another section here that indicates that there would be a prohibition for discharge of water into a highway ditch. I know that in many cases, and I think in the majority of the cases, the highways are constructed and the material that is removed from the side of the road allowance, the ditch in other words, that material is removed in order to make a grade and a road, and it's not the intent of the ditch to be a drainage ditch, as such. There are some that are designated as drainage ditches but there are those that are not designated as drainage ditches. But, Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of farm lands that have been drained, whether it's been done without a permit from the department or otherwise, there are many lands that have been drained and there are ditches made without any objections from the highways department. I have raised this question, I believe, in the House before and asked the Minister what were the regulations in regard to making all these ditches for drainage of farm lands into ditches that are not designed for drainage, and what does the Minister expect these farmers to do now? Does he expect these farmers, having been allowed to make all these ditches and drain some of their land off into road allowances, is he now saying that these farmers will have to now close off these ditches? He indicates also that no water or other liquid materials — into a ditch. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that practically every gallon of water that comes off a farm into a ditch will contain other material than water. We all know that with the new technology in farming there is more and more fertilizer being used on land and pesticides and whatever there is for beetles in rapeseed and so on, and we all know that the water that goes into a drain will contain other material, other liquids than water — diluted in water, for sure.

Now I can understand the objection of planting trees along a road allowance. My concern, Mr. Speaker, if this is not only the beginning of where a person has had a shelter belt planted, 50, 100 years ago — it takes 50 to 100 years to grow a nice tree, a conifer or an evergreen — if this is not just the beginning, Mr. Speaker, that very shortly the Minister will be coming in with legislation giving him the powers to go in and remove trees that have been there, and that people really value, and that are valuable. Some of those trees, I'm sure are worth hundreds of dollars to the people who planted them there. With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I find this particular section on the trees very objectionable because I am sure there will be a lot of people who will be upset with this particular section. I would ask the Minister, perhaps if he should look a little further into this particular section, and particularly the other one that I did comment to him on, particularly the construction that is at the Kergwenan corner where there is a 40-foot hole with no protection whatsoever. There's an opening in the bank and that's the only place it's open. Anybody that drives in there goes into a 40-foot hole and he'd better not

Friday, June 6, 1980

have his seat belt on when he gets down to the bottom. He's going to have to get out somehow.

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

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In perusing the existing legislation, and in looking at the amendments, and in listening to the Minister's few comments, I'm not in a position at this point to truly understand what it is that the Minister wishes to accomplish by these amendments and perhaps it will have to go to committee and we'll get more elaboration at that stage.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of concerns, not only with respect to the amendments but even with respect to the existing law as I understand it, and perhaps the Minister will be able to clarify for me when he closes debate. But we have here a number of sections that suggest that, except for a permit issued by a Minister and Section 15(1) of the existing law talks about a permit issued by the Minister, that for 125 feet distance from a right-of-way, no person can erect structures and so on, and then the amendments deal with trees, shrubs, and so on within 50 feet. All of these things are restrictions which I'm sure most Manitobans aren't aware that they exist.

Now if Manitobans were to be aware that they exist, I think what you would see is perhaps the lack of the beautification of front yards, yards adjacent to the highway system in that people would feel that they would be wasting their effort, and indeed a tremendous amount of expense, in trying to beautify and to landscape their properties alongside provincial highways. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if you travel down any highway in Manitoba you will see almost every farmstead, almost every residence along the highway, a fairly elaborate landscaping job, well treed, perhaps well sheltered, all of which could be removed at the discretion of the Minister without compensation as he suggests in his amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is, in principle, bad if that is the intent of the department. I don't know what the department hopes to achieve by that, although I recognize they've had these provisions for some period of time. Is it their expectation that should they want to expropriate additional right-of-way at some point that it would then not cost them as much in that expropriation and therefore reduce the costs of any upgrading of their highway system. If that is the intent, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's time to rethink that policy because I believe that it's too high a price to pay for that convenience. I believe that most Manitobans would want to encourage the beautification of their properties along roadways and that somehow should be built into our philosophy and our thinking when we are building public access or public highways for the convenience of Manitobans. I don't believe we should build into our laws disincentives against people, against the idea, of wanting to plant trees, to develop beautiful lawns, flower gardens, etc. along our roadways. Heavens, the roads are monotonous enough as it is without taking away from them, Mr. Speaker, the natural beauty and aesthetics that can be put there by man. It seems to me that if people go to the trouble and expense of beautifying the province along the

roadway system, that should be subject to compensation. Mr. Speaker, I would even argue, and I have to admit a conflict of interest here, I would even argue that, to the extent that people beautify the right-of-way, that should those structures or trees or whatever or lawns have to be removed that there is room, in my mind at least, for compensation. Because what are we doing, we are enhancing the image and the beauty of our province through these efforts, Mr. Speaker, and they should not be efforts that are subject to penalty. They should not be subject to penalty. I don't believe that anyone in this Assembly, thinking this through, would want to discourage people from beautifying the landscape right up to the pavement, along the provincial highway system. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do have a conflict of interest in that regard because that's precisely what we have done at our own place along the provincial road. We have developed our landscaping to blend in with the highway ditch; we've erected structures to beautify the otherwise eyesore that was there, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me, although it's a conflict of interest at this point for me, that I believe most Manitobans would agree with me that, to the extent that people are willing to spend their own money, their own time, to beautify Manitoba that I think they should not be penalized. I would hope that the Minister would reconsider the existing law which restricts that kind of development and improvement to 125 feet from the roadway, as well as his new proposals with respect to trees and shrubs which he proposes to restrict up to 50 feet. Now if the Minister would tell the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, the Assembly, that if a permit is issued, and perhaps that is the way it works and perhaps it's my ignorance, that if a person receives a permit to make these improvements, whether any subsequent demolition is then subject to compensation. If he could at least go that far and say, yes, if we provide the individual with a permit to make such improvements and we subsequently want to demolish or destroy those improvements, for whatever public purpose, that those improvements will be compensated for. If he could tell us that then maybe, Mr. Speaker, I could accept what is being proposed and not only what is being proposed, perhaps I could accept what is in the existing statute. But I believe that there is a need for a thorough review of the whole philosophy.

To me this smacks of convenience to bureaucrats, Mr. Speaker. The ease of authority, the ease of right-of-way, the ease of entry disregarding the consequences of the same. I don't believe that we should capitulate to that kind of bureaucratic pressure. I know that it's very nice for the person that has to maintain the highways program to have the knowledge that he can trespass and cause damage without fear of recrimination because there is provision in statute that gives him the right to trespass on those grounds. But, Mr. Speaker, there are important things than the convenience of people who are working in the field and in this area I don't think that I can stress too much the importance of developing our natural beauty and aesthetics throughout the countryside that all Manitobans would enjoy. So with those few comments I would hope the Minister would take some time to review that policy and if I am incorrect, to at least correct me,

Friday, June 6, 1980

that perhaps my fears are unwarranted, Mr. Speaker, and we would be pleased to hear from him just what he has in mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 38 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. ORCHARD presented Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Bill No. 38, Mr. Speaker, contains a number of amendments which are housekeeping amendments and as such they don't change any principle of law. As well, Mr. Speaker, Bill 38 contains some innovations that we think will be of benefit to Manitobans. Some of the housecleaning changes, Mr. Speaker, are the elimination of legislative provision for commemorative centennial plates and some parts of the clause which pertain to the old chauffeurs and what not, the drivers licence system prior to the introduction and complete establishment of our class licence system now. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members will note that we are removing slide-in campers from registration under this amendment. That is a move, Mr. Speaker, which is deemed advisable because the original intent of registration of slide-in vehicles has by past years review not achieved the necessary function that it was thought to be able to achieve. As such, the registration of slide-in campers has been a penalty by the very fact that the cost involved and the effort involved has been somewhat of a penalty to the vast majority of Manitobans owning slide-in campers in an attempt to prevent what was thought to be a small group of people who may have been purchasing slide-in campers from out of the province of Manitoba and hence not paying sales tax. The cost involved to the majority of Manitobans who were honestly and legitimately operating their slide-in campers was deemed too high for the very marginal and somewhat unidentifiable benefit of catching those very few who may have been bringing campers in from other jurisdictions.

We have another amendment, Mr. Speaker, which will be of benefit to the trucking industry. Currently we require registration of trailers every year. Now as anyone who is familiar with the trucking industry knows, those trailers are not for use only in Manitoba but rather can be distributed across all of Canada, indeed across all of North America. Come the due date for registration it takes a considerable effort on behalf of the owner, No. 1, to track down that vehicle and, No. 2, to make sure that the new registration plate gets to that vehicle. What we

propose with this amendment is the ability to establish regulations to change the length of period of time for which a registration of a trailer may be applicable.

Another amendment, Mr. Speaker, is of great benefit to those purchasing cars or vehicles outside of the province of Manitoba. Every province has the ability right now to issue an in-transit permit to a purchaser — and I'll use an example of an Albertan buying a vehicle in Manitoba, he would obtain from our registrar an in-transit permit which would be good only to the Manitoba border. Upon crossing the Manitoba border he would be required to purchase an in-transit permit in Saskatchewan. Now not always is that available and there have been instances where that person, upon entering Saskatchewan, was issued a ticket because he was driving an improperly registered vehicle. What we are achieving with this amendment is the ability that an in-transit certificate issued in Manitoba shall be good in all jurisdictions crossed to destination. This is an amendment that has been requested by all provinces and the Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Administrators has agreed that this shall be enacted in all provinces and it will be of great benefit to our automotive dealers and to our motor car purchasing public.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of rail-line abandonment many farmers are finding that they have to haul their grain increased distances. Many of those farmers do not have, Mr. Speaker, trucks of adequate size to accomplish that job economically. We are allowing, by legislative amendment in this Act, that farmers who lease a truck for a period of time in the year to accomplish the hauling of his grain shall be able to register that truck as a farm truck and enjoy the benefits of a farm truck registration such as a lower insurance fee and the ability to use dyed non-road taxed fuel. That will be an amendment, Mr. Speaker, that is very much welcomed by our farm producers in areas where they have been grossly affected by rail-line abandonment.

Mr. Speaker, an anomaly has always existed in the application of drivers' licences whereby minimal proof of identity was required. What we intend to do now with this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to prescribe by regulation what type of identification shall be required by a person applying for his first driver's licence. Instances of fraudulent use of driver's licence and in fact fraudulent obtaining of driver's licence are becoming somewhat more common and it is an oversight that we do not have prescribed by regulation, requirements of identification to assure that the person applying for the driver's licence is, in fact, that person and by this amendment we are going to develop those regulations.

Mr. Speaker, another amendment that is in this package is the sprucing up of the used car safety certificate requirement and under this amendment, Mr. Speaker, the current one is somewhat remiss in that it does not cover private auto sales; it covers used car sales from car lots. But the legislation has been easily avoided, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that it has not covered private sales. For instance, the Member for Kildonan may well purchase a car which does not have a safety certificate from a used car dealer which he cannot register until he gets such

Friday, June 6, 1980

certificate. If he chooses not to, under the present legislation, he may sell that car to his good wife and she may register it without the requirement of that safety certificate. What we are proposing by these amendments is that no one shall be able to register a used motor vehicle without that safety certificate and, Mr. Speaker, we believe that this will very much improve vehicle safety on our highways and provide protection to the consumer of used motor vehicles. Provisions will not apply to used cars or cars that have been inspected in the last three months by the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program nor will it apply to antique vehicles or mopeds.

We are providing an amendment in this bill, Mr. Speaker, an increase in length of 23 metres to the trucking industry. This provides uniformity across the prairie provinces in length. Currently we are somewhat shorter than the other provinces and Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, with this amendment, will be uniform and equipment travelling between those three jurisdictions shall not have to worry about that length restriction as an impediment.

We are increasing the slow-moving vehicle speed to 40 kilometres, the changeover in metric at 30 kilometres gave us what was equivalent to 18 miles per hour which was somewhat too slow for some of the farm tractors that are on the road who could achieve 22 and 23 miles per hour, so we are raising that to 40 kilometres to remove that anomaly. We are introducing parallel legislation regarding the sale of pneumatic tires in the province, parallel legislation which was enacted by the federal government at the request of the Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Administrators. Our parallel legislation will offer the final authority to the province to comply with those federal standards applying to importation of pneumatic tires.

Another amendment, Mr. Speaker, provides for the registrar to release to the Licence Suspension Appeal Board any medical record that is deemed necessary in the Licence Suspension Appeal Board or the Court of Appeal in making a decision as to whether a driver, appealing for remission of his licence suspension, is suffering from a medical problem. That, we think, will help, Mr. Speaker, to assure that people who are granted remission from driving are indeed not suffering from medical problems. The most common one that we are concerned about, of course, is alcoholism. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Now go back to Adjourned Debates on Second Reading, Bill No. 12, The Law Fees Act, Loi sur les frais judiciaires, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand.)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Defamation Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin. (Stand.)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 19, The Education Administration Act. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: We are not prepared at this time, Mr. Speaker, to deal with any of the other bills. Could we have them stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: I would then move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Environment, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

I would say and just confirm for the record, Mr. Speaker, following Municipal Affairs, the Department of Economic Development and Tourism will follow in Room 254.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Education and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Municipal Affairs.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, last night in a section of the Committee of Supply sitting after 10:00 p.m. the Member for Rossmere moved that Section 1.(a) of Resolution 93 be amended by reducing the salary of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to 1.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before committee is, moved by the Honourable Member for Rossmere, that Section 1.(a) of Resolution 93 be amended by reducing the salary of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to 1.00.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. USKIW: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a request for Yeas and Nays. Call in the members. The motion before committee, moved by the Honourable Member for Rossmere, that Section 1.(a) of Resolution 93 be amended by reducing the salary of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to 1.00.

A COUNTED VOTE WAS TAKEN the result being as follows:

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: Yeas 18, Nays 25.

Friday, June 6, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion defeated.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, if I might, just to correct an earlier statement I made on Monday, rather than Economic Development and Tourism, the Department of Finance estimates will follow in Room 254.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. We will return to Resolution 93 1.(a) — the Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last evening I had referred the Minister to a specific subdivision in the Fraserwood district of Manitoba, and I recognize that his staff is not here now, but his staff had indicated that there were 12 lots approved on Section 17. Since last evening I received further information that, in fact, there are another 28 lots have been applied for by one individual, and two lots by a second individual on that same section. That's a fairly massive development for a rural district which has had no development for some 30 years, and this is an area where I would hope that the Minister would consider bringing in some amendment to the Planning Act. It's never been in there, and I think it should be, and that is that there should be some notice to the adjoining landowners, for say, a mile or two surrounding a proposed subdivision when you're dealing with rural land, because the local farmers surrounding this subdivision had absolutely no notice of the application or of its consideration until it was a fait accompli.

Now, they could have, had they watched their newspapers very, very carefully and read the minutes of the local council meeting, they would have discovered that council had, at a certain point in time, approved this 12-lot subdivision, for instance, and then later on, it would have gone to the Municipal Planning Branch for approval. But they were not given specific notice, and it would seem to me that it would make sense that adjoining landowners who are farmers, should have the right to notice, so that they can have some input into the decision-making process, as well as the developer and the municipality and the Municipal Planning Branch.

In this particular case, we are now suddenly talking about some 40 lots, 42 lots, which I am sure the Minister will appreciate, in an area where there was no subdivision whatsoever, where for miles around all you had was farmland, all of a sudden to have sort of a new village created, is something that I think members from all sides would agree, that there should be some discussion of that by the local people — and it is true that the municipal council approved the 12 lots and may well have approved the 28 lots — but the local individuals who are going to be affected should also be consulted, and I would hope that the Minister would, in fact, consider bringing in legislation to permit that kind of, not

permit it, to require that kind of notice of such a massive development.

It may well be that such notice should not be required if a farmer wants to split off five acres for his son in order that his son can participate in the farming operation. I don't think we have to get that far into notice provision, but in this case, it had been 30 years since the LGD of Armstrong undertook any massive development, and again, the farmers were totally taken by surprise. In this particular instance, there are three farms surrounding this operation, they have over 5,000 acres jointly which they are farming, and no one, absolutely no one, sought their concerns. The Municipal Planning Branch didn't, council didn't, the developers didn't, and I'm not suggesting that's a departure from previous procedure. I'm somewhat familiar with the process and it's just never been brought to my attention before, that this is something that we are lacking in the Act, and I certainly would hope that the Minister would consider that type of change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass; Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 749,600 for Municipal Affairs—pass.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 40 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education, Resolution No. 53, Clause 4. Program Development and Support Services, Item (a)(1)Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, is the other committee meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon?

MR. MILLER: Is the other committee meeting, the Municipal Affairs committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe so. We are in committee now. I was seeking guidance from the House Leader. He didn't say that.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. KOVNATS: Item under discussion is Clause 4. Program Development and Support Services, (a) Division Administration, Item (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had a discussion last evening about the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy and I promised the committee that I would review my notes and get some information and inform the Member for River Heights and the Minister of what the facts were in relation of the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to duplicate any debate or be out of order but I did give that undertaking that I would obtain some more facts on it and I'm in a position to now.

Mr. Chairman, you might recall last night when we were discussing this that I had asked the Minister for

Friday, June 6, 1980

an explanation of the basis for the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy, and I believe that the facts that he gave me last night were not entirely correct. Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to get into this debate. We've had over several days of members or Ministers misleading the House. I don't want to do that. I believe that the Member for River Heights does not understand the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy or the basis for it and the Minister questioned my asking him for an explanation of it. If you will recall, Mr. Chairman, I said one of the reasons why I was asking that was that I suspected that many members of this House did not fully comprehend the basis for that Greater Winnipeg Education Levy. From what the Minister said to me and the Member for River Heights said to me, I am even more convinced that members of this House don't understand the basis of it, don't understand the full ramifications of the formula on which it is based. Had they done so, I am sure that an honourable member would have stood up in the committee last night and made it quite clear and educated the members of the House on the implications of it.

Mr. Chairman, I don't claim to be infallible. Very often I don't know all of the facts and I'm willing to listen to any other member who has the facts and is willing to explain. The Member for River Heights obviously didn't have the information or the facts and he contented himself with shouting from his seat that I was all wrong and that I should get my facts. Mr. Chairman, we will see who is right and who is wrong.

I want to ask the Member for River Heights whether he is aware of the affect that a portion of a school division, a rural area, what affect that has on the education taxes that he pays and his constituents pay. Does the Member for River Heights know what affect the school in Landmark has on one of his constituents living on Oak Street?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, can I suggest that we are now on Section 4. Program Development and Support Services, that we have completed the section dealing with educational finance, and I suggest that we have had some discussion, that we can move on to Section 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, the Minister is correct. We have proceeded on to Clause 4. It's on the point of order? Carry on on the point of order.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I began my remarks by pointing out to you, Sir, that I did not wish to be out of order or to repeat any discussion but that I had given an undertaking that I would seek out further facts and figures and bring them back for the information of the members. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that because you did not cut me off at that stage that I had your permission to continue the explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There could be all kinds of discussion on previous items brought up on a point of order and I would strongly recommend that if

there is any more discussion on items that have already been passed, that the honourable members make reference to them under Minister's Salary.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, would it be with your agreement that I would now give the information that I promised last night that I would provide for the assistance of the Member for River Heights and I believe, Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Minister, who, as I mentioned earlier, I believe he gave incorrect information to the committee last night. Now, as I mentioned before, I don't want to raise any points of privilege or allege that the Minister misled the House but I do believe that there was an incorrect impression left with the committee by the Minister and I would like to see that corrected, Mr. Chairman, before we proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, I don't want to get into any debate on previous subjects. If it won't take too long, I think by unanimous consent, we can allow it. Does the member have consent? All right. Would the honourable member table the papers?

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, these are notes and it is, I believe, not immediately clear from the documents that I have, the point that is at issue here. What the Minister said to the committee last night, as I recall it, was that the basis for the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy was a figure applicable to the Seine River School Division that was related to balance assessment per pupil. I understand that was what the Minister indicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: I suggest that the honourable member is attempting to rehash an item that we have passed. If he does want to reopen that discussion, he would have the opportunity under the Minister's Salary. It's my understanding that you have announced that we are in Section 4, Program Development and Support Services, and yet the member seems to have no inclination to address that particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, I think that the discussion on Greater Winnipeg Education Levy would be out of order at this time even if it would be a matter of correcting what might appear to a member to be contrary to being the truth. I would suggest that the honourable member would withhold his discussion and his debate on it until Minister's Salary.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I won't argue with your ruling and it was not my intent to try to embarrass the Minister. I really wanted to see that it was placed on the record what the proper factual basis for this matter was. If the Minister feels that sensitive about it, I will heed your warning, Mr. Chairman, and leave it till a later date.

Friday, June 6, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights on a point of order.

MR. GARY FILMON: On a point of order, it isn't a question of sensitivity; it's a question of following the rules. The member has made various allegations that it was requested that he bring back information and no such requests were made, neither by me nor the Minister, and he's named us several times in his preamble. I suggest that we follow the rules and get on with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think on the point of privilege, the honourable member's remarks will be accepted. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think it's very correct that the Member for River Heights said that the Conservatives do not wish to have information and never ask for information on this subject because they would prefer, Mr. Chairman, to proceed on the basis that they don't wish to be misled by the facts. I'm not going to deal with that question, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to deal with the item under consideration, namely Program Development and Support Services. I specifically wish to deal with Program Development and I will try to deal with it in such a way as to not be repetitious but to reiterate remarks that I made in the House with respect to what I believe could be a very important educational program in the province of Manitoba, which would also fulfill a community need. I think, Mr. Chairman, it's not often that we are blessed with the luxury of being able to develop an educational program and also fulfill a community need for which we are paying many many dollars and not getting anything like the service that we would like in a particular important area.

Mr. Chairman, I raised this item during the Department of Health and I won't go through it in detail. When we were discussing it in the Department of Health, it was indicated that it had implications with respect to the Department of Education and indeed it does, and there was some indication that there was a conflict — I don't think I'm using a word too harshly — between the objectives of the Department of Community Services, that there were differences in objectives and indeed what I think can be described as conflict between the objectives of the Department of Community Services and the Department of Education with respect to this program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that schools are very conveniently located in the province of Manitoba; that schools now, in many cases, have over-capacity insofar as classrooms are concerned; that whether or not they have over-capacity of classrooms that it would be much less costly to provide an extra accommodation in the school rather than building a new accommodation, if what is desired can be done conveniently in the school.

I also believe, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a wonderful asset to have available to students in Manitoba an opportunity of engaging in a program of child care. It is also conveniently coincidental, Mr. Chairman, that the best possible people to be companions of infants under the age of four and five — indeed beyond that but we're dealing with infants

under the age of four or five — are young people between the ages of 12 and 15; that the kind of companionship that such people will offer to infants would be far superior both, Mr. Chairman, technically and, what is more important, in terms of the emotional relationship, than that could be offered by any person, no matter how many degrees that they have after their name or how many schools that they have attended to teach people how to be companions of people between the ages of one and five.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation with respect to child care which is rapidly becoming apparent to all sides of the House as being one which is becoming institutionalized. And when I say institutionalized, Mr. Chairman, I say that there is a danger that the child care program that we have is in danger of becoming much more one suited to fulfil the needs of those people who are delivering the service rather than those people who are receiving service; much, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated by example with regard to Medicare, where there is a built-in feeling on the part of medicine that fee-for-service medicine is the only way to provide proper health care, when in reality fee-for-service medicine is much more designed to meet the needs of the people delivering the service rather than the people who are receiving the service.

What this House would like to see is that people, from whatever walk of life, of whatever race, creed, colour or religion, of whatever economic grouping, should be equal with regard to being able, where they are working parents — and I stipulate that — and where there is no parent available in the home during the day, to have their child attend a child care institution at, Mr. Chairman, either total social cost or nominal social cost, merely to prevent it becoming something where the parent saves money by using the institution rather than using the home. The present situation is that howsoever we have tried to subsidize child care institution that we have one of two results. One is that the subsidy is high enough to keep out the very poor and low enough to result in society subsidizing, in many cases, middle class and upper middle class parents. Mr. Chairman, please don't take from that any suggestion that I'm not interested in all of the people. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the only way of getting to all of the people is the same way as we did it with the educational system and with the health situation is to regard all people equally and say that it is in my interests and in the interests of all of us that a person in the wealthy home receives health care as it is in the person in the lower income group because the only way we know that the lower income group will receive proper health care is if we are satisfied that that's the kind of health care that the people in the upper income groups are getting and that, Mr. Chairman, was the principle behind universal Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, we could do what everybody in the House seems to have professed to want to do — and I believe those professions — if we said that there is a day care institution attached to every school, where there is a need for it — and I admit that there will be a problem in many of the rural areas but there will be no problem in the urban areas — that a parent can take that child to this day

Friday, June 6, 1980

care institution; that the day care institution will be staffed by one person, Mr. Chairman, not a group of degree people but one person and that children, or young people, more properly, between the ages of 12 and 15 will be voluntarily permitted to enrol in child care courses at the educational institutions, which child care courses would include practical being with infant children for, let us say, three hours a week, either a morning or an afternoon. That therefore doing a total week, the child who is at the day care institution or the child care institution would be in contact with young people between the ages of 12 to 15 and with their peer groups of course, other infants, and the supervisor, who of course would generate the program. That, Mr. Chairman, would de-institutionalize day care; would make it possible for people of whatever walk of life, of whatever income group, of whatever race, creed, colour or religion, to attend a public institution of that kind and would dramatically, Mr. Chairman, increase the service and reduce the cost. It would do both. The schools are heated, they are there, they are built, Mr. Chairman; they don't require all of the fixed costs which are now incurred when we build a new day care institution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that I have gone on too long because I've repeated much of what I have said. I'm talking about Program Development, Mr. Chairman; I'm talking about a program development of child care in the school system and I think that there would be no objection to the Minister discussing this item on that basis. When we discussed it under Community Services, the Minister said one of the problems is the schools charge us a tremendous fee for having a day care institution in the school. Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister of Education should see to it that that is not possible; that schools be built on the basis that that is available at the marginal cost, not at a rental fee; that the school should only charge day care what it would cost to have that facility looked after if the day care institution wasn't there. They are not charging them rent on a square foot basis as part of paying for the cost of the school system.

Mr. Chairman, it is completely unnecessary. We are ourselves defeating our objective. The other thing that the Minister of Community Services said is that there is a fight between those people responsible for child care and those people responsible for education. Mr. Chairman, I am intolerant toward these fights. These fights are the kind of thing that prevent the public from delivering a service and the Minister and his colleague have to get together and say that there will be no fight; that the rules will be laid down here. When the Minister of Community Services says, I hope you will attend in my office when the coalition for child care, which has completely different ideas, Mr. Chairman, as to day care than I have — and I agree — that if I attend in his office I'll do better than that, Mr. Chairman, I'm willing to take over his office. All he's got to do is get out of the chair and move over here and I will move in, if that is the only way he can handle it. — (Interjection)— Well, if there is no way then tell him not to ask me to help him with those people because I will deal with those people as I dealt with them between the years 1969 and 1977. I don't think that I, at that time, ever felt that I needed the help of one

of the Conservatives to help deal with a citizens group that came to my office.

But nevertheless, put that by the boards, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation; we know the need. Everybody now is committed in principle to providing the service. The institutions are there. The service can be much better provided if we do not institutionalize it because, Mr. Chairman, the members on this side, all of them, the Member for Seven Oaks, the Member for St. Boniface said we are heading toward a dead end; we will spend more money but the service will become more and more expensive and it'll do less to facilitate the people who are receiving the service as we spend more money on it. What we will have is we will have day care people, perhaps there will be three to a group of 20 children, and then they'll say they four and you have to get a licence and you have to have a degree besides your name to be with these kids.

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is the direction that the professional people will take you. They'll take you there every time. The Member for St. Boniface knows it with the dental people. We had the same argument with the chiropractors, and now we have a chance, Mr. Chairman, of not building the institution but starting on a different basis. I say to the Minister of Education, I would like him to get together with his colleague and consider doing, on an experimental pilot project basis, an experiment into how we can provide day care on a different basis at much less expense. But don't then write into the program 20,000 a year for rental of a classroom; write in the amount of heat that it's necessary, that you find out. That if it cost to heat the school last year 20,000 and because one classroom, which had the radiators turned off, had them turned on again, it cost 20,500, then charge day care 500. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we are biting off our nose to spite our face. So you say that we won't do this unless the institution pays that kind of money.

Now I hope that's not what's happening in The Pas, but I attended the day care institution in The Pas and the day care institution is in the school; it's for specially handicapped children and I think it is very worthwhile but, Mr. Chairman, there should be that type of facility available for all children. But it's there and I hope that The Pas school is not charging that institution the sum per foot rent which is not related to the cost of providing the service but is related to the cost of rental accommodation, as if you were making a profit on the day care situation.

Mr. Chairman, my request, I believe, is a modest one. I would like an experiment; I don't want to have the Minister leap into a program but I would like him to walk very slowly into an experiment, in two areas, Mr. Chairman, one which is lower income and one which is higher income. I have no objection to the people in River Heights having such a facility available to them if their needs are the same: They are working parents and they want a child to go to day care. As a matter of fact, I know that if it's done well in River Heights and it's done all over, it will be done well. I know that if it's done on the basis of meeting the needs of the wretched poor, it will be done very poorly and very begrudgingly and making the people feel that somehow they have sponged on society for what is a very normal need which society is wealthy enough to produce for everybody.

I would ask the Minister to get together with his colleague. I think it is very legitimate that a child in our society have, as part of the educational curriculum, the right to participate in a course of child care which involves practical application by being with children, who, at the same time, are being dealt with in such a way as to utilize what we all say is a very important, social need.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in response to the Member for Inkster, I have to say there are two particular aspects of the program that he mentions that are of prime interest to myself, apart from the general concept that he's brought forward, and certainly one is the utilization of school buildings. I have to tell the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, that I am sympathetic to the idea that communities should be able to use school facilities that are vacant or that are unused. I have no problem with that at all, that has been my particular stance for some years. They are buildings that have been placed there at public expense, are maintained at public expense, and on every occasion I have urged school boards and so to attempt to accommodate the public in that regard. I have not always been successful, Mr. Chairman, there are all sorts of problems that seem to arise, or seeming problems that are used by people as excuses for not adapting facilities or allowing them to be utilized. We have had tremendous breakthroughs, or supposedly so, where some athletic groups have been able to use facilities or evening course groups and that has been considered a tremendous breakthrough. I don't see it as a breakthrough at all, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be commonplace, I think it should be something that happens as a matter of fact. That in truth our school buildings are public buildings and should be utilized by the public.

The other aspect I want to touch on before I remark on the proposal that the honourable member has is the idea of students having a course in child care. We do have a course, although not a course in itself but a course in child care that is part of the home economics course that's offered in our high schools. Now this exists today and I would suggest because the greatest percentage of our students in home ec, although not all, are girls, that it is catering to only that one particular group of students. Boys of course can take home ec but we don't find as many of them enrolled in the courses. However, when the member suggests that we are seeing child care becoming too institutionalized in the setup we have today, it seems to me that in his proposal he is merely going to substitute another type of institutionalization by placing it then in the school system or at least in the school buildings, in the physical plant, and I can see that down the road, Mr. Chairman, it would only be a year or two until it would be decided, by whatever government of the day, that should become part of the regular school program and then we would have it institutionalized, Mr. Chairman. It would be very much institutionalized, we would be then looking at state-run care of children from whatever age, the honourable member didn't stipulate all the bounds of child care, whether it be from age two up and so on. I have a little bit of concern in that area, that we would be substituting only one type of

institutionalization for another one and I mention it to the member at this time. I am not one who has a great amount of familiarization with child care, Mr. Chairman, I do know that we offer a course in this regard at Red River and I have heard very favourable comments about the competence of the people who graduate from that two-year course. They do not have a degree and the honourable member seems to infer that people working in this area all have degrees. I suggest that seems to be a general move in our whole society, that everybody must be upgraded and have higher qualifications to almost do anything and I think that is a very expensive and unnecessary type of mood in our society.

However, at the same time, I am a little concerned that the Member for Inkster seems to infer that almost anybody can look after these children, it doesn't require any expertise, he does say that there is some need for at least one adult to be there, I believe. He doesn't talk about what qualifications they should have or what function they perform except there will be a program of some type and it would be a program where students in the school, I believe he mentions the age of 12 and up, could become part of the program and receive credit for some child care training.

I've no problem with the child care training at all, Mr. Chairman, I think certainly that probably one of the biggest jobs that face most individuals in life is raising their children. It's a very challenging one and one where we do have little training, as we do for marriage. But I have to say to the honourable member that his reference earlier to some conflict between Community Service and Education is really not correct. There is no conflict, I think what my colleague in Community Services was referring to was the reticence probably — I say reticence on the part of school officials — to really open the schools up to community groups and when they do, as he has suggested, perhaps thinking that they must charge rather heavy fees. That is where the problem exists at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I think we have a certain mind-set that has to be overcome there, where the school facilities are more readily available to people in the community. I have no problem with that area at all.

I would be interested, and I have had, I might tell the honourable member, informal discussions with the Minister of Community Services on this topic; we see a need to pursue it further and I thank him for the proposal. I know that he has no doubt thought it out in some detail. It's not just the concept he's stating this morning, that he has gone beyond the concept to all of the details, costs and service levels and I can tell him that I'm quite prepared to look at this in concert with the Minister of Community Services, to see what the feasibility of his proposal happens to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I acknowledge the next speaker. I must apologise to the honourable members, I've been following the debate very closely and this debate, I believe, has taken place before and rather than rule it out of order —(Interjection)— I thought it was under this department —(Interjection)— Oh I thought it was under Research, I'm a little confused.

Friday, June 6, 1980

MR. GREEN: Under Community Services with another Minister, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fair enough then. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of minutes and I thank the Honourable Minister for the positive reception of the idea. I do think I want to dismiss several misconceptions as to what institutionalization means. In my view institutionalization means it becomes an entity in itself where the institution of day care is separate from other organizations. And by doing it that way, Mr. Chairman, it's not the same as having it part of the school system, because as part of the school system you at least avoid the duplication of the facility, you avoid the duplication of the buildings and, most of all, you avoid the kind of thing that's going to happen in a day care institution where they say that everybody who's there has to have a degree. Now they are now talking about certain qualifications and they're going to have in other people and they're going to say that the only people that can look after children are people who have certain areas, the Minister should be aware of that. I tell him, without fear of equivocation, not any 12 year old can look after children, but the best people to be with children are 12 to 15 year olds. — (Interjection)— That's right, my friend from St. Boniface says, not every 30-year old, not every adult can look after children. And the chances of having adults looking after children, and getting the kind of care that is conducive to the development of that child, are much less than having children doing it. I tell the Minister that in this area I know whereof I speak, I have been involved in the field and that the patience, the willingness to engage in the kind of fantasyland and the kind of games that stir the imagination of young people, are there in the highest sensitivity with 12 to 15 year olds rather than with adults. Adults tire with children . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 12:30. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committees deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, J. Wally McKenzie: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that this House do now adjourn.