

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, July 14, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; The Honourable Attorney-General.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the first annual report of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. In doing so I table a copy and give assurance to the House that other copies will be distributed in the House as soon as I have them available, or in the event that that is not possible they'll be mailed to each member.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports, any others? The Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to table the report, a White Paper on health policy. This has been a few weeks in coming. On the other hand, I want to say that it's been a massive job and I would like particularly to thank all those who have spent hours and weeks in making the tabling of this paper possible before the end of the session. I recall stating to the Member for Fort Garry that it would be tabled and he wanted assurance that it would be tabled while he was still in the House. I told him this I could guarantee providing he didn't resign. He hasn't resigned and the paper is now tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call Bill No. 108.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an error on the Order Paper. I have no objection to speaking again on Bill 108, in fact I'd like to, but I don't think I have the legitimate opportunities.

MR. PAULLEY: Thanks to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): . . . short question period as we had this morning, however I do have a few notes on this bill. Actually it's enabling legislation and as such I really have no quarrel with the provisions in the bill. I was pleased that it didn't try to tie down every aspect of the services that would be covered by the Health Sciences Centre but rather leaves the development of it to the Board of Directors.

I am a little concerned about the Boards and Directors of the Sanatorium Board and the Cancer Research and Treatment Centre, whether they are giving up something in which they had a very long and deep involvement, and I'm sure that it's a little difficult for them to see this removed from their particular sphere of activity.

Over the years, many years, that the General Hospital -- it is, I believe, almost 100 years old -- and the Children's Hospital, and all these organizations that have existed, there have been very keen groups of citizens who have given endless hours as volunteers and who have contributed financially to the building of the institutions and the operations of them prior to the hospitalization plan. And I hope that as this new board replaces the old ones that there will be some official recognition from the government of the many years of dedicated service that these people have given. I understand that there will be an effort made in the General Hospital to commemorate the work of such individuals as part of their Centennial celebrations. However, I do think that the government also owes them some expression of gratitude as they take over a bit more the whole operation.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd)

The principle of merger of course is being looked at everywhere and in this respect Manitoba may be in the forefront, and I'm certain that many other communities will be watching with interest to see what happens here. The amalgamation should result in greater efficiency. It certainly has its parallel in the City of Winnipeg merger legislation. I suppose we can expect that in the beginning there will be additional costs rather than a saving but that in the long run probably there will be some levelling off of costs or, at least, the speed with which costs rise as a result of this amalgamation.

In the past we've all become very attached to the names of these hospitals, Children's Hospital, Winnipeg General are very meaningful names to this community. The new title Health Sciences Centre seems very formal and impersonal but I suppose the old names will stick for some time. People will still regard them as the General Hospital and the Children's Hospital.

I took a little exception to the provision in the bill that if any excessive, or any, I forget how it was worded, but if any big raises were given to any people during this interval that then the new board have the power to change those. It was just a little bit of a slap in the face I think as a parting gesture to the voluntary boards that, you know, it sort of suggests that they might be a little irresponsible. Perhaps the experience in the City of Winnipeg was the reason for this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the new Board of the Health Sciences Centre is very anxious to start its work and to get on with the business of the merger. We'll be watching this develop with great interest and certainly would like to see it move forward quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House . . . The Honourable Minister shall be closing . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone is desirous of speaking on Bill No. 98, The Natural Products Marketing Act. If anyone desires to speak on that they -- the Member for St. George has the adjournment and I'm not sure whether he'll be here today. He's had some difficulties, and I'm not sure even whether or not the Minister of Agriculture, who has had some severe problems with his son, will be here. I'm wondering if nobody is desirous of speaking that permission might be granted to -- possibly the First Minister would say a few words and then allow the bill to pass for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Well, Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to the First Minister speaking but when the House Leader implied that we would allow it to pass for second reading, then I think that we would object because we intend to vote against this bill, and we hope that we can defeat it at second reading.

MR. PAULLEY: Do I understand my friend, Mr. Speaker -- did I understand my friend the Member for Morris, the House Leader of the Conservatives that he would not allow it to go into the committee?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said I don't think, at least to my knowledge nobody has indicated on this side of the House, or at least in the Official Opposition, that they intend to further speak on this matter. We are prepared to allow it to go to a vote and hopefully defeat it. And so if the First Minister wants to close debate -- we understand the situation that the Minister of Agriculture is in -- if the First Minister wants to speak now and I wouldn't suggest that he would be necessarily closing debate, but we would be prepared to allow it to go to a vote after he's spoken.

MR. PAULLEY: That will be fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, and understanding full well that under the rules I am not closing debate, it may be that my remarks may provoke some honourable members to speak, not again but who have not yet spoken to speak, and thus hold us up from proceeding along the lines that the Member for Morris thought we could follow this morning so I shall try to keep my remarks non-provocative for that reason and unfortunately they may lose something in proceeding that way.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)

It's one of those cases, Mr. Speaker, where the desire to expedite House business sort of supersedes one's desire to speak with feeling and I do believe, Sir, that it would be appropriate to speak with feeling here because I really think that at least some of the honourable members opposite, not all, but some of them, in their remarks demonstrated quite clearly that they were under a misapprehension as to what lay, as to what lay behind the introduction of this legislation. I believe the Member for Roblin, in particular, has misconstrued the intent of this legislation, and has also demonstrated that he is not aware of the series of events that took place prior to this Bill No. 98 being introduced. What I'm saying in effect, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not as though this legislation is the product of the thinking of this government acting in splendid isolation of all other provinces in Canada. In fact the converse is true. This legislation is the result of the series of meetings that our Minister of Agriculture here has had with his counterpart Ministers of Agriculture in the Prairies and I believe on two occasions with the Ministers of Agriculture of all the provinces of Canada.

It has been quite obvious for a number of years now, Mr. Speaker, that there was need with respect to at least certain farm commodities to work out a more rational marketing arrangement in our country than has been the case up to date. And I know that my honourable friends opposite are pretty negatively inclined about -- rather negative attitude towards concepts of supply-management and market board arrangements in agriculture and some honourable members have made their point quite articulately in that respect. Nevertheless it is considered opinion on this side, and obviously it is shared by Ministers of Agriculture and governments in other provinces including both Liberal and Conservative governments in other provinces, that there is need to have a more coherent and rational farm commodity marketing approach than we have had to date. And while some may yearn to return to the days of the free marketplace in the sale of farm products, we've had many years of the free marketplace and those years were not particularly kind to agriculture and to farmers. And so while it would be silly to pretend that this legislation and farm product marketing boards are the ultimate solution, nevertheless they do represent an honest attempt and effort to try a new approach, an alternative approach, after going through the experience of the free marketplace, which certainly has its limitations as well. So let it be very clear to the Member for Roblin and other members as well that it is not as though we are acting on our own in this respect. We are acting after detailed discussions, I mean really detailed discussions with Ministers of Agriculture in the other provinces of our country.

And market sharing and supply management while it is true that one can argue that these elements are definitely being worked into our farm product marketing system and into this legislation, nevertheless it is something that all provinces have begun to practice, some with greater intensity than others, and for some years now. And there is general agreement in our country that we should proceed along these lines. It may be that five years from now, or thereabouts, that subsequent governments of the several provinces in our country may decide that the experiment, or the new approach, was inadequate in too many respects and therefore they wish to go back to the status quo ante of the 1960s.

Well only time can tell, Mr. Speaker, and so I can say without any fear of departing from practicality that this legislation should commend itself to honourable members.

The Federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Olson, representatives of the Canada Department of Agriculture and of the several provincial Departments of Agriculture have been present on at least two occasions in the course of the past 12 months to negotiate, perhaps the better word is to discuss, many of the details that are involved with the interprovincial flow and marketing of farm products. And what is embodied in Bill 98 is our understanding of what the several governments in our federal system have agreed to. Now I'm not suggesting that every provincial government has as much enthusiasm as we may have in this particular respect, nevertheless there has been broad agreement as to the way in which to proceed.

The Member for Roblin has said that we by putting forward this legislation and agreeing to what is in effect a market sharing arrangement, that we are really placing Manitoba and other smaller provinces, presumably I suppose the argument is are placing themselves as well into a disadvantageous position relative to Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia, because these are the provinces with the larger markets for foodstuffs and by agreeing to market sharing we are in effect denying ourselves the free kind of access that we had in years gone by with respect to sale of farm products. But my honourable friends I am sure are well aware,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) certainly the Member for Morris is well aware that over the years there has been an incremental change in the extent to which various provinces have been bringing in orderly marketing board market protection legislation and because that is the simple cold fact of the matter, it certainly was not as though we were agreeing to limit ourselves to access to markets in these larger provinces, because that was taking place anyway and it is our contention in the absence of any evidence that the Federal Government was prepared to act quickly and firmly against provinces that were barring or impinging on the inter-provincial flow of farm products, since this was not happening the provinces were moving in this direction, that we should agree to an arrangement where this phenomena was brought under some semblance of control by agreement among the several provinces, rather than being stubborn, refusing to agree and therefore allowing by default these larger provinces to impose the kinds of restrictions they had in mind, and that is the justification for this legislation.

I believe that honourable members would be interested in the submission that was made to the standing committee of the House of Commons on agriculture by the government of this province; the submission I refer to is directly germane and directly relevant to the subject matter of the bill that is before us and if it would be of interest to honourable members, I would ask that this submission be tabled and can be available to honourable members so that they can read it before clause by clause consideration in committee. If that's agreeable, that will short-cut the time I need to conclude my remarks and should help honourable members, give them the opportunity to read the submission before committee stage.

So, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I table the document and conclude at the same time by saying this Bill 98 is counterpart here in Manitoba, counterpart to similar legislation, similar in intent that is being put on the statute books in other provincial jurisdictions.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? On Division?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, Mr. Speaker, will you call the ayes and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The motion before the House is adoption on second reading Bill 98.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Adam, Allard, Barrow, Burtiak, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski, Walding.

NAYS: Messrs: Blake, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, Patrick, Sherman and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 14.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the ayes have it, declare the motion carried. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, now that the Bill has passed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland have a point of order?

MR. FROESE: Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could the House Leader indicate to which Standing Committee this bill is referred to and whether the Agricultural Committee will meet and when it will meet at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, that was the reason for me rising in order to inform members as to what I contemplate in respect of this bill. It is contemplated first of all that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and it is intended that the House will be called for 2:30 on Monday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, be requested to leave the Chair at approximately 3 o'clock and the Agricultural Committee will meet at that time. So that will be 3 o'clock Monday afternoon for Agriculture Committee and I trust members will get in touch with those people that they feel may be interested in attending the meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. Procedure?

MR. PAULLEY: Number 112, I note that this stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, I believe that another honourable member will be talking, but I must call it of course in the presence of my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, Bill 112.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand? Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I adjourned this on behalf of the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell. The Honourable First Minister.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SCHREYER: If the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell would allow me just a moment to - and you, Sir, - to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of a group of delegates from the Cooperative Council of Canada, Le conseil de la coopération du Canada. Les délégués sont ici, je comprends à cause du congrès qui aura lieu ici. (Translation - The Cooperative Council of Canada. The delegates are here I understand because of a congress which will take place here this week.) Mr. Speaker, normally this function is conducted by yourself but because of the late notice of the presence in the gallery of delegates of the Coop Congress of Canada, I'm wondering if I could on behalf of all members welcome them to our province and hope that they have a successful and useful meeting.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In reference to Bill 112, Mr. Speaker, I have had some concern over the transfer of planning from the Municipal Board to the Environmental Committee of the City of Winnipeg and the control of that by the Registrar General. My reason for concern at that time, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that in the past we have had a bill before this Chamber which dealt with a tax deferral system which had particular application in the green belt surrounding the City of Winnipeg. However on closer perusal and consultation with other people, I find that this is dealing entirely with planning and the planning authorities while they have the right to classify and subdivide certainly do not have any authority regarding the assessment of such property and I would hope that the assessment which is under the control of the Minister of Municipal Affairs will not be affected in any substantial way by the activities of planning in this area. I don't want to deal with assessment at this time because it's not included in this bill. The Minister is very well acquainted with my views on assessment in this particular area. However I would hope and I'm sure that the Minister responsible for this bill has had active dialogue with the City of Winnipeg and with all the surrounding municipalities involved in the additional zone; I'm sure he has sat down and discussed this matter with all of them, and when the bill goes to committee I'm sure that he will notify each of the municipalities which might be affected so that they will have ample time to prepare a brief if they desire to do so.

And with those few words, Mr. Speaker, that is all I would like to add to this debate at this time. We are prepared to have the bill go to committee to hear any briefs, if any, on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have not had the time to check this particular bill out. I notice it makes reference to certain lands outside the City of Winnipeg and due to what the Member for Birtle-Russell has said, I wonder whether the Minister of the Municipal Affairs would not have any comments to make on the bill before it passes second reading, so that we could have his views on it. I reserve my rights, however, though to pursue any particular matter or aspect with the bill in committee if I feel at a later time that, having perused it by then, that it could affect me or any other party adversely.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the -- The Honourable Attorney-General shall be closing debate.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my opening remarks the provisions of this bill are considered to be a necessary corollary of the proposed amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act contained in Bill 109 and any difficulty in respect to principle of course in revised techniques really arises from any change in principle involved in the arrangements for subdivision and plan control as found in Bill 109. That is not to say that, you know, if there is concern about the provisions of this bill that this is not the place to debate it. It can be debated under this bill. But I think when the committee deals with Bill 109 they will be dealing with the provisions of subdivision control and changes in respect to registration of plans as provided in there and the amendments in this act are just, as I say, a necessary corollary or subsequent variation in the Real Property Act to accord with that changed technique. I'm not in a position to articulate at length as to the extent of discussion that has taken place with the representatives of the City of Winnipeg and council itself. There have been discussions in respect to this whole area of subdivision control and planning control with the executive of the City of Winnipeg Council,

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) and particularly with representation from their Environment Committee charged with the responsibility in this area. There is no question as to our commitment to work out a better technique in respect to the handling of lands, zoning and assessment in the so-called outer zone or extended area beyond the built-up area of the city proper. As the honourable members will recall, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs did introduce for discussion a plan that was discussed with representatives of the various outer zone or fringe municipalities in respect to variations in technique respecting assessment and taxes. And that is an ongoing concern. It is not a matter that lends itself to easy solution and when proposals have been made they haven't been all that readily acceptable to the persons involved because it is a very difficult matter for them to reconcile themselves that in the event that they want a tax break that they would have to eventually pick up any differential when the lands were sold.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the issues that are involved, that the honourable members have quite rightly indicated are a matter of concern, do not arise by way of point of principle directly under this act - they don't originate under this act, they originate under Bill 109 - and I think when the issues are discussed under Bill 109 and resolved, then it's a question of accepting if the provisions therein are acceptable, as I hope they will be, then it's a mechanical thing to make the adjustments to the Real Property Act to accord with those changes in principle.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to see the bill discussed in committee subsequent to the discussion of Bill 109.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the -- Does the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell have a question?

MR. GRAHAM: Will the Attorney-General permit a question? Was the change in the act arrived at by a bilateral agreement between the province and the City of Winnipeg, or were all the additional municipalities consulted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I'm not in a position to indicate the extent to which discussions took place between the City of Winnipeg, Council members, the Environment Committee and representatives of other municipalities not part of the City of Winnipeg. I assume that there was discussion between members of staff - at the staff level - but I'm not certain of that. I know that the staff of our Urban Affairs Department and staff of the City of Winnipeg Department had considerable discussions in the preparation of the drafts which were considered and I don't know the extent of the dialogue with the municipal representatives from the outer zone.

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

MR. GRAHAM: The second question. Will the Attorney-General undertake to advise the municipalities affected in the additional zone of the time when this will go to committee?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to give that kind of undertaking. It's my understanding that it is the expectation that the bills will be referred to the committee today. In the event that the committee decides that they want to hold it over, whatever they want to do, that that's in the hands of the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Could the Minister indicate to which committee this bill and the City of Winnipeg bill are referred to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that to facilitate the members of committee and the working of the House that this act which really arises as I say as a necessary change in the Real Property Act resultant from Bill 109 would be considered by the same committee dealing with Bill 109 and that would be the Municipal Affairs Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether you would now call Bill No. 104. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, Bill 104 is an act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act and when the bill was first introduced I had expected that a bill of this sort would be a bill to deal with the updating of the superannuation that is now made available to civil service employees. However as I studied the bill and compared it to the existing statutes I found it really didn't do this at all. It included, it made arrangements to include a

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) broader scope of government employees including commissions and marketing boards, etc.; it provided for educational leaves for civil service employees which I thought was practised in the past anyway but this would make it more legal; it would provide for the integration of the Canada Pension and the superannuation payment so that you don't get two cheques and so that the two are in some way coordinated. The bill provides for definition of partial and permanent disabilities - which is a clarification. It provides for superannuation to be paid to spouse instead of widow or widower, which is a minor clarification; it also provides for payments to be made to a third party in the case of a deceased employee and if claim is made on behalf of that deceased employee. Therefore my judgment is, Mr. Speaker, that although it is a superannuation act, it really does nothing for the superannuation of the civil service other than clarify the existing laws.

I am a little surprised that we can introduce this kind of bill and really not change the superannuation made available to civil service at all. I find that in a time when we have unemployment, when we have difficulty finding employment for all our people, it might be the right time, Mr. Speaker, to have a look at the pension plans that exist in various parts of our society. And might I say at this time that I feel critical of both the Provincial and the Federal Government for not looking at the possibility of being able to retire people who are working now until the age of 65. I think it's a little ironical when we find the Government of Manitoba as well as the Federal Government almost in desperation making available social assistance money to the younger segment of our society - between the ages of 18 to 24 especially - while at the same time they are by law compelling the 64 year old to pick up his lunch kit and go to work. In my view that is not proper judgment and we should be concentrating at this time on lowering the retirement age rather than providing assistance, social assistance, to the younger group who we are unable to employ. I find it surprising that the Labour Minister hasn't seemed to sink his teeth into such an obvious kind of discrepancy. I know that the Minister of Labour will likely come back and tell me, well the whole matter is under study. And we've heard of this kind of study before and my only answer to this, Mr. Speaker, is that after being government for three years, if we are still studying the matter I hope they'll forgive us if we suggest that it might well be that another three years - should they still be in power - they will still be studying the matter. It sounds like an answer that we've been getting from several departments, namely the Department of Education, the Department of Universities and Colleges, the Department of Health, this is the pat answer we get: We have been studying the matter. And it's getting late to keep on studying the matter without making changes, making available to our older citizens earlier retirement and creating employment for the younger segment of the group.

I couple with that, Mr. Speaker, the retirement age and the pension plans of the teachers although as I understand the teachers operate under a different act - the Manitoba Teachers Pension Act I believe it's called - which there again the same anomaly exists. It's kind of strange that in the Department of Education we haven't seen fit to give retirement privileges to teachers who are now 64 years old while we know that there are a number of teachers being graduated from our universities - the University of Manitoba and Brandon - who are unable to find employment in the teaching profession. The slowness, the lack of activity on the part of the Minister is certainly to be reproached. I myself have been of the opinion - and I think quite founded because I have done some research in that area - that should we change the act very insignificantly possibly, to retire those teachers who have 40 years of service and who are 60 to 65 years old, so retirement at 60, it would cost very little because the number is not great and yet it would be very relieving to some of those people who are eager to retire but unable to do so because of the statutes.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of change in principle would be a relief to the employee, a relief to the employer and in the case of teachers, an advantage to the students because there is little secret in that the motivation of a person who is there for his last year or who is there because he must put in two more years is certainly not the same as that of a younger person who is setting out in life.

Just one more point, Mr. Speaker. I find it a little ironical to have the civil service left out of Bill 81 and I bring this matter in because we are dealing now with the civil service, not that I insist that they be included but the anomaly is one that I have pointed out before and would like to point out again. I think the Minister of Labour in all justice can be accused of having dragged his feet a bit and in so doing maybe has placed the civil service at a disadvantage when you consider other groups in society. It's a little strange, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen fit

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) in this session to give authority to policemen, for example, for the policemen to go on strike but we haven't yet thought of the civil service. I am not suggesting that it is the right move to give the policemen right to strike, I am opposed to it; however I cannot follow the Minister's reasoning when he deliberately, conscientiously says the policemen must have the right to strike, but we'll be dealing with the civil service later. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is pretty hard logic to follow. All in all may I suggest that the bill is a rather innocuous bill in my view. We have, like we usually have, no objection to this kind of bill. This is about the 8th or 9th labour bill that has been brought to this session and as you know, Mr. Speaker, all but one have had the support of this side. And we don't propose now to make an exception. We want to be co-operative and therefore we will be supporting this bill, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that it goes to committee soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on glancing at the bill before us, 104, I don't recall too much of the introduction when it was made. Maybe I was absent at the time, I forget. At any rate I am interested in the matter of educational leave with salary. I wonder if the Minister could tell us who decides on this very matter? I do hope he is listening. I certainly would like to know whether it's the Lieutenant-Governor in power or whether it's the Civil Service Superannuation Board, who grants leave and who sets the condition of the leave. I notice there's a section here, employees on educational leave with salary, where a leave is granted, and who decides whether a salary will go along with it because if I'm reading the act I certainly can't read into it that at all times that when leave is given that a salary is granted or a portion of a salary. Could he indicate to the House just what portion or what kind of a salary is given to those people granted leave of this type? Because in my opinion I think this has a great bearing on the number of applications that they would receive or may receive. He could probably at the same time indicate how many such leaves are being granted. Surely enough if the leave is sufficient so that the person can get by without going into debt heavily that he can carry one that there were more persons would be asking for such a leave. And is this purely by request or does the government encourage in certain cases that such be done? If a certain employee shows promise in a certain job and where the prospects certainly would be much better for the employee if he took leave and acquired further skills or further qualifications for that particular job, what encouragement is given? Certainly I think these are matters that I would like to know a little more about. The portion of the salary or whatever the case may be I think would certainly be of interest to me as well.

With the number of bills that have come before us I certainly cannot check every last bill and detail. I try to check certain aspects of the legislation and the provisions in the measures that come forward and this is why I may probably be asking for a little more information than necessarily but I think it is important when we pass legislation of this type that we know exactly in what terms we're speaking of and just what we are proposing and what we are putting into the statutes.

The Member for Emerson raised the matter of Bill 81. I really don't take that exception, Mr. Chairman. Maybe we should have a discussion on this matter when we discuss Bill 81 in Committee to hear his views or why he takes the stand he does in this connection. I'd be very much interested but I'm not at this particular time prepared to debate the issue on second reading of this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be kind enough to give us some information on the questions that I put to him before Bill 104 is passed on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments on this bill because I would have thought that the Minister would have brought in a more comprehensive bill in respect to the Civil Service Superannuation Act instead of what he did. In my opinion, all the bill does is - it's a housekeeping bill and does very little, Mr. Speaker. I would have expected some updating of the superannuation for the civil service. I do not find it in this bill. I would have liked to have asked the Minister or perhaps he can explain it to us. Is there a formula that full pension now will be paid at age 60 after 35 years of service or is it still not if the employee retires prior to age 65. I believe that some of the other provinces at the present time do this.

Now also the other point. I understand that some of the other provinces are averaging out - over the last on the pension formula, which is averaged out over the last five years of the

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) total earnings, while I believe that we're still on 10. If I am incorrect I hope that the Minister will correct me. And I feel that this area could have been updated and corrected as well. So really the Minister did not get to the real problem as far as the - has not given us the real amendment as far as the civil service superannuation is concerned. I think that all he's doing is correcting, and in my opinion this is no more than the housekeeping bill. I believe that we could have got involved into talking about early retirements, talking about options and the pensions, and I would like to know what is in the present pension; how does our disability options compare to some of the other provinces; how many years does a person have to be employed before he gets a disability pension? I also understand that refunds for contributions, 15; again I'm told that some of the other provinces it's 10. So I see that there's a large area that the Minister can cover as far as this bill is concerned.

There's the other point that I wish to ask the Minister. What is the interest rate on the refunds for contributions as far as the pension concerned? Again, I understand at one time we never paid any refund. What is the interest? I believe it's 3 percent, that's half to what some of the other provinces are paying. So really either the Minister did not do his homework as far as this bill is concerned or he didn't actually intend to really get into the real problems that exist as far as the civil superannuation act is concerned except to update one or two points that he has brought in. --(Interjection)-- Maybe that's what it was.

So really I don't intend to talk at any length on this bill because I do remember that I had a couple of years ago asked the Minister about many of these points and would have hoped that he would be bringing or making corrections that exist at the present time. But I do wish to ask the Minister at this time, has he given any consideration or will he be giving any consideration to the portability of pensions within this Act. I'm sure that the Minister will agree with me that we do live in a very mobile society and there's more and more civil service moved between provinces and some take the opportunity to take perhaps better paying jobs within the federal service. I do recollect that even the Deputy Minister of Agriculture a few years ago left here and went to the Federal Government. Well surely the Minister - if there's an area that's very inconsistent and perhaps not right at all, that there shouldn't be portability of pensions as far as the civil service is concerned. So I would have thought that the Minister would have at least looked into this area or zeroed in into this inconsistency and would have done something about it.

So I really am concerned about early retirement on a reduced pension as well. Say somebody leaves at the age of 50 or 55, surely after he's had say 15 years of service there should be such a thing as an early retirement pension. I believe that the Minister should have concerned himself with increasing the existing pensions to offset increases in the cost of living. I believe that these are very very important points. And the one that I really am concerned is the formula, that after say 35 years of service that employee if he retires and has such a long - or many years of service, say 35 years of service - surely he should have the option of retirement prior to age 65 with full pension. And the other serious anomaly is the portability, and I would hope - it's not in this bill, so there's very little in the bill - perhaps next time the Minister brings in the bill to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act he would give consideration to the points that I have raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister shall be closing debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would be closing the debate as you have indicated. I accept, Mr. Chairman, some of the criticisms that have been offered in respect of the present bill that's before us - and I only wish the Honourable Member for Emerson - oh, excuse me, I notice that he's here; I didn't see him in his proper seat, but that's okay. I accept, Mr. Speaker, the criticisms because this particular bill does not contain points of interest to honourable members. And I am of course quite prepared to accept those criticisms in particular, because we haven't done anything in accordance with the spokesman this morning.

I do want to point out though that we haven't been entirely negligent since we came in office and made some provisions of change in co-operation with the Superannuation Board. I agree that the retirement age is still at 65 without penalty; however, on taking office the retirement age was not 65 it was 65-1/2. Well, maybe six months doesn't make much difference but at least we did bring the Manitoba Superannuation Retirement Age in line with those that were prevailing basically in other jurisdictions, so that was some reduction.

Now insofar as earlier retirement, it is possible for a civil servant to retire earlier but

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) it is of course on a reduced pension. And the point raised by the Member for Assiniboia that the pension should not be reduced after say 35 years of receipt of pension - when we took office from the previous administration now represented of course by the spokesman for civil service, by the Honourable Member for Emerson, there was no such thing as an award of cost of living bonuses to retired personnel; this had been requested time after time by the New Democrats when in opposition, and fell on deaf ears. We have made at least two adjustments in the cost of living bonus in the three years, Mr. Speaker, that we have had the opportunity of guiding the affairs of Manitoba.

Now, the Honourable Member for Rhineland had one or two questions in respect of leave, who pays the salary? I think, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would check in he'd find that the salaries are paid by the departments who granted the leave to the employees. The salaries are not paid out of the Superannuation Fund. The provision contained in this act is to make it amply clear that a person who is given leave by a department has the opportunity of continuing their contributions into the Superannuation Fund in order that they do not have any break in their service. That is the purpose of the clarification so I say, Mr. Speaker, the leave is granted by the department concerned. If the leave is the type of leave that carries some or all of the salary then that portion of the salary that comes out of the public treasury, the employee can make his contribution as well. If leave is granted to go, say to a person who may be rendering assistance, and I'll just use the broad term the "United Nations", if it's granted and it's on a term basis say for a couple of years the bill as before the House will provide that that person will be able to make his contribution, also the six percent which normally would be picked up by the government. So here again, that where leave is granted for specific purposes of humanitarianism or what have you, that the employee is still in essence continuing his service for superannuation funds. --(Interjection)-- As though he was getting full salary, yes. In this case however, Mr. Speaker, the illustration that I've just given is that the salary would be paid by the agency to whom the employee has been loaned and not from the public treasury. In other cases, indirectly the salaries may come out of the provincial - I use this in an illustration - that there were a number of employees that were seconded to the FRED programs and ARDA programs which technically took the employee out of the employment of the Province of Manitoba because of the shared program and the aspect and the likes of that. But in order that that employee was not harmed insofar as his continuity of service is concerned and his eligibility for the same type of a pension in the amount while in the service, that was the purpose of these amendments.

Another point that I raised on introduction was that it was required to change the legislation to give a person who had been in the service - as a matter of fact I believe he's still in, will be retiring this fall - who was deprived of a disability pension by order-in-council of some former administration in 1940 who declared by order-in-council that because this person happened to be a disabled person he wouldn't qualify for a disability pension no matter how long he was here. Well that order-in-council was passed in 1940, this is 1972 - 32 years later - an injustice has been remedied and the only way that injustice could be remedied was through this bill.

Members were critical of the Minister of Labour who is charged with the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission and the fund of not bringing in a comprehensive bill of adjustment at this session. If I recall correctly when I introduced the bill I said at that time, and I want to repeat it - and in case I didn't say it I want to say it for the first time, Mr. Speaker - that there is a triannual actuarial study of the fund and that changes are made to some degree after that actuarial study has been reported to the Minister. It is anticipated, Mr. Speaker, that that report will be made to the Minister in August or early in September. That is the main reason why the bill was not before the committee or the House this year in a broader sense. I want to say to particularly the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the points that he raised are valid, that we are contemplating in co-operation with employee representatives - and there is a liaison committee comprised of management-employees that sits and figures out the better way of spending the money that's in the fund. There is definite consideration being given to the possible reduction of the age of retirement without loss of pension; there is consideration being given to the possibility of reducing the period of time for the computing of the pension from ten to say five years, that's all under consideration. There is a task force at work at the present time.

The Member for Assiniboia drew to our attention the desirability and indeed I would say it

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) even goes beyond the desirable; indeed the necessity of attempting to bring about, Mr. Speaker, a system of portability of pensions. There are a number of provinces at the present time that have portability of pensions between civil servants at the federal and provincial level. We have some but we haven't got it all at the present time and that's under consideration. I think that generally answers the questions. The Member for Rhineland said who decides on changes in plan; I think he could gather from my remarks that this is done by joint consultation between members of the civil service, and in the final analysis by order-in-council or changes to the act whichever are provided for in the act.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I share and regret in some case, at least if there hadn't been changes for this year, but I'm sure my honourable friends will appreciate and realize that until you know exactly what you have to work with then you can't really make judgment on any sound basis. Just in passing, while he was speaking, the Member for Assiniboia asked about the amount of interest on refunds to contributors. Here too, Mr. Speaker, was a situation we found when we became the government that no provision had been provided by the previous administration for any refunded interest at all; and while I do agree that in the light of high interest rates today, three percent really is peanuts but nonetheless I would suggest it's a little better of a peanut than the employees who withdrew their contributions obtained under the previous administration. We're not perfect, we realize that, but after all, Mr. Speaker, we have these matters under consideration and I hope that there will be a bill for the consideration of the Assembly at the next session of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Assiniboia have a question?

MR. PATRICK: Yes. Would the Minister permit one question? Would he not agree that 70 percent of your average yearly income, 70 percent of that over a five-year period as compared over ten, because of increases in salaries it may mean as much as \$1,000 difference of the pension to somebody in Manitoba as compared to Alberta or Saskatchewan making the same salary, but averaging it between five and ten. Would you not agree with that?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, I agree basically with my honourable friend, yes, it does increase the amount that they do receive in pensions, Mr. Speaker. But would not my honourable friend also agree that it would increase the possible costs to those who are continuing to contribute and including of course the treasury of the Province of Manitoba who picks up half of the tab in respect of pensions.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Would you call Bill No. 114, The Convention Centre Corporation Act ...

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY presented Bill No. 114, The Convention Centre Corporation Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this afternoon to be able to introduce for second reading this Bill 114, The Convention Centre Corporation Act. This bill establishes the Winnipeg Convention Centre Corporation and provides the legal mechanism for its operation. The Winnipeg Convention Centre Corporation as it will be known is to be a non profit organization. All incomes accrued to the corporation will accordingly be used to further the objectives of the Convention Centre. This provision, Mr. Speaker, is unlike previous acts of incorporation of a similar nature. Specifically this bill of incorporation delineates the Convention Centre's corporation objective as being to build, promote, establish, own, maintain, organize, operate, conduct and manage the new Convention Centre, its buildings and facilities in such a manner that will promote our new City of Winnipeg as the foremost Convention Centre on the North American Continent.

The bill before us establishes the board of directors for the new Convention Centre. It will be made up initially of four members of the Winnipeg City Council appointed by that council for a one-year term; four appointed for three years each and the remaining three appointed for two-year terms; all seven would be appointed by the City of Winnipeg Council. The board would also include two members appointed for one-year terms by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Passage of this Act, Mr. Speaker, will enable the province and the City of Winnipeg to establish a corporation board of directors. Then the many organizational problems and details which need attention can be resolved so that the target date of completion, two years hence, will be effectively realized.

Having dealt with the proposed organizational structure for the Winnipeg Convention Centre, Mr. Speaker, permit me for a moment to offer members a brief progress report on the construction to date. May I say first that at this time plans appear to be on schedule; construction began on both the Convention Centre site and the adjacent hotel-apartment-office building complex last December. I should point out to honourable members that were it not for this government's commitment to provide a grant of 7 1/2 million towards the construction cost of the Convention Centre, that total estimates of around \$15 million that construction and the initial private development by Lakeview Developments would not have begun as yet. These moneys, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will appreciate represent a grant - the \$7 1/2 million maximum represents a grant. We are not and will not be partners in the project. It will be the City of Winnipeg that will be the operators through the Convention Centre Corporation and the people of Winnipeg will be the owners. This commitment and the confidence of this government in the project as part of Winnipeg's downtown redevelopment scheme has provided the vital and necessary impetus for the attraction of private development to the project. I trust that members of the Opposition will realize this when they visit the construction site just a few blocks from the Legislature bounded by St. Mary, York Avenues and Carlton and Edmonton Street. One of the buildings is well on the way and is rising above the levels of the other buildings around.

Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to invite and urge members to visit the development say following the closing of this session. I indicated before that that completion of the Convention Centre is intended two years from now. The hotel, part of a \$30 million project by Lakeview Development and to be operated by the Commonwealth Holiday Inns of Canada will be completed in about a year and will be operational at that time. Members are aware also of the announced development of the Japanese Gardens. It was officially named after the popular Japanese Consul - Uchida Gardens. This ambitious development is an example of imaginative planning. It represents the initial stages of a plan that will eventually see the ethnic and cultural diversity of our city and province, a mosaic which we all are so very proud of, incorporated in the series of downtown parks, gardens and other projects. This unique feature planned because of the Convention Centre will be a lasting tribute to our many ethnic groups and the thousands of members who have played such a significant role in the life of our province and Winnipeg especially. This aspect of the plan will also allow for citizens living in our city

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.) centre to enjoy certain leisurely amenities which otherwise would not be available to them. Hopefully too the many different ethnic groups will be encouraged to contribute their own thought to their respective projects.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier the confidence and commitment given the Convention Centre program by this government. Before concluding I wish to make a few remarks on this. This government - and I wish to single out for particular praise - the First Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works, recognizing the benefits for Winnipeg and supporting financially the construction of the convention - recognize the benefits for Winnipeg in supporting financially the construction of the Convention Centre. We foresaw the creation of jobs not only for the construction trades in an immediate sense, but that jobs would be created in the service industries which make up the tourist and convention trade. Employment will be created for the maintenance of new facilities also. Because of this government's initiative, foresight and confidence in supporting the development of a Convention Centre, Winnipeggers can look forward to many benefits. We have seen some already. Construction jobs have been created. The initial Convention Centre development has been joined by a \$30 million project also under construction now. This, Mr. Speaker, is ample evidence of how public and private enterprise can and should work together in the interests of Winnipeg and our province generally. But had it not been for the initial involvement of this Provincial Government, I am convinced Winnipeg's redevelopment plan would have been shelved. I think too, Mr. Speaker, that this co-operation should be ample proof to certain of the opposition members known as the prophets of doom and gloom and who suggest private investment is lacking; that their comments are nothing more than distortion and idle rhetoric. Idle rhetoric because in fact they - and particularly the two Opposition Leaders have nothing constructive to offer.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that the passage of this measure to establish the Winnipeg Convention Centre Corporation will in effect be a vote of confidence in the project and the actions of this government in supporting it. And, Mr. Speaker, I might add that I had the opportunity of representing, or the pleasure of representing the Premier at the Convention of the Fire Fighters Association of Manitoba at which there was the national President of the Fire Fighters Association who told me that they have their annual convention planned two years hence. I did extend the invitation on behalf of the province at that time, stated possibly the Minister of Public Works would make inquiries that they bring their convention to Winnipeg. The last time they had the convention in Canada was in Toronto in 1968 so I stated that it's a fairly large convention; there is some 1,250 delegates, so that if the people begin to work there is the adequate facilities for those people to come out to one of the most beautiful which I'm quite positive will be one of the most beautiful Convention Centres in North America.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I commend the member for his explanation of the bill. Mind you he did move around a little bit, the bill really is there to set up the corporation which would operate the convention centre; I didn't ever see anything in the bill about operating a hotel or anything of that nature. And I appreciate also the history of the convention centre, and you know when he said that this imaginative government - it wouldn't have gone ahead without the imagination of this government, I would say that if it hadn't been for certain commitments and discussions of the previous government the present government might not have gone ahead at all. There certainly was a little bit of friction among the NDP caucus when it was decided to put some money into that particular building.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is a sensible bill, it's basically the same as the Winnipeg Enterprises Act which sets up a corporation to operate the convention centre properly. The convention centre is the type of an undertaking that has to have a group of people that are continually looking to the operation of the building so that the building will show a profit and be a true benefit to all Manitobans.

There is a suggestion that I might make regarding the committee that is set up. I think that the rural people of Manitoba certainly are interested in the convention centre and it's to be hopeful it will benefit all of the people of rural Manitoba also. A suggestion that maybe somebody from the Association of Manitoba Rural Municipalities, the Manitoba Urban Association or something of that nature be placed on this board would be a good suggestion so that they would have a very close liaison with the convention centre. Mr. Speaker, I think that's all we have to say on the bill, we have no opposition to it. I was pleased to hear from the new public relations department of the NDP in the Member from Radisson, but after all I guess they have to try and

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) blow their horn once in a while. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support the bill. I believe it's the right course of action that the City of Winnipeg is taking incorporating the Convention Centre and to run it in that way. I believe that the administration will become much more efficient by having the convention centre set up under this basis. I know that four members will be selected from the City Council and seven persons citizens of this city, and two will be appointed annually by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I believe the point that was made by the Member for Sturgeon Creek is a valid one and perhaps a very important one, that there should be perhaps somebody representing rural Manitoba as well. I do feel that the course of action that's taken in this bill is a correct one and I intend to support it.

I also wish to say that I feel that the convention centre is the right thing for the City of Winnipeg and the right thing for the Province of Manitoba. I think it will need a considerable amount of promotion and just because Winnipeg is located in the centre of Canada I think that this venture will be a success and it will be a great asset as far as attracting tourism to this province, attracting big conventions, and I feel that this is the right thing to do what this bill calls for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise not to in any way delay or oppose the legislation, but it's not frequently that one gets the opportunity to reply to statements made while he's standing on his feet, from the Honourable Member from Radisson. And as I listened to him I couldn't help but be reminded of the story of the itinerant preacher who had decided to call a meeting in cattle country in the west, and the night of the meeting only a handful of ranchers showed up and he wasn't sure whether he should deliver his sermon or not, so he checked with a grizzled rancher in the front seat and said "now what would you do under the circumstances"? He said "well", he said, "if I was going to feed the cattle and it was feeding time and only a few of them showed up I would feed them anyway". And taking that as his cue, he gave forth with the full brunt of his eloquence and after an hour and a half of sermon he went down to the rancher again and said, "Well how was that?" He said, "Well, if I was going to feed the cattle at a certain time and only a few of them showed up" he said, "I wouldn't throw them the whole damn load". And that's just about what we got from the Member for Radisson - the whole load. And when I asked him to explain the terms of this bill I wasn't expecting the full force of his eloquence at this stage. However, we are pleased on this side to lend support to the bill and the thought and the idea that's behind it and we hope that - all Manitobans hope that the convention centre will indeed be one of the more important and the more attractive features of the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 84, I believe the Member for Gimli is prepared to do it on behalf of the Member for Wellington.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Member from Wellington, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, that Bill No. 84, an Act to Incorporate the Icelandic Festival of Manitoba or Islendingadagurinn Manitoba be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. GOTTFRIED: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that this bill has been proceeded with by way of a Private Act because the undersigned wished to have as an alternative the name "Islendingadagurinn Manitoba" which is a free translation of the English name into the Icelandic language. While the Companies Act allows alternative names in the French language it does not allow alternative names in other languages. So it was decided to proceed with the bill in this manner.

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd)

The present unincorporated association that carries on the annual festival, every first long weekend in August, has been in existence for 83 years. During this period of time the Islendingadagurinn has grown from a mainly local event to one that now sees the return of many families of Icelandic origin from all parts of the North American continent; the descendants of the early pioneers to the Gimli Park to renew acquaintances and to enjoy a day of fellowship. Mr. Speaker, because of the growth of the event and the various activities carried on, it has been deemed advisable to incorporate to protect themselves from personal liability that might arise. I therefore recommend this bill to the House and ask for your wholehearted support.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 84 which reads "An Act to Incorporate The Icelandic Festival of Manitoba" or as better known "Islendingadagurinn for the Province of Manitoba". I can't resist the temptation, Mr. Speaker, to say that when we have another language mentioned in this Chamber other than the English language, I have had the pleasant experiences on a number of occasions meeting with people of other tongues such as my good French people that I know so well and sometimes I don't understand their language. They might speak to me in their own mother tongue, I reply in the Icelandic language and of course it's very amusing to see the reaction of people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that the Icelandic people of this province and particularly of Gimli have been concerned about and were hoping that it would receive quick passage. The member commented that the people who have been responsible for this undertaking has been a tremendous one and one that they have not been too comfortable about because if something goes wrong then they are liable and the celebrations that are held at Gimli, which is a yearly affair, in the first week in August the things that are now going on there and the new programs of entertainment what have you that are being introduced warrant the kind of legislation that offers itself in this bill, and as a result of this they are very thankful that this legislation is forthcoming.

I should also like to say, Sir, that I think that this is another ethnic group of the Province of Manitoba and you dealt with a bill that was passed, namely dealing with the moneys going toward the cultural centre in St. Boniface. By incorporating the Icelandic Festival it does make it legal for them to apply for grants and this is another area and I think that, Mr. Speaker, that since the government of the day has taken upon itself to, shall I say, maybe use the word cater to, one segment of society I think they're going to find that all ethnic groups are going to feel they are entitled to the same treatment.

So, Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side are very pleased to support this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words of congratulation to this group - the name is a bit harder for me to pronounce - the Islendingadagurinn. I think this is a step in the direction that a lot of ethnic groups will take note of and I can only say that I want to try and attend some of these festivals because when I think of all the pretty Icelandic young girls and also the smiling sincerity of the elders as is portrayed in this House so often by members of the Icelandic group, I want to make sure that I will attend some of these festivals.

However, I think this is a step taken by this group that other ethnic groups will certainly first of all watch and I think follow and I do wish that their intentions and their deliberations is going to be one that will help in the unification of their group, although usually they don't need much more uniting, they're usually together anyways, but if it helps in any way to further that cause I'm sure it will be of benefit to all concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the bill. I too well remember when the former Minister of Education and Health at one time in the former government, Dr. Johnson, spoke of the jewel of the north, Gimli, and told us of all the good things and about the Icelandic people. I certainly wish them well and I hope the bill will assist them in furthering their purposes.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill 102 please.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson. The honourable member.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply to increase the capital stock . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the honourable member introduce it first.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood that Bill 102, an Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying this bill is simply to increase the capital stock which is presently \$250,000 to 525,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you call Bill No. 74.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to support the bill, we have no objection for the bill to proceed to committee.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you call the resolution of the Honourable the First Minister standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, there were a number of interesting submissions by Members of the Opposition most recently. The two that stand out in my mind of course are the Member for Riel and the Member for Lakeside. There were many points in the comments made by the Member for Riel that I could subscribe to; however, the Member for Lakeside gave a rather different kind of speech. It was a kind of performance that I'm sure he gives on the stump, really wowing the folks back home and playing possum as well, because he made a big point of the fact that he doesn't really know what to do in the event of this particular issue and this specific resolution. Mr. Speaker, I think that if the member is unclear in his thinking or is confused or is uncertain at the time that the question is called he should simply not vote.

He also indicated to us that he represents Lakeside on all issues and presumably on this particular issue as well. I suppose the grounds of justification for his position is that he won the election, But I wonder whether he in fact fought this particular issue in his campaign against Bobby Bend who was then the Leader of the Liberal Party, whether he has taken a poll on this particular issue; or whether he has made an analysis of his mail and whether he thinks that that does in fact accurately reflect the thinking of the people in his constituency. We know, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. D. L. Campbell, the former Premier of the province, represented Lakeside for some 47 years and as Premier and as member did not in fact support the principle of aid to private and parochial schools.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside also offers advice to the Premier of this province; told the story of how he spoke to him at the time of the passage of the last resolution; suggested to him that he should therefore bring in a bill which he would support and which a majority of the House would support at a time when the government was in a minority position. Mr. Speaker, I would question taking advice at any time from a member of the Opposition on a tactical or a strategic matter. I think on factual points or on opinion, I think we give consideration to the opinion of every member in this House, but when it comes to suggesting a certain strategy or tactic in a very complex situation, that the Premier would be very ill-advised to take Opposition opinion in that regard and particularly the opinion of the Member for Lakeside - because I would certainly believe that one of his most famous pieces of advice was to his leader in 1969 to call the general election, with disastrous results for his own party. Mr. Speaker, in short I think that the Member for Lakeside baited the Premier and has attempted to indicate that he isn't sure what he's going to do, intended to embarrass the Premier but in the time of the voting itself, all of us know that he will simply vote for the resolution. -- (Interjection)-- You'll find out very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is reminiscent of the 1970 resolution to consider the advisability of granting aid to teachers' salaries for private and parochial schools which

(MR. DOERN cont'd) was passed by a vote of 36 to 15. That resolution was supported by three groups of MLAs. First, the private and parochial school supporter; secondly, those who wanted a new variety of schools, and third, those who attempted to straddle the issue. Now the issue has surfaced again and I would like to direct my attention to those who followed a course of action in 1970 that they may repeat in 1972. Although I have a word or two for private and parochial school supporters, my comments are largely directed to those in the second and third categories.

First, those who might be described generally as private and parochial school supporters, everyone in this category will undoubtedly support this resolution because it is a step in the direction of more government assistance. There are three possible outcomes. First, should the resolution pass a bill will be introduced and when the bill is passed there will be more aid. Later further aid can be requested. Mr. Speaker, I believe that once that pattern develops that this will in effect open the floodgates and forever after political parties will vie with one another at each election to out-bid each other. Should the resolution pass and the committee recommend against further aid and/or the bill failed, there is always next year. And similarly if the resolution fails it can be reintroduced at another session.

Mr. Speaker, this is an annual affair. We have heard that unless there is state aid private and parochial schools will disappear; this was the cry of the 1890s in Manitoba; it was again repeated with some swelling of chorus in the 1960s in our province; and once more in the 1970s we are hearing this statement again. There is no doubt that some schools may disappear, but others will spring up. Some are in trouble now, but others are healthy. I am certain that those of us who live on into the 21st century will still be listening to dire predictions about the imminent closure of private and parochial schools. There are some in fact, Mr. Speaker, when you hear all the opinions that are offered on this complex question, some will even tell us that the failure of this resolution will antagonize Quebec, thereby reviving an ancient argument. This may have been true in the 1890s but there are now four western provinces with four different approaches in the 1970s.

The question today is not aid versus no aid. It is present aid versus more aid. Presently we have shared services whereby books and buses are provided, there is access to public schools for any part of the curriculum, and ultimately there is open entry into the public school system for any or all private or parochial students as public students.

During his Estimates the Minister of Education identified \$96,000 paid by the province for salaries and admitted that the cost of parochial schools integrated in the public schools by special agreement are not shown. And it wouldn't surprise me if one attempted to calculate the amount of money that would be allocated for those schools whose budgets are contained in the budgets of other school divisions, that one would arrive at a figure of hundreds of thousands of dollars if not millions. Those who continually raise the issue tell us that tell us that something must be done now or there will be dire consequences; there will be hard feelings or bitter animosity, schools closing, hundreds of schools entering the public school system and so on. But it is equally valid to argue that such aid will threaten the harmony and delicate balance of the province. Mr. Speaker, I have heard statements made by respected member of the community who contend that if aid is granted, and increases in amounts over the years, that the public school system could shrink eventually becoming the home of the poor - the Protestants and the Anglo Saxons - while the private schools will become the preserve of the rich and the parochial schools the home of ethnic and religious minorities.

Mr. Speaker, the second group of MLAs that I would like to address my comments to are those who want or seek a new variety of schools, those who seek or desire more innovation. They argue that the public schools do not meet everyone's needs. Many of these people are former teachers or people who view education as a means of radically altering or transforming man and society. Some of them want money for their favourite dreams and schemes. Their logic is as follows: There are defects in the public school system, therefore provide for the establishment of new private schools by providing aid to both private and parochial schools; or they believe that we should radically transform the public school system. If there are defects in the public school system, let us remedy them for God's sake, don't weaken or abandon it. We can provide more money for the public school system for better teachers, equipment and administration. We can encourage citizen involvement in school boards, PTAs and parents' nights or any other form that exists to involve the public and the profession.

It is interesting to note that during the Estimates of the Departments of Education and Colleges and Universities - the two departments - there was no real criticism of the public

(MR. DOERN cont'd) school system as it exists today. Now there is and will be talk of defects and shortcomings, but during the actual debate in the House where was the effective criticism? One of my major concerns is that the implementation of a program to provide assistance for private and parochial schools means more money for other school systems, which means less money for private schools - pardon me, for public schools. We are all aware of the load of education cost on the taxpayer and in particular the real property taxpayer and now we have proposals which would increase that load, at what price? More for private and parochial schools, less for the public schools. The implementation of new programs of financial assistance will mean the proliferation of private and parochial schools. There will be more schools and more students outside our present system, and there will be assistance to wealthy schools and parents who can well afford the little extras in life. A number of school divisions passed resolutions opposing further government assistance to private and parochial schools. Mr. Speaker, all of us have had considerable mail in this regard but I wish to refer to the school divisions themselves. I don't know whether I have compiled the complete list, but among those who are opposed in principle to any extension of aid or any major revisions of the present system were the Winnipeg No. 1, Dauphin-Ochre Area No. 1, Interlake 21, Portage la Prairie 24, Midland 25 which is the Carmen area; Turtle Mountain 44, Killarney-Western 47 around Morden; and in addition to that the Manitoba Association of School Superintendents.

In particular I would like to meet head on the ridiculous charge that the public school system fails to provide variety and opportunity to meet the individual needs of a student. In order to have a variety of courses we require larger schools. For example, in a Manitoba high school with 700 students there are as many as 85 programs. Of course size alone does not provide all the answers and could in fact be an impersonal factor, but in general to have diversity one needs size. Breaking up schools lessens options. The flexibility in the public school system is a mess. There are trimester systems in Winnipeg and in the rural areas, there are many experiments in curriculum. Those who contend that the curriculum is not relevant are unaware of the course and projects that students occupy themselves with today. Those who are familiar with some of the attempts by individual teachers to bring current issues into the class room to get the students on field trips to study the question of pollution and so on, this is what is being done in the Manitoba school system; there is a great deal of flexibility and a great deal of variety. The flexibility in the public school system is a mess. We have a large variety of courses and programs. There's a university entrance course, general occupational entrance, developmental education for the slower students, vocational programs which include commercial and industrial; there's a great flexibility in course and program with the possibility of transfer. And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I think some credit goes to MLAs on this side and Ministers who as members of the Opposition fought for greater flexibility and greater transferability between courses, because some students were being locked into particular programs or streams and I know that the two present Ministers were instrumental in widening that possibility.

The centralization is a fact today. The dropping of departmental exams allows each school to set its own exams or to grade students on the basis of continuous testing. There is individual programming and individual timetabling. In elementary schools there is continuous programming; for example, a student may be at the Grade 5 level in reading and at the Grade 3 level in mathematics. There are new science courses in Manitoba schools, such as the PSSC physics; in many cases we have more variety in that department than many American centres. Flexibility however costs money. A small number of students in each classroom is desirable but expensive. Exotic courses cost money, and a variety of programs and options requires large numbers of students. To provide a course in graphic arts for a dozen students or so one might require a student body of 1,000.

Now some of my colleagues, particularly in the back bench, if I understand their argument correctly, Mr. Speaker, they argue for a new great democratic ideal, namely let the parents run each school. This I suggest will ultimately lead to chaos because school will be individually fought over by competing groups, experimentation will be rampant and the students will suffer. We cannot satisfy everyone. This would require one school for every parent, one for every child. In fact we have always had this, it's called the home.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard of a new concept or an extension of an existing concept referred to as the umbrella. I categorically reject the umbrella concept put forward, because this is equivalent to providing complete aid for private and parochial schools. We may as well

(MR. DOERN cont'd) provide 100 percent aid outside the system as integrate them in the present school system; I see no difference. We would no longer have a public school system, we would have a public, private and parochial school system which would be referred to as the public school system, just a matter of semantics.

Mr. Speaker, the final group that I wish to address some comments to are those who in the past have sought to straddle the issue and are once more considering that same position. This includes those who are genuinely undecided and those who are buying time. Those MLAs who procrastinate or play it safe should seriously consider the implications of their actions. For instance, those who took the position that a vote for a resolution put forward in 1970 enabled them to buy time simply fostered the notion that they were in favour of aid. For the sake of expediency they will lock themselves and their constituents into a course of action that is irreversible. A more honourable course of action would be simply to absent yourself during the vote if you find yourself in this quandry.

The establishment of a committee to study the various alternatives providing aid for private and parochial schools will be a colossal waste of time. A committee might make a useful contribution in studying the public school system, although this is continuously under review by parents, students, the Department of Education and the Manitoba Teachers Society and the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. If we are to study the anomalies and the problems that exist in the present Shared Services arrangements per se it would seem that that would only require a couple of weeks. If however we are going to study the public school system and its relation to the private and parochial schools and examine some of the notions and ideas of people who believe that this resolution in fact calls for that type of a study, then I suggest that we will require from one to two years to make a reasonable and fair and in-depth assessment.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster characterized the present problems regarding Shared Services and some of the special agreements and some of the anomalies that exist as an administrative problem and I believe that that is in fact an accurate assessment. Those who are in favour of revamping or re-evaluating the public school system should vote against this resolution which is primarily for the benefit of private and parochial schools. Then they should pressure the government, the Cabinet and the Minister of Education to undertake a systematic and exhaustive analysis of the public school system.

If it is a question of anomalies in the present Shared Services arrangement, the government can iron these out alone. Legislation can be introduced and regulations can be modified. This resolution calls for a study on ways and means of increasing financial assistance to private and parochial schools, with an examination of the curriculum in the public schools. Perhaps we should do the reverse. Perhaps we should study the curriculum of the private and parochial schools and new methods of financing, increased financing for the public schools. Because of the financial difficulties of certain parochial schools we are being asked to consider making changes in the public school system. Mr. Speaker, that's a little like noticing some red spots on your youngest child and then sending your oldest son to the doctor for a check-up. This resolution appears to study both, but in fact it seeks to provide for aid to private and parochial schools. As far as I'm concerned the rest is a matter of packaging. Those of you who buy the illusion are buying aid to private and parochial schools. I say, stand up and be counted now. Your vote in favour of the resolution is the equivalent of supporting aid to private and parochial schools. Your decision is simple. If you favour aid, support the resolution; if you are opposed to aid, oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I have attempted to speak directly to my colleagues and associates on every side of the House. As a former public school teacher I know the system and support it. Further evolution and further improvements are possible within the present framework. As the MLA for Elmwood, I reflect the thinking of my constituents who indicated by a 2-1/2 to 1 margin that they oppose aid. As a New Democrat, I stand in the mainstream of my party's thinking on the issue; and as a Manitoban, I want unity in the province and equal opportunity through a strong public school system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I move and seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder whether it would be appropriate to consider it as being 12:30

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) we'll adjourn the House, or you'll adjourn the House until 2:30 this afternoon. And if I may be permitted just to outline once again some thoughts that we have that we will come into the House at 2:30 and go through the routine proceedings. Two committees will meet this afternoon, I understand by agreement; the Municipal Committee will be meeting in Room 200, the Industrial Relations Committee will be meeting in Room 254. May I give advance notice that because of the large number of delegations yet to be heard in Industrial Relations Committee, it will be considered that Industrial Relations Committee will meet this evening at 8 o'clock to continue hearing representations. I had announced yesterday afternoon that I thought possibly this evening at 8:00 o'clock, Law Amendments Committee would meet. In consultation with the House Leader of the Conservative Party, it would be deemed advisable now to not call the Law Amendments Committee for this evening at 8 o'clock in order that the Industrial Relations Committee should continue hearing representations.

I also think that it may be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me at this particular time as House Leader to give some indication as to tomorrow for the benefit of the honourable members. I say to the members on the Industrial Relations Committee that if hearings are not completed, representations are not completed - we hope that they will be, tonight or early tomorrow morning - then the Committee on Industrial Relations will continue to hear representations tomorrow morning, Saturday morning; it would not be our intention to call the House for Saturday or for this evening. So, Mr. Speaker, if there are any questions pertaining to this that the honourable members wish to discuss with me over the lunch hour I'd be more than pleased. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, at this time I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, the House do now adjourn until 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m.