

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

1:30 o'clock Thursday, May 9, 1974.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 65 students Grade 9 standing of the Rivers Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Anderson and Mrs. Fisher. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Virden.

And we have 25 students, Grade 12 standing of the Garry High School in Minnesota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Meyer. They are also guests of the Assembly.

We have 13 students, Grade 12 standing of the Grant Park School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Cullen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the Estimates of the Department of Education, last day the Honourable Member for Riel had some time left. I notice he's not here. The Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Mr. Chairman, yes, the Honourable Member for Riel was on his feet at the time the Committee rose yesterday, and I thought that I would just take this - in view of the fact that he is not here - I would wish to respond at this point in time to some of the comments made by the honourable members who participated in the debate up to this point in time.

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

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Is it the intention of the Minister to permit the Honourable Member for Riel to speak . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well that is not a point of order. The member will have an opportunity in the usual manner.

MR. BILTON: I said a point of privilege.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have an opportunity without having to resort to any kind of a point of privilege or order. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commence by replying to some of the points and questions raised by the Honourable Member for Brandon West. One of the first matters of concern to him that he raised was the time allotted to physical education, and then in the same light he also spoke of the time allotment for other subjects in general, as well as the impact of the CORE Committee recommendations. So I may not be answering the questions in the order in which they were presented to me by the honourable member but I would prefer to deal firstly with all the questions related to curriculum, to all subjects, physical education, the matter of choice of options, and so forth.

Now honourable members ought to be aware, Mr. Chairman, that the revised high school program that is presently presented to the schools is not a complete implementation of the CORE Report. There have been some changes, some variations from the recommendations of the CORE Report.

Now although there are some features in common, such as the use of the credit system, the revised program still retains the essential features of the existing system which is the

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) core of compulsory subjects. That, Mr. Chairman, is still there, and that is, the compulsory subjects are mathematics, English, science, social studies, in the first two years of high school, and English in the final year; that has not changed. Further liberalization of the program will depend on the interest and desire expressed by trustees, school personnel and local communities.

The requirements of a credit or its equivalent in physical education does not represent anything additional to the program. In that respect there has not been any significant change.

In the existing program, six percent programs are required in both Grades 10 and 11, and these of course may be continued if desired. They would constitute, one half credit programs each together would satisfy the stated requirement. However, many schools have changed their pattern and were offering in addition a 12 percent course for those students who chose this option, and to clarify the situation the requirement was changed to read one credit or its equivalent, that is two half credits, taken during the three year high school term. Now this does not preclude a school from offering additional courses in physical education on an optional basis. In a special case where a student has completed Grade 10 and the school is moving on to the credit system in the fall, and at the same time is introducing a single 12 percent physical education program, it is not necessary to insist that the student pick up an additional half credit in physical education in order to qualify for graduation.

Schools which decide to dispense with the current six percent programs in Phys Ed and instead substitute a single 12 percent program suitable for all students, need not obtain departmental approval for the new 12 percent program, providing that they utilize the departmental guidelines concerning the balance of activities to be included in the program.

Now for all programs where recommended time allotments have been reduced from 18 to 12 percent the new course guidelines are being prepared and will be distributed to the schools as soon as possible in May or early June. The necessary reductions in content are being recommended by committees of teachers on which are representatives of the post-secondary institutions to maintain liaison with these institutions, recognizing the fact that your high school program is designed to provide the student with a certain basis or ground work which he can apply toward the continuation of his post-secondary studies, and in order to achieve that there has to be this measure of liaison and the schools, our school system has to be cognizant of the post-secondary needs and vice versa; the post-secondary institutions have to be mindful of what is being offered in our high schools.

At the same time some committees are examining the possibilities of creating outlines for additional one half credit courses on specific topics in the same subject areas which could be tried on an experimental basis.

The unit of a credit defined as 110 to 120 of instruction is being taken as the basic measurement unit only. Thus it will be possible for schools to devise courses which would, for example, equate to a half a credit or even two credits, if desired. Now by making, speaking of opposites, by making all options available to all students for credit of any time during their high school years, theoretically makes it possible for a student to graduate with one course at the 300 or 301 level, or Grade 12 level. However, this is not greatly different from the existing system because up to the present time English was the only compulsory Grade 12 subject for the completion of Grade 12 on the rest of the subjects. For many many years a student was able to make up from the Grade 10 or Grade 11 levels.

Now the revised system provides additional flexibility for both the student and the school. I just wish to mention at this point in time, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps back in the days of Confederation, which I'm sure the Honourable Member for Brandon West does not recall, but I'm quite certain that in the days when he was enrolled in high school, certainly going back in my own memory over a third of a century to my high school days, there always were options offered at the senior high school level, perhaps not as wide a range as at the present time but nevertheless there were some. You had a choice of second languages. You had a choice of any one of a number of second languages, typing, industrial arts - agriculture used to be an option course offered at the senior high school level at one time - and so forth. So a student always did have the opportunity to select certain options, and he was put in the position of having to make that choice of that decision. But as the Honourable Member for Brandon West himself alluded to, one of the advantages in this day and age is that the students do have the benefit and the assistance - the benefit of the assistance of a guidance counselling staff in the

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd). . . . schools to assist them in making an intelligent choice of options that may not have been as readily available in the years gone by.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney says that this assistance is not there. But may I remind the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, who is speaking from his seat, that perhaps all schools, some of the smaller schools may not have a guidance counsellor, but our guidance department does provide and furnish information to all schools, enabling all teachers to offer the type of guidance and counselling assistance that they require, to whatever degree that may be necessary.

Now, the honourable member also spoke of - he expressed concern about student-initiated projects, student-initiated courses for credit purposes. Now I'd like to assure the honourable member that responsibility for the approval or rejection of such courses rests with the school division, and consequently these projects will not be submitted to the department for approval, the approval will have to come from the school divisions. But I would hope that this gives the honourable member the assurance that this will not open the door to the establishment of what may be concern, courses of relatively little value or importance, but that they'll be carefully scrutinized by the school administration prior to being given approval.

Locally devised programs which are to be offered by the school - I've now been speaking on the student-initiated courses, and there may also be courses, various programs devised by school divisions which will have to be submitted to us for our approval. The guidelines for this have been furnished to all the school divisions.

Now the revised high school program continues the policy of decentralization of authority from the department to the local system. The department, for example, requires a minimum of 20 credits for graduation and has left up to 20 percent of a school day as unassigned time. The purpose of the unassigned time is to allow the school time in which the school - to allow it time in which to institute curricular or extra curricular programs of its own, which it considers advantageous for its students; or if it wishes to allocate more than 120 hours of instruction per course in any particular subject area, depending on the needs of the different student groups.

Similarly the school may establish any course prerequisites that it considers necessary, and may also require students to complete more than 20 credits to graduate from the school, if this is the policy of the local school system. By passing this authority and responsibility to the local division it makes possible the development and implementation of an educational system tailored to the specific needs, wishes and expectations of the local community. It is not expected that such a policy will necessarily be developed for the coming year, and it is not a prerequisite step to the implementation of the credit system, but it does represent another step in the strengthening of local autonomy in educational matters.

Now just a further comment about the student-initiative projects - and I would just like to for the benefit of honourable members, Mr. Chairman, outline the guidelines and the basic principles that are being followed. Now for a number of years high school students have received credit for out-of-school programs through work education. For example, in our occupational entrance courses programs, some of the courses contained in there, students and business education and industrial courses. The concept of student-initiative project credits extends this principle to all students by providing a means whereby students may initiate their own courses in areas of special interest, academic, work education, which are not provided for in the regular high school curriculum. Such project credits should be for activity or process and growth therefrom and not for competence already possessed. And the basic principles are as follows:

(1) That the introduction of student initiative project credits is at the discretion of school boards. In other words, the school board will have to give the approval for making provision for student-initiated projects.

(2) Student initiative project credits will be open to all high school students but should be limited by the capacities of staff of any one school to carry out such activities, recognizing of course that this would increase the workload upon the staff, make it necessary to provide the necessary guidance and supervision and direction in assisting the student with a project initiated by him. So therefore the local limitations of local resources, human and otherwise certainly have to be taken into account.

A student-initiative project credit should be equated with a measurable learning experience

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) appropriate to the needs of a high school student, and the initiative should come from the student. A student-initiative project credit program should have the form of a contractual agreement involving student, parents, teacher, principal, and where applicable the responsible person in the out-of-school learning situation. For example, honourable members may recall a couple of months or so an interest, or a desire, expressed by a student in Winnipeg in the Seven Oaks School Division seeking credit for her experience gained working at a home for retardates where she spends a considerable amount of time. Now in a program such as that it would require a commitment on the part of all of those that I have mentioned, including the institution wherein she'd be working, or where he'd be working.

A student-initiative project should be approved, supported and supervised by a teacher sponsor and have the approval of the school principal. There should be a written record of the agreement reached between the student and the teacher to include such details as the purpose of the project, resources needed, methods, approaches and activities to be followed, expectations, results and evaluatory procedures to be used. It may take the form of an extension of an existing school course or a course in a new area not related to a specific subject in the existing high school curriculum. For example, it may be in the field of electronics related to a course in physics that a student may be taking as part of the regular high school program, and he may have an opportunity to pursue - in other words it would be an extension of the study of physics, his work on his own in the field of electronics, or whatever else it may be. --(Interjection)-- The basic Maths is part of the school program. I'm merely using that as an example, It may be a course not in the field of sciences and mathematics, the range is limitless.

A student-initiative project credit program should not be equated with regular extra curricula activities of the school, with activities and services regularly provided within the school division, nor with the regular activities of organized community groups. Among the requirements to establish a student-initiative project credit should be the minimum of 110 to 120 hours of work. On this basis the project credit requiring 55 to 60 hours of work would be considered a half credit. A student may not include more than three student-initiative project credits in a total number of the 20 credits that would constitute as minimum total high school programs. So there is a limitation of in a sense it could work out to one a year or so.

Students will receive no remuneration for their involvement in a student-initiated project credit program. The reason for that is that employers not take advantage of this program as a means of obtaining a cheap source of supply of labour.

As an extension of its services the correspondence branch may accept a limited number of student-initiated projects for credit as an experiment where the principal is prepared to sign the students application. Under such conditions the agreement will be worked out between the correspondence branch and the student, with the school being provided with a copy of the agreement for its information. It's the school's responsibility to satisfy itself that any student-initiated project proposed is within the student's capacity to accomplish it. Each project agreement approved by the school should be forwarded to the Department of Education for information purposes.

Now during the forthcoming two years it will be initiated on an experimental basis, and being such will of course be evaluated by the Department of Education with a view of determining the success of the program and the need for the future modification.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West also commented on the change in philosophy of education that we're witnessing now, and he drew the analogy between it and the swing of a pendulum, and the honourable member's probably quite correct that educational philosophy does swing perhaps in a direction of one extreme to that in the other, perhaps never quite reaching either extreme, and at what point we are in the swing of the pendulum, I don't know. But perhaps the honourable member is correct that we're somewhere at the midway point and swinging away from the direction in which the pendulum was swinging four or five years ago, or somewhere in that area.

Speaking in that vein the honourable member also made reference to open area and trimester. I should inform honourable members that in the approval of school construction that we do see to it that schools are built, are designed and built in such a way as to allow for both types of teaching to be carried on in the traditional classroom and in the open area. And I'm confident that all school divisions are well aware that the open area concept of teaching is

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) not something that can just merely be thrust upon teachers, it requires considerable planning, preparation, inservice training, and this is done in all school divisions involving all of those teachers who are involved in open area teaching. By seeing to it that provision is made for both types of instruction. This also implies the recognition of the fact that some teachers can function more effectively in a traditional type of classroom and therefore opportunity for them to do so should be provided.

I would find it difficult to accept the statement made by the Honourable Member for Brandon West that our schools may tend to become drop-in centres, fun places. I think if any honourable member will compare the program of studies of today with that of 10, 15, 20 or 25 years ago, one would quite quickly and readily see that the challenge offered to the students today is far greater than that which may have ever been offered at any point in time previously. I'm at a bit of a loss as to what the honourable member's exact position or attitude to this is because I do recall - I do not have yesterday's Hansard, we're a day or so behind - but if my notes are correct - I have written down that the honourable member did state that he is impressed with the serious approach of students toward the school program. Well if they are serious minded about the education that they are seeking, then I would doubt very much whether the schools can be regarded as drop-in centres or fun places, or that they are regarding schools as drop-in centres or fun places.

In the honourable member's opening remarks, and I just wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps during the time that I have I will not be able to comment or respond to all members who have participated in debate to this point in time, but I would hope that as the consideration of my estimates proceeds that there will be the opportunity to do so. The honourable member, I believe the second point that he made, the first one was his expression of concern about our expressing a desire to see our physical education program expanded.

His second point of concern was one of the burden of taxation, as he called it, and I would just like to draw to the honourable member's attention, and perhaps at a later point in time if this should be necessary I could elaborate on this, that in 1970 the provincial share of the school expenditures, the provincial share of a total of the school budgets amounted to just slightly better than 50 percent; and it remains at about that level for '71, increased to about 54 and a fraction, 54 - 2/3 percent; and then in '72, '73 and '74 it was in the 70 percent range.

I would also wish to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that in our meetings with the Manitoba Association of School Trustees the trustees have admitted, have indicated to us that with a view to retaining their measure of local autonomy, and we are moving in that direction to allow school divisions more flexibility in the planning and the design of their programs, they do feel that to enable themselves to retain that measure of local autonomy, they should also retain some revenue raising power, some taxation power. We've asked them, and they've indicated to us that somewhere in the 20 to 30 percent range is the range in which they would wish to remain. I would like to indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, that via our tax credit system, via our adjustments in the grant system, the student grants, the student equalization grants, examining the sum total that this year the province is picking up something in the order of better than 71, between 71 and 72 percent of the total school expenditures in the Province of Manitoba.

Now having said that, I would like to repeat the comment I made in my opening remarks that what I indicated, that this year the entire grant structure, the method of funding schools will be reviewed. I did mention that inequities exist. We make no apologies for the extent to which we finance education in total in the Province of Manitoba; but within the province on a division by division basis there still exists problems in some divisions that have to be rectified. It is our hope to design a formula, a program, that would be sufficiently flexible to meet the varied needs of the different school divisions in the province, needs that may differ on the basis of population, economic base, and so forth. Now . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I would first like to say that I found many of the comments made so far in this discussion of estimates to be quite interesting, mainly because I think they reflect a variety of opinions and views on the state and quality of education in the province. But I rise mainly to express my surprise and to some degree, disappointment in the neglect of the Minister in not in any way treating what I consider to be probably one of the most dramatic and critical occurrences in the educational system of Manitoba, and that is

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) the combination sort of declining enrollments, consolidation of the school problems into sort of focusing on school divisions themselves, and the accompanying problems it really seriously brings about, teacher supply, and the student-pupil ratios, and the basic challenge that is posed to reorganize the system which for many years has been used to being on a growth curve, where the enrollments were going up, teachers were going up, and all of a sudden the top of that curve has now been reached. All those post-war babies have passed through the system and are now sort of providing the bulge in the housing market, they are beyond the school system and what we have to look forward to now is a downward curve. I think that the statistics that were issued in the Minister's own report provide both an indication that enrollment is now down to its 1969 level, and that the number of teachers in the province is declining accordingly. That creates, Mr. Chairman, I think some very soul-searching issues related to the problem of education.

To being with it poses the problem of the grant structure and whether in fact under the present grant formulas a serious disservice is applied to those school divisions, smaller school divisions, which because of declining enrollment and shifts in population, find themselves continually having less coming to them through the Foundation Program, and therefore having to undertake serious surgery upon their teaching staff with the result that there is a serious danger of the quality of education in these divisions being affected, and particularly because in many school divisions, which are attempting to provide for a variety in educational experience, the Foundation Grant does not cover certain supernumerary functions, guidance counselling, and other kinds of activities, to any major degree. Therefore for any school division that has any interest in providing a full range of the educational services, they are posed with a very critical problem of whether they are going to cut back on the support services of the school, which provide for counselling and art and drama and music, other things such as that; or whether they are going to cut back on the stricter academic subjects and therefore have to rely upon consolidation in the school room, a larger student-pupil ratio, and to say nothing of the particular hardship effect upon teachers, who have been teaching in school divisions for several years, have developed a certain career pattern, and all of a sudden find themselves being dislocated.

I think that one of the major problems too that has to be traced back to the workings of the grant formulas which do not take into account that kind of flexibility that is required in order to insure that certain standards can be maintained, and that certain protection can be afforded to teaching staff. I would think that this is a particularly critical issue when - I stand back with great respect to the Minister in his description of the CORE program, talking about the new flexibility, and all the new options, but the fact of the matter is that if you're going to offer that flexibility and those new options, you need teachers to do it. In fact, you need probably a more selective student-pupil relationship than you now have; that you can't offer individual instruction, student-initiated programs without some closer student teacher supervision, which cannot be afforded by some, formerly that 25-1 classroom ratio. That is simply not possible. So there is a curious anomaly, or perhaps even a contradiction, that while the Department of Education is now beginning to try and promote this progressiveness in its education system, is in fact taking away the wherewithal for the school districts to provide it properly. What they're simply going to be forced to do is either to provide a watered-down, diluted, nonsensical CORE curriculum because they don't have the staff to do it, other than in the very largest divisions, or simply not to be able to offer it at all, and therefore have a comparative disadvantage again to the large school divisions. So it would seem to me that when the Minister made remarks about having to review the Grant Formula, it struck me as having more significance than what he really let on, that it really strikes to the basic heart of the kind and quality of education that we're prepared to offer, and whether in fact that grant formula is so constructed to insure that not only there will be a preservation in maintenance of standards, but that with the introduction of new curriculum, requiring a much higher degree of supervision and a much smaller ratio of student to pupils, that in fact he is denying that in many respects. I think that that is a problem which I didn't hear him talk about. I would certainly welcome his comments in relation to this problem because if the population curves have any meaning, it is a problem which is going to become more present and more ominous because the population curve is going to continue to go down.

It also relates very strongly again to something I didn't hear the Minister comment at

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) all upon, and it may be just an oversight, about the question of teacher education and supply and training but again, in those halcyon days when education was the fair-haired boy of public expenditure, no one really questioned it, everyone sort of was prepared to do and die for the dear old school, and there was no second reservations about teaching. But as the costs are beginning to rise, and as the population curves go down, and the grants get smaller, all of a sudden we find ourselves still with the situation of having constructed several new teacher training programs in the province, and having a very large teacher supply, and I've heard the Minister in the past deny that it's a problem. I think that when a group of teachers in the Winnipeg region banded together into an organization last year to suggest that they were simply out of work, the Minister said, well there's lots of work out in the rural areas. Which I thought was really not a very good answer. Because if that is the case, then that kind of prescription that he was offering should be built into the educational training program, and we should get away from the kind of, you know, the market type system where everyone kinda goes and chooses, and so on, that obviously there has to be some major reconstruction of the teacher training program.

Also, I suppose, I want to know if the Department of Education has been doing any hard thinking about establishing limits on enrollment in these teacher programs. I'm not advocating it; I'm just suggesting is that going to be an issue. Because certainly we also reach the problem of two contradictory trends occurring that you are finding an increase in enrollment, or at least still a very high enrollment in the universities in the arts and science subjects, out of which many elementary and public school teachers are drawn, teaching is still a major profession to which many of them are oriented. We've introduced new programs into the universities, while at the very same time we are sort of wondering whether we're going to need all those teachers. I can tell from my own experience over the last two or three weeks, and through the experience of my wife, who is in the teaching profession, that the number of teachers coming out on the market again, you know, they're knocking on the doors right now, and finding many many of those doors closed, because the school divisions that they would normally be able to absorb one or two per year, are now in fact being forced to let go teachers, or certainly to sort of readjust their own teaching staff, or to allow the normal attrition rate to take care of it.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, just for one moment. I would like to draw attention of the members to the gallery on my left where we have some 27 students from the Rossville School in Norway House, students from Grade 7, 8 and 9. They are under the direction of their teacher Mr. Lennon. The students are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. On behalf of all members present I bid you welcome.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION cont'd

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you Mr. Chairman. So that that is a series of questions that I would certainly like to have the Minister, if he could, respond to about how he sees the Department of Education developing a proper strategy or approach, at least, towards the situation in the educational system that is posed by the changing in the population trends, and the fact that we're now going to have to undertake major readjustment to adapt to the declines in enrollment, and how that will affect issues all the way related to grants, so that we can protect the small school divisions. Secondly, how it relates to the question of student group, teacher pupil ratios, to insure again that there would be some perhaps additional bonus system established for school divisions that are faced with that particular problem.

It also of course relates to the question of the use of school buildings which, as has been brought up before, that again with shifts in populations, it's a common occurrence, and I believe in conversation with some of the members from outside Winnipeg, and I can also speak of schools in my own area, in the downtown part of Winnipeg, where --(Interjection)-- and the Member for Assiniboia just tells me he has the same situation in his own - where there is again because of the shifts in population, school buildings, some of which were built four or five or six years ago, which are now half empty, and others which are bulging at the seams. Which seems to me, it requires either the application of a program similar to what the Toronto Educational system undertook, where they developed sort of a portable modular system to make

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) those kind of adaptations or, and perhaps this will be even more constructive, developing a variety of uses for school buildings. I believe during the debate we had previously on day care centers, it was suggested that one of the obvious uses for school buildings, school classrooms, which are not being used for elementary and other purposes, would be in the child care field for offering facilities for lunch and after care programs, day care services, etc., and perhaps they can also be incorporated as part of the social community health clinic concept that is being somewhat bandied about. In other words, making the school into that multi-purpose kind of occupation, again providing some assistance to help in the transition.

Again I have spent some time with school boards talking to them about that in terms of some of the research I've been involved in, and many of them pay lip service and very genuinely would like to do it, but again come back to the question as to how to do it? How do you get the money to change the capital? There is no really provisions under the capital assistance the province provides for adjustment and transition to other uses of schools. In fact, they're pretty niggardly when it comes even to upgrading the schools, and we ran into the very unfortunate situation, I believe, in the Daniel McIntyre school, and others in that west end, where in order to make adaptations that would be suitable to changing needs in the area they found themselves sort of cut back substantially. The Minister denied any responsibility but the fact is it occurred. It is something that I think is symptomatic of the problem that a variety of school buildings are having to adjust to major changes in use, and again if there is to be a variety of community uses incorporated in those, where they're often very good structures, then it would seem to me that we should at least have some form of program to enable them to do so without having to do it on an ad hoc basis or to kind of go around squibbling for little bits and pieces where they can find it.

Another issue that I wish the Minister had spent somewhat more time on is the question of research and planning. He indicated that the estimates this year on research and planning are improving substantially - I believe the figure is, was it \$500,000 or more? I wonder what it's for really. I went through the report and found out the things that Research and Planning is supposed to be doing but I would think that their most essential function I don't see anywhere being performed, and that is a basic evaluation of what is happening in the schools. I was intrigued, I was listening to the member from Brandon West, and I think the Member for Riel, who are raising some questions about the open area system and the continuous progress system, that these were educational innovations that were introduced four or five years ago and they had good credits assigned to them as to the effect it would have upon children, and many schools have incorporated them. Yet in some research that was done by some students of the University of Winnipeg this year, they went back to try and find out who is responsible for determining whether that open area continuous progress system is working or not, what effect is it having, and he found out that no one was prepared to admit and that they were responsible. So here was a major educational innovation that was introduced, and we have a very expensive Research and Planning staff which is doing no evaluation work to determine whether in fact that major innovation is living up to its purposes or not. I would think that that would be their primary responsibility, would be not simply to go around sort of dreaming up all their new ideas but also seeing if the ideas in fact, work. That is a fairly important issue, and that I think is something that, unless I'm mistaken and unless the report of those students is mistaken, is something that is not being done.

I think it comes back to another, a basic issue that certainly taxpayers and others who pay for the schools are raising, and that is the, and I almost don't like to use the economic word, but the productivity of the school system if you like - that we don't normally apply the concept of productivity to schools. But certainly the issue is being raised whether we can in fact get better use for a dollar spent, and that again is a very important piece of research. I think the Minister has probably looked into the reports written by people like Christopher Jencks in his study "Inequality in the Schools", and the James Coleman study done in the United States, and I found out that that is now emerging as a major issue that without sacrificing the quality of education, one can certainly begin to look at what in fact is the money being spent for, and does it have any use. We find out that a lot of the frills and the fancy gymnasium, and all that kind of stuff, that have been normally accepted as part of the school system have nothing to do with the issues that the Minister himself has said are important. He says his most important priority is equality in the school system. I would simply pose to

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) him that the research that is being done in other jurisdictions at least, and the ones I read, and I refer particularly to the Coleman study and the Jencks study of the Harvard School of Education, show that if you analyse, and I think they analysed something like 21,000 students and 5,000 school divisions in the United States, came up with the conclusion that basically the issue of equality has nothing to do with the capital structure of schools, that that's an irrelevant factor to really the attaining of better education for disadvantaged children.

I think that that's a very striking conclusion because it certainly would then pose some serious problems to members of this House again as to whether this very large budget that we have to pass upon is being applied in the right way. It would seem to me again that that is the kind of evaluation that should be being done by Research and Planning to find out again if that productivity factor, that use factor related to the goals that the Minister set out, which I agree with, I have no disagreement with the goals whatsoever, but whether in fact those goals are being properly serviced by the nature of the educational system we now get into.

I think that that again comes back to the earlier propositions about the size of the classroom, and the teacher pupil ratio, because again one of the conclusions of both the studies I mentioned is that the key factor, the essential factor, is the teacher and the student and the relationship that goes between them, and that can be aided and abetted by reducing the ratio; that the quality of education is directly attributable simply to the teacher and the pupil, and forget the color and the painting on the walls and everything else, and all the rest of it. That's the key factor. So it may be that we are misapplying our budget if we're not taking that factor into full account, and that's why I would have hoped that we would have had some assessment coming out of the catacombs of the Research and Planning Division to give us some wisdom and some intelligence on that very important question. I would hope that the Minister perhaps has just overlooked the intelligence that has been gathered, if it has been gathered, and would be prepared to report it to us.

I come back finally in terms of remarks to a word the Member from Riel used, and I'm not sure he used it in the context I'm prepared to use it. He used the word "drift", and I suppose if I had to apply any one sort of verb to the activity of the Department of Education it might be that word "drifting", that it is not without, you know, it doesn't have the direction that's required, it is simply drifting; the trends change and it sort of bobs along on top of it, kind of making a correction here and an adaptation there, but it doesn't have a course, and it's not gearing its enterprises into that course. I don't want to be critical in the sense that I might, because maybe there are clear directions than have been articulated, and certainly the Minister did indicate his goals. There's a very big difference between saying these are the goals I believe in and providing this House with a description of the program and policy that he has to attain those goals. I think that I have indicated at least in some partial way some of the policy and program areas which are presently lacking at least in the discussion so far.

I know that my colleague from St. Boniface will have further comments in the same area. But I would hope that the Minister would be prepared to demonstrate to the House that the department is not in a situation of "drift" but in fact does have some direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a curious situation because I find that I agree with very much of what has been said by the members of the Opposition on the estimates of this Minister. You're going to find that this isn't a paean of praise for the Minister or his department, unlike my other speech where I never got to the criticism of the Minister.

Now I think for the first time since I've been in the Legislature we've really had some serious questioning of educational philosophy, and the Honourable Member for Brandon started it and he did a, I thought, a beautiful job. I agreed with virtually everything he said.

A MEMBER: Let me smell your breath.

MR. JOHANNSON: I'm sober. Now, Mr. Speaker, before I proceed into taking a strip off the hide of the Minister, whom I like, but unfortunately I think on this occasion a strip should be taken off his hide, I would like to refer briefly to the comments made yesterday by the Leader of the Liberal Party. He stated in a rousing speech, which I guess was designed to produce Manitoba patriotism in the children of this province. He was talking about the greatness and grandeur of this province. He said in the process of his oration that he'd been

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) in over a hundred high schools of this province and, Mr. Chairman, I would plead with the members of the Liberal Party to keep him out of the high schools of this province. I'm not doing it out of the political motive because I think the more we expose him to the children in the high schools the less support he's going to have politically. But, Mr. Speaker, he's going to set back the teaching of history a hundred years if he goes back into the schools. He made, I think, about four historical allusions in talking about the greatness and grandeur of this province and on virtually every one he was wrong. He talked about scaling the walls of Quebec during the fall of the City of Quebec; it never happened, Mr. Chairman. He talked about La Verendrye for the first time announcing that he was at the forks of the Red and Assiniboine, that he was going to find the western sea. He announced that long before. He talked about Fort Prince of Wales being an example of the greatness and grandeur of this province. Fort Prince of Wales was besieged once and it fell without a hostile shot being fired; it simply surrendered when the French arrived. So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the history students and the history teachers, I would plead with the members of the Liberal Party to keep the member --(Interjection)-- no it didn't. Well if it was, it changed hands several times, but a battle was never fought over it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get back to the Minister of Education. Basically I would like to talk about the CORE Report which was very ably discussed by the Member for Brandon. I have read the CORE Report rather carefully; I can't accept it, and I can't accept the implementation of it. In spite of what the Minister said in reply to the Member for Brandon, in spite of the fact that he pointed out that this is simply a slight extension of current conditions that were existing in the schools; and I don't blame the Minister particularly.

The Member for Fort Rouge talked about the Department of Education being on a drift towards no apparent goal. Well I think there is a drift, but I think there is a goal. I think he's wrong on that point. And the goal is the goal of the progressives. The Honourable Member for Brandon talked about the CORE Report being the response to a temporary permissiveness in society. Well, that's not correct. The CORE Report is part of a trend that started over 50 years ago. It started when the honourable member was in high school, or before he was in high school, and this was the trend of the American progressive school. It started with the implementation of the doctrines of John Dewey, and that trend I can't accept. I think it was wrong; I happen to be a traditionalist in the field of education, I believe in a tough. . .

A MEMBER: Bloody Conservative.

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes, in this area I guess I am, I believe in a tough academic system; I believe in discipline within the schools. (Applause) Mr. Chairman, I'm getting applause from the wrong side of the House.

A MEMBER: Beat them into submission.

MR. JOHANNSON: No, I don't believe in beating children into submission. But I really think that the CORE Report is an example of what I would call intellectual barbarism. It is an example of foggy "obscuritism".

A MEMBER: Whew!!

MR. JOHANNSON: The educators who are supposed to be formulating the directions, clear directions, for the children and the teachers of this province come out with a document that has phrases like this in it - and I ask the honourable members to listen carefully to try and see if they can understand what's being said. This is on Page 11 under Evaluation: "Because we're in an age of accountability in all social systems it is of utmost importance that educators become more concerned to find new and better methods of evaluating the educational process." You can understand that. But the next sentence is a classic: "This is not to say that they have evinced no concern, but that they have been using instruments which effectively assess cognitive achievement but are not applicable to the effective domain, nor to the present methodologies used in the attempts to humanize educational procedures."

A MEMBER: Translate. Translate.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Chairman . . .

A MEMBER: Who wrote that?

MR. JOHANNSON: This sounds like Casey Stengel, he has . . .

A MEMBER: Joe Borowski.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the school system is supposed to be teaching is the ability to communicate clearly, and here we have the people who are

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) directing the destinies of our system indulging in claptrap like this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that my sentiments are shared by most parents, by most teachers in this province. Now I realize that I'm probably a minority in my own caucus (Applause) I'm not speaking for the caucus, I'm simply giving my own views, and I'm giving them honestly.

The majority of parents would like to have a school system where their children are taught some knowledge, some skills, where they're capable of coming out with a reasonable ability to cope with the world in which they'll have to live. I'd like to make a plea on behalf of the teachers. I think the teachers of this province try to do a decent job. The qualifications have been steadily improving, and I'm not saying, Mr. Speaker, that the educational system is a total disaster, I think there have some substantial improvements.

A MEMBER: It's a mitigated disaster.

MR. JOHANNSON: It's a mitigated disaster, yes. The qualifications of teachers have been improving, and this is a key factor because I think that the teacher is the key to the whole system. If you can provide good qualified teachers, you can put them in barns and they will be able to do a pretty good job of educating the children. So the whole key is producing good teachers, and I think that -- the Honourable, former Minister of Education I know doesn't agree with me . . .

A MEMBER: Now you understand what's the matter with the system.

MR. JOHANNSON: . . . but I will tell the former Minister of Education that most teachers probably share my views to a fairly large extent.

A MEMBER: What age?

MR. JOHANNSON: What age? --(Interjection)-- Well, the former Minister tells me that the teachers who have this opinion are over the hill. I would tend to disagree with him.

But the problem with the recommendations of the CORE Report is that they're going to be costly. There is no way that you can extend options, extend the number of courses, without making the system more costly. You have to have more books, you have to have more equipment. You have all --(Interjection)-- well, more teachers, you need more teachers if you have more courses, and when you extend it into student-devised courses you move into an area which is simply incomprehensible.

Mr. Chairman, I spent ten years teaching in high schools, and one of the problems that many teachers suffer under is that they have pretty heavy course loads. The more you increase the number of courses the heavier the load on the teachers. And their teaching suffers, there's no way that you can give a teacher ten courses to teach and expect him to have the academic background, the training, to do a good job on those courses. So what you're doing, you're increasing the workload for the teachers, I think, to an unbearable point. I think this is the wrong direction, and I think there's going to be a - the quality of the teaching is going to suffer inevitably. --(Interjection)-- You may be correct.

Now most parents, as I said, want their children to learn something at school. Most parents don't think the school is a place to amuse the children; it's not a place to amuse the young goats; it's a place where children and where students are supposed to learn something. They need to learn some English, they need to learn some history, they need to learn some mathematics. Now the Minister did say that there was going to be continuation of compulsory subjects, but the thing is that there is a constant shifting away at this and a constant extension of options. And I would say that this is a continuation in the wrong direction.

I think for example that one of the absolute necessities that a school must achieve, the transmission to the new generation of the wisdom of the past, the heritage of the past. This is simply a means of helping the child avoiding the trials and errors of the past. It makes sense, common sense. We have moved into a number of new - I don't really think they're new - but a number of new programs which were given new titles, they don't really represent new directions. For example, the discovery approach. The discovery approach is simply a reversion to trial and error to some extent. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'm lazy, if I can avoid trial and error I would prefer to avoid it, and I would prefer my children to avoid it.

One of the things that has been happening over the past years, and this didn't happen simply under this Minister; it happened under the previous Minister; it happened when the Member for Riel was Minister of Education; it happened prior to that. What has been happening is that there's been a gradual disappearance of standards in the schools. Failure, failure is

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) being abolished in the schools.

A MEMBER: Hurrah!

MR. JOHANNSSON: There's no clear grading system. The CORE Report recommends a grade system, but you notice in the report it doesn't refer to failure for first and no credit. So this is a

A MEMBER: Euphemism.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Euphemism, yes, for failure. But, Mr. Speaker, we all know that some time in life we're going to suffer some kind of failure, and it's happened to all of us I would think in this Chamber, that we have failed at something in life. If you abolish failure in school, you're simply abolishing the relation of school to reality, because there is failure in life.

Now failure doesn't have to be a brutal thing. A teacher can be sensitive and he can use this to teach the child something. It doesn't have to be a brutal thing, such as some progressives describe it. What we're having today are social passes; if a child reaches a certain physical maturity, if he's five feet six, or six feet tall, he's passed on to the next grade regardless of what he knows. What's happening is that graduations in this system are becoming like graduations in a lot of American systems. They're mass tribal rites, which don't mean a damn thing except that the student has now spent 12 years in the school and he's out. It doesn't mean that he's learned anything. It doesn't mean that he has any basic skills. It means that he spent 12 years there. --(Interjection)-- He doesn't even have a veteran's pension. No.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the wrong direction as I said. This is an example of American weakminded liberalism. American weak-minded liberalism, which I don't think we should accept. I find no relationship between this and the socialism in which I believe. I don't think that Conservatives should accept it, although they did in the past when they governed this province, for the last decade before we took over. I don't think this development really helps equality. Because, Mr. Chairman, the student who comes from a middle-class home in one of the suburbs of Winnipeg, let's say, has a lot of advantages in his home background and he'll do pretty well in almost any school system. If he doesn't do very well his parents have the resources to cushion failure for him. If he doesn't do well in school his father will take him into his business and he's not going to suffer excessively. But, Mr. Speaker, I think this direction does penalize working-class kids, and I think it penalizes rural kids. Because the only way that these kids are going to become upwardly mobile, the only way they're going to improve their position in the economic world, is by acquiring knowledge and skills. I think that we're stopping that upward mobility for these kids. Now I may sound like an old fogey but I really think that a tough academic system is the best thing for these kids. It will help them the most in the long run. Now I'm not talking

A MEMBER: I'm going to throw up if he keeps going.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Mr. Chairman, some of my caucus members don't agree with me.

A MEMBER: Keep going Wally you're doing fine.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Mr. Chairman, I spent ten years teaching in the schools. The Honourable Member for Churchill spent none teaching in the schools.

A MEMBER: He has a better education, he was in the Navy.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Mr. Chairman, you know, I'm not talking about imposing a standardized system necessarily for example on native kids in the north, because I think you need a different sort of approach in that case, but I'm talking about, let's say, the large part of the province south of 53, south of the remote communities. I think the school has to have standards, and I'm not saying that standards are disappearing under the new system but there is a mini-mizing of standards. The report for example talks, and this really appalled me. The report talks about, and I quote from page 12: "There must be developed evaluative techniques "- That's a new word for exams or tests - "Which have been co-operatively evolved by both the evaluator and those being evaluated."

A MEMBER: Translate.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Translation meaning that the kids help to set the exams. That is to say evaluations should be positive and supportive. In other words it shouldn't be nasty. You shouldn't fail kids.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. JOHANNSSON: I think you have to have standards in the school system, and I think

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) . . . that this is a move away from standards. I think you have to have discipline; this is a move away from discipline. I don't think any great society has achieved great things by coddling, by indulging its students, by allowing them to do nothing. It's achieved great things by making demands on students, by stressing duty and discipline, sacrifice rather than self-indulgence. I think that most students require a pretty structured learning situation. In other words they need some discipline.

I understand that there was a report by OISIE in Ontario which pointed out that most students need a structured learning situation, a fairly highly disciplined system. Some can do without it but those are very few. Mr. Chairman, the best student I ever had didn't really find his true vocation until after he'd finished an Honors Degree in Economics. He started on a Masters Degree in Economics at McGill and at that point he decided to go into law. This student was the brightest and the best student that I ever had. To think that students have a sense of judgement in Grade 9 when they're 14 or 15 years old, Grade 10, 11 or 12, which makes them capable of deciding at that point what is best for them five, ten, fifteen or twenty years hence, I think is nonsense.

Mr. Chairman, you know, I have a young daughter whom I would like to educate in the Public School System of this province; I've always been a defender of the Public School System, even though I sound now like I'm not a great defender. But I think it can be improved; I think it can really serve this society, can provide equality for those who have the most difficult course to follow, the rural kids, the remote kids, the working class kids. I think it can be a means whereby they can acquire the skills, the knowledge, they need in life. But if the direction of the Public School System continues the direction it's taken for the last number of years, I'm going to be tempted to take my child out of the Public School System --(Interjection)-- Well I would prefer to change the school system. I would prefer to change the public school system, so that my daughter when she reaches the age of going to school will receive a good education. I would plead with the Minister to reconsider the direction he is taking. He's not taking a new direction, as I say it's an old direction. The Member for Riel was taking the same direction; he has simply moved further along the way. I would plead with him to reconsider. Now I frankly doubt that I have much support on my side, and I'm sure that the speakers who follow me are going to stress that, but nevertheless I would hope that the Minister doesn't make this new system mandatory a year from this fall. I really would hope that he would reconsider that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Chairman, I have looked around and I have found the enemy is us. I used to think that all the reactionaries were on the School Board in St. Boniface, but I find that this is - I got fired. We both end up in the same place.

When I first got elected in 1969 and Stanley Knowles phoned me up and congratulated me and said, "Bud", he had one word of advice, he said, "stay out of education, we have enough experts in that field already." So I followed his suggestion, and really I haven't had that much to say about education but I'm sorry I just can't sit still with one of my colleagues going on as he has.

I will try and keep it gentle because our violent arguments have taken place elsewhere. But nevertheless one of the things that the gentleman does is to pick up a book which is written, admittedly in jargonese. When you're speaking among people who are in the same field as you are you are inclined to use jargonese. For example, if I told members opposite, asked them about a crouper, you know they would know having had experience with horses I'm sure what a crouper is. You see a crouper is that piece of harness that goes around the back of horse and any horse's ass knows what a crouper is. When you're in the field you're inclined to use jargon. So that when he reads these statements about cognitive learning and all the rest of it, those people who have exposed themselves to some kind of university training in education this is the kind of jargon that they use among themselves, and quite possibly it confuses those who haven't progressed as far as others in searching for a new and novel approach for an educational philosophy.

The gentleman says that the philosophy is basically attributable to Dewey. He is right, and he says it's an old course; but the course that he would follow is rather older than that. Of course when you get right down to the basic argument, and it is an argument. Fundamentally it is an argument between nature and nurture. You know the nature of man and what man has

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) the potential to become, and the nurture of man, what man is forced to become.

Now I will reveal my personal bias just before I go. I am an existentialist. I'm eclectic. Now there again is jargon. What is an existentialist? An existentialist is someone who hasn't got a clue of what man can become. We don't know what a man can become. Eclectic means that you try what works. It's as simple as that. There are some people who say eclectics only are so because they don't know what they're talking about. But yet on the other hand you have people who say, that we will use this philosophy where we will sit kids in a room, and we will beat them into submission, and we'll pour stuff from big pitchers into little pitchers. We have people who say that you should use behaviouristic psychology, that you should sit kids in rows, and everytime they make a mistake you hit a button and you give them a zet, you know, and they learn in another way.

There are very many schools of thought of how information is passed on from one generation to another. But fundamentally it is the responsibility of one generation passing on to the next the information and the skills necessary to survive in the world. Now as the pressures build up on humanity the new pressures arise then mankind is charged with the responsibility from one generation to the next to devise systems whereby the next generation can survive.

Now I have often wondered why history teachers teach history, and we had a very good example of why history teachers teach history given to us in the last half hour. But I don't say this in a derogatory way at all. Because there is some reason for mankind looking at the mistakes of the past. But to assume that in teaching history man is going to avoid the mistakes of the past, is very naive. People have to make their own mistakes.

The Member for St. Matthews said that this is but a new approach to trial and error, and he said, and perhaps for a moment if I may digress and talk as a Freudian would, that he made a Freudian slip, he revealed his bias in his statement. He said, if given the opportunity he would rather not err. This is the fundamental difference between those people who think that they can inculcate others. Now the semantics of the word inculcate are such that it means shaping somebody to your own image and likeness. The gentleman laughs. But if you pause and think, this is exactly what it means, because if anybody has to avoid - when you want them to avoid error you're going to show them how to do things so that they will avoid errors. But in so doing they only repeat the errors that we make.

To say that you will by some way help people avoid error, I said is naive. But nevertheless there is that fundamental difference that by inculcating - in fact let me digress. The program of studies for the Grade 12 English course had in its aims and objectives until a very very few years ago, the aims and objectives of the whole English course because Grade 12 was supposed to be the summation of everything that went before. When people graduated from Grade 12 unless they went on to university, that was their full developmental program in learning the communication skills within our system. It is said in the aims and objectives of the educational program that Grade 12 English program is designed to (1) develop broad literacy and inculcate democratic principles. Now if you stop and think about that this inculcation type of thing is exactly what people think we should do. We should nurture people.

Now I'm not going to make the case for one or the other at the moment because we haven't got this time, and we are on Estimates, and which in my judgment belongs mostly to the Opposition. But the Member for St. Matthews said discipline. I will have to mention my particular bias on this. I think discipline comes from within, not without. If it is from without it is not discipline. It is restraint.

Of course this philosophy permeates my empathy, my gestalt. I'll use another jargon. Everything that I am dispersemates. Even when we get into such areas as Bills of Rights, I have an aversion to Bills of Rights because I think we should talk about bills of responsibility. That we have to have people develop so that they acquire the knowledge, develop the skills necessary to survive in the world. This means that they have to realize their strengths, they have to accept their weaknesses and operate within that. This is what, in my view, the total educational system is all about. If it is anything less than that, it is becoming just a propaganda machine for the people who happen to control society at a particular point in time. If it is more than that, we move towards anarchy. What is the balance between one and the other colleagues, I do not know. But for someone to say that we have to lock ourselves into a system which has brought us to this point in time, with people coming through our educational system -

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) don't think of knowledge for a moment, think of their ability to withstand the buffeting of life which we have created. They are not developing the skills; they are not gathering the knowledge.

Let me just relate to this, as one of the other hats I know this information comes into me, the incidence of divorce increasing, crime rates, alcoholism, everything else is going up. And what does it mean? It means in the terms that we're talking about at this particular point in time, is people are not getting the wherewithal to withstand the existence and reality of life in 1970, and if we lock ourselves into the methods suggested by the Member for St. Matthews, then humanity is damn well doomed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being three o'clock and in accordance with our revised rules, call in the Speaker. Committee rise.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, reports progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate or confirm that a study was undertaken by the government with respect to the cement industry in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, that is a question which the Minister of Industry and Commerce might be able to reply to just extemporaneously, I cannot. I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'm assuming that the Minister of Industry and Commerce may be in here yet and I can possibly wait to ask him that question directly. But I wonder if the First Minister can indicate who would be the Cabinet Chairman of Management Committee. Who is the Cabinet Chairman of the Management Committee?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, by Cabinet Chairman of Management Committee, I take it my honourable friend is asking who the Chairman of Management Committee is, and it's the Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then --(Interjection)-- no as a matter of fact then I'd like to ask the Minister of Education whether he could indicate whether the Management . . .

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

MR. SCHREYER: The matter of Cabinet committees, their function role, procedures, is one of those which the Member for Morris, were he here, I'm sure would confirm is very much internal to operations. It is something which until recent years in most jurisdictions was not even taken official cognizance of. We do not deny it exists, but certainly matters that come under its purview really are under the purview of Cabinet and as such should be asked of a Minister of the Crown in his normal departmental capacity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I.H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour, relating to his expected announcement on the minimum wage increases. Could he indicate whether the government is prepared to tie the minimum wage increases in the future to some sort of an index, whether it's the industrial composite wage index or the cost of living index, but automatically floating with the index?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker. I'm sure my honourable friend would be aware of the fact that that is a matter that will be given consideration by Cabinet, and that the setting of the minimum wage is done by regulations after matters being considered in Cabinet, and that will be revealed in due course.

MR. ASPER: Well, will the Minister act to tie the minimum wage in the future increments

(MR. ASPER cont'd) to some sort of a floating index if the Minimum Wage Board makes that recommendation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is: Is it the Cabinet's intention, or the government's intention then, to only act by regulation, or would it under any set of circumstances tie the minimum wage to a floating index?

MR. PAULLEY: As I indicated a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter for the consideration of Cabinet and what Cabinet does will be revealed in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Has the Government of Manitoba - to the same Minister - has the government of Manitoba acted on or rejected the recommendation by the Manitoba Federation of Labour that the minimum wage be tied in future to floating indexes such as the cost of living or the industrial wage composite?

MR. PAULLEY: Again, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it's almost the same question; it would have the same answer, that after due consideration by the Minister of Labour and his recommendation to the Cabinet, eventually the decision will be revealed to the public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has entered. I wonder if he can confirm that his department has completed a study on the cement industry in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been some studies done of the cement industry. There are other personnel involved, however, in other departments. I wouldn't say it's therefore finalized.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister would be in a position to indicate the recommendations of that study.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not really in a position to indicate recommendations of the study. I said there are more than one department involved; there's no final or one recommendation that one has considered, or I have considered. There are many observations made of cement industry, particularly with pricing differentials between here and other major cities in Canada.

MR. SPIVAK: By way of another question, I wonder if the Minister can indicate what other departments are involved in connection with that study.

MR. EVANS: Specifically economists working for a Cabinet sub committee, Resources and Economic Development Sub Committee.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder then if the Minister could confirm to the House that the recommendation of the study was that the government take over the cement industry in Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, there could be many conclusions one could arrive at. The intent of the study was really a follow-up of concern expressed by the City of Winnipeg Council on a number of occasions, at the lack of competition in the cement industry in Manitoba, and also the differential in pricing between Winnipeg and other major centres, where Winnipeg prices seem to be rather high compared to certain other centres. In that light studies have been done, various observations have been made; there've been no specific recommendations that have been considered formally by myself or my colleagues.

MR. SPIVAK: I put the question again to the Minister. Did the study not recommend. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The same question has been answered.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'll put it in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member is not satisfied is not one of the procedures of our House . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . and he cannot rephrase a question that has been once put. Now he indicates he wants to rephrase. That's contrary to our procedures, and he should know that. The honourable member wish to put another question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will put another question to the Minister and ask him whether it's not a fact that the study that he's referred to recommended, the study recommended the take-over of the cement industry in Manitoba?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is out of order, because it's the same question as before. Order please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I understand his department of Parks Board has undertaken studies called Optimum Population Lake Studies, and those are not completed. I wonder if the Minister can make them available to the members of the House.

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd like to see the study myself, and at that time I'll decide.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Would the Minister indicate to the House if the camp-site at Falcon Lake in the picnic area, will that be removed from that area during this tourist season?

MR. TOUPIN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I'll check.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. I'm glad the Minister took the question as notice. Would he indicate to the House, or make the information public so the people would know if that affects them.

MR. TOUPIN: By all means, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I would like to direct my question to the First Minister. Is the First Minister aware that a serious flooding situation is developing on the Marsh and Roseau Rivers and that 16,000 acres of land are inundated by water?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was in conversation earlier today with respect to water levels of certain parts of the province, including Lake Winnipeg. It has not come to my attention the specific geographic area my honourable friend is referring to.

MR. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell this House whether a study to improve the situation has ever been done on this problem area?

MR. SCHREYER: If my honourable friend is referring to the Rat and Roseau Rivers, then I would have to indicate that--(Interjection)--Yes, the Marsh and Roseau Rivers - areas. I would have to indicate that I do not know specifically just offhand. I would be surprised however if the Water Control Branch has not had some survey and investigatory work carried out, as indeed they are in other parts of the province, such as on the Pembina and - well, other parts of the province; which led in some cases to recommendations to proceed with the construction of dams and reservoirs, and in other cases led to recommendations of a negative nature.

MR. BROWN: Can the First Minister tell this House whether the plans that the United States are working on on the Roseau River basin, can the Minister state whether this will allow more water to flow along the Roseau River or whether any water will be coming down any faster than what it is at the present time?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the extent that any water control and drainage authority in Minnesota has authorized the extension of drainage works that end up in the Roseau River, then to that extent there will be an aggravation of the problem. Because we've learned from experience in this province to the extent to which we continue to drain additional acreages of land. To that extent we compound problems on the lower watersheds of a number of drainage basins.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister tell us if the government has any plans at present to alleviate the shortage of labour experienced by Flyer Industries at the present moment as they outline in the Committee on Economic Development meeting this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, I cannot answer my honourable friend definitively. I was not at that meeting this morning but we are receiving reports from time to time as to the committees. I'll take a look at the report at the first opportunity.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister tell us why a government controlled corporation in fact a government owned corporation is not communicating with the government itself concerning its labour shortages so that some action could be taken.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my honourable friend, I reject his supposition completely. Certainly my honourable friend is not knowledgeable of what is going on within the ranks of government; that we have established a sub committee on manpower within the Cabinet; that sub committee, of which I have the honour of being chairman, is meeting constantly to consider all problems respecting the provision of manpower in the Province of Manitoba. And I reject again, Mr. Speaker, the insinuation of my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge. He is not knowledgeable of what is going on.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the view of - or for the purpose of enhancing the knowledge of all of us, could the Minister thereby explain why Flyer Industries Coach did not communicate with this committee that he heads, concerning their labour shortages, and why the government presently does not have plans to help provide an additional supply of that labour that they need in order to produce the industry they have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: The Committee on Economic Development is meeting; it has not yet reported. Those questions were asked in committee. I do not feel that it is in order to be asking questions here.

MR. SPEAKER: Since the Economic Committee hasn't reported the point of order is well taken. The Honourable Member for Wolseley state his point of order?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, are we to take it from your ruling that we are not able to ask questions in the question period on matters that are before any committee of the Legislature including Law Amendments?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not wish to get into a debate with the honourable members, but one of the rules is, and it's in Beuchesne - I can find it in a moment - that when a committee has not reported, matters before that committee should not be debated or discussed in the House. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, let me make it clear that my colleague the Minister of Labour, the government, has no objection to answering the subject matter of the question. What we are uncertain of however is whether it is in accordance with the rules. You, Sir seem to be aware of some citation of Beuchesne that relates to the particular point of order, and perhaps the best way would be to take it under advisement rather than deal definitively with it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): On the same point of order. It appears obvious that if that rule were to be strictly adhered to there would be no debate in this House, or no questions asked in this House, because there is nothing at all stopping the chairman of that committee from just not submitting a report, which is his right. As a matter of fact when the Municipal Affairs Committee met the other day the report was submitted that same afternoon. Now the Member for Radisson cannot continue to hide behind that committee report just because he hasn't tabled it. He has had an opportunity to table that report, and having tabled it, then the questions would be asked. Now if he is admitting that he is deliberately hiding that report or preventing it from being presented to this House in order to prevent question, well then it becomes obvious, Sir, that that could be a ploy used by the government to very good advantage. I think that if that rule were adhered to it would deny discussion and debate and questions in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Chair has used discretion. I have allowed the questions and they have been answered, but they have not possibly elicited the precise answer that the members wanted, and in order to further alleviate the issue I suggested that we not discuss matters which can be discussed better before a committee. Now I am not applying the rule rigidly; in fact I didn't, because I allowed the question to be on the floor three times. Can we proceed? The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister for Health and Social Development. Can the Minister verify that the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission have imposed budgetary cuts on the Steinbach Bethesda Hospital to the point that that hospital will now show a \$45,000 deficit in the coming year?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks):

Mr. Speaker, I saw the newspaper article that is obviously being referred to. I have no details of it. It's being handled by the Health Services Commission. It's my understanding that the Hospital Board will be meeting with the Manitoba Health Services Commission, according to the story in the newspaper, and I'm sure they'll put their case to the Commission.

MR. MARION: Another question to the same Minister on the same subject. Will the Minister be receiving information on the reasons for these cuts, if in effect they were effected or requested?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker. The Minister does not receive the details at all. The matter is within the hands of the Commission. Their Management Committee meets with the Management Committee of the various hospitals and the matters are resolved there, then they're referred to the Commission Board. The Minister and the Department itself is not directly involved in this kind of information.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour verify that there has now been a decision reached with respect to the minimum wage level that will be proposed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accommodate my honourable friend. I understand that the last public hearing was held yesterday by the Minimum Wage Board - there's some reference to it in the newspapers today - but until I receive the report from the Board I cannot answer the question of my honourable friend.

MR. MARION: A final supplementary to, again, the Minister of Labour. When does the Minister of Labour expect to be able to make the recommendations known to this House?

MR. PAULLEY: Shortly after I have received the report from the Minimum Wage Board, the matter will be given consideration first of all by myself, as the Minister responsible, second by my colleagues the Premier and members of Cabinet, and then, following that, an Order-in-Council will be drawn up which in effect establishes the minimum wage rate. It does not have to be agreed to by this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Agriculture on my behalf, while I was absent from the House, introduced for First Reading Bill 49, The Child Welfare Act, and Bill 60, The Social Services Administration Act. I have explanatory notes that should have been distributed with the bills. I'd like them to be distributed. The Clerk has copies and I think it would assist all members if they had these explanatory notes with the bills themselves because they would be much easier to follow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question's for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can confirm that the study undertaken by his department in connection with the cement industry was a report or study completed by William Cruse, of the Policy Planning and Research Branch?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, a report has been prepared. It is being reviewed by others in the government. Which civil servant exactly prepared it, I don't think is necessarily a subject of debate in this particular House. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that there were many recommendations in this preliminary report. Many recommendations.

MR. SPIVAK: Another question to the Minister. I wonder if he can confirm that while the report presented alternatives as to government action, the recommendation was the takeover of either one or both of the cement plants in Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I indicated the intent of the report, how it began, a concern for exorbitant prices, lack of competition in this particular industry, and there were many recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the First Minister in his capacity as Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. Would he indicate to the House what is the practice of Hydro with respect to the disposition of bunkhouse trailers in Gillam when they are. no

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ASPER cont'd). . . longer required for accommodation of workers involved in the Gillam hydro project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this is a matter which arises frequently, and therefore is one that has a standing policy, or whether it is dealt with on an ad hoc basis whenever the situation arises. I do recall about two years ago, on one occasion, that trailers were made available at cost by Manitoba Hydro to other departments of the Crown, but if there's a specific case in point I'll take it as notice and get the specifics.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would take as notice and report to the House as to how many trailers were taken out of use last year and what purposes they were put to once they were taken out of use.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for return.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, then if that requires an Order for Return perhaps I can put another question. Will the Minister advise the House whether any of the bunkhouse trailers owned by Hydro and used at Gillam, were burned rather than put to other uses as housing for other people, and if so, how many were burned?

MR. SPEAKER: The second question is hypothetical.

MR. ASPER: The question, Mr. Speaker, is very unhypothetical. Were any Hydro trailers, used for bunkhouse purposes, burned? And I'm asking him to take as notice the second part of the question: Why?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I suspect that if the honourable member wants specific numbers that a question or Order for Return might be in order. I would simply indicate that it is entirely possible, for example, that out of 48 trailers 36 were moved to Long Spruce because of start-up of construction there, and that 10 were either sold or leased to some other agency of the Crown or perhaps even a contractor working in the general area of Northern Manitoba nearby, and I do believe, Sir, that two were burned by accident; in other words, a fire.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, based on his answer that two were burned by accident. Would he indicate, then, would he report to the House on what alternative use was made of the other trailers when he decides how many were moved to Long Spruce - how many were offered to other people and at what cost?

MR. SCHREYER: I will get the exact numbers, Mr. Speaker. The numbers I used were for illustration only.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG: (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and ask him if he has any information he could convey to the House in regard to the proposed park area in West Winnipeg known as Headingley, and a portion of the RM of Cartier.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I took part of that question as notice yesterday. I was hoping to have an answer for the honourable member that asked the question yesterday, today, but unfortunately I haven't got the detailed answer before me. There is a proposed development in the Headingley area, not including a park by the way, but in regards to the other portion of the question, hopefully that I can bring an answer by early next week.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was yesterday that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked a question which was taken as notice by the First Minister, dealing with a recent incident involving the Fire Commissioner's Department, which of course is one of my areas of responsibility, and the Attorney-General's Department. I believe eventually, Mr. Speaker, that it was accepted, a question posed by my honourable friend, not in a legal way, but would the Minister indicate why the Attorney-General's Department is now investigating, why the report of that fire investigator was suppressed and not prepared and presented to the hearing on the case relative to Mr. Barkman.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, I have now had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the Fire Commissioner, and the answer is that the Fire Commissioner's office investigated the fire, and that then the Winnipeg detectives apparently had obtained a confession from the

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . party involved and he had indicated to them that he had set the fire. The Fire Investigator's report indicated that the fire that they were investigating was in a different area of the facility, and the Fire Investigator was not subpoenaed to go before the preliminary trial. Therefore, the report was not made known at that time and did not have to be reported by the Fire Commissioner's department to the Attorney-General's department. Subsequent to these events, the lawyer who was defending the party concerned, waited on the Fire Commissioner's office, he was made aware of the contents of the report, and at that time the report was made available to the Attorney-General's Department.

I might indicate to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, this is in accordance with the Fire Preventions Act Chapter F.80, and in section 37 a report to the Attorney-General which says, "If there is evidence to charge any person with the crime of arson, he shall report to the Attorney-General". Because of the difference in the locale and the incident involved, there was no requirement of the Fire Commissioner's office to make that report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would clarify for me the description he just provided. When he says that the fire was in a different locale, does he mean in a different building, or in a different area of the same building?

MR. PAULLEY: In answer to my honourable friend; in a different area in the same building. I believe I would be correct and subject to correction, I believe that when the Fire Commissioner's department were asked to investigate, it dealt with a fire inside of a bedroom, and subsequently the investigation by the City Police revealed an area out in the corridor some distance removed from where the fire was investigated.

. continued on next page.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

A MEMBER: Third Readings?

MR. SPEAKER: Third Readings.

BILLS NOS. 21 and 32 were each read a Third Time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debates, Second Readings. Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. (Stands)

BILL NO. 46

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for St. James. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: On the point of order. The Member for St. James phoned about 15 minutes ago and said he was on his way. The Member for Souris-Killarney is prepared to speak on the bill right now and we will require unanimous consent for this. If the Member for Souris-Killarney can go ahead and the Member for St. James comes in, he can conclude his remarks. If that's agreeable to the House, we'll proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, being a rural member I shouldn't speak too long because I'm supposed to be uninformed and misinformed about the City of Winnipeg, but I'll try to speak from authority and speak from experience and express myself in the way that I feel the City of Winnipeg is going, speaking from a standpoint of a person that comes from a place with a population of 35 people, and I feel that I should be pretty independent, and all you city members, I hope you will listen to what I have to say.

But I am a resident of this city for five months of the year Monday to Friday, and I do happen to see what's going on, and I guess I leave as much taxes here in this city as many of you do, contributing to all the hotel costs and to the sales tax, the Minister of Finance here every day, every time I sleep, every time I eat, every time I get laundry done, or -- I don't know, I seem to be paying tax to the Minister of Finance every time I move around the City of Winnipeg so I guess that I'm contributing in many ways to the City of Winnipeg. I also married a girl from the City of Winnipeg, too, and helped improve the population of the rural parts of Manitoba by removing one person from the City of Winnipeg. That's my contribution to the rural parts of Manitoba.

Also, too, I think that I've been around here, with the exception of the Minister of Labour, about as long, and I have seen the City of Winnipeg grow. I've seen it grow in many ways. I've seen it grow from the time there was about 20 municipalities, 20 municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area, and I've seen it grow, and back in 1961 when Metro form of government was brought in, condemned by everybody, but we do still have it in Toronto and we still have it in the city of Miami. Many of you have been to Miami. The Metro government is still responsible for a level of government there, as well as Toronto, so it wasn't that bad in those cities and it wasn't that bad here, Mr. Speaker, either. It wasn't as bad as what many people made out. Because a lot of things happened during the Metro form of government, and I must say to those ten men that guided that government in those days, they did an admirable job and they did a job, I think, which everyone respects, even though everybody thought that they were gouging the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg at that time and all the urban municipalities.

But I would safely say, Mr. Speaker, that in many of the municipalities now, when they look at their tax notice, if they had a choice between One Big City and the Metro form of government, that I'll bet you they'd take a second look at the Metro form of government today, and I say that for a good reason. I say that for a good reason, because bigness isn't always the best. We've had bigness in school districts and nobody has to be told what happens when you have a consolidation of school districts. The mill rate always goes up to the highest level; it always goes up to the highest level. And I made a speech on that two years ago, three years ago, when this bill was going through for the one big city, Unicity at that time, and I predicted at that time that it wouldn't be long before the mill rates would be all higher than the City of Winnipeg at that time. And I remember East Kildonan, I think, East Kildonan and the City of Winnipeg I think had the highest mill rates at that time. I think Tuxedo was the lowest and Charleswood, I think, and St. James-Assiniboia were the next lowest in that neighbourhood.

BILL NO. 46

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

But what's happened, Mr. Speaker, if it hadn't been for the government trying to cushion that load on the urban municipalities, they'd have been in trouble long ago. I must say that the government did assume some of the responsibility of cushioning that load by over a three year period, and I guess that three-year cushion is practically gone now and the municipalities will have to from now on, unless the government of the day sees fit to continue that cushion, trying to reduce the mill rate, these municipalities in many cases, Mr. Speaker, will be paying double the municipal taxes they were three years ago. Now that's progress, I guess. That's progress. And one of the reasons why it's progress, I guess all the firemen and all the policemen in the City of Winnipeg are now getting the same rate of pay. Maybe they aren't quite all the same but pretty close to it, because they will have to eventually anyway.

Now I guess for those men that are all working on public works and all over the City of Winnipeg, they'll all be getting the same rate of pay too. Now for them that's progress and I think that's deserving to them. But what happens, Mr. Speaker, is that bigness, 540,000 people, run by one City Council of 50 men and a Mayor, dictating policy over that large area, doing all the planning for that particular area, have a tremendous job to do. And before we always thought that having five or six councillors in the municipality of Charleswood, same in St. James-Assiniboia, that was a duplication in many cases, a duplication of maybe services in many areas, but I think in the long run that we went a little too far and a little too quick. And I realize the government of the day had a decision to make. The Mayor of Winnipeg at the time was condemning Metro. He was applying pressure on the government of the day and I know what pressure is applied on the governments from day to day, but I think they should have stood firm until they had sufficient knowledge and sufficient advice and experience in what decision to make. And I think they made the decision a little too quickly. I think the government was new at that day; they thought that they were going to step in and they're going to sweep the table clean of all the problems. Mr. Speaker, one of the experiences that I was taught in my 11 years on the government side, that you're always going to have problems. Some of them will be bigger ones than others but you're going to have problems, and you can't eliminate problems by sweeping the table clean. And they swept the table clean. They cleaned out the 70 councillors in the City of Winnipeg and elected 50 new ones. And I was amazed at the Minister of Public Works - and I don't know if he's in . . . here he is in the front row now; he's advanced - I was amazed at the speech he made in the House here the other afternoon, because this man has been in the Legislature since 1966 and I thought he had more knowledge than to call the men down on Main Street there running the City of Winnipeg, a bunch of amateurs. Because I don't consider them amateurs. I consider every elected person in this province a dedicated individual doing what he thinks is best for his community, and those 50 men are working hard and they have worked hard, and I know many of them personally even though I'm not a resident of Winnipeg. I know the dedication they've put in their job. Many of those men sat in this Legislature and we have now, presently have two men that sat on that Council elected at the last election here, the Member for St. James and the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DOERN: Would the Member submit to a question?

MR. McKELLAR: Sure.

HON. RUSSELL J. DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to attempt to explain what I said or what I didn't say, but I would ask my honourable friend to comment on this. Does he believe that a group of people who are working part-time can compete with a group of people who are working full-time? Call them amateurs and pros, call them anything you like. I say that it's not possible . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister is making a speech and he's also expanding the argument. Questions are allowed in respect to clarifying statements. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, I'll answer this way. I'm a part-time farmer, I was a part-time insurance agent, I'm a part-time politician. That's my occupation. I guess I'm a part-time everything. I don't know what I . . . But I have a lot of fun doing everything, I'll tell you that. I have a lot of fun doing everything. And I don't consider I'm any worse farmer, I don't consider I'm any worse insurance agent or any worse politician. I don't think I'd be any better if I sat in here 12 months than by sitting here four. I think if I--(Interjection)-- Well I'll debate you on that. I say let's get out of here right now and get campaigning. Let's get out of here

BILL NO. 46

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) and get campaigning. I like campaigning. I like campaigning, and I'd sooner we'd get out of here and get the crop in and then get campaigning. That's what I want to do. That's what I'd love to do the 24th of May, but I'll likely be in here longer than the 24th of May.

Mr. Speaker, the men down there on Main Street, God bless them, the last three years, for two and a half years now they've been actually in office. And I tell you they need some pats on the back, not to be hit in the rear end like the Minister of Public Works did the other day. They need pats on the back because, God bless them, they're running a corporation there on a \$150 million budget or \$200 million or whatever their budget is, so they've got a big job. A bigger job maybe than we have here if the truth was known. Because when somebody's garbage isn't emptied, who do they phone? They don't phone their MLA for Elmwood, they phone their Councillor in Elmwood. If somebody's house has been robbed, who do they phone? They don't phone their MLA, they phone their Councillor. And if their house is burned down like ours was over here at 23 Kennedy today, our headquarters, who do they phone? They don't phone their MLA, they phone their City Councillor. And I tell you they've got a big job, and I don't have to tell you more because many of you sat as town councillors and city aldermen in your many communities, and you know the responsibilities. Your phone rings early and your phone rings late; and I tell you, more power to a man that runs for public office and gets elected because he's got a big job. As I mentioned before, he needs a pat on the back, not a kick in the rear end like the Minister of Public Works gave them the other day. And I don't care what we say about these men, some of them are going to get re-elected and some of them are going to get defeated, but I know what the Minister of Public Works wanted. He won't be happy until there's 50 men down there all New Democratic Party. That's when he'll be happy. And then he'll be able to tell in his little forms in his office down here, he'll tell them everything to do. One of the big problems, Mr. Speaker, is that he can't tell these men what to do because they don't think the same as he does. And that's one of the problems he's got.--(Interjection)--No, he never did. But he will. I know the Minister of Public Works. Actually there's a different philosophy here, Mr. First Minister. There's a different philosophy. The difference is that in our philosophy we didn't tell the other fellow, but, you know, the New Democratic Party they want to run everything from the top down. That's the difference. That's the difference. But I tell you, God bless the people of the City of Winnipeg. Two years ago last October they did the right thing and they're going to do the right thing this October too. I'm sure of that. Because I have a lot of faith in the people of the City of Winnipeg; a lot of faith, and I know they are going to do the right thing. Yes, even in Transcona.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great debates when we debated this bill three years ago was the election of Mayor. The government of the day, after much pressure - and I remember the pressure that was applied on them - decided in their wisdom to elect the Mayor for the first time. For the first time. Give him a trial. We're going to see who's elected and then we'll decide a few years later whether we're going to elect the Mayor in 1974. Well, Mr. Speaker, our friend, long-time friend Steve Juba, former Mayor of the former City of Winnipeg, was elected. And I sat in this Legislature with the present Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, and he sat right there where the Minister of Tourism and Recreation sat the year I came in here in 1958, the year the First Minister came into this House too. And that man is an amazing man, and I congratulate him, because there's no other man that can ever imitate him or duplicate him, or there's no phrases that I can use to . . . He's one of his own, in other words. And he will live and remain in that Chair as long as he wants to down in City Hall. And I admire him for it, for giving leadership. He has given leadership to the City of Winnipeg even though the Minister of Public Works tried to get into a battle with him over on Broadway last year. There's no way anybody's going to win a battle with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. There's no way you're going to win a battle. We had a Minister of Municipal Affairs and she was a lady, and she tried, and she found out that she couldn't win. We told her in advance she wouldn't win but she had to be proved; had to be proved. No way you're going to win. No way you're going to win. So I admire the man and I congratulate him, and I hope he remains as Mayor of the City of Winnipeg for many years to come.

But I must say that amendment pleases me. I wish you had put that in on your bill when you brought the first bill in because I think you'd have been admired for it, you would have been congratulated, because no City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, can exist without an elected

BILL NO. 46

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) Mayor. What kind of a mayor would you have if you elected one out of the 50 and put him up into the Chair? What kind of a Mayor would you have? They say you can do it here. It's a different thing in our system of government, a different thing. It's a different thing. The City of Winnipeg would have no prestige at all in our country of Canada unless he was elected, and I say I'm glad that amendment is in this Act.

Now one of the things that does disturb me, and I'm always disturbed about regulations, it's at the bottom of the first page, where the Cabinet by Order-in-Council are going to decide how many aldermen are going to be--there you are, "in establishing the number of councillors comprising the City Council in the future." Now can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine, every three years we're going to have an Order-in-Council and we're going to change the numbers of councillors every three years. Mr. Speaker, that's not the way to make legislation. The right way is to put and establish it by law, not do it by Order-in-Council. And I say to him, pull out that amendment. Pull out that amendment. You've got a glorious opportunity in Committee. Don't ever pass that amendment because you'll have turmoil. Who's to say whether you're going to have 45 or 26? I've heard that mentioned before and the Minister of Public Works said cut it in half. The committee who looked into this said 45. You're going to have confusion to no end. Maybe that's what you want. I don't care what you have; I don't even live in here so I don't care. But I tell you my best advice would be leave it at 50. Give them a second run around. Let them have another three years. Let them get their fee. You can't go wrong by using the same men even if the same 50 get elected, because the experience they've got will be of benefit to the City of Winnipeg and taxpayers of Winnipeg, I'm sure. So I say, if you're in doubt you leave it alone, and I'm sure the government are in doubt because they've mentioned many figures, and I'm sure they're not convinced in their own mind yet what they do want. But you're really going to have confusion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to say much more on this particular bill because I was against this One Big City in the initial stage. I think you went into it too hasty. You dumped it - you were just like a bunch of frisky colts over there about that time. You've slowed down a lot since then, but I'm sure that if you had to do this over again, the decision to make whether you went for one big city, that you'd have second thoughts today, because I'm sure you would be a lot wiser right now than what you were three years ago when this bill was originally passed.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this in my closing, that I do hope the municipal men who represent on City Council will have representation there when we deal with this bill in Municipal Affairs, because I think there's many bylaws in here dealing with trailers and tourist camps that I'd like to ask a lot of questions about. I don't know just what their present regulations are, but I think we need to be a lot more familiar than we are as members of the Legislature on how they're going to deal with these many problems.

One of the problems, as I see it, in the City of Winnipeg, one of the problems that many other communities have in the province of Manitoba, is the large influx of mobile trailers that are coming into our many communities, and many of the communities are not prepared, they're not set up to handle this large number. I even see in this one section here dealing with mobile trailers, that even if you take the wheels off a trailer it's still a mobile trailer. Now I don't know who ever came up with that explanation. I always thought that when the wheels were off, it would be classed as a whole. But they say under this one section.

Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of unanswered questions yet dealing with this bill and the City of Winnipeg, but I'll just--I see the member who had originally--he's back in his chair and that was my intention anyway, to hold the fort until he got here. But I just want to say this, say to the government, that don't be too hasty before you make decisions. Sleep on them a little longer, at least 24 hours. In this case you should have slept on it about five years, I think; five years before you brought this Unicity in, I tell you, and you'd have been a lot smarter men for doing so. But you made your decision. Now let's not mess around with the Council now. Let's not mess around. Let's not mess around too much. I think you can't go wrong by going too slow.

So I say to the government of the day, I say to the Minister of Public Works, who is leaving the Chamber at the present time, before he makes any more speeches he better sleep on that kind of a speech a little longer, that he made the other day. As I said, pat those men down on Main Street. Give them a pat on the back and not a slap on the rear end.

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

BILL NO. 46

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 15 minutes.

MR. MINAKER: I would like to thank the House for supporting my House Leader's request for a unanimous consent to allow me to speak after the Member from Souris-Killarney.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall when I was speaking yesterday before 4:30 cut-off time that I had commented in regards to credit that should go to the citizens and the civil servants of the City of Winnipeg for the orderly changeover which occurred in 1972 from the former 13 municipalities and cities into one big city, and I would again stress that a lot of credit has to go to the employees of the former cities and now the City of Winnipeg, the administrators, the workers, and also to the councillors, because many hours were spent in meetings and in co-ordinating the changeover which occurred. And, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to review more or less the comments that I had made with regards to the official delegation, that my experience with the official delegation was one of sincerity and effort to try and make the new city structure work, and I would stress again that there is no need for rivalry, that the urban department was set up, in my understanding, for coordination with the urban centers and to work with them, not against them, and I would hope that the thinking of the Honourable Minister of Public Works is not the unanimous thinking of the Cabinet members who meet with the official delegation.

I would like to comment, which my understanding is was the government's objectives in the implementation of the original City of Winnipeg Act, and that was to create a uniform tax base in the City of Winnipeg to provide a uniform mill rate for our citizens; to work under a broad development plan; and thirdly, which I feel is a very important objective, local participation. And in particular I would stress that it's very important that we do have local participation in our city with any future changes that might come about in the Act, and I would also like to review the price tag that the citizens of Winnipeg paid for some of these objectives, because I still am of the opinion that the price tag that was paid for the uniting of the services and the cities could have been achieved in a different fashion and still get the same end results but with much higher efficiencies. And I can cite that if you look at the budgets that we had presented to us in 1972 on the City of Winnipeg council, the total expenditure in 1971 - this was actual expenditure for all of the municipalities and cities at that time for municipal services including Metro - was \$88 million, and in 1974 this year, three years later, after three years of operation under this new process, we're looking at a budget of \$127 million-plus, an increase of 45 percent in three years. If you look at individual communities for the same service, and compare them back to '71, we have increases in the orders of 154 percent, 170 percent in St. Vital, 190 percent in St. James-Assiniboia, 200 percent in Charleswood, so that there has been a price tag to pay for this proposal and decision of the government, and the government was warned back in 1971 that this would occur.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that if the new City of Winnipeg is to continue to operate relatively independent, that it will need new fiscal relationships with the Provincial Government and that it is important that the government realize this and review its present policy of individual annual grants that are given to the city from year to year, a type of grant which does not allow any forward thinking or planning for the City of Winnipeg other than from year to year, not knowing what it will expect to get in the way of assistance from the Provincial Government.

And I might comment that from indications that I have had from members of council, that they are reviewing other means of raising funds, such as the amusement tax that was offered to them from the Provincial Government, and I understand they are also looking at the increased value of land due to zoning changes. But I would stress, Mr. Speaker, that if we want to have good municipal government we will not have it if they are puppets of the Urban Affairs Department or if they are puppets of the Provincial Government, because it will not work, and I can see that with legislation that is being proposed in this bill that it could very well be that the City of Winnipeg could become puppets of the Cabinet. Without any difficulty at all, the Cabinet could control the City of Winnipeg, put it in its hip pocket, and decide the structure of the City: how many councillors, how many wards, or how many particular community committees would exist at the whim of the cabinet, at any time they wanted to.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments of my own personal experience operating under the Act, that we found it a very cumbersome legislation, one that detailed certain operations of the city's political decision-making that made it very cumbersome, very slow. In particular, it was not uncommon for an individual, if he happened to be a chairman of a

BILL NO. 46

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) standing committee, to have an item come before him at a community committee meeting, a decision could not be made, it would then be forwarded to the standing committee where he would deal with it as a chairman, where a decision would be recommended to the Executive Policy Committee, where they in turn would make a decision and they in turn would refer it to the City Council, and I think that the legislation has to be reviewed in that with this type of basic thinking there is a multitude of meetings, some of them at times unnecessary, and there is a multitude, I might say a pile of paper work and paper issued daily out of the City of Winnipeg City Hall.

The other thing Mr. Speaker, is that when the White Paper was presented a few years back - and I'd like to cite this because I feel it's important - that there was a stress in the White Paper that there had to be local identity, there had to be local participation. And the same thing took place in the Hansards that I have read of the debates that took place at that time. There was a stress that there had to be local participation, citizen participation. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot legislate participation or interest. It's something that one either has or hasn't got, and I suggest that the only way you can attract participation is if you allot responsibility; because with responsibility, if a person is interested and takes on an objective or a duty as a citizen advisor or at a community committee level, if there is some say and some authority or some responsibility, if the decisions that are made are correct and they achieve something, then the achievement itself will keep that interest and will keep that participation. So I suggest that you cannot legislate participation but you can achieve it by giving responsibility, and I think it's an important thing that the City of Winnipeg has more say at the community level, in particular in the fact that much of the services that are provided by a municipal government are labor-oriented in nature and are most efficiently provided, not only from a cost point of view, but from the end results of providing what the community wants is best done when it is done in a small area rather than a large, huge area where you get involved with many levels of management before a decision is made on something that at times is a very simple decision to make but, because of the legislation, you cannot make it at that local level.

I would like to comment on the principle of the Cabinet having the right to make a decision on the size of the Council and the numbers of community committees in the City of Winnipeg, and I would suggest, Sir, that if this particular principle is passed in this House, that we are taking away the right of representation on that particular item for over half of the population of Manitoba, because if this legislation is passed and the House is dissolved, the Cabinet at any time can decide that we will have 14 councillors, one councillor; they could decide we would have one community committee, 14 community committees, anything they wanted, and there would be no method, no vehicle for the people of the City of Winnipeg to make representation to the government. The only representation that could be made would be after the fact, after the decision had been made; when the House sat the next time, then the Opposition or the Independents or whoever might be here, could get up and voice their opinion and try and discuss and debate something that had already occurred. I might liken it to the Federal Government saying, "Well, boys, we're going to give the power of decision to the Cabinet that we'll decide how many provinces we're going to have in Canada. We'll decide where their boundaries are going to be. We'll decide how many MPs we're going to have." And this is basically the power that the Cabinet is asking at this time and I would think it would be grossly wrong to give this power to the Cabinet because, if the government was sincere when they presented the White Paper, and if the Honourable Member from St. John was sincere when he talked in Hansard two or three years ago that local participation was the ultimate goal, one of the ultimate goals in the new City of Winnipeg Act, then I would suggest this is the direct opposite view; that what they are saying is that we no longer feel that the City of Winnipeg is important enough to hold a debate, to present a bill in the House when the House sits, at some future date if we want to change the structure of the City of Winnipeg or we wanted to change the numbers of councillors. And I suggest, Sir, that the City of Winnipeg is a very important part of our province, and also any other cities are an important part of our province, and we should not deny the right of people to make representation on changes of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, I can only stress again that . . .

MR. DOERN: Would the Member submit to a question?

MR. MINAKER: At the end, if you wouldn't mind, please.

The only thing I can stress, Mr. Speaker, is that it is important that we strengthen our

BILL NO. 46

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) urban governments and our municipal governments, not weaken them, and I suggest that we cannot have professional representatives on our council; we want people, the ordinary people, whether they be a farmer, a doctor, a worker, a draftsman, you name it. This is the type of people we want on our council, a cross-section of our community, and I say that the present legislation restricts many of these people from taking part in council even though they have the interest, and that is why I believe that possibly some type of a regional board or regional council that would be the representative from the community committee area, that might either be elected from that area by its councillors for that area or elected in that area as the representative, to sit on some kind of a central regional board to deal with the regional matters; and be limited in number, not the same size as the present one, but strengthen the community committees and to maintain that local interest and that local identity which is so important in our urban communities that we don't want to become a very bland, large, non-thinking, non-different type of community that we see happening in places like Chicago and New York and so on, and I would hope that before changes are made and the power given to the Cabinet to make decisions on structure change in the City of Winnipeg, that they will think very strongly before doing such.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Only by leave of the whole House. The honourable member's time is up. Agreed? The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: I wonder if the honourable member could answer this question? I assume that in the early stages of setting up a new structure, that responsibility fell to the Provincial Government. Does the honourable member think that the Provincial Government and Legislature should have a say as to the size of council in the first years of its operation? Or that once having established it they've forever lost their ability to influence the size of council? Or does he think that the Provincial Government has at least some say in the early stages of the operation?

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the government, or Provincial Government would have a say in the general design of the new city, or any new city that's formed. I think the point I was trying to put across was that we shouldn't remove the right in this House to debate any further changes which might occur, because it's a matter that the city was formed and created under debate in this House and any changes to that city structure should follow that it would be debated and changed in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this debate. I'm sorry that the Honourable Minister of Finance, who was former Minister of Urban Affairs, is not present. I appreciate the fact that the First Minister and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources are at another meeting at the present time and are unable to be here, but I particularly wanted the Minister of Finance to be here. It is my intention in dealing with this bill to refer to what I would call "The Epistles of Saul." I understand that he's sick. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that when the Unicity debate took place in 1971, the members opposite received from the Honourable Minister of Finance one sarcastic remark after another when criticism was offered on this side about the Unicity bill, about the potential and about the direction, and it's my intention in dealing with this particular bill and in dealing with the approach that the government has now taken, to basically recall from Hansard the statements of the Honourable Minister of Finance as Minister of Urban Affairs, when he dealt with this bill. And then, Mr. Speaker, after I have completed the recitation of the statements that were made, and placed them in Hansard, I then want to review very quickly, because I think it can be done very quickly, the experience of the government with the Unicity Council in the last, almost the last 2 1/2 years. Because, Mr. Speaker, I want to compare the action of the government with the words that it expressed when the Unicity bill was announced and brought forward, and I want to be able to trace their conduct with respect to the Unicity in solving the problems with the actual intent, and I want to be able to prove, Mr. Speaker, by this very bill, the inconsistency and almost the hypocrisy of the position of the government with respect to the proposals of Unicity and the lofty explanations given by the Minister of Urban Affairs then, and the reference again to the chastisement on our part when we raised a skeptical approach to what was being proposed, and we questioned--

BILL NO. 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) you know, we had just the gall to question that the Minister wasn't really being direct and wasn't really explaining the position that the government really felt it was in, correctly to this House.

On June 3 of 1971 the Minister introduced the bill, and I want to quote from page 1464 of Hansard, and he stated and I quote, "I think it will be a proud day for Greater Winnipeg at a future day when it becomes so organized that it can cope or attempt to cope with what we know will be tremendous problems that the future holds in store, and which we know of a certainty because we know what is going on in other cities of the world, and especially to the south of us." And further on, on the same page, he states, and I quote: "This legislation, it's a categorical commitment to the belief that if you make it possible for people to determine how their own community shall be run, determine in the most direct and personal way, and in all aspects the daily affairs of the community, they will do it very well indeed. And with this legislation we hope to provide a framework to make it possible that this happens and an incentive to the people of Greater Winnipeg to make it happen, in order to get all people in Greater Winnipeg, but at least many more people than exist today, to show that kind of interest to be thoroughly effective and enthusiastically involved in the operation of their community, and we've come a long way in our study and preparation for today."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the members opposite whether this bill really reflects the government listening to the people. If there was a commitment to be given on this bill, that you will make it possible for the people to determine how their own communities shall be run, then I say, did the people really want the government to have the authority to change the community committees, to change the names of the Community Committees, to maybe alter the boundaries by Order-in-Council, by Cabinet decision, without reference to the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, how many meetings did the members opposite attend in the various Community Committees to listen to the people, to be able to find and determine this commitment? Mr. Speaker, I must say that the government who brought this legislation, who took the responsibility for this legislation, both in '71 and now, haven't been listening to the people at all.

Now I'm going to go further, Mr. Speaker. On page 1467--(Interjection)-- Listen to what? I am quoting the statements of the Minister, the policy statements of the government. And he states: "One of the prime reasons that major U.S. cities are in trouble today is that metropolitan areas, that core cities and the suburbs have been unable to work together and thus to prevent the ugly urban sprawl that exists today, to take efficient and rational transportation systems, to marshal resources to remedy the severe housing problems, to reduce the environmental hazards of noise and air pollution, and in general to deal with the problems that affect negatively the quality of life in the urban community." Well there's the description of the problem, and the suggestion of the Minister is that there was going to be a solution as a result of the Unicity Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what's happened in the last two and a half years? Have the Unicity Council solved, or even dealt with any of these problems? Has the government dealt with any of these problems with the Unicity Council? The Unicity Council wants the approval of a bridge over Sherbrook and McGregor, an overpass, a very simple overpass. It's been approved by the Unicity Council. Will the government proceed?

The First Minister indicated yesterday in answer to a question that the position is very simple. It has always been our position that we would not deal with this unless we rationalize the problem of railroad relocation. Well, Mr. Speaker, how much time has the government spent on railroad relocation? What kind of studies have been undertaken? What direction is the government giving? How much time have they spent listening to the desires of the people? And I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this was again rhetoric. What this was in the presentation of the bill was the philosophy and the rhetoric of reform, with not even any desire, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the members opposite to try and participate in that reform realistically. Now it may be that they were a little bit surprised at the make-up of the Council. It may be that they did not find as many of their colleagues elected as they suggested or believed would be the case.

But whatever the reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think that one can document very thoroughly the fact that there have not been the kind of reform that should have been undertaken because they never addressed themselves to that problem; because they were prepared to let, and they

BILL NO. 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) have let, the Unicity Council try and deal in their own way with the problem. And of course, Mr. Speaker, the resources that are required for what is necessary in the kind of reform that we're talking about will have to come from additional sources than the taxation sources allowed to the City. They have to come from a provincial input. And there isn't a federal-provincial conference on finance matters that takes place, that the Provincial Government is not saying to the Federal Government, we need more money because our municipalities and our cities are in trouble, and they have the great problems of servicing to deal with, and we require that money for them.

Well further, Mr. Speaker, on Page 1469, the Minister of Urban Affairs then, the present Minister of Finance said: "When arriving at the concept we went all the way back to the basic definition of democracy, the power of decision by the people." Mr. Speaker, and now they propose a bill in which the power of decision will be by the Cabinet, not even by this Legislature. The power of decision by the people.--(Interjection)-- Beg your Pardon? No I'm not hysterical. I want to tell the Honourable Member from Radisson, I'm not hysterical at all. What I simply am is appalled by what I consider the hypocrisy on the part of the members opposite, and even their stupidity. Because they have to be stupid to believe, Mr. Speaker, stupid to believe that three years ago they could talk in language of reform, use a cliché of power of the people, and then come to the people and say, and to this Legislature and to the people of the City, we now are going to want the authority to be given to us to alter and change the Community Committees, and to in turn basically change the units within the City, as we deem fit later on when we make the decision. That, Sir, is the power given to the people.

I want to go on with what Mr. Cherniack said at the time: "We try to work hard towards that, and I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the government is pleased with the support we received of other governments from other jurisdictions." In quoting from a study or from a letter from Europe, he said, and I quote: "At what stage and in what way do local government provide concrete opportunity for the citizens to influence decision making." Now I want to ask the members opposite: How many of their Ministers have talked to the Community Committees? How many of them have met with the Community Committees? How many of them have talked to the resident advisory groups? How many of them have discussed the bill that's being proposed here with them? Well, Mr. Speaker, one.--(Interjection)-- Who else. Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, you know the Honourable Minister of Public Works should recognize one thing: He's the government; he brought in the bill; he is basically saying that having listened to the people, and having given them the power, the people have decided that they want the Cabinet to have authority to change jurisdictions, to change the areas and the boundaries, and in turn the people have decided that they want the Cabinet to be able to eliminate, alter, and change the Community Committees.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I've attended Community Committee meetings, and I attended one last night as well as the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. And, Mr. Speaker, this is after the fact, but they heard loud and clear, the people who have been working in the Community Committees as resident advisors do not want to see the basic structure that they've been working in destroyed at the present time. If anything, they want the power to be given to the people, and they want the kind of relationship that is developing to continue so that they can have that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of being able to express through the structure their concerns, because they have recognized the community of interest that does exist. And, Mr. Speaker, they don't want those Community Committees blurred, and I must suggest to you that when this bill was brought forward by the government, they weren't interested in the question of the power being given to the people, they want the power to be given to the Cabinet; the power to be given to the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the bill, the Minister of Finance, then the Minister of Urban Affairs, said the following: "We have decided certain things: equalized tax base, yes: removal of conflict, yes: removal of competition which is wrong and bad planning, yes: creation of the possibility for real planning method to implement good planning and development, yes, we are doing that. But the delivery of services, no, we are leaving it to them, and it'll be for the Community Committees' meetings in concert, representing their own areas but still being part of the regional council, and thus having a dual loyalty that is so necessary, they will make the decisions. Section after section of the bill makes certain that real power, the

BILL NO. 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) effective decision making process is placed where at the local level it properly belongs, in the hands of the members of the community through their representatives, from the wards and the community levels to the regional councils and in all the development stages. All the planned committee levels to the regional . . . All the planned developments of the community itself becomes involved if they wish to. We're not going to force people to come to meetings, but the means whereby they have the right to come to meetings is recognized in this legislation more than in any other existing legislation I'm aware of. Indeed I'm not aware of any legislation that imposes an obligation on elected municipal councils to meet with the people. Yes, to meet on open and certain occasions, to meet in the presence of people, yes, but to impose on them obligations to meet with people is in this bill. I haven't seen it anywhere else."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I must indicate, if anything, I think we should amend this bill to impose the Cabinet to meet with the people. I think if we're going to have an imposition imposed on anybody it should be on the Cabinet to meet with the people. I think what we should force, Mr. Speaker, is the Cabinet to start listening to them, and then, Mr. Speaker, they can decide that the power should be given to the people and not to the Cabinet.--(Interjection)-- There's no moral obligation on the part of the councillors. They are forced by the Act, by the Unicity Act to meet with the people. The people may or may not have to come.

On 2695 of Hansard of the same year, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cherniack says, and I repeat: The Minister of Urban Affairs: "All I can say though is that the deep commitment that this government has to the role and the potential of Community Committees and functions that they will perform to keep government at the municipal level as close as possible to the people receiving the service. I will expand on that a little later, but our feeling is that no matter how much legislation you bring in you can't force people to participate, but you must make it possible for them to do so to the fullest extent."

"There was no discussion, Mr. Speaker," and I'm quoting from the Minister of Urban Affairs, "that I can give much weight to in the future of the urban area of Greater Winnipeg. There was very little said by the Opposition in recognizing the decay at the core area and the impact of that decay on the area as a whole."

Well, it's two and a half years, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that the government has done one thing on the core area. I don't think that they have been concerned about the decay. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that they have really concerned themselves about this problem. I think what they did, Mr. Speaker, was to again talk the language of reform and not to be too concerned about what was really going to happen.

On Page 2698, Mr. Speaker, "We say that the new regional councils will be able to unify certain services, they could decentralize certain services, and that is something for them to decide."

And going on, Mr. Speaker, he says: "Because understanding it, he cannot help." He's referring now to the Honourable Member for Riel. "But I understand as well that by this bill we are returning to the people the right and power to govern their own local affairs. I only wish that the Honourable Member for Riel would have been able to sit down with his leader and certain other members of his caucus and explain to them, especially his leader, what was the philosophic background of this bill, because he understood it. And he would save the Honourable Leader of the Opposition many questions on his list that had to do with projections."

Mr. Speaker, at the time, we listed some 30 questions to the government for answers. One of the questions we listed was whether Mr. Bole's representation of an additional 18 million-dollar cost for general unification was correct or not. I think, Mr. Speaker, that members in the House will recall the Minister's answer at the time: How did he know what the projections are? He couldn't tell. How did Mr. Bole arrive at his figures? You could have used 18 million; you could have used 20, he didn't know. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have the tax bills now. And the fact is that what Mr. Bole said is correct. What the fact is, Mr. Speaker, without any new additional services being provided, without any attempt to tackle the problems of the core area, which they referred to, without getting involved in the problems of a metropolitan city in the necessity of moneys becoming available to be able to try and deal with the blighted area around the central business district, without dealing with the essential problem that Winnipeg has with respect to the problems of the native people who come into the city and who require particular attention, Mr. Speaker, without any of this additional cost that

BILL NO. 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) must be borne in the City of Winnipeg, and by the province as well, without any of these, Mr. Speaker, we have Mr. Bole's \$18 million figure being realized.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, at the time who was naive at the point? Were we the opposition, the combined opposition, naive in suggesting the cost, or was the government at that time purposely misleading the House as to what the costs were really going to be? One has to wonder at the logic and the time that was spent on the part of the government in presenting a fundamentally new proposal without any clear commitment on their part to try and live up to the words that they expressed when they presented that proposal. Because, Mr. Speaker, that really is the experience of the Department of Urban Affairs and the government; they have not lived up to that proposal. They have not done anything which would be a concrete indication - and I'm sorry the Minister of Industry and Commerce is away for that remark, because obviously his interest in the cement industry, the concrete proposal would be important to him. But Mr. Speaker, where have they indicated and shown in their legislation, in the papers that have been presented in the debates, the kind of commitment that would follow through from the rhetoric that they talked about when they provided the reform.

So, Mr. Speaker, they bring in a bill which provides for the election of a mayor, which is something that every party has already committed themselves to, and which should have been provided in the original legislation, because once you give the power to the people, Mr. Speaker, to elect the mayor, there was never a question that you could take it away from them. And they bring that proposal in, plus two other major proposals. The ability of the Cabinet by Order-in-Council to in fact restructure the Community Committees, to eliminate the Community Committees, and to change the boundaries of the Council, and they feel that they have satisfied their words and their commitments of reform as expressed in the House.

The Minister of Urban Affairs said on 2699: "We the elected members of this Legislature who form part of this Cabinet committee, take full credit for the development of this Unicity concept." All right, Mr. Speaker, they take full credit for it. They were not prepared to deal with Mr. Bole's figures; they suggested it wasn't so; they suggested there would be an escalation of costs without the kind of amalgamation that would take place. And they suggested, Mr. Speaker, that we really lacked the information. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they proposed that there were a number of task force that they had working, who were prepared to work for the city and who were prepared to furnish the information. And my understanding is that very little was done with the city with respect to this, and the degree of co-operation really offered was minimal, and the degree of information supplied was not that significant. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I could be wrong, and I would be interested in hearing from the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs as to exactly what really happened.

Quoting further on Page 2706: "The absolutely critical aspect of all these duties and functions is that they must be carried out in direct and open consultation with the people of the community." Councillors must deal in open consultation with the people of the community. The Cabinet does not, the Legislature does not, but the Council have to. The power of the people is limited to the Council. The power of the people to direct their own affairs is limited, Mr. Speaker, because it can't be dealt with unless they have a favourable reply in the Cabinet. Now, Mr. Speaker, is this what getting democracy to the people in its truest form is all about?

"The councillors will be required by law to be directly responsive to and responsible for the citizens of the community." Now, Mr. Speaker, what I'm doing is repeating really the same thing over and over again but I'm repeating different words of the Minister - not my words - expressed at different times in the speech, in the speeches in the House on the Unicity bill. And what I'm trying to indicate is really the sham that is proposed now in the legislation, that the government should be able to change this by Cabinet decision.--(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Public Works says, "Is that the only point?" I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only point in this whole bill, which was the Unicity bill, was to give power to the people. I've repeated this six or eight or ten times with direct quotations from the Minister, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the same government that talked about giving power to the people is prepared now to take power to itself to determine what is good for the people. And, Mr. Speaker, if there was anything that's basically true, the difference in philosophy between the members opposite and the members on this side, it's the fact that their rhetoric has always been a sham because they have never really seriously been interested in giving power to anybody except themselves. And we can go through this in one

BILL NO. 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) situation after another, they have basically and have always been concerned in being able to make the decisions for people for themselves, whether it be by way of the tax dollars that are raised, whether it would be by the way of a mining tax that is going to be proposed that they will decide, whether we will be in the control of industry, they know better. And when the Honourable Minister of Agriculture keeps talking, as he does, about the decisions being made by the various marketing boards and by decisions being made by the groups of producers, one knows that the decision to a large extent is being made by him and by his own officials. The fact is, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Will the member answer a question?

MR. SPIVAK: In a few moments, if I can. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that they are not interested in giving power to the people, and the basic feature of the bill is altered by the amendments that are proposed.

The Minister of Urban Affairs says on Page 2710, "The people of Greater Winnipeg will have to decide and will want to decide what sort of community they want." The people of Greater Winnipeg will have to decide and will want to decide what sort of community they want. I don't see anything in this bill that will allow the people of Greater Winnipeg to decide what kind of community they want. Nothing at all. And if the members opposite can show me in this bill the provisions and the sections which will give the people of greater Winnipeg to decide exactly what they want, then I'd like them to spell that out to me. They now will have the right to elect the Mayor. They had the right given to them before, after the members opposite finally were able to resolve it in their own caucus, and finally amended the original bill that was proposed. But beyond that, how are the people of Winnipeg going to be able to decide and want to decide what sort of community they want? How does the government know on the opposite side whether the people want the community committees to change? How do the people on the opposite side know whether the people want 50 wards, 20 wards, 30 wards?

A MEMBER: We're in touch.

MR. SPIVAK: You're in touch. In touch with whom?

A MEMBER: With the people.

MR. SPIVAK: You're in touch with the people. Well yesterday I attended the Lord Selkirk Community Committee and I would tell you that the people were in touch with your two Ministers. Very different than you being in touch. They were very very much in touch with the Ministers. They were in touch in telling them that they didn't want it to change, that they weren't consulted on the change, that nobody talked to them about the change, that they didn't understand why there should be a change when they were starting to work as a unit, and they didn't understand what the government was doing, frankly. They felt that the Ministers opposite who came from the north end would have understood their basic desire for a Sherbrook-McGregor overpass, considering the fact that they have problems with the McPhillips Subway, considering the fact that they can't get over the Arlington Bridge all the time, and considering that they have some difficulties from their own particular situation. They wanted to be in touch with the government to find out why the government had been delaying on the Seven Oaks Hospital, and why announcements have been made and why the program hadn't been proceeded with. Mr. Speaker, they wanted to get in touch with the government, but I suggest to you that the government really doesn't want to get in touch with them. And the government hasn't been in touch with them for the last two and a half years, and if the Minister of Public Works believes, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Public Works believes . . . The Minister for--Oh, last June. Well, you know, last June the members were elected and that election meant, insofar as the Honourable Minister is concerned, that they were in touch with the people and therefore the people were prepared to give them the authority to be able to alter the Community Committees and alter the boundaries. Mr. Speaker, democracy, giving people the authority, in the member's terms, means that the Cabinet can have the authority to exercise on behalf of the people anything it so desires. And, Mr. Speaker, that's where we differ on this. We have reached the point, Mr. Speaker, where we don't believe that the Cabinet can or should be given the authority.--(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, you know, the honourable members may want to in some way try and fuzz this issue up, and I have done this with only a few quotations. I could present many more. The speeches presented by the members opposite were consistent with the belief that the people in the Community Committees and the people in the wards would be able to decide

BILL NO. 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) exactly what kind of city they wanted. If there is a problem, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the number of councillors, if there is a problem with respect to the operation of the community committees, if there is a problem with respect to the community committees - that is, the structure and the way in which they operate - if there is a problem with the way in which the city is dealing with their problems, then, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility based on the proposition provided by the government is that the government should be responding and listening to the people.

But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they are not doing that. I suggest that what they are doing has been consistent with what I've said. They are going to make the decisions as they deem advisable, and they want the power to make their decisions without realistically having any control exercised by the Legislature.

When the Premier introduced this bill, he brought in a statement saying, and I quote from Page 2886 of this Session, "There is, in any case, always the power of review which rests with the Legislature in respect to any action taken by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council." Well, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that we can debate it, to the extent that we can talk about it, the power of review exists. To the extent that we can stop it, we can't stop anything. They have already exercised by a special warrant, by Order-in-Council during this Session, dealing with Interim Supply, or moneys for Interim Supply, which was a breach of a tradition of the last--well, as long as Parliament has existed in Canada. And, you know, we can talk about it and to that extent there's a review, but when we gave power to the people in this bill, did we give power to the people only to the extent that Cabinet could do whatever they wanted and the power of review would only rest in this Legislature? And I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that that was what was originally intended. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite, when they passed this bill, really intended it, but I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't looked at the City of Winnipeg in the last two and a half years; they have not been interested in the City of Winnipeg in the last two years; they haven't responded to the requests of the City of Winnipeg in the last two and a half years; and now all of a sudden they know that there's going to have to be some kind of reform and they're not interested in listening to the people, they're interested in providing their reform as they see fit because they know better than anyone else, and because, Mr. Speaker, it is their honest belief that they have been given a mandate as a result of the June election to basically do whatever they want, and I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that's what the people want, and I don't believe that's what the people who are the Resident Advisory Groups want, I don't believe that's what the councillors want. What they do want are changes to occur and an evolution to take place that will reflect realistically the involvement and the concerns and the answering of the needs of the people. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what is lacking in the presentation, and what I would suggest has been a very cold presentation by the Premier, who is prepared to come in and say, "We've got a majority; we want authority for the Cabinet to do whatever it wants. That's it and sit down."

. . . . continued on next page

BILL 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the problems. The government used the rhetoric of revenue-sharing about a year and a half ago, or a year ago when they presented the budget. They said, "We're going to provide revenue sharing with the municipalities and with the city," and that sounded pretty good. We were going to give a participation in a growth tax. We're going to take 95 percent and we're going to give the municipalities and the city 5 percent. And that's an offer they can't refuse. So, Mr. Speaker, did anybody on the opposite side look realistically at what the normal costs would be just for the essential services that were being maintained at that point? And did anyone believe that that participation would even cover that? Then one has to say, well what is the city going to do in its revenue-sharing, or what is the province going to do to assist the City of Winnipeg in dealing with all of the problems of the core area that have been identified by the Minister?

MR. DOERN: Will you answer a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Well I would like to know, if the City of Winnipeg made a proposal to ask the province for five percent of a large number of growth revenues increasing over a five-year period to 25 percent, and this figure was of the order of \$160 million a year, I'd like to know whether the Leader of the Official Opposition would have responded positively to a share of growth revenues of that order?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the proposition that was offered by the City, but I am also aware of what has been offered by the Province. I would say to the honourable member opposite that if there is really going to be a commitment on the part of the government to assist the city in dealing with the many urban problems, that the kind of revenue-sharing that they are talking about now is not sufficient. Whether the projections that the City offered are correct in terms of their needs or not, is something that I can't deal with. I haven't the information, the technical information, that obviously the Department of Urban Affairs would have. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that I can say to the honourable member opposite that I don't know how you can deal with urban renewal, I don't know how you can deal with the core problems, I don't know how you can deal with the problems of the native people with respect to their particular problem in the city of Winnipeg, I don't know how you can deal with the essential need for changes in the arterial highways - by that it's the bridges that I'm referring to - unless there's going to be more money available. And I don't know how a government that comes in with \$52 million of surplus revenue, with \$52 million, can say to the urban area of Greater Winnipeg that "we're going to give you five percent or very little" and basically say to you, "You raise the money your own way". Or the Minister of Finance will stand up and say, "We've given up Amusement Tax. Now, you take it. It's \$500,000 or \$600,000."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of money we're talking about are not five or six hundred thousand dollars; and the problems that I'm talking about have to be dealt with, because if they're not dealt with, Mr. Speaker, then I'll predict what will happen in the urban area of Greater Winnipeg. I will predict that the crime rate will go up. Well, you know, the members opposite say no. Mr. Speaker, I think that you can document that right away. I'll predict that the housing conditions in the blighted area will deteriorate. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the actual cost in years to come will be far more.

Now, if the members opposite say that they're satisfied with this city as it is now, if the members opposite say that we don't have these problems, if the members opposite say, well, there's no need to deal with these problems because they can be staged over a period of time and they're not really - really, you know, problems that we have to cope with, then I ask them to do as I have done, and I think some members opposite, to start walking down the street in the blighted area and start to talk to the people; to look at the conditions under which they live; to look in the urban renewal areas, and to ask the people there what they think their future really will be. And then, Mr. Speaker, I ask them to start talking to the people.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no imagination used by the members opposite in dealing with the problems. They are so wrapped up in, frankly, I don't know what, but they're wrapped up in matters that are not really concerned with this particular area, that they have allowed this thing to develop, and they think that the reform that they're bringing in now is sufficient to justify their lack of initiative, lack of activity, and lack of concern. And so,

BILL 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . .Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult in dealing with this particular bill to respond to the members opposite by saying to them that either this was a masterful con job on your part to try and suggest to the people that they were going to be better off, or you have lost the way that you had first proposed.

Now, if you have lost the way because you have been concerned with other problems and have not been able to deal with it, then I would suggest that you'd better start mending your ways and I would suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that you better start examining what you said when you first presented this bill. And if you do this, Mr. Speaker, then you will amend and change this Act, and, Mr. Speaker, that commitment to amend and change this Act will have to come fairly soon because, Mr. Speaker, if they are not prepared to amend or change this Act, then I would say to members opposite that this was just rhetoric. Insofar as you were concerned, the reform only consisted in saying that we provided a Unicity. That the concern for what really was happening in the urban area is not a real concern. That you've been able to trade off on again the language of reform, and you'll try to trade off in this bill in the language of reform. That you'll examine and look at it and in a couple of years later you may make some decisions that you yourself will decide, and you'll follow this same course of action you've followed in so much of what you've done. You will not, Mr. Speaker, provide that kind of commitment that was referred to by the Minister of Finance when he first introduced the bill. You are not going to provide and allow people to determine how their community shall be run, nor will you deal in the way that the Minister of Urban Affairs at the time, the Minister of Finance, suggested in providing an opportunity for the people to try and develop the kind of community that they wanted.

Mr. Speaker, unless there will be additional financial resources supplied by the government, unless there is going to be additional moneys put forward by the government, there is no way in which the Unicity will be able to deal with the problems that it faces, and we will have a City of Winnipeg essentially standing still in a state of confusion, you know in a way in which the basic urban problems will not be dealt with but will deteriorate, with additional costs yet to be borne or to be borne by the people of Winnipeg, and with, Mr. Speaker, the added concern that the compounding of the problem will then lead to quick solutions because of the political necessity of trying to show some action, which I suggest will defeat the very purpose of the attempt to evolve out of this proposal something better than we had before.

Now with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, outside of the resident participation in the community committees, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . .can show or indicate. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . .people in Greater Winnipeg are better off as a result of this proposal than they were before. I don't think there's anything to indicate that they are better off. Now if, in fact, you are going to eliminate the only improvement that appears to have taken place, which essentially is the involvement of people, if you're prepared to eliminate that by this Act, by giving the power to the Cabinet, and not even to this Legislature, then I would suggest to you that the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent by the government with its researchers, the work and effort that was put in by the Minister of Urban Affairs, the meetings that were held, are in vain. And Mr. Speaker, the time again has come for the government to accept and to show some maturity with respect to its past statements and its action, and to recognize that the bill that they have proposed is not a bill that is consistent with the logical and proper development of the words that they expressed when the first Unicity bill was brought in, and that changes have to be made to that bill and, the power cannot be given to the Cabinet; it must be taken away; it must be a power given back to the people to let them decide with this Legislature being able and being in a position, Mr. Speaker, to approve it. And so, Mr. Speaker, we will wait and see whether the government's going to be prepared to amend it.

I know that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who did not give a commitment to the Community Committee last night, basically said that he would bring to the Cabinet the views of the people there, and those views were pretty strong, Mr. Speaker, and they were people who had not been involved in political life before. They were people who were concerned about the community, who could not understand the insensitivity of a government who claimed that they were sensitive to people's interests, who could not understand the way in which government operates to in fact really negate any ability on their part to influence the decisions

BILL 46

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . .that will affect their lives. And, Mr. Speaker, what they were basically pleading for, and that plea was given to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and I have no doubt will be conveyed to the Cabinet, they were pleading for the power to be given to them to make the decisions. And, Mr. Speaker, after all, that's what the government said they were going to give in the first place, and the question is: did they really mean it or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: The Leader of the Opposition made an impressive point of the fact that he was in touch with people and talking to people all over the City of Winnipeg. Could he inform us of his impression of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The gentleman is asking to elaborate a further argument. Questions are for clarification of the speech only. That's the rule. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOERN: Well could the Leader of the Official Opposition indicate what he feels is the view of the public at large on the size of council, whether or not it should be reduced?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: That has no bearing whatsoever on the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do believe the question is not pertinent to what the honourable member spoke about. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the member for not hearing all of his remarks, but I doubt very much if the first part differed much from the latter. One of the debating techniques of the Leader of the Opposition is to stand up and hold forth in general rhetorical terms and then every once in a while holler real loudly, "about \$100,000 cost" you know, and everybody wakes up and the press puts a pencil mark down somewhere.

With reference to the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, generally what he has said is that, you know, we shouldn't change things. We shouldn't evolve, we shouldn't amend things. I can remember when the Unicity bill was brought before the Legislature as Bill 36, and it went to Committee. I remember a gentleman by the name of Mr. Huband, who appeared before Committee and made some very constructive criticisms, I think, that the government enacted, because they were, you know they were valid criticisms and he had some alternatives. But Mr. Speaker, you know, as any Einstein said--let me put it this way. Einstein said that, you know most things should be reducible to fundamental principles - and I certainly don't want to pretend that I stand on a plane, intellectually or otherwise, with Einstein, but the fundamental principle that people bandy about that Einstein threw at us, that sigma is equal to MC squared, you know, most people are familiar with this, but yet when you get down to the sigma being a Greek sign for the sum or the total of, the sum total of, the energy available in any particular object being equal to the mass measured in grams times the speed of light squared, you usually get about that far and you lose half your audience. But really, the essence of the Unicity bill as it was introduced and as we're now modifying it a little bit more as we have learned, is that the strength of the whole concept was the community committee, and that everyone who had been in politics or who has been involved in politics knows, that it takes awhile for a group of politicians to get together and to work and to, you know, who will come out higher up on the echelon than someone else.

Now I don't know, Mr. Speaker, there have been decisions taken by City Council or individual councillors which I disagree with, but nevertheless by and large I think that the City Council of the City of Winnipeg has done an excellent job with a very difficult job. They have done well with a difficult job. And doubtless after the next election, the people who survive the democratic process will do even better. The tasks that the councillors were left with, the amalgamation of the Fire Department, and currently the amalgamation of the Police Department, are monumental tasks unto themselves, and I think that the councillors have done well in this regard. I may have certain criticisms that I've heard, you know, various members on both sides of the House talk about development and particularly development of certain areas, including my own, but nevertheless as we make available to the City of Winnipeg the instrumentalities to develop the communities, and the relationship of these communities to the elected official, we will invariably have to make, maybe even on an annual basis, minor amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act.

As most people will recall, the major analysis, it says statutorily, will take place within five years of the establishment of the Act, but Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the general thrust of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks in that he said that, you know, the Minister

BILL 46

(MR. BOYCE cont'd). . . of Finance in introducing the bill to the House was once again in a position where he spoke--I forget what the remarks were made relative to another debate in the House, that he had deluded them, that he had not been honest with them and everything else but nevertheless, the Minister's remarks, if you look at them and you look at them in the context that the City of Winnipeg is an evolving instrument and changes will doubtless have to be made, and I'm sure after the next election--I see, you know, just as an aside, Mr. Speaker, some of the councillors who held themselves forth as being interested in being involved in City Council, their interest was relatively short-lived in that some of them took the first opportunity out in that they offered themselves to run in the provincial campaign, which perhaps they should - I'm not saying that they shouldn't - but nevertheless, doubtless other people who have become involved in the Unicity or the City of Winnipeg as we know it now, at the political level, will not be able to deal with the frustrations of political life and won't come forth to offer their services to the people. Those people who do, and survive the process, doubtless - and once again I would repeat - the next time around will address themselves, and whether I agree or disagree with some of their decisions, I know that they will, in the interests of all the people in the City of Winnipeg, try their darndest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I've been sitting by here listening to the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, and I was not inclined to participate, but frankly I feel that some of the things he said are, to use his words, a sham, and the sham is one that he is trying to perpetrate on this House. Mr. Speaker, this man has the audacity to get up here and say that this government deluded people, that in fact what we brought into being was not a government for the people but in fact was some device by which the Cabinet of the Provincial Government could take hold and could control. The reality is that the towns, villages, LGDs, municipalities, and cities are all creatures of the Provincial Government, and he knows that. He's known it for years. This is not new. The fact is the City of Winnipeg is not the city state of Winnipeg. It is the City of Winnipeg within the Province of Manitoba. It is a part of a province. It doesn't exist unto itself; it doesn't rule unto itself, or by itself, or for itself, and if it did that, I can tell you the province would suffer and in the long run so would the city.

What we brought in 2-1/2 years ago was the creation of a vehicle, a vehicle whereby we could make it possible for the citizens of the City of Winnipeg to work together, instead of in a fragmented way, towards achieving something for themselves within the City of Winnipeg. And that's all we did. We created a vehicle. But you can't stand still. The bill referred to is suggested that it's really a con - and what is the actual words here - it's rhetoric, and it doesn't mean anything, and the government is trying to intrude by Order-in-Council to determine the size of the Council or alter the wards or boundaries of community committees, or indeed the number of community committees. The fact is, there has been much written on this in the newspapers. There are many views. There are views that come out and say that there should be 25 members of council, that that's the way to run it; efficient business. The more people you have, the more difficult it is to operate; the less people you have the more efficient it will become - operated like a Board of Directors, and I suppose if 25 is more efficient than 50, 12 is more efficient again, and perhaps the most efficient is one man. One man. No problem. He moves, he seconds it, he resolves all the problems.--(Interjection)--No I wouldn't take that on either.

So, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that there's some plot here is nonsense. The fact is there has been much speculation and much talk about whether indeed the first boundaries drawn were the correct boundaries, whether the number of community committees were the proper ones, and we have to go back in time to remember what occurred and why it occurred.

If you recall, Mr. Speaker, and some members here might, it was originally considered that there would be, I believe 48 wards. However, it was recognized that the reality, the practicalities of the situation were that although a new city structure was coming into being and a new council was coming into being on December 31st of a given year, that the very next morning, January 1st, certain services had to be continued to be provided. A house might burn. Streets had to be maintained. Water breaks had to be repaired. Refuse had to be picked up. Snowplows had to operate. And so there was no way that one could ignore that and therefore the old municipal structures that had been delivering these services had to be recognized, and therefore the direction to the Boundaries Commission, the terms of reference

BILL 46

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . .stated that that should be recognized in establishing the first communities and the wards within them.

As a result, and there was one other, in order that no community would have less than three representatives irrespective of the population, that too was imposed, or suggested as a term of reference, and they were to work within those terms of reference. So the Boundaries Commission at that time had to be seized of these two situations; No change in the boundaries. No less than three members to a community committee. And as a result they came out with the boundaries which we have today. And during that period there have been many questions raised and, as I say, some have suggested half the council, others have suggested other numbers, and I don't believe in the magic of numbers. I don't believe for one moment that if there were half the councillors there'd be more agreement - or more disagreement. I think that, as the Member for Winnipeg Centre has said, that in fact the City of Winnipeg has done a miraculous job in going as far as it has; that it's extremely difficult to go from one type of government structure into a completely new concept, considering that most of them, most people there came the day before from working within a certain municipality, under a structure in which they were comfortable, had worked for years, and it was expected of them to move into a completely new type of structure, a new format, a new type of operation, and it was inevitable that it would take weeks and months, and I think years. But we couldn't simply do nothing, and so all this hullabaloo about the province is planning to run the city from the . . .of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is nonsense. What was done was simply refer the matter to the Boundaries Commission and ask them to look at the present wards; ask them to study the matter; suggest to them what whereas in the first instance they were constrained by municipal boundaries because of the need to deliver services, that they were constrained by the suggestion, the proposal that there should be a minimum of three members of Council, even though those three might represent a much smaller ward than in other parts of the City. So there wasn't that representation by population which is preferable. In some cases there were councillors who represented 7,200 people; in other cases there were councillors who represented 13,000 people. So we asked them to address themselves to that, and could they come up with something that would adjust it? And so they came up with a proposal and that proposal's been looked at; it's been referred back to the Boundaries Commission; we've asked the Boundaries Commission to accept hearings or to have hearings or to accept submissions from interested parties, from elected people, from councillors, from resident advisory groups - and I don't doubt they're getting those submissions now. And in the light of those submissions, they will then come up with a final recommendation. If we had done nothing, then I tell you the same Leader of the Official Opposition would have got up and probably would have made a speech about the fact that this government's doing nothing, it's turned its back on Winnipeg and is not doing anything with regard to the City Council.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition says we have turned our back on the City; how can the City possibly deal with the problems in the Core, the roadways, the problem of the influx of native people into Winnipeg (and it is a problem) the question of housing. He predicts the crime rate will go up. Well you know, I agree with his prediction. It's going to go up in Winnipeg, in Calgary, in Vancouver, in Edmonton. It's the times we live in. But don't let him tell me it's because of Unicity. That is nonsense and he knows it's nonsense.

He suggested the bill is either a con job or the government's lost its way. The bill is not a con job. Basically, the bill deals with many many matters which the City of Winnipeg itself wanted to have brought forward, because in any new act, and over the many years there isn't a session that goes by that amendments aren't brought in to existing acts, whether they be municipal acts, whether they be dealing with cities or towns, and the Leader of the Official Opposition knows this too. He says we haven't responded to the City. That's absolute nonsense. This government has made more money available to the City of Winnipeg in many forms than ever before. He talks about the high rise of the municipal tax, and that one Mr. Bole estimated and projected costs of \$18 million. Yes he did. I wonder what the same Mr. Bole estimated would have been the cost if there had been no City of Winnipeg Act. I never saw that figure. He just estimated what would be the cost if there was one.

Mr. Speaker, we never indicated, we never indicated that we were looking to save money. The City of Winnipeg Act was to make possible for the citizens of Winnipeg a more rational system than existed; that one municipality wouldn't have to undercut the other

BILL 46

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . .municipality in order to attract an industry; whether it made sense to have that industry or not didn't matter, but they wanted it for the industrial tax base. So that this squabble between Metro and every municipal council and the City of Winnipeg had to be laid to rest once and for all. Because, if you recall - and some of you may have short memories, some long - the headlines, the screaming headlines and complaints annually about what Metro was doing to the municipalities, and how Metro was undercutting the municipalities, and how Metro was trampling on the municipalities, and how Metro was draining all the funds from the municipalities. And I tell you that that wasn't liveable with in those days. And earlier this afternoon we heard a speech from the Member of Souris-Killarney who in his comments about the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, he paid him great compliments and great accolades. He must forget that the same person he has been talking about appeared at Law Amendments and said, "This bill is the best thing that ever happened to the residents of Greater Winnipeg." He seems to forget that.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg has problems, yes. The tax bills have risen. But did the Leader of the Opposition also indicate that tax bills have risen right across the country? Did he acknowledge that this government has made money available to the people who pay the tax bill? That this year, for example, the basic amount, the minimal, and it will appear on every tax bill, is \$150.00 per ratepayer, per taxpayer, paid direct by the Province of Manitoba on behalf of that municipal taxpayer to the City of Winnipeg? So what he's really saying is this: Municipal taxes have gone up, therefore this is bad. What he is ignoring completely is that the ability to pay these taxes is what counts and we have done what we think is right. We have made the moneys available to the people who pay the taxes no longer so that the taxes can be collected from these people, and that the City therefore is accountable. And when the City therefore has to increase taxes by a certain mill rate, it will do so, but we have made it possible, we have softened the impact of those taxes on those people who can least afford it, and we've done it through a number of devices.

As well, we have made grants far in excess of any previous government to the City of Winnipeg. As well, we have a formula, albeit it may not please the Leader of the Official Opposition, but there is a formula which is tied by formula to the income of the province.

How can the City deal with housing? How can the City deal with the core problems, the Leader of the Opposition asks? Those are vexatious problems, and frankly I'm disappointed that the City has not come to grips a little faster than it has with these problems. On the other hand, they are I think coming to view the problem and at least moving in that direction. In the urban area No. 2, the old blighted area, the Neighborhood Improvement Program has been designated, and together with the provincial and the federal governments there will be a Neighborhood Improvement Program developed, and this is a direct attack on the area referred to as "the core area".

In the matter of housing, I regret the fact that the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has to date been thwarted in its attempt to get more public social housing into the City of Winnipeg, and I am critical of the City Council for dragging their feet on that. I think, however, that they've come to recognize that they can no longer adopt the position they have, and I expect that there will be movement in that direction too. But I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite, that no way, never under the old municipal structure, would anything have been done vis-a-vis the core city, the slum areas, railway relocation, overpasses, underpasses, you name it. The City of Winnipeg could not, without grouping together the suburbs into one city, could never have even discussed the problem let alone try to tackle it in any meaningful way, because it needs the financial and human resources of the entire Greater Winnipeg region, and that is now possible. All that this government did was to create developer vehicles. It is not our intention and never has been that the City of Winnipeg should be run from this Chamber. We've never done it. It is our hope that that vehicle be successful, that people will avail themselves of that vehicle. In the coming year, I believe the resident advisory groups are going to have some support, resource support, that was lacking to them in the past, and that is good. I think perhaps they can benefit from it. I think that now that two and a half years have passed, the city councils themselves perceive their role in a somewhat different way than they perceived it when they first took office on January 1, 1972; that they've now been exposed to the problems which they did not really fully appreciate before.

So Mr. Speaker, this government makes no apologies for that bill. This government is

BILL 46

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . . proud of what it did, and I suggest to the Leader of the Official Opposition that the City of Winnipeg can and will decide the nature of the city that it wants for itself, and this government will not impede it and it will assist it. There had to be some mechanism and some way whereby changes are made, and legislation was brought in. If, as a result of the referral back to the board dealing with the boundaries, if as a result they modify their proposals or they alter them, we will certainly look at them, but in every case it will eventually have to come for ratification, because no city can of itself and no city has the power to simply determine for itself whether it shall be 25, 35 or 50 councillors, because the City, like every other municipality, is simply--it's created by provincial legislation and is there by virtue of provincial legislation. That is in the nature of our system and that's how we operate. So they are creatures of provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, I have to reject completely and utterly as fatuous, the comments by the speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition. Really, he's groping for something to say and he's looking very hard on how to say it. And so he's critical of this government for: not listening to people and for not doing this and not doing that. The fact is that the bill, The City of Winnipeg Bill, is probably the most forward-looking of any in any province, in any jurisdiction, in its role vis-a-vis the senior government and the city government. And it will work if the City of Winnipeg wants it to work. I think in time it will work. It will be given time. There's a statutory requirement that review will take place, I believe in 1975, I can't recall the date. At that time I don't doubt there will be more formal hearings held; people will then come forward and express their views. By that time we'll have a better idea of how people feel about it and have had a better chance to read what has really occurred, because when you go from one kind of system into another you are bound to have problems of adjustment, of perception, of an appreciation of one's role, and even an appreciation of the goals that one is out to achieve. But I cannot accept and I don't think the public will accept that the Leader of the Official Opposition really had anything to say of any meaning. He jumped on what he thought was an issue but in fact it's an issue of his own making, it is not an issue of any great importance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be now adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister is not in his seat. --(Interjection)--

MR. PAULLEY: Well, there's quite a difference between the two Ministers. It was just a slipping around of seats, Mr. Speaker. So therefore I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47 (a) (1)--pass? The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I had commenced replying to some of the comments raised by honourable members who participated in the debate of my estimates--(Interjection)--I think it's ten minutes; we can continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on.

MR. HANUSCHAK: There had been some comments made with respect to the student population of our schools, not on the debate of my department but rather on the consideration of the estimates of the Honourable the Attorney-General, and I was very much tempted to reply at that time but I thought that I would rather not because I felt quite certain that you probably would have ruled me out of order, Mr. Chairman, speaking on matters related to education and our youth rather than the Attorney-General's Department which we were debating at that time. However, the comments did relate to the students in our schools, and I've had

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd). . . some reaction to that and therefore I think that it would only be proper that this matter be clarified, and it may well be that some of the comments that the honourable member made - and this was the Honourable Member for Roblin, who is not in his seat at the present time - but I'm certain that he would not wish to leave any doubt in his constituents' minds or in anyone's mind as to what he really meant, or what he wanted to say.

He spoke at that time, Mr. Chairman, of the irresponsibility of our youth and some of the problems that we're faced with. Students toting six-packs of beer to school. The drug problem. You open a locker and you find beer in there and all this sort of thing. And then he--(Interjection)--Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not denying that from time to time problems do arise, this year and last year, as they had when the honourable member attended school and as they no doubt will continue to arise from time to time.--(Interjection)--That's right. But the honourable member left us with the impression that this is in some way typical and characteristic of all youth in general and, as I've said, I did not have an opportunity to respond at that time, but the honourable member did indicate that the Minister of Education knows what's going on in the school system. And yes, I'll agree that I, you know, I thought, I firmly do believe that I do know what's going on in the school system. But then when I heard what the Honourable Member for Roblin mentioned, I began to wonder that, you know, maybe the school division in his constituency is different from others, and that. . .

A MEMBER: He's different.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, so I did check, I did check to see what in fact is going on in the school divisions in the honourable member's constituency. And here's what I found, that the students in his constituency are really no different from the students elsewhere. At this time of the year I find that there are many who are very busily involved preparing themselves for track and field meets, and they assemble at the school early in the morning and they're there during the noon hour, and they're using the hallways for track practice and so forth. Now surely, Mr. Chairman, those wouldn't be the ones toting the six-packs of beer to school, because if they did they wouldn't be practicing for track and field. And there was a science symposium in Winnipeg not too long ago, involving many students from Manitoba high schools, and science fairs throughout the province. Now surely the students working on the Science Fair, on the science projects, they wouldn't be the ones to whom the honourable member was referring.

There are music festivals held involving tens of thousands of students, the big one in Winnipeg as well as others in other parts of the province. Now they wouldn't be the ones to whom the honourable member is referring. And I find in his constituency, as well as elsewhere, that students are assisting their parents at work at home, on the farm, in the family business. Many have part-time jobs. So surely the honourable member didn't intend to include them, although he didn't exclude them when he made his remarks the other night - on Tuesday night I believe it was. And in speaking to the teachers and the principals, I find that there are students who are doing extremely well in their academic studies, getting good marks and working hard to get them. Some may not be achieving as well as others but they're working to the best of their ability. Now those working to the best of their ability, surely the honourable member didn't include, didn't wish to include them. And so it goes.

So for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would like to set the record straight about the youth of our schools, and I would also like to assist the Honourable Member for Roblin, because I am sure that from time to time he visits his home constituency and someone may. . .

A MEMBER: Not very often.

A MEMBER: Not often enough.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . someone may call upon him to explain the comments that he made, and particularly at this time of year when it's customary to hold year-end closing exercises and this type of thing, and I don't know the honourable member may be invited to speak at the closing exercises of some schools in his riding, and he may be called upon to explain the comments that he made in the House. Now it appears that he is the one who is not really familiar with what's going on in the schools in his constituency. So I would like to, oh perhaps--I would like to refer him to a couple of students, and this, by the way, Mr. Chairman came to me very recently, about a week ago. I received a list of the top one hundred achievers in a mathematics contest sponsored by the University of Manitoba. And lo and behold, in the top third, one of the prize winner, I find the name of one Murray Trakalo from a school that

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd). . . also has an excellent choir, and has made - and the Honourable member would agree - has made a tremendous contribution toward the enrichment of our cultural mosaic in Manitoba, St. Vladimir's College in Roblin, of which I believe the honourable member has spoken on one or two occasions. There's Murray Trakalo from St. Vladimir's College in Roblin Manitoba, his district winner, and one of the top performers in Grade 11 mathematics contest sponsored by the University of Manitoba, in which several hundreds of students participated. Now, I'm sure that the honourable member wasn't referring to him.

So I would think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Trakalo may be able to direct the Honourable Member for Roblin and introduce him to other students who ought to be excluded from this general smear that the honourable member just cast across the entire student population of our schools.

I also found--now, he may know some, and to further assist him, within the last couple of days I approved a community STEP program, and a community STEP program, Mr. Chairman, is approved by--there is a local committee set up of the Ag Rep, the Municipal Council people, the school board people and so forth, who select the project, select the students to participate in the project, and lo and behold, there's one that I approved for Roblin and I just can't see this type of project being--and this, by the way, was devised and initiated by a group of students, a post-secondary student as well as three Grade 12's and one Grade 11, and these people are from Roblin. And I don't think that the honourable member would want to include them, and he'd probably want to send them a letter stating that, yes, that he was excluding them from this general smear. A Barbara Livingston, a Randy Pitts, a Joyce Paczkoski, a Kelly Karney and Carol Kelenchuk.

Now these students are going to spend their summer months doing a sort of a skills and ability survey of people in the community to determine what skills, talents and abilities there are, what human resources there are in the community. They are going to do a clean-up campaign in the Town of Roblin. They're going to repair the playground. They're going to man the tourist booth. Those are not the toters of six-packs of beer, I'm sure. I'm sure they're not. So I thought, Mr. Chairman, that to assist the honourable member I would give him this information and perhaps during the dinner hour he may dictate appropriate letters or do whatever else he wishes to do to, just to inform his constituents that he does know what's going on and that he would want his comments that he made in the House two nights ago not be misinterpreted by anyone, because I'm sure he wouldn't want that. I'm sure he wouldn't want that to happen. Now. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 7:30.