

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 16, 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 11 standing of the Sturgeon Creek School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Paul Chartrand. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

We also have 30 students, Grade 6 standing of the Florence Nightingale School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Rybuck. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

And we have 15 members of the Canadian Mennonite Bible College. These people are under the direction of Mr. Harry Huebner. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

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. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the report of The Pas Forestry Complex. Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to - this is for the period ended September 30, 1973 for the Complex in receivership. And I would like to have a meeting of the Economic Development, the Committee on Economic Development, on Thursday at 10 o'clock where Mr. Hallgrimson will be available to present his report and to answer questions concerning the Complex.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to indicate to honourable members that yesterday I had a daily flood - a spring runoff outlook report, which I neglected to give to the House. I was asked at 10:00 o'clock by the press for this report and I gave it to them - it's a very short one - in the hope that I would have the indulgence of the House having given them the report without having had it tabled in the House, and I table it now.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister and my question is simply this. Has the government come to any decision as to whether or not they are prepared to institute a judicial inquiry into the matters raised over the past number of weeks by the Official Opposition, with particular respect to the construction company R & M, and the fishing co-ops in the north?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fishing co-ops, I believe it is true to say that the Provincial Auditor has been requested and is proceeding with an audit with respect to the fishing co-ops, as well as the Department of Co-op Services.

With respect to the other matters they're still before the committee and just this morning we received what's purported to be certain documents bearing on that question. We have asked those who supplied those copies of those documents to submit written questions or points of contention, and when this is received, which should be very soon, they will be referred to the Director of Prosecutions or at least some law officers of the Crown for investigation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Has he acceded to the request made by the Manitoba Metis Federation to have the RCMP look

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ENNS cont'd) into the conduct of certain of its executive officers with respect to the expenditures of moneys?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a request was received from the former President of the Manitoba Metis Federation requesting an investigation relating back to a resolution which the Metis Federation had passed indicating that they wanted an investigation. The reference in the resolution did not pertain to RCMP investigation per se; I read the resolution as being one of an internal nature. In any event the Director of Prosecutions for the province has received a preliminary police report; he has met with some of the officials of the Manitoba Metis Federation, and on the basis of his report and advice there is no reasonable or probable cause for the bringing of RCMP into any further investigations on the basis of present material. If anyone in the Manitoba Metis Federation wishes to submit further material they certainly are welcome to do so; but on the present basis of material there is insufficient material for a RCMP investigation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Did not the letter that the Honourable the Attorney-General referred to as coming from the former President of the Manitoba Metis Federation not specifically request the intervention of the RCMP in this investigation.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes of course it did, Mr. Speaker, and I will table the copy of my reply to the former President of the Manitoba Metis Federation. But the case will be handled, and is being handled, in the same way that any other case is handled, by the input and advice from legal officers within the Department of the Attorney-General. The Director of Prosecutions has reviewed this matter extensively as I've indicated, and his advice is - and he has also as I say received a preliminary RCMP report. On the basis of the present material there is insufficient grounds for a RCMP investigation.

MR. ENNS: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Will the report referred to, or the in-house investigation as referred to by the Attorney-General, be in any way made public or tabled in this House so that perhaps other people could ascertain as to whether or not the conclusions arrived at by the Attorney-General are indeed the correct ones.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say this that I have complete and full confidence in the legal competence of the Director of Prosecutions. He has made his report; he has done so after a number of inquiries on his own, including discussions and meetings with the Board of the Manitoba Metis Federation. I do not think that any report outside of the letter which has been sent to the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation would serve any useful purpose to be tabled, and I will table that letter in the House which indicates the grounds for the present position, leaving open however for the former president to submit further material if he deems fit to the Director of Prosecutions, but at the present time the advice from the Director of Prosecutions is insufficient material for any RCMP investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, thank you. My question is directed to the First Minister. Can he indicate to the House whether he now has received, in the light of his earlier comment about receiving documents, has he now received an affidavit of John Webster, dated April 3, 1974 in which he alleges that the law was circumvented - sorry, in which he alleges that the true ownership of Schmidt Cartage was not the person to whom CEDF made the loan, but was rather Ben Thompson?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the documents that were, copies of which were presented at my office this morning have been turned over to the Attorney-General for investigation to be conducted in a full and systematic way to ascertain the facts. Up to this point the allegations contained - some of them have already been made and dealt with by the Minister reporting for the CEDF. I am not in a position to know if any new information is contained in those documents but in any case they're turned over to the Attorney-General's Department for a systematic investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the letter which I referred to in my

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) earlier answer to the Member from Lakeside. I think I should also mention that as a result of the letter from Mr. Spence and the subsequent investigations and inquiries, Mr. Guiboche, the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation, has proposed - and I understand he is in the process of arranging for an independent audit of the Manitoba Metis Federation funds to insure that there has been in fact no improper accounting or handling of funds, and the copy of that audit report, independent audit report, will be made available to myself for perusal upon its completion. So that I think that Mr. Guiboche ought to be commended for taking this step to insure that the name of the Manitoba Metis Federation is not unduly held or besmirched in any way.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, following the lead of the Attorney-General, I now will table the affidavit to which I referred in my question to the First Minister, and direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Communities Economic Development Fund relating to answers given yesterday in connection with the same issue. Would he indicate to us whether he is personally satisfied, or he as Minister is satisfied, that the loan in question was not made in a manner which

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is asking for an opinion. Would the honourable member rephrase it?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking for a conclusion from the Minister. Was the loan made in a manner which circumvented with the concurrence of the board, which circumvented the law of Manitoba, namely that no

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again a legality has been introduced by the preface. The honourable gentleman knows better.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is: Is the Minister satisfied that the proper conduct of this loan was observed both in the letter and the spirit of the laws of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that the Board of Directors of the company, the Board of Directors of the Corporation, Communities Economic Development Corporation, felt that the loan that was applied for was a good one, that it fulfilled the role of the Communities Economic Development Corporation to advance entrepreneurial leadership of indigenous peoples in northern Manitoba in a role in which they could function, and that the way in which the loan was made was legal. They at first, Mr. Speaker, I indicated, had an application from Mr. Thompson and Mr. Lamirande. When they learnt that Mr. Thompson could not be an applicant, they still wanted the company to be a facility operated by indigenous people in northern Manitoba; they proceeded with granting the loan to Mr. Lamirande. I reported, Mr. Speaker, that information to the House last year when asked by the Member for Thompson whether a loan had been made to Mr. Ben Thompson, I indicated that I was advised by the Fund that the loan was not made to Mr. Thompson, it was made to his brother-in-law. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, if it was the same thing

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . then the honourable member should have complained about it last year when he was advised.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentlemen wish to debate they'll have to find another hour, not the question hour. The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: The first that I was aware that the loan was made to Mr. Lamirande, or that a loan was made for a transportation company, or a purchase of a transportation company, was when the question was asked by the Honourable Member for Thompson last year in the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, for good or for bad, it has been decided by this House that there will be a board composed of people who were the representatives in many cases of the communities in the north, the Manitoba Metis Federation, the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, the Northern Association of Community Councils - these were the people who made the suggested appointments to the Board and the intention of the entire House was that this board would have the right to make that kind of decision. Now, Mr. --(Interjection)-- Yes, by our government, Mr. Speaker, and I do not

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would appeal to the Honourable Minister; I am allowing latitude but we cannot allow too much, especially when it becomes argumentative,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) and the interjections by members from their seats are also annoying to the Chair as well as to the Assembly. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister responsible for the Communities Economic Development Fund. In view of the fact that the Board took this action and failed in making this loan to take security for the moneys advanced, does the Minister intend to take any disciplinary action against members of the Board or its chairman?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Again I must ask the honourable gentleman to rephrase his question. His preface becomes argumentative, and I've asked that he refrain from doing that. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may put the question first as to the preface, and as a supplementary the follow-up. The first question. Will the Minister confirm that in this loan in which the CEDF lost its money, no, or inadequate security was taken, particularly on the trucks that were used by the firm which were mortgaged to someone else?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to honourable members that a full accounting of the particular loan will be made by the Chairman of the Communities Economic Development Committee when he appears before Committee which I hope will be in a very short period of time. I do want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday when I was answering questions I had as part of a memo more material than I thought I had, and therefore there were some questions that I said that I would get answers for which I already had a memo on but which I did not realize was part of the material I had. One of the things for instance, Mr. Speaker, is that the loan was secured, as I understand it, in the normal way, that the Fund has a - and this is from a previous memo - the Fund is to be presented with a debenture giving it a charge on all the company's fixed assets, a floating charge, personal guarantee of Willard Lamirande, assignment of fire and theft insurance, assignment of life insurance on Willard Lamirande, hypothecation of all capital stock, and assignment of a lease. To my knowledge at the present time - and this is rather dangerous because I indicate that the information will be given more correctly and in greater detail when the Fund appears before Committee - the only place where the bank is ahead of the Corporation is with respect to accounts receivable. So I do not agree; I indicate, as I did yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that the Fund took normal security, or the best security that they could get, with respect to the loan.

The honourable member also asked whether there was \$30,000 in cash at the time of the loan. My understanding is that there were \$20,000 in cash, and there were approximately \$18,000 in current accounts payable - at the same time that they took over the balance sheet they took over \$20,000 in cash and approximately \$18,000 in accounts payable.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, that every single one of the questions that are being asked, and will be asked, will be answered by the Communities Economic Development Corporation when they appear before Committee, which I trust will be very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. GREEN: May I just read specifically what my memo says: Security: Debenture providing first charge on equipment, vehicles, furniture and fixtures; Floating Charge Debenture; assignment of appropriate insurance, hypothecation of shares; assignment of lease; personal guarantee of Willard Lamirande for \$50,000; assignment of \$75,000 life insurance on life of Willard Lamirande.

May I also say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lamirande abandoned this company in approximately December of 1974 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It is not possible.

MR. GREEN: . . . and since then - 73 - an attempt was made by Ben Thompson to try to keep the company in operation. It is also true that Ben Thompson was a signatory on cheques with the knowledge of the Communities Economic Development Corporation, and something which they thought would be useful for the company, and it was entirely legal, Mr. Speaker, entirely legal in that he was not a beneficial shareholder of the company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have a final question to the Minister, the First Minister on the subject matter. Mr. Speaker, my question is simply this to the First Minister. Is it the position of his government that the Official Opposition and the Liberal Party, or other members

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . of the news media, have to prove a case beyond all possible shadow of doubt whatever before this government, or his government, will concern itself with instigating an inquiry as to the proper or improper use of public money?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is not what is at issue at all. If there are allegations that are made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . the mere persistency of allegations is not what determines the proper course of action, but rather whether on the initial investigation of allegations there proves to be anything that might deem to be prima facie evidence that there is wrong-doing, and we have followed the course thus far of having matters and documents referred to law officers of the Crown for investigation. We still are in process of having the Committee on Economic Development consider the report of the Communities Economic Development Fund. There are certain documents which the Minister of Mines and Resources has been referring to, to which the Chairman of the Communities Economic Development Fund will be able to elaborate on in greater detail.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing upon which to proceed to judicial inquiry, and in any case at this particular point in time, it would still be premature.

I might add furthermore that some of the allegations that were made in the initial instance have now been retracted, some have been refuted, but some have been retracted by those who themselves made these allegations in the first place. It seems to me, Sir, that at the outset, some couple of weeks ago, there were some allegations that there was some effort or activity of vote buying - I guess is the simplest way to put it - and this morning I had it confirmed to me, Sir, by those bringing documents forward that they had not intended to make those kind of allegations and if they had, they certainly were withdrawing them at this time. That was not at issue. So what is at issue is allegations still having to do with what? With allegations of criminal activity or wrong-doing? And this is a matter which will be referred in the normal course to those whose function and task it is to investigate such allegations namely law officers of the Crown.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I said one final question, but one final supplementary question to the First Minister.

Will the First Minister not agree that there has been sufficient reason for him to concern himself about instigating a judicial inquiry in this matter as for instance there was some few years ago to allegations of wrongdoing in the Highways Department in Dauphin in which time the government posthaste instituted an official inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. I must say the Chair deplores people taking advantage of the Chair to ask a question and then debate the issue. If the honourable member wishes to conform to the rules I will appreciate that; if not, I'm sure that the Assembly would appreciate if he didn't disrupt it.

The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that the Member for Lakeside has left on the record unfortunately an erroneous impression, or statement, that we in 1969 or 70 had initiated a judicial inquiry in to some allegations reflecting back -- (Interjection)-- reflecting back, Mr. Speaker on previous ministers of the previous administration, and I think that the Honourable Member for Lakeside will recall that we did not proceed in that manner. We referred the matter to the Civil Service Commission, and it was dealt with in that fashion.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my questions to the First Minister in his role as Minister for Urban Affairs. Can the First Minister advise the House if following this morning's meeting with the City of Winnipeg's official delegation, if a new cost-sharing agreement has been concluded with the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the term a new cost-sharing agreement connotes that some completely rewritten and reformulated form of financial support and cost-sharing has been arrived at. It would be incorrect to give any such impression. What we have been

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) doing, Sir, is discussing over a period of several weeks the budgetary position of the City, the extent of their programming and increased expenditures, the extent to which certain of the programs operated by the city are unique to the city and are at deviation from programs that are cost-shared province wide, and we are attempting to arrive at some standardization of cost-sharing treatment with respect to programs operated by the city.

MR. MARION: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. The requests then are being studied by the government in view of improving the cost-sharing program that is now in vogue between the city and the province?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we have been making improvements, or increasing the level of financial support for certain of the programs being operated by the city which are analogous to programs operated by other municipalities across the province but under which there have been different cost formula, cost-sharing historically. We're attempting to rationalize that so as to bring it onto a greater level of standardization of cost-sharing.

MR. MARION: Was the First Minister expressing government policy when he stated that he had hoped for a greater reduction in the number of councillors than five, a greater reduction than five?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is academic really because the report of the Boundaries Commission has been received; there are certain recommendations relating thereto. I was expressing an opinion as to what I would regard as optimum but the difference is only one of minor degree and is largely academic at this point in time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary.

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

MR. MARION: Are the government plans then, long-range plans for a further reduction in council prior to the elections of October, 1977?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's entirely premature. So much depends on the experience within city government during the course of the next few years. It would be foolish to try to indicate in advance some prognosis as to what would be an optimum number of councillors three or four years down the road. It is the experience within city government that would be the overwhelming determination in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. When in Ottawa last week did he have discussions with any member of the federal cabinet toward the \$4 million grant to the Saunders Aircraft of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the reference I believe should be to \$2 million not \$4 million, and well, I just make that one correction. I can indicate to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River that discussions with government, Federal Government officials did bear on Saunders Aircraft, and did bear on the fact that it would be extremely difficult for the province to continue to attempt to foster this aircraft industry if it could not assume some level of support and interest by the Government of Canada that would be somewhat comparable with the level of support extended by the Government of Canada for aircraft manufacturing capability that exists today in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

I did not discuss specific figures with them but rather the principle that in attempting to provide alternative employment at the abandoned Canadian Forces Base at Gimli that we had been encouraged to proceed with the establishment of this aircraft manufacturing company; that there was initial DREE interest and indication of support to the extent of a million dollars, which had not been realized except to a much smaller fraction; and pointing out to the federal authorities that we hope and trust that there will be increased and enhanced federal interest and support more comparable with other aircraft manufacturing operations elsewhere in the country.

MR. BILTON: Is the First Minister telling the House that he got no commitment whatsoever from the government in Ottawa?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, certainly there was an acceptance of the principle that steps would have to be taken in order to attempt to continue to provide this alternative form of employment and industry at the Canadian Forces, what used to be the Canadian Forces Base at Gimli. There was also a undertaking by federal authorities to provide for officials and staff

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) personnel from two departments of the Federal Government to carry out intensive discussions and analyses of the operation in an effort to see the extent to which federal financial support and involvement might be increased. And the matter is being pursued actively with the Federal Government at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Is it correct that there is no benefit accruing to Manitoba from Olympic Lottery tickets sold within this province; and is it correct that there is benefit accruing to the Province of Alberta from Olympic Lottery tickets sold within that province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I as the Minister responsible for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs could assume that there's no benefits whatsoever to any Manitobans pertaining to the approximately 6,000 tickets that were sold here in this province. There could have been an indirect commission paid to some of those involved in the selling of tickets - which by the way is against the Criminal Code, that Section of the Criminal Code - so to that extent the Lotteries Commission of this province has not benefited or its agencies.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Was the Minister then misquoted in an interview in which he is reported to have said there was no such benefit, there was no benefit to Manitoba whatever?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry asked me a question pertaining to benefits derived, say, by the Crown, and there was no benefits derived by the Crown; but benefits by individuals I have no way of knowing.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that Alberta has a so called special deal with the Olympic Lottery tickets, and since that is the case . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if that question is necessary to our procedures. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Since Alberta is involved in the WesCan Lottery planning, Sir, and their entry into WesCan is crucial to the success of the four-province operation, I submit it is relevant to our procedures. Since Alberta has a special deal with the Olympic Lottery situation, how does that jibe with the position of the Minister who has suggested to the House that Alberta is inside the WesCan structure.

A MEMBER: We've been asleep at the switch again.

MR. TOUPIN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, if we check back on the record, we will find that I have indicated that the Province of Alberta itself has tabled with us letters of intent through the Foundation, not directly through the government itself. There is an arrangement of the Olympics with the Province of Alberta and the officials that are discussing the possibility of a Western Canadian Lottery Commission are equally discussing the possibility of having the Olympics' tickets sold in those participating provinces, being Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Manitoba. We are not at a stage where I could make a report to the House but hopefully that this could be had fairly soon.

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

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. It relates to the answer he gave to the Honourable Member from Swan River about how he had said in Ottawa that the Federal Government should grant aid to Saunders Aircraft because of its support for the industries in Ontario and Quebec. My question is: Was it not drawn to his attention in Ottawa that the Federal Government is aiding those aircraft industries in Ontario and Quebec because they have planes which have certificates of air worthiness from the United States and also a proven market for their goods, none of which attributes apply to Saunders Aircraft.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I disagree completely with the closing words of my honourable friend's questions. The aircraft which is receiving substantial, and I mean really substantial, Federal Government financial support is aircraft for example, the De Havilland DHC7 does not have any certificate of air worthiness at all. It is not yet at that stage, and already far far more in the way of dollars and financial support by the Federal

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Government has been provided to that particular development.

I might add further that the Saunders Aircraft does have certificates of air worthiness that are valid in many countries of the world, if not in the United States, and that with respect to the SD27B model, which is in process of completion, that everything is on track with respect to meeting the various stages of tests required for air worthiness certificates by both DOT and the counterpart United States Civil Aviation agency. So that is not a relevant factor.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would he confirm that the clothing manufacturing plant, Gemini Outerwear in Steinbach has closed operations as a result of having lack of a labour force to fill the plant.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I understand they are having some difficulties, and I am sure the honourable member is quite capable of communicating with the company as I am.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister indicating that when a hundred jobs are lost he makes no inquiries of his own, and if so, could he indicate whether the reason for the closing of the plant was as stated - a lack of people who wanted to work.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there are according to the latest labour force statistics, somewhere in the order of 15,000 people unemployed in Manitoba and I say this to the honourable member, you pay the people of Manitoba adequate wages and they'll work.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has it been brought to his attention that the bottom wage at that plant was \$3.50 an hour, and that there are several other Manitoba garment industry plants threatening to close because of a lack of labour supply? (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has just made a statement regarding wage levels being at a minimum of 3.50, I believe. I would like him to substantiate that because that differs with the information we have on the garment industry in Manitoba, which indicates that the wage level is deviating through time and is becoming generally depressed relative to the average wage level of manufacturing industries in Manitoba. And this is the essential crux, the crux of the problem facing the garment industry in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. Order please. I hope it's not a supplementary like the last one.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister, supplementary to what I have just asked. Does he have information or knowledge, or reports in front of him, indicating that there are several other garment manufacturing plants in Manitoba considering closing and moving operations because at \$3.50 an hour, they are unable to find people to work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The problem with a question of that nature it becomes argumentative because the honourable member is supplying information instead of asking for information. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Member for Birtle-Russell put a number of questions with respect to the relationship between the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the Department of Co-Operatives. The first question being, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there were any agreements between the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the Department of Co-op Development for the collection of fish from various fishing stations on behalf of the various northern fishing co-ops. The answer to that is no; agreements which are entered into are between the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the local co-operatives, who are their agents, Mr. Speaker. And as usual the department does assist in the negotiations on behalf and with the local co-operative boards.

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, was also put and that is, whether the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board paid any moneys to the Department of Co-operative Development for such collection, and of course that becomes redundant since we are not involved in contracting. No moneys are paid to the Co-op Development Department; payments are made by the Freshwater Fish Corporation in the name of the co-operatives involved.

Another question was whether or not the government in turn, if they have received any

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) money from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board for this duty, have they paid this money, and of course that is redundant as well. I simply want to point out that from time to time the officers of the department do assist in the collections for the fish co-operatives and in essence provide a mail service or a deposit service in the name of the fishing co-operative in question, but are not involved directly themselves. So the government has not, nor has the department, received any moneys and consequently could not disburse any moneys to any co-operative, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Will the Minister indicate at what stage the inquiry into allegations of land speculation by employees of the MHRC is at, and when the findings of this inquiry are going to be made public?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member has asked a very valid question because I share with him the concern that we get this material to the House as quickly as possible. The inquiry did involve the interviewing of some individuals within the Province of Ontario and we did have a delay until we obtained the approval, which was a courtesy measure of people from the Ontario Attorney-General's Department, so that officials could proceed from Manitoba to Ontario to interview the parties, and it is part of practice that approvals or consents as a matter of courtesy be obtained. The interviewing took place last week in Ontario, and I understand that the individual which was doing the interviewing has returned; the affidavits which he obtained were needed in order to verify or confirm other statements which he had obtained which were of a more verbal nature, and I would expect hopefully that within days now we should be able to pass the report on to the Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question on another matter, and I don't know whether it should be directed to the Attorney-General or the First Minister. When will the CFI inquiry report be released? Is it in the hands of the government yet? When will it be released?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is not in the hands of the government yet. We continue to hope that the report will be completed and made available just as quickly as possible. My honourable friend the Member from Portage will appreciate that we are somewhat at sixes and sevens here because it would be improper for the government to bring any kind of what shall I say? - to make representations to the Commission urging them to follow a course of action that is other than what they deem is most prudent and appropriate under the circumstances. They've been given terms of reference and asked to present their report in the shortest time possible that is compatible with doing a thorough job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General responsible for the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. I wonder if the Minister can indicate, or table studies in the House, why the proposed new Ellice liquor store would not be able to handle -- the new proposed Ellice store would not be able to handle or serve the clients on Main Street, which there is an undertaking to build a new store there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've received some rather lengthy documentation in respect to this area. The honourable member had posed a question I believe about a week ago in respect to it, and I am presently perusing it and intend to respond to the honourable member. I'm not quite sure whether it would be better through estimate review or through some other channel, but I do have considerable documentation as to the reasons by which the Liquor Control Commission proceeded with the choice of that site.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister a report from the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission if services and brand availabilities at St. James-Ainslie store will be maintained at the former level?

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I've received no such indication from the Liquor Control Commission. I would assume that they would be - I will however inquire.

MR. PATRICK: Last question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister received any complaints from the residents about parking facilities at the self-serve liquor store at Vimy Road and Portage, and if he has, would the Minister give consideration to providing traffic commissioners

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) on weekends - Friday and Saturday?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did receive some complaints in respect to parking difficulties in and about that store. I have referred the complaints to the Liquor Control Commission and I was expecting that they could deal with such complaints by inquiring into them, and if there is validity to them to deal with them as they would in any other instance. Certainly I will pass on the honourable member's suggestion to the Commission and relate their response.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. In view of the the Minister's stated concern with the . . . development of the Maple Grove area, could the Minister indicate whether the Parks Branch of his department is now prepared to acquire riverbank land within the Winnipeg urban regions for park purposes or to provide financial assistance to the City of Winnipeg for the acquisition of riverbank park areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there has been over the years several studies pertaining to that subject matter. There is now discussions taking place between officials of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and officials of the City of Winnipeg, and hopefully that this will - and as the honourable member equally knows, there is approximately a million dollars within the estimates of the department for that purpose. So things are happening, and hopefully in a partnership way with the City of Winnipeg.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister if by that purpose he means the acquisition of land within the Winnipeg urban regions on riverbanks for park purposes, is that what he refers to?

MR. TOUPIN: That is happening to some degree now and hopefully that in time when property becomes available or is needed by either the city and/or the Department of Tourism and Recreation, funds for that purpose are available.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell us whether those negotiations that are now being conducted include discussions for the purpose of setting up a joint riverbank acquisition authority which would have as its main function the purchase of land and the development of parks within the Winnipeg urban region?

MR. TOUPIN: I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. What action is being taken by the Minister to assist the Roblin School Board with respect to the roof problems that developed some weeks ago, and we spoke about in this House, a development which sparked a meeting of some 150 concerned parents last night in Roblin?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any meeting that took place in Roblin last night with parents. I haven't had an opportunity of reading the daily issues due to other commitments but I certainly will look into the matter. As I did report to the House, Sir, the Department of Labour Engineering Department investigated and looked into the matter. It was my understanding that as a result of certain happenings, the students returned to school. Now if the meeting that my honourable friend refers to, which was held last night, is a meeting of concerned parents as to the future, I am not aware of that - and my honourable friend nodded his head which indicates agreement that it's something to do with the future rather than the present situation regarding the school. I will be more than pleased to converse with my honourable friend, or if he would give me more information I certainly would be glad to check into it.

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I'll take up the Honourable Minister on dialoguing with him further on this, but I have a further question. How quickly can the situation be rectified in those classrooms that are now closed and are causing 30 students to remain away from school?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to my honourable friend, as far as information that I had, was to the effect that all of the students were attending school. Whether they are attending school in the precise building or not, I'm not knowledgeable of at the present time, but I certainly will take a look into it.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

And Mr. Speaker, dealing with the matter of Roblin if I may, while I'm on my feet, the Honourable Member for Roblin asked me a few days ago insofar as a dispute between the Roblin Forest Products and the Union of Operating Engineers at Roblin - I'm sorry my honourable friend is not present, but I'm sure that one of his colleagues will inform him that I have now received a report that a settlement has been achieved between the Union and Roblin Forest Products. Details of the settlement are not available at this moment; the employees will be returning to work as soon as possible, and the meetings were held under the auspices of a conciliation officer of the Department of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can now proceed to the Orders of the Day. I'd like to have you proceed with the second reading of Bills but, Mr. Speaker, just before you do so I made an incorrect assumption in the House yesterday which I'd now like to correct. I indicated that apparently under the MDC Act it is permissible for a board member to be a loan applicant. I am advised that that is not the case, that it is the same under the MDC Act as the CEDC Act, so I'd just like to correct the assumption that I made.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 27

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of my colleague the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, while leaving the debate open to anybody who wishes to speak, I would ask the indulgence of the House in having this matter stand. (Agreed)

BILL NO. 30

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have had the opportunity to go over this bill, and go over the bill with my colleagues, and I certainly am in complete agreement with the comments that were made by the Member from Birtle-Russell on this Bill 30, and I would say that the bill is generally in the position that it can be certainly agreed to and go to committee for questions to be asked.

I would just like to make one comment, Sir, that this is again another type of legislation that we are so used to getting from this government. Very obviously they haven't looked into the bill, they haven't looked into the ramifications of the bill, and of course if we hadn't caught it the government would get up and say well the Opposition didn't catch it, and accuse us of not being on our toes. It's very obvious that this bill wasn't studied very thoroughly before it was presented to this Legislature because of the item about having a riding horse in your barn, and because you happen to have a riding horse in your barn you're going to have your barn assessed for amusement or some other sort of an assessment.

To me that type of legislation coming to this Legislature and passing the Cabinet over there, and then passing the caucus over there and being presented to us, is something that is just hard to understand. But, Mr. Speaker, as I said the other sections of the bill are - they're quite acceptable. There is one area of the bill that I certainly would like to question, and that is the areas of extension of farm buildings and partial exemption and versus - we get into the situation there of net income, and in this area we could very well be looking at an invasion of privacy when we start getting into questions of that nature. But this government certainly hasn't been backward in sticking their noses into everybody's business in this province, and I'm sure they won't be backward on this bill. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the questions will be asked in the Law Amendments, and I'm certainly hopeful that the ridiculous sections of this bill will be changed to make sense. Thank you. ~

QUESTION put and carried.

BILL NO. 33

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 33. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this bill, and I believe the Member for Fort Garry will actually be speaking on it in perhaps more detail than I wish to speak on it. The Act before us, the Power Engineers Act, has been described by the Minister to us and I think that in general we agree, don't disagree at least, with the remarks of the Minister in introducing the bill. We realize that technology has had its effect on this particular field of endeavour perhaps more than it has on many other occupations in changing equipment, and so on. It is difficult to spell out in legislation exactly what equipment must be run by the traditional Operating Engineers Act, or come under it. So while we're loathe by instinct to grant too much discretionary power to regulations, and too much discretionary power to the direct staff control of these matters that involve trades, we do realize that it's important that there be flexibility to allow changes to bring in exemptions, in particular, from the very strict applications that would be brought in by writing all of these things into legislation. We appreciate the fact that for mobility in the ten provinces of Canada as well, that the Act should be dovetailed and that there should be a degree of similarity so that people with specific training can move back and forth across Canada with as much ease as possible because if the equipment, which it is, is standardized across Canada and across North America, there is no particular reason why the qualifications of people who operate the equipment should not also be relatively standard, so it makes good sense to have as far as possible a standard Act for the ten provinces in Canada. We note that from the Minister's advice that eight of the provinces have agreed at this point to work towards the establishing of a standardization.

The one point that I have in particular that I am concerned about is the Title to the Act. It changes the Act from the traditional Operating Engineers and Firemen's Act and calls it the Power Engineers Act. I think that the government is probably introducing some conflict here because the power engineer has traditionally, the word "engineer" has always been up for some dispute, and a power engineer traditionally has been known as one who took a power option in electrical engineering, which is a degree course at the university, and has been a degree course at the University of Manitoba for many years. So in changing the Act from Operating Engineer to Power Engineers Act, I think that there is the danger here of running into some conflict.

I understand that there is some desirability of having the same title for this trade across Canada, and I think one of the provinces has moved on it, but it might be timely for Manitoba if they are only the second province to in fact sort out what the title should be for these people. I understand also that there is some concern at the national level to insure that there is a logical implication brought in by the titles that are put on these different things and different trades. I see it as somewhat of a problem. I trust that perhaps the government, or at committee, that some consideration might be given to perhaps retaining the original title, which is the Operating Engineers - I think at one time in history they were probably referred to as stationary engineers - but I think either operating or stationary identifies the type of person that is involved here, and that there does not appear to be anything in here that would substantiate the change in name, and since it will provide a conflict of some sort with other Acts - in fact, provincial Acts, here and in other provinces - I would think that some consideration might be given to this.

I think in the selection of it, of the name, that with the development of the community colleges and the development of technology, that probably it would be more logical to think of something else that identifies with the trade generically right through the courses that are offered at the community colleges, or wherever they're offered in the training schools, so that there is a natural generic communication that exists between the two, and I don't think that the title on the present one does this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that probably representation will be made by the different parties that might be affected by this Act when we get to Committee, whether it's the trades people that are involved or people that might be concerned about the conflict I've mentioned. Beyond that we would wait to hear that representation so that we can discover whether there are or are not problems in the Act as they refer specifically to the present trade.

It is noted that the Board that has traditionally governed this particular trade is being disbanded and that the authority will be vested in the Minister, but that an advisory committee will be provided within the Act. In addition to that it's noted that the Act also provides for an appeal to the courts in the case of a dispute, which is perhaps a logical out for a person having a grievance with the department or the Minister specifically. So I think in general terms,

BILL NO. 33

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) Mr. Speaker, beyond making those remarks, it would be wise to listen to - hopefully representation will appear before the Committee, and we look forward to hearing the comments made by the people that are going to be directly affected by the Act. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the kindest action that can be taken toward this particular piece of legislation is to move it along and move it into committee where it can be properly assessed by those in the field and those in the trade who, as my colleague from Riel has suggested, no doubt will have some professional expertise and some professional opinions to bring to bear on it.

My basic position with respect to the bill at the moment, Sir, is not one of opposition or criticism in terms of the principle of the bill. I'm afraid, much as it pains me from time to time to say so, that my opposition really is with the - my fight really is with the Minister, and my opposition really is directed at him, because I think once again, Sir, the members opposite, and the government opposite, have demonstrated their amazing and their almost unchallenged capacity to act unilaterally without reference to anybody else in society in Manitoba, and this is what's happened again and again and again, and now it's happened again.

The legislation before us is not all that earth shattering, and I imagine even the power engineers, the stationary engineers, and others in the trade would agree with that, but what is crucial and critical here, Sir, is that the Minister and his colleagues are dealing with a trade and have not sought recourse to the expertise and the opinions of practitioners in that trade, rather they have, it seems to me, sat down in their familiar ivory tower and theorized as to how best to administer the affairs of this trade, and came up with a piece of legislation which to my knowledge, and I stand to be corrected but I've checked with many people in the trade--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: To my knowledge, and I stand to be corrected but I repeat I've checked with many people in the trade, there has been no consultation of a meaningful nature sought by the government. The Craftsmen's Council for example, has not been consulted for meaningful input to my knowledge. The Institute of Power Engineers has not been consulted; the operating engineers in the province have not been meaningfully consulted; the stationary engineers in the province have been virtually disregarded; and the Trade Union Movement generally, Mr. Speaker, has not been consulted in a way that would inspire confidence, both inside and outside that movement, that the government knows what it's doing and cares really what the trade and what labour generally feels about this situation. -- (Interjection) -- I've talked to many union representatives who tell me that they have correspondence from the Minister, Sir, assuring them that that kind of communication and consultation would take place. They suggest to me that that kind of communication and consultation did not take place, and so one must conclude, as I suggested a moment ago, that once again in arbitrary, high-handed, unilateral fashion the government has decided to strike out on its own, and let the consequences, and let the chips, and let the movement fall where it may.

The Minister has said with respect to other legislation that he's piloting through the House he's amenable to suggestions for amendments. I would hope that that position applies in the present circumstances, in the present legislation, too, because I'm sure that representatives of some of the trade and professional organizations in the labour movement, to which I referred a moment ago, will have some things they'll want to say, and will have some amendments they will want to propose.

I agree with my colleague from Riel that we look forward to that kind of communication with the trade generally. We hope there will be representations made in Committee, and for that reason we're anxious to move the legislation along to the Committee stage. It's that sort of high-handed action on the part of the Minister which arouses my objection at this point Mr. Speaker, not the concept of the legislation itself.

There is one other aspect of the legislation to which I find it difficult to muster enthusiasm, or for which I find it difficult to muster much enthusiasm, that was referred to in passing by my colleague, that is the provision in the legislation which does vest more authority over the trade generally in the Minister's office. And I think this is a rather dangerous and unfortunate direction in which to be moving. I think that Manitobans generally would share the opinion that it's not helpful to vest too much authority in Ministerial hands where the livelihood and welfare

BILL NO. 33

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) and destiny of particular groups of society are concerned. So I can't let the bill pass this stage of deliberation without registering my reservations about that aspect of it, Sir. I think there's enough authority over the lives of Manitobans in the hands of this Minister and his colleagues without widening the field and widening the opportunity for them any further. But provided there are solid representations made from the trade when the bill is in committee stage, and provided we have an opportunity to look at that possible danger, the vesting of greater authority in the Minister's hands, I am satisfied to let the bill move past this stage of deliberation and in Committee.

But I will be anxious to see that the Minister is open to and amenable to the best advice coming before the councils and the institutes and the trade bodies that I've mentioned because, I repeat, Sir, my information from them has been that they have not had that opportunity to advise the Minister as to what is desirable in this field, and I think if he wants the kind of rapport with them which he hopes he has, and believes he has, he is going to have to sit down and talk and listen and it's going to have to be a two-way street.

So we'll be looking for that at Committee stage, Sir, and we hope that perhaps this may be one of the last pieces of legislation that comes into this House in authoritarian fashion. Perhaps some change will take place that will produce a change in the mind and the spirit of this government where legislation is concerned, and perhaps some day in the not too distant future we can look forward to a government that does consult with people, that does consult with Manitobans, before framing legislation and then ramming it at them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 36

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we're dealing with the Amendments to the Public Schools Act it would always seem appropriate if the Minister were in the House, unfortunately we find he is not present today. I'm sure though that he is attending to the affairs of the province and probably finds some other place that is more convenient than the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon West, I believe, enunciated fairly well the position of the Conservative Party with respect to Bill 36, but, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this that personally as an individual in this Legislature when I see the number on this Bill 36 it sends shivers up my spine because I well recall some other debates in this House over a certain Bill 36.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the content of the bill, and I want to state that with respect to the indemnities of school trustees that I feel fairly sure that the trustees in most school divisions will have a very grave concern for the taxpayers of the area that they represent. And their own assessment of their value, the value of their service to those taxpayers will be one that will be correctly represented in their actions. However, Mr. Speaker, there are school divisions, and schools in operation in this province, where the members of the board, or the Advisory Board - I don't know whether this applies to the Advisory Board or not - are in areas where there is relatively little tax base and the responsibility for the payment lies with the province. And I wonder whether the responsibility of the trustee in that particular area would be exactly the same as that of a trustee in an area where most of the money is raised locally. I would sincerely hope that it is. However time will tell as we see the evidence of it, the implementation of this part of the bill in a year or two's time, and we can then better assess whether this change in the statute is beneficial.

When the Minister introduced this bill, Mr. Speaker, he referred to a section - and I know I can't name the section but it was where there was a change being added where as a language of instruction for transitional purposes in compliance with the regulation; the Minister at that time indicated that there could be other language, or languages, other than English used in the school for the purpose of a transitional language. I'm sure that the main area that the Minister

BILL NO. 36

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) was referring to was areas where English is not the basic language in the homes, and the children that are entering school are not familiar with the English language and are hence under a severe handicap. But the Minister when he brought this subject forward did not indicate to the legislature, nor does he indicate in the statute, or the changes in the statute, whether the person that is going to provide that transitional language will be an interpreter, whether he will be a professional, a teacher's aide, or whether he will have to be, he or she, will have to be a fully qualified teacher. And I would hope that when the Minister is closing debate on this subject that he will explain to us the qualifications of the person that will be providing this transitional language assistance so that we can then better assess what the implications will be, and it may very well be, Sir, that when this bill reaches Committee that dependent on the explanation the Minister gives when he's closing debate, we may at that time have amendments to suggest to the Minister.

There is another section, Mr. Speaker, in the Public Schools Act dealing with the Foundation Program. Mr. Speaker, there have been many speeches made in this Legislature since the inception of the Foundation Program asking for changes in the structure of the Foundation Program. When the Foundation Program was first introduced in this Legislature some years ago, Mr. Speaker, at that time the intent of the Foundation Program was for the Province of Manitoba to pay two-thirds of the cost and the school division, roughly one-third. And what has happened since that time, Mr. Speaker? We find today that in the - for instance in the paying of teachers' salaries, we find that the Foundation Program has lagged so far behind that the percentage that was originally set up under the Foundation Program has almost reversed. When the province was paying in excess of 60 percent before, we are now finding that the local municipalities and the local school boards are **paying** almost 60 percent of the costs. And if the principle of the Foundation Program was correct, Mr. Speaker, when it was introduced, then I think that the program has to be continually updated to take account of the inflationary aspects of our times. Inflation, Mr. Speaker, which I might say shows little signs of being checked by this government or the government in Ottawa but at the same time government is doing little to alleviate the burden that is placed on the local school boards.

The Minister announced very early in the Session the huge assistance program that he had to assist the school divisions in this province for the coming year. Mr. Speaker, in my particular constituency in the Pelly Trail School Division the additional assistance that the Minister has announced will be something in the neighbourhood of \$6,000. Six thousand dollars to a school division which is operating on a budget in excess of a million dollars, Mr. Speaker, does not truly indicate any attempt by this government to keep up with the increasing cost of annual operation.

When local taxpayers are going to be faced with a 10 to 12 mill increase in taxation purely for school purposes, this indicates that something has to be done, Mr. Speaker.

Section 520 of the Public Schools Act deals with the Foundation Program levy. We find no reference at this time, when the Minister is changing the Public Schools Act, to any mention of that particular section. The Minister is ignoring, Mr. Speaker, he is ignoring the annual pleas of the trustee of school divisions; he's **ignoring** the pleas of municipal councillors when they ask that the intent of this government, which was announced when they took office and has been repeated on numerous occasions, where they say they are going to take over in a regular increasing percentage the costs of education. But really, Mr. Speaker, we find that the reverse is actually what is happening.

What the government has told us they are going to do they are not doing. And, Mr. Speaker they are failing to live up to the promises they made to the people of Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: They are backsliding and short-changing **our** children in education.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, if the government has any integrity whatsoever, if they are sincere in the promises they made to the people of Manitoba when they said that they would take over an increasing percentage of the education costs, then they would have to change the Foundation Program. They have not done so.

Mr. Speaker, I would plead with the government at this particular time to bring in a further amendment in this bill to upgrade the Foundation Program so that the rising costs of education that are **facing** each and every school division will again restore to the Foundation Program the proper proportionment that has been spelled out in legislation, and has also been reiterated on numerous times by the government where they intend to increase their share of

BILL NO. 36

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) the cost of education.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 38

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a few comments on the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act. In particular I would like to deal with that area or principle that deals with the application for zoning bylaws, and in particular the mailing out of notices.

Formerly, as the Act exists today, the decision on whether or not to mail out notices to homeowners or tenants within 500 feet of a zoning change was left at the discretion of the council of Winnipeg. With the amendments that we have before us now, this has now been changed to a mandatory order on the part of council to mail out these notices. Not only that, it will provide a necessary demand on the council that they further mail out notices to tenants of rental homes, and to my knowledge I do not believe that such a law existed in the former regional government of Metropolitan Winnipeg. So that this is a policy change and, if I am correct, if I remember correctly the First Minister when he introduced the bill indicated that the amendments were primarily procedural in nature rather than policy, and I would question the First Minister in this regard whether or not the changing of something that was left to the discretion of the council to one that is mandatory, is this not a policy decision on the part of the government?

Further, this particular amendment is going to be costly, whether it be a small developer who wants to put in a duplex unit in an area where it will require rezoning, or whether it's a big developer. Now we know the big developer can afford these costs and can cover them, but I question whether a small individual owner who wishes to build a duplex will be able to cover it in the same manner or same ability. Also, it will cause delay and I think we all are aware that the City of Winnipeg has been criticized, and the Act, the City of Winnipeg Act, has been criticized by people for the delay that it causes in processing and zoning land, and we are now looking at an amendment that will further cause delay, and with it, increased costs.

The other area that I wish to deal with is that section that deals with what my honourable colleague from Sturgeon Creek indicated was retroactive legislation, and that is that section that deals with the rank of people in the services of the City of Winnipeg. It was my understanding when the Honourable Minister of Finance, the then Minister of Urban Affairs, presented the White Paper on the City of Winnipeg Act, that the employees of all the municipalities and the different communities would be protected, that they would be no worse off after the amalgamation than they would be before the amalgamation. The question of rank, whether or not the rank of a police officer or the rank of a firefighter is a fringe benefit, is one that is being decided in the courts at the present time and I would think it would be duly unfair of this Legislature to pass retroactive legislation which would make the court case redundant, that it would no longer have any meaning, and I would question whether this is ethical and whether or not such a legislative act should be undertaken by this government because, as I indicated earlier, it was my understanding when the White Paper was presented - and I attended many meetings at that time - that the employees of all the cities and the municipalities involved in the amalgamation would be treated fairly, would not be worse off than they were prior to the amalgamation, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government should let the courts decide whether in fact a rank is a fringe benefit of an employee or not, not take the matter into its own hands, away from the courts, and decide retroactively that rank is not a fringe benefit to an individual working for a former municipality or a former city prior to amalgamation.

The other area that I would like to comment on is that which has been left out of the act, in my opinion, or the amendments to the act, and I would hope that when the act gets to the committee stage that an amendment be given consideration dealing with that section that deals with revising of assessment rolls, in particular where it deals with golf courses and curling rinks. The City of Winnipeg, back in September of last year, and July of last year, adopted a policy on what they thought would be fair to curling rinks and golf courses in the City of Winnipeg in regards to taxation for the education costs, and this was discussed at great length by the council and they discussed it with the principle that the curling clubs and the golf courses, whether they be considered private or not, were providing a very important recreational service to the community, the curling clubs providing an integral part of the winter recreational services in our communities and the golf courses providing an integral part of our recreational services during the summer months and, in addition, providing a social fabric, an over-all social fabric to the community in the fact that it was providing green areas and adding to the community

BILL 38

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) environment, and I believe this was driven home to light in our own community of St. James-Assiniboia where the Glendale Golf Course was going to be sold to a private developer. It was not until such a threat occurred to the people of the area - and actually to the people of the City of Winnipeg - that they were going to lose a green area, and why were they going to lose a green area? Because the taxes were starting to skyrocket and the people who used this facility found that they could probably no longer afford to pay these taxes and thought, well, we should sell it and let it be built into residential and commercial areas.

So that when this fact came to the attention of the city council, they looked at the green area, they looked at the curling clubs, and they felt that if these community services are providing a very important part of our community recreational services, that maybe they should be considered in the same light as agricultural lands and residential lands when it came to the Foundation levy. So they discussed this particular question with their legal department and they advised that there would be certain amendments that would have to be made to the City of Winnipeg Act to protect the province and to protect the City of Winnipeg if the province agreed to this policy that curling rinks and golf courses should be considered the same as residential and agricultural lands and not as other lands, and pay the 33 mills or 32 mills - I forget the exact figure - of the education Foundation levy. So the council adopted a resolution requesting legislation amendments that would protect the province and the city if such tax concessions were given consideration - the 25 mills reduction in the education levy, and they suggested that the amendments include a five-year rollback that if they received these tax reductions because they are now considered part of the agricultural and recreational or residential assessment roll, that any moneys that were refunded or not charged them, they would keep track of this for five years, and if for some reason the golf course would decide that they would like to sell their land and put it into some other use, they would be charged these back taxes and would act as a discouragement to golf courses to do such a thing and change the general use of that particular land and green area in the city. In addition, they said, well, if such a golf course or a curling club would agree to such a proposal in writing, a legal document, the city should also have first choice to purchase that land and to maintain it as a golf course. And there were other protections in the amendments so that we would be covered - the province and the city - that if there was favor given to such facilities that it would be done in such manner that it would encourage the golf clubs to continue as golf clubs, to encourage the curling rinks to continue as curling rinks.

Now, one might say, well, they're private clubs; we don't want to give these people any benefits because the public can't use them. But really, is there any difference between a public-owned curling club - I believe there is one in Stonewall - and, say, the Deer Lodge Curling Club in my own constituency or the Assiniboia Curling Club in the Honourable Member from Assiniboia's constituency, because really the curling club is limited to how many people it can handle and if it's running at full capacity, whether it's publicly owned or privately operated, you are restricting the use of that facility to certain individuals. Furthermore, not everybody curls. Whether it's publicly owned or privately operated, not everybody is going to make use of that service, that facility.

Now let's look at what curling clubs have provided in our City of Winnipeg, and I'm sure they provide them in our rural areas. I know that in my own community the Deer Lodge Curling Club has provided facilities for high school curling, blind curling, senior citizen curling and junior curling, as well as their own membership curling. I know in the constituency of Assiniboia, the Assiniboine Memorial Curling Rink, I believe they have provided last year curling for some 1,100 people, I believe was the number, that were not even members of that facility. Now surely if these clubs are providing this type of recreational service in our community, then should we burden them with education tax when in turn they are providing a facility for high school curling? You know, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government should look at this, or we have also inequities because some of our curling facilities in the rural areas are located on agricultural land. Some of the facilities I indicated earlier are owned publicly by the community, so that there are inequities at this point.

Then one looks at who belongs to the curling clubs, who belongs to the golf courses. Well I can tell you. We're fortunate in our constituency that we have the Assiniboine Golf Course and we have the Deer Lodge Curling Club, and I'll tell you who belongs to these facilities. Ordinary people. Ordinary working people who want to have some place to go on an evening or

BILL 38

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) on a weekend to relax, to have a bit of recreation at the least cost and the least cost to the community. And I know after being on a recreation board in the St. James-Assiniboia area for six years that, believe me, if we were to take over the operation of curling clubs or golf courses they become a very expensive item to operate, and at the present time they're an inexpensive, relatively inexpensive service that is being provided to the community for the majority of the people of the community who want to make use of that type of service.

I suggest that the government has indicated that it favors recreational facilities. It has given grants to various communities and I know to the community committees of the City of Winnipeg from its earnings from the Sweepstakes, that it recognized capital grants. Now we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that amendments be considered for the City of Winnipeg Act that will allow the City of Winnipeg to enter into agreements with these clubs to allow them to get consideration as a residential assessment rather than a commercial which they are presently faced with. And this is costing the clubs considerable amounts of money, in particular this year the increased cost of the special levy and the municipal costs itself are going to mean increases to these various facilities, that I question whether or not they can afford to take. And I would hate to see the clubs say, "Here, City of Winnipeg, take it over. Here, City of Brandon, take it over." Because Glendale Golf Course offered their golf course to the City of Winnipeg and they couldn't afford to take it over.

So I think if we want to keep these green areas in our city and it's obvious the City of Winnipeg Council has indicated a desire to do so, they have approved the principle, they have approved amendments that they feel would protect--amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act which would protect the province, would protect the City of Winnipeg and any tax concessions that the clubs might get, and yet they're not here in the Act's amendments that we have before us in this bill. And I would hope that when this bill gets to committee, the committee would give consideration to amendments and come forward with amendments under the section dealing with revised assessment rolls, and I'm sure they have these recommended amendments from the City of Winnipeg because they were approved by council back in September 5, 1973. I'm sure they've had lots of time to have a look at these and to give consideration into including them in the bill that we have before us.

One would say, well you know, what kind of dollars are we talking about? Based on the 1972 taxable assessment and the taxes at that time, you're looking at a total of some \$77,000 of reduction in the Foundation Levy in the City of Winnipeg - \$77,000, and I know that it costs the City of Winnipeg to operate a community club some \$35,000 a year, so we're talking about if we were to take over two community clubs, two community clubs, but in turn we can now assist I think some--I could be wrong in this figure, I think there's something like 17 curling rinks in the City of Winnipeg, and golf courses, I forget the numbers. We can do so for some hundred thousand dollars, give them relief, give them the desire to continue on as clubs and services in the community at the lowest cost to the community and, I would suggest, at the lowest cost to the Province of Manitoba.

I'm talking about non-profit curling clubs and non-profit golf courses. We are not talking about the, say, Tuxedo Golf Course which is operated as a revenue-bearing facility, or the Highlander Curling Club which is operated as a revenue-bearing facility. We're talking about non-profit facilities that are owned and operated by the people within the community and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government will give fair consideration and include an amendment at time of committee to this Act and hopefully we will keep our curling clubs and our golf courses running in a manner that they are at the present time, rather than being turned over to private developers as land development and we lose the green areas and also find that they are turned over to the City of Winnipeg as community services that we cannot afford to operate and see them close down or see our costs rise further. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from St. Boniface, that debate on this bill be now adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood wish to speak? Very well. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

BILL 38

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Actually, Mr. Speaker, it's a bad afternoon, I suppose, to speak on any of the bills before us. I notice that Bill No. 30 got passed through second reading; it's gone to committee without the Attorney-General getting up to answer any of the questions, the queries that were made by the members on this side.

The next bill that came up was No. 36 and the Minister of Education wasn't here. Now we're dealing with Bill 38 and the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs is not here. There was one that was here - somebody's hollering "responsible Ministers" across the way - there was one Minister here, the Minister of Labour, but then we got to question that part about responsibility, I reckon, because he is the only one that's sitting in his place and I suspect because people have given up asking him or coming to his office to see if they can find anything out. I don't know why he's sitting here.

But, Mr. Speaker, there's one or two areas of the amendments that's before us that I wanted to mention, and one is cash in lieu of--dedication of land through project building and development. Originally, I think, both by the City of Winnipeg Act and the Municipal Act that govern the municipalities, this money went back into parks and recreation, and I see that this Act would take and widen it out to the City of Winnipeg, and it simply says in here that it doesn't have to be used to purchase more land. Well, that's not the question. I think it should be more clearly defined than that because some governments, particularly local municipal governments, City of Winnipeg, whatever, if they run short of funds and they start to make their tax bill and their budget look bad at the end of the year, rather than go the correct way about it and increase the mill rate and make themselves look bad, they are more apt to dip into reserves and get permission from the Minister to spend the reserve, and I think that this property, the shortage of parks and recreation is caused in any areas by development, I think this property or cash in lieu of for the dedication should be spent back into parks and recreation and make sure that our children and senior citizens, particularly, have parks and recreation as well as the more active types of recreation that's used by our younger people.

It was mentioned by the Member for St. James that the First Minister mentioned that there's more procedural changes and housekeeping type legislation in Bill 38. I can't agree with it when the one section of the Act says that the City of Winnipeg would have power to change titles or ranks in the amalgamation of personnel. Well if you look, Mr. Speaker, at an area like St. James-Assiniboia, where the fire department is being amalgamated in with the several other municipalities, you take a deputy chief, age 55, who put possibly 35 years of his life into becoming a deputy chief, and he's set back down to lieutenant, he's going to retire when he's 60 and his pension is determined, the major portion of his pension and the size of it at 60 is determined on his earning power in the past five years. Well if he's set back to a lieutenant at 55 years old, there's no way he's going to become a captain. And I can remember this government in the introduction of Bill No. 36, the City of Winnipeg Act, there was no way that anybody was going to lose their job. What's the difference if you lose your job or you're taken from the managerial end of it and put back down as a caretaker? There's a difference, and I think with the fact that we only have the one responsible minister in his seat today, if he would turn around and listen because he's our minister so concerned all the time about the goings-on of the working man in the province of Manitoba, and they're being badly shuffled around. There is nothing they can do about it. The men that I talked to in St. James, they put \$4,200 together to set proceedings for a court case and it's been held back for two years, and now with this Bill 38 if it passes, that court case is shot down; they've got nothing to win whatsoever and just the \$4,200 to lose.

Now these men have gone from lieutenant back to fireman, and that cost them \$1,000 a year. Now that's a big drop. And the deputy chief going back to lieutenant, that cost him \$4,000 a year, and I think, Mr. Speaker, if this section is left in the Act, that it's a crime for these people to be put in the position. The government said at the time and the City of Winnipeg certainly assured all their employees; no loss of jobs. Well, if you go down from a deputy chief to a lieutenant, I would say you've lost your job. You're certainly not kept on par with what you're at, and to be knocked down money-wise and classification, that's a loss. All the people in St. James are faced with, like a good many of the other area municipalities, particularly you look at the firemen and the same thing is going to happen to the police, they've got higher taxes, less service and half the job that they had. That's exactly where they're standing on it now, and that's not all; there's more to come.

BILL 38

(MR. MOUG cont'd)

But certainly, Sir, I hope that the First Minister takes a second look at these amendments he's brought in and not try to make the Opposition side believe that they're procedural changes and housekeeping type legislation. Well I know he's the fifth minister of Urban Affairs since they set this government up and set up that department, but I was hoping when I saw that the move was being made, that he was going to be the Minister responsible, that he would take those responsibilities and not shirk them and shake them as you do in the day by not even being in the House with important legislation such as this where there are so many jobs when he promised, three short years ago, that nothing would happen to these jobs, and these are the jobs that are disappearing today along with the wages that these men worked for.

If you put in 35 years of your life on one job and you become deputy chief, your life is molded. You're gone by the point of turning around and saying, well, I'll decide to be a policeman instead. This has gone and it's happened to the man and, as I say, I hope the First Minister looks to it before passing this particular item in this Bill. Thank you.

QUESTION on adjournment of bill put; carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 42. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. Absent.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if 42 and 43 could stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Both stand. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development, 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 Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Labour, General Administration. Resolution 74. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's been so long since we were dealing with departmental estimates I'm not sure whether or not I had answered all of the questions that had been raised by honourable members opposite, and so I must be--I beg your pardon? No, I can understand that. And I do believe that I did give some replies, at least, to the contribution of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, who I understand has been elevated to the position of being the labor critic for the Conservative Party. I recall some of his remarks in which he indicated that I was the most incompetent Minister of Labour that Manitoba has ever had, and in his typical fashion berated me for what we are endeavouring to do. However, I accept of course, Mr. Chairman, with a grain of salt, anything that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry says in relation to matters pertaining to labour because I am confident that what he doesn't know would fill far more volumes than what he does know, and I think that was exhibited in a contribution he made today in respect to a bill dealing with Power Engineers. However, I will be making some comments on his contribution in respect to that bill subsequently, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will listen to them with a great deal of interest and I hope--I hope that as a result of any contribution that I might make, will sort of add to the possible education of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, but I'll leave that for another day.

I do want to mention, make reference to the contribution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, a member of the House that I do appreciate has some considerable knowledge in the affairs of labour, and while from time to time there may be differences of opinion between that honourable gentleman and myself as to the forward thrust of legislation in the province, I certainly would suggest that he is far more knowledgeable of the problems--yes, he could even be more knowledgeable than I, my honourable friend from Morris, but either of us is far more knowledgeable than the Member for Morris in any event, so you just pick and choose the way you like. So I would like, Mr. Chairman, to make a few comments respecting my honourable friend from Assiniboia.

I must go back in history, of course, to those days when we were discussing the estimates of the Department of Labour because the honourable gentleman from Assiniboia was quite concerned, when he made his contribution to the debate, of the possibility of a strike with the Winnipeg Police and he wondered what emergency measures were being taken insofar as the strike, which in his opinion was just around the corner. And, of course, that same situation

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) prevails today in respect of the possibility of a strike at the Health Services Centre. The same boogeymen are being raised by members opposite to my colleague the Minister of Health as the Member for Assiniboia raised when we were last on the estimates for the department. I do appreciate, however, the fact that the Member for Assiniboia did compliment the staff of the Department of Labour, as indeed I do, and in particular his complimentary remarks pertaining to my Executive Assistant Arthur Wright were sincerely appreciated by myself and all who know Art Wright. Here is a man who is a political appointee, and there's no question of doubt about it that this political appointee transcends all of the imagination of the honourable members for the Conservative Party, and I join with my friend from Assiniboia in paying tribute to a gentleman that I've had the pleasure of knowing for 30 years or more and is at the present time my right hand insofar as dealing with matters of concern directly to constituents, not only in my own constituency, but every honourable member opposite I am sure has used the services of my Executive Assistant to some degree at least. So I appreciate . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . question. He appears to be completely knowledgeable on the character of his Executive Assistant and I don't disagree with him, but if that's the case, then I wonder why he has refused to answer a question that's been on the Order Paper for 2-1/2 months inquiring about this certain gentleman's qualifications as an Executive Assistant.

MR. PAULLEY: That question, Mr. Speaker, has been on the Order Paper but it is of no concern to my Executive Assistant and he is not responsible as an Executive Assistant to answer . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm asking the Minister why he hasn't answered the question.

MR. PAULLEY: The question will be answered in due course as indicated by the First Minister, but if my honourable friend from Morris has any criticisms to offer in regard to my Executive Assistant, he will be the only one, I believe, Mr. Chairman, in this whole House.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . be very clear, I have no criticism to offer. I'm simply seeking information which the Minister up to this point has refused to supply us.

MR. PAULLEY: The Minister hasn't refused to supply any information at all. He just hasn't supplied it. But that is no matter of responsibility as far as the gentleman that we were discussing, and of course, so typically of the Honourable Member for Morris, he would like to place red herrings insofar as any accolades that may go to anybody in this House, particularly those associated with this side of the House, and it is typical of my honourable friend from Morris.

When the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was talking of the department estimates, he made reference to a number of matters which are of vital concern to the labouring force and to the people of Manitoba generally. He raised the question about the minimum wage as it applies to handicapped personnel. I want to say to my honourable friend that in accordance with the regulations under the Employment Standards Act there is a provision whereby the Minister may issue what is called Handicapped Persons Permits which allows for a lesser remuneration to a person who is handicapped than that under the Minimum Wage per se. One of the reasons for this, Mr. Chairman, is because of the contribution or the ability of a person to contribute productively in an institution or in a sheltered workshop, or some other accommodation. There is a working agreement or arrangement between the Department of Health and Social Development and the Department of Labour where some people are given employment in sheltered workshops, and the likes of that, that they would not otherwise be able to obtain, and, as I should indicate, that in the regulations there is ministerial authority to allow for a lesser amount than the minimum wage.

My honourable friend also mentioned the question of the 40-hour week. We have just passed a resolution asking the government to give consideration to the advisability of reducing the standard work week from 44 to 40 hours a week, and we have of course, as my honourable friend knows, accepted that resolution.

Mr. Chairman, one of the major concerns of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia over the years that I have known him in this House, has been in the field of Workmen's Compensation. I want to give that honourable gentleman credit for his concern, and I've shared with him many of his concerns. So far as the upgrading of pensions, as far as the raising of the ceiling, as far as the pensions for widows, or widowers, whose spouse has been killed as a result of an

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) industrial accident, and other aspects as well, the question of looking into the possibility of a more continuing review of the Compensation Act, and I'm sure that my honourable friend is aware that there is a resolution before the House, a bill before the House standing in my name as Minister of Labour, dealing with changes for Workmen's Compensation. And that bill, Mr. Chairman, is just about ready for distribution in the House for the consideration of the Assembly. In due course I will be speaking directly to that bill.

But I thought it would be of interest, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend from Assiniboia particularly, to the House in general, and to the people who are concerned with Workmen's Compensation in Manitoba, if I took this opportunity in reply to the points raised by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia to indicate to him and to the House some of the changes that are contained within the Workmen's Compensation Bill, so that he may have further time for contemplation as to the contents of the bill.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia had a resolution before the House asking the name be changed from Workmen's Compensation to something else. I don't know whether he meant work person or not, but it's been generally accepted that women do work, and his resolution indicated that there should be a change to workers' compensation. I'm sure that he will be glad that I did make the statement in the House that that would be provided for. I'm sure that when he sees the bill he will burst into cheers of happiness that that is contemplated in the Act which will be presented. Now then . . .

A MEMBER: He'll weep with joy.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I'm sure he will. I'm sure he will; he's a decent sort of a guy. And there are other matters contained in the bill which I will reveal on second reading.

I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia that we intend, subject of course to the acceptance by the Assembly, to make it possible, or to provide for I guess would be the better way, for anyone who is made a widow or a widower after January the 1st of this year to receive the same compensation as indeed the worker would have received had he not died and been totally disabled. In other words $\frac{3}{4}$, 75 percent, of the actual amount the man was earning, or woman as the case may be, a point I'm sure that will receive the acceptance of my honourable friend from Assiniboia. Also, Mr. Chairman, in conjunction with that I would indicate that the ceiling on wages will be increased from \$8,000 to \$10,000 in taking a realistic view of the general average increase in wages in the province of Manitoba.

I also want to indicate to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and also the House, that the pensions to widows whose spouses died as a result of an industrial accident prior to January 1st of this year will on July 1st, providing the bill is passed, have their basic pension increased from \$150.00 a month to \$250.00 per month, an increase of $66\frac{2}{3}$ percent. In addition to this, in addition to this, Mr. Chairman, there will be a \$10.00 per month increase in the amount of the allocation for dependent children, which I believe, Mr. Chairman, will raise them to the highest of any jurisdiction in the whole of the Dominion of Canada.

There will be other aspects contained within the bill, Mr. Chairman, the details of which of course I will enunciate on second reading of the bill.

There is a provision for further increases in the pensions now awarded based on a cost of living increase from the time of the accident, or the time that the accident occurred. For an accident which occurred prior to 1969, there will be a 25 percent increase; for an accident in 1969, a 19 percent increase; for an accident in 1970, a 15.5 percent increase; for an accident in '71, 12.5 percent; for an accident in 1972, an 8 percent increase. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, these increases of course are in addition to the increases that were awarded I believe some years ago in an endeavour to raise the pensions more realistically.

I do appreciate and realize, and I'm sure that my honourable friend from Assiniboia will realize, that there may be some jurisdictions across Canada that in some instances may have greater, larger pensions than we have, but on average, Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that in total non-average the propositions that I make to this committee and to this House will make us among the highest insofar as compensation payments across the whole Dominion of Canada.

In the case of permanent total disabilities the minimum compensation will be raised from \$175.00 to \$250.00 per month, an increase of 43 percent.

Also the minimum compensation payable in temporary total disability cases will be raised from the current level of \$40.00 per week to \$250.00 per month, or approximately a 50 percent increase in the amount of the pension. And again, Mr. Chairman, as I say that

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) these may not be the highest, if you take any individual position or rank, but they will be an average amongst the highest in the Dominion of Canada.

There also will be a provision - I'm sure my honourable friend from Assiniboia will welcome this - there is a provision contained in the bill for the establishment of an advisory committee to the Minister or to the Cabinet on an ongoing basis as to deficiencies contained in the bill or recommendations for change.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, what I have now outlined in reply to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is an indication of the desire of the government to make changes within the Compensation Act to bring into effect many of the problems that we've had over the years because of the lack of adequate pensions. We're hoping that this will go a long way to relieve many of the burdens that the injured workers in the province of Manitoba have.

I say to the committee, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and I realize that it's not all perfect but I do trust and hope that when the committee or the House gives consideration to the bill, which will be tabled either tonight or tomorrow, that they will give due consideration to it.

I'm sorry my honourable critic from the Conservative party is not here at this particular time. I'm sure though, Mr. Chairman, that when he makes his contribution on second reading he won't give any bouquets to the Minister, but he may consider the fact that we are at least progressing in some areas. Maybe I'm just standing here and talking with crossed fingers when I suggest that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry may ever have anything nice to say about the Minister of Labour. We have a conscience too and that is one of the reasons why we are suggesting changes in the Workmen's Compensation Act, which incidentally, Mr. Chairman, aren't without a cost impact, and it is estimated that the additional cost will amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of 10 millions of dollars to achieve this, to the employer.

My honourable friend also mentioned, Mr. Chairman, in his remarks, and again he dealt with matters of real concern to the workers of the province of Manitoba. He made quite a comment dealing with industrial safety and he suggested, quite properly, that here we have a bifurcated involvement insofar as safety. And I agree with him. I want to say to him that we have had, as a result of our assessment in the field of industrial safety, we have had for some, a year or so, a committee working on various aspects of industrial safety to see whether or not it would not be feasible and possible to bring occupational safety under one umbrella so that everyone knows where they are and each department then will be aware of their responsibilities. And incidental to this, Mr. Chairman, the western Ministers of Labour had a conference just recently in Calgary and one of the major considerations was in this field of occupational safety and I'm honoured, and I'm sure that if my honourable friend for Fort Garry was here he would say I'm just patting myself on the back once again, I'm honoured with the fact that I have been appointed to an international board on compensation for the purpose of trying to consolidate in the field of occupational safety. Now I only say that because I think it was in the press the other day, but what I'm really trying to say without asking for any accolades, Mr. Chairman, is that this is a matter of concern to all of us I'm sure that have any engagement in the field of compensation because the less accidents you have the lesser is the cost of compensation.

So I say to my honourable friend we are doing this and I'm hopeful - I hope I'm not thwarted in my efforts, I'm hopeful one of these days to be in a position to present a bill for consideration bringing all aspects of safety under one umbrella. At one time, Mr. Chairman, the provision of safety regulations and rules was domiciled in the Department of Labour and under the previous administration, and I don't fault them for it, the emphasis was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): I wonder if the Minister would permit a short question just before he moves off the subject of safety which I know we're all concerned with. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister might speak to the Minister of Finance and have the items of safety exempt from sales tax. I understand that there are the safety shoes and goggles and whatnot used in welding are exempt from the five percent sales tax and yet the safety equipment used in the high noise areas, the earmuffs used are subject to sales tax, and I wonder if he might mention this to the Minister of Finance and have the sales tax removed from all items pertaining to safety equipment in industry and mining. (Hear, hear)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the honourable banker from Minnedosa, the Honourable Member from Minnedosa excuse me, ex banker I believe, that he

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) being so expertise in the field of finance might quite appropriately raise that when the Honourable Minister of Finance is dealing with Ways and Means of raising of revenue for Her Majesty. And I might say, I might say that I'm not too far apart with my honourable friend, except Mr. Chairman, my main concern is that these safety appliances and devices be supplied to the worker in order that they continue to earn money so that they may continue to make contributions by way of income tax to the coffers of my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance. So you see it's a two-way sword.

However, what I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, in the field of safety, and I'm sure my honourable friend from Assiniboia may be aware of this, that previously responsibility for industrial safety was domiciled in the Department of Labour; it was transferred I believe in 1963 or somewhere about then over to the Workmen's Compensation Board, and the theory then was that if the requirements for safety was vested with the Workmen's Compensation Board they would have a greater emphasis and greater input with the employers to indicate to the employers the lesser the number of accidents, the lesser their requirements of contributions to compensation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I'd like to know. Resolution 74 (a)--pass? The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I will not make a speech, I know that I'm not all the time too pleasant to the Minister, there's times I take issue with him and chastise him at certain times that opportunity presents itself, but today I do wish to congratulate him for being appointed to the International Safety Council and I think it speaks well for the Minister from this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 74 to 78 were read and passed). Resolution 79, Fire Prevention (a)--The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just want to take the opportunity while discussing the Minister's Estimates to begin to look at an issue which has become of increasing importance to residents particularly of the City of Winnipeg over the past year but is symbolic or indicative of an issue which has much wider currency throughout urban areas in all parts of the world in fact and that is the increasing recognition of the dangers that we now find ourselves in in terms of the problems of fire in downtown, Inner City areas and particularly areas which are heavily populated by older buildings and by high-rise apartment blocks. I don't think that I have to belabour the House with the evidence that we have seen of recent in the City of Winnipeg concerning the dangers existing in older apartment blocks, but it does demonstrate, Mr. Chairman, that in many cases the existing protections that are available in older buildings is not adequate and that there is a very strong requirement that we begin to look at this problem, because it is not one of one or two buildings, it is becoming of serious magnitude because of the peculiar nature of the age of maturity of the City of Winnipeg.

In a study done I believe in 1969 on downtown development, it was indicated that over 60 percent of buildings within the study area were over 50 years old, and furthermore those buildings were primarily of frame construction and built in many cases by the construction standards of an earlier time in which perhaps there wasn't as many hazards to fire as existed in previous eras. And what that really means, Mr. Chairman, is that at the present moment in the City of Winnipeg literally thousands of people are living in buildings built in an age when the standard of fire construction and safety was not adequate and have only been partially amended or changed since then so that in effect we have in existence a number of fire traps and there's no other word to describe them. Now that does not lay onus of blame on irresponsibility on the part of owners because they are living up to the standards we have set; it is not laying any blame particularly on fire departments because they can only enforce the fire rules that are set down. But what it does demonstrate, that as the hazards and dangers inherent in fire become more prevalent in large urban areas simply because there are more toxic materials available, there is greater incidences of chemical fires and electrical fires, certainly a greater degree of arson, simply because of the breakdown in some cases of social control and the greater incentive in cases for those deviants from society who want to express their frustrations to do it by way of lighting buildings on fire. So what in fact is becoming the case is that we now find in the City of Winnipeg because of the age of the city that a substantial proportion of our downtown accommodation in older apartment blocks contains within it serious dangers. And furthermore, those apartment blocks are oftentimes occupied by elderly people who are not

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) nearly as mobile or can move about or to respond to dangers as easily as someone of a younger age and therefore again the dangers inherent mean that the kind of standards we have now, you know, the pail of sand and the axe and pick and the little fire alarm with a little gong is just in no way adequate.

I think that one would only have to refer to the statement made by Fire Chief Cam Shewan of the City of Winnipeg about a month and a half ago where he indicated that basically most of the older buildings in the city are not adequately regulated or protected and the standards just do not apply, and in many cases fire departments are sorely and sadly inhibited in their ability to protect people because of the nature of those older blocks, particularly the danger of smoke inhalation, that the danger to human life as well as to property is increasing as time goes by.

I would like to add to that what has become a very obvious and evident danger, one which is becoming I think as serious and perhaps as time goes on even more serious, and that is the increasing recognition of the fire danger in large high-rise apartment blocks. That again large high-rise apartment blocks are becoming the standard form of accommodation in many cases for the City of Winnipeg. Last year we built close to 6,000 apartment units in the City of Winnipeg, many of which were contained in buildings above 12 storeys high. I would like to refer to the Minister some studies that I have available from recent copies of the Fire Journal which basically point out that fire departments are incapable of protecting people in high-rise buildings, they just simply can't do it. And I would sort of refer to statements made at the meeting of the Fire and Smoke Seminar for High Rise Buildings held in Toronto about a year ago, which stated that, with unequivocal terms, that what is going on now is in fact we are building large numbers of apartment units in the City of Winnipeg which are not safe.

The question that I would like to raise very seriously with the Minister is whether his department and the Fire Commissioner's office and his responsibility that he exercises for the building code and other matters, is whether he is preparing now to seriously investigate the requirement that automatic sprinkler systems for example be incorporated in all new apartment buildings? Now I recognize that under the City of Winnipeg bylaws there is a requirement for sprinkler systems in areas like storage facilities but there is not sprinkler systems required in hallways or in the residential accommodation itself. And again if the Minister requires I could table for him a series of five or six statements made by a variety of experts, all of which point out that the only kind of real protection in those large high-rise apartment buildings and office buildings are automatic sprinklers and smoke detection systems. This is not a requirement under our present building code and yet if it is to become, as many builders say, the form of accommodation of the future where increasingly more thousands of Winnipeggers will be compelled to live for reasons of economics, that it would seem pretty necessary that we investigate very thoroughly the requirement to put into effect a mandatory automatic sprinkler system in our large multi storey buildings.

And that goes back to a question as the Minister may recall that I raised with him I think about two months back, asking whether the Provincial Government was prepared to offer in many cases financial incentive for builders to improve the safety standards in large high-rise buildings and I think at that time he seemed to be fairly vehement in his response that this was not the job of the Provincial Government to help builders. And yet you know I take with some notice that the Provincial Government announced last evening by the Minister of Finance is putting up \$7-1/2 million towards a Convention Centre and that Convention Centre according to the guidelines of the downtown development plan is designed as an incentive to build high-rise apartment blocks in the downtown. So here we are prepared to spend \$7-1/2 million to encourage us to build apartment blocks but we're not prepared to provide any incentive to make sure that those apartment blocks are fully safe.

Now I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that there's a certain gap in the logic that escapes me and perhaps the Minister would be prepared to more fully respond to that, because if in fact the Provincial Government is investing good taxpayer money in the City of Winnipeg to encourage and stimulate the production of more apartment units in taller buildings, it would seem only a natural logical sequence of thought to suggest that those apartment blocks should at least be full surety that they are safe against fire. Again I think the Minister would recognize, and I don't have to again belabour the point, that most fire authorities say they are not safe, that fire departments as they now exist cannot protect them. And again I would be prepared to table if the Minister is interested a series of these reports relating to that central point.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

So the question I really want to raise at this point when we look at the question of fire protection is first, is the Minister at the present time, is his department undertaking specific studies on the need and ability to improve fire safety codes and the enforcement of those regulations and equipment in terms of automatic sprinkler systems, smoke detecting systems, protection against hallway and trap fire exit systems, none of which are required under our building code; and if such an investigation is being done, who is doing it; when can we expect the results; when can we expect the legislation to change those codes so that we don't have to continue much longer with what is a very unsatisfactory situation.

I would also like to ask the Minister whether he in joining the International and National bodies concerned with safety has also taken up this matter of high rise design and construction with other Ministers in other provinces who are experiencing the same problem to again inquire as to their safety. And while, Mr. Chairman, I recognize this is not directly on target in terms of this particular item of the Estimates, I would indicate that increasing studies show that high-rise apartment blocks also become dangerous in terms of the problems of criminality and assault and breaking and entering and threat to human life - and I hope to bring up that matter at more length and detail when we get to the Attorney-General's estimates because I think he bears some responsibility in this area. But the fact of the matter is there is obviously some serious questions that should be raised. Perhaps we shouldn't be building high-rise buildings at all because perhaps we just simply can't find a way to insure that people are safe and I would hate to think that any one life is being risked because of the inadequacy of the fire regulation. And as I say it's not good enough to add more people to fire departments or to buy more fire equipment or to provide for better fire safety education. The fact of the matter is if you're on the 22nd floor of a high-rise building and a fire goes on, is the basic threat that you see is not fire but of smoke and panic and being trapped, and there is just simply no way that any particular fire department, according to all the expert testimony, can in any way help that person who is trapped in that situation.

So I would like to raise those questions with the Minister. As he may notice, we have a resolution on the Order Paper which we hope to debate at greater length concerning specific measures that can be incorporated to provide for protection, that we would like to hear from him at this point what measures, in specifics, the Minister has undertaken since this issue was brought to his attention two months ago, and whether we can expect at this session some major initiatives to correct inadequacies in our present codes and regulations and enforcement practices; and more importantly whether we are beginning now in the province to seriously look at the over-all question of apartment block construction and how it relates to safety both in terms of personal safety and fire safety of the residents of those areas, because if in fact we are going to be in a cycle where that is to be the homes of the future for literally thousands of people in this city then we better make damn sure that they're safe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour. Pardon me, the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the remarks of the Member for Fort Rouge in respect to the hazards involved with older buildings in our society and then as he proceeded to discuss the problems related to modern high-rise construction. I think that the concerns he expresses are certainly serious ones but from personal experience I might give some reassurance to those who live in high-rises having experienced a fire when I was living I think on the 20th floor and while it was not a major fire I think the kind of construction that's being used in high-rises is almost eliminating the possibility of a major conflagration. There may be serious dangers involved in terms of panic situations that arise but in this particular building it seemed impossible that there could be a fire of major proportions and that the fire was of a minor nature and was eventually contained.

That is not to say, Mr. Chairman, that there isn't some real concern here when we are told by those responsible for controlling fire that they're unable to effectively operate beyond 8 or 10 or 12 floors, but it was these remarks that reminded me of some observations made by the Minister a few weeks ago when he was discussing the possibility of some improvements to the training facilities for fire-fighters in the province. And as I recall his remarks it was suggested at the time that there might be a possibility of establishing a fire-fighters training facility in the province and that they were at that time looking at certain facilities that were

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) available, and while no final decisions had been made nevertheless it was a consideration I think which is appropriate to the current discussions and one that perhaps the Minister would enlarge upon when he is replying to the subject matter that was raised by the Member for Fort Rouge. I have a special interest of course, because it was suggested that perhaps this fire-fighting facility might be established in the western part of the province and might make use of some federal building that now is available for this purpose. So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister might find it appropriate to comment on the progress being made with respect to the possibility of a new training facility for fire-fighters in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I have just one or two comments, and I'm probably approaching it from a different level, and that is from a rural point of view. I would like the Minister to inform the House as to whether or not the fires in rural Manitoba are on the increase as compared with the previous year and whether or not the fire prevention staff that are under his command do periodically travel throughout Manitoba examining buildings, particularly commercial buildings? During the last few months we have seen up in my particular area anyway, and as far as The Pas hotel after hotel being destroyed by fire and I wonder if the Minister has anything to report in that particular direction, and my colleague from Brandon was mentioning a moment ago the possibility of a training depot that the Minister might have in mind, and I wonder just what has been done during the past year or what is intended in the immediate future to carry out instruction to volunteer firemen which man the fire brigades throughout the province; and then in the smaller communities, I wonder if the Minister is giving any thought toward the provision of equipment to fight fires which are possibly beyond the purchasing power of the community itself.

I must reiterate to him in no uncertain terms that in the community I come from there's two commercial buildings, a hotel and a large warehouse destroyed by fire, that we all hope that they'll be rebuilt; but in the meantime I'm just wondering what supervision there is of these commercial establishments in the various communities throughout rural Manitoba for not only the safety of the people that are working in them or live in them from time to time, but I would like an opinion as to what the thoughts of the Minister and the department are toward fire-fighting facilities and fire-fighting personnel throughout rural Manitoba.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Chairman, while we're on this topic of fire prevention, I have a couple of questions for the Minister. This matter touches me pretty closely because I happen to represent an urban area which has a fairly large number of what the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge called firetraps. I have a number of blocks, a number of old buildings, built around the turn of the century and a bit later that are real firetraps. The Haslemere fire occurred right on the fringe of my constituency, it happened to occur in the constituency of the Member for Winnipeg Centre, but I have a large number of blocks, old rooming houses where the same sort of thing could happen.

Now these old firetraps are generally inhabited by low income people and the reason they live in these buildings is because they can afford nothing better. I would like to know from the Minister, and perhaps he can't give us the answer now, but I'd like to know at some time, what would be the cost involved in the installation of smoke detection or heat detection equipment in small blocks, let us say in a block of 20, 30, 50 suites. Perhaps he could get this information from his department. Now the inevitable result of the installation of such equipment will be an increase in rent, so I'd like to know approximately what costs would be involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to say that - you might say I have somewhat of a vested interest when it comes to fire fighting because I used to serve on the Steinbach volunteer fire department - and I would at this time like to say that the response or the help we've had from the Fire Commissioner's office in the past has been excellent, I think the gentlemen in charge are doing a fine job. As I mentioned the other day when I asked the Minister of Labour several questions about the establishment of a fire school in Brandon, I would ask the Minister that along with the fire school if a type of training could be provided probably through the direction of the fire school and make it somewhat of a portable school--(Interjection)--no, the biggest problem facing most of the rural

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) volunteer fire fighting brigades is the fact that it's comprised of people who are usually very active in the community and find it very hard to take a week off of their job simply because of the time factor and because of the economic factor of it.

So I would urge the department to have a look at and run a type of school that was conducted several years ago when the Emergency Measures Organization had some more funds at their disposal and did come out to the smaller communities and did hold fire schools. I add again that the Fire Commissioner's office has I know, in my area, together with Niverville, Steinbach and Grunthal, Ste. Anne have run joint fire schools in the town of Steinbach during the evenings in a week and I think this is a step in the right direction. I think if the Minister could possibly take that as notice and provide staff that could go out and train these people in providing better protection for the community.

Most of the people serving on voluntary fire departments do so for very little remuneration. I think in Steinbach they're paid \$3.00 an hour for active fire fighting. It's a dedicated job, I think a service to the community, and if the Minister could have a look at it - I think the fire school at Brandon is a good idea but basically just because of the time factor involved and the people being volunteers it's hard to take a week off to go to a school like that. I think if it was made rather mobile and have your instructors travel to the different locations in Manitoba, maybe in a central area holding a school during the evening or even possibly for a couple of days during the week, I think that would be a step in the right direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the comments that have been made in respect of this matter of fire, particularly the points raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, dealing with high-rise apartments. I share his concern. I had an opportunity this past year of going to Louisville, Kentucky at an International Minister of Labours Conference and I was most fortunate to have assigned to me as guides members of the fire-fighting force of Louisville, Kentucky, and it was most informative to discuss the question of the effect of fire protection in high-rise apartments and hotels.

I happened to be domiciled on the 18th floor - no excuse me, on the 23rd floor, in a brand new hotel in Louisville and in conversations with the boys of the fire department I asked what I feel is a natural question - what would happen if a fire broke out in this apartment or in this hotel during the evening when we were asleep. And he said, well Mr. Paulley I just want to say to you you'd have to be awfully lucky, or if you were lucky enough to be able to get up to the 24th floor, which was the top floor, and we were lucky enough to have available a few helicopters maybe we would look after Canada and get you back to your province of Manitoba.

Now I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there were many safety provisions or fire-fighting provisions such as fire doors. There were facilities for hoses and water and the likes of that. I believe also that in this particular hotel there were smoke detectors and other pieces of equipment. I was somewhat amazed though, Mr. Chairman, to have him tell me that if there really was a fire the elevator service would go kaput, and I said why? Well because, he said, and he assisted me in my education, even though my signature might be on a number of certificates or permits in an elevator he indicated to me that it's the heat from your thumb that calls for the elevator to come up and down and it's not the pressure that you put on the little device to call for the elevator and he says if there is a fire there's sufficient heat generated to render inoperative the elevator. However, he did explain to me, and I think we should be cognizant of this - and the point raised by the Honourable Member for West Brandon I think encompasses this - that generally speaking particularly in construction of a more recent nature, that the buildings themselves are made as fireproof as possible, that the materials that are used have been tested and by and large are fireproof.

One of the factors in fire, in high-rise apartments of recent construction particularly, is not the materials used in construction itself but the material that goes into the apartment by the apartment dweller. Many of the pieces of furniture are made of highly volatile materials, plastics and the likes of that, and so damn many people are stupid enough even in this day and age to smoke in bed, that this is the cause - they were informing me that you can have the most perfect construction fireproof-wise that it is possible and it is the human element that enters into the situation and causes the loss of life.

Mr. Chairman, I've just received a recent report of the number of fatalities as a result of fire this year, and from January of this year until April 14th, just a day or so ago, there has

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) been a total of 30 fatalities as a result of fire. --(Interjection)-- No this is in Manitoba. And most of these fatalities were caused by human carelessness, gross negligence, or in some cases possible criminal negligence, because we do encounter that as well.

The point I'm really trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that to a large degree it is the human element that is involved that causes fires to occur in high-rise apartments. And referring back to my sojourn in Louisville, Kentucky I asked the fire-fighter that I was with, at what level of construction or the height of construction can your equipment reach in order to give protection or at least possible escape routes and the likes of that and facilities, and he says by and large we cannot go beyond the 10th floor. He also told me that at the Hotel Gault, or in Louisville they had the latest type of equipment and that was the highest really that they could go with safety. So it is a great problem.

Reference has been made - my honourable friend from Fort Rouge referred to a question and answer between he and I a few days ago dealing with the question of financial aid and I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Proceed, the Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: One minute? I just want to say before we return at 8 o'clock, on that particular point, I am still of the opinion that the owner of the apartments has the responsibility of providing for the equipment because they get the revenue as a result of rentals from their apartments. On that happy note, Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to continue at 8 o'clock this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 5:30, I leave the Chair to return at 8 o'clock.