



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



Vol. XXVI No. 37A

2:30 p.m. Monday, May 8, 1978

# Manitoba Legislative Assembly

## Thirty-First Legislature

### Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, May 8, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 24 students of Grade 9 standing of St. Johns High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Norman Sanders. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

On behalf of all members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the members have noticed the beautiful blue spruce trees on their desks. The trees are there to help mark National Forest Week which has been proclaimed here in Manitoba. This week is proclaimed to bring the attention of Manitobans to the importance of our forests. Not only do they provide a valuable economic base for hundreds of our citizens, but they also provide the habitat that makes it possible to reap ensuing benefits as well including opportunities for recreation and rest.

The blue spruce before you is not a native of our province but it does grow well in Manitoba. Friday, May 12th, is Arbor Day in Manitoba and I hope you will take this occasion to plant these blue spruce as indicative of your support of the preservation and enhancement of your forest resources. The Manitoba Forestry Association which includes group and individual memberships from all segments of our population is promoting National Forest Week with a variety of events including displays in the Polo Park Shopping Mall in Winnipeg and demonstrations in several northern communities as well as encouraging the planting of trees on Arbor Day. They have arranged, in co-operation with Renewable Resources and Transportation Services, to provide these trees for you today. Thank you.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take pleasure in joining the Honourable Minister in marking the National Forest Week. I note by looking at the size of the trees before us that this is one area where the present government is not practicing restraint. I believe we were giving out smaller trees . . . I believe these are somewhat larger but I assume the same practice is being followed as in previous years, where the Manitoba Forestry Association is providing these trees for the government to provide as an example of their dedication to the forests of Manitoba I hope and trust that this is an indication that the Manitoba government is not providing any kind of restraint measures in the area of reforestation since this is a very serious matter in this province. I know there is a gap which could be very much widening if the government is not vigilant in maintaining a good reforestation program in the province, and I know while we were in government we put as much emphasis on that as we could, given the budgetary opportunities of the government. And I hope that the present government will be providing at least the same measure of support for the reforestation of Manitoba, and in fact I hope that they will be increasing that so as to narrow that gap between the forests that are harvested and destroyed over the years and that which is required to bring about a proper reforestation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed, I'd like to welcome 22 students from the Arborg Collegiate under the direction of Mr. John Strutyński. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member of St. George. We welcome you here this afternoon.

Notices of Motion.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur)** introduced Bill No. 25, The Cattle Producers Association Act.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East)** introduced Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Brandon Charter.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne)** introduced Bill No. 20, an An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act, and Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Jury Act.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking as the Member for Inkster, Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I would like to ask whether the Minister can confirm to us that the proposal to build a condominium in the Whiteshell has been rejected by the Cabinet of the Province of Manitoba.

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

**HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN(La Verendrye):** No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that, I am in the process of collecting data dealing with that particular subject and if there are any announcements to be made, I will be announcing them in the House as I promised.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on the 23rd of March, I asked the Honourable Minister whether he can assure the House that the transfer of Walter Danyluk by the previous Conservative administration had nothing to do with his objection to the condominium proposal in the Whiteshell. The Minister wasn't able to give me an answer at that time. I wonder whether he can assure the House that this long time civil servant, who worked for previous Conservative and New Democratic Party administrations, was not prejudiced in his choice of employment by the fact that he opposed this 200 unit condominium program. .

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I think if my memory serves me right, at that time I mentioned that was part of the thing I was looking into.

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

**MR. A.R. (PETE) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if Mr. Al Church represented him or the department at a meeting at Elkhorn to explain the beef checkoff legislation along with the Member for Virden.

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes. He did attend the meeting, was invited there by a group of individuals. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question that was taken as notice. In reply to the Member for Ste. Rose concerning the 5.134 million, which I stated during discussions on my estimates, and the 4.192 million tabled by the Minister of Finance, the honourable member will recall that the amount of 5.134 million was the capital authority carried over from the previous years, whereas the amount of 4.192 million as represented by the Minister of Finance, is the estimated capital spending required for the departmental commitments in 1978-79. The balance of this unexpected authority of capital is slated to lapse at March 31st, 1979.

**MR. ADAM:** I thank the Minister for his reply to my question of last week. Supplementary to my first question today, did the Minister receive a report on what happened at the meeting from Mr. Church?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I received a verbal report; I am not sure if I have received a written report from anyone at that meeting. I would have to check that with the department.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Yes. Would he also, while he is reviewing the report that he has received or not received, could he check out to see if there was an unanimous resolution passed at that meeting opposing the introduction of 8 beef check-off legislation without a referendum?

**MR. DOWNEY:** I could check that, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is to the Minister of Tourism. Can the Minister confirm that his deputy and presumably he himself as Minister, were in receipt of a memorandum from the Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Danyluk, advising strongly against the proposed agreement with Mr. Jarmoc for a condominium development in the Whiteshell, two days before he had instructed his Deputy Minister to sign this agreement?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, regarding the questions asked by the Member for Inkster, I think that this is part of the data that I am trying to collect and get from the department, and as soon as I have got

it all together I will be making a report to the House.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that the Minister has made this commitment to us. However, we have been waiting some considerable amount of time now and I expect he will appreciate our patience for waiting this long. And I will ask another question which I believe he can answer, yes or no. Does he and his department know the financial backers behind the proposed Jarmoc development?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, that's another thing we are checking into.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Could the Minister of Labour inform the House what training programs her safety inspectors are going on, in-province and out-of-province?

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

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, that will come up in my Estimates.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister. Can the Minister table in this House, any cases of harassment by her safety inspectors, as she said in this House on a previous occasion, and as has been reconfirmed by the resigning Director of Safety in the Province of Manitoba? Can she table in this House any actual cases where her safety staff have been harassing industry in this province?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been any harassing of my staff as was reported by the former Director.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not referring to what Mr. Rabinovitch said, I'm referring to the time that the Honourable Minister said in this House, I believe in reply to a question from the Member for Kildonan, that she felt that members of her staff were harassing Hooker Chemicals and Simplot. Can she table that, is there any proof that these people were doing that?

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that there is considerable concern on the part of members of the construction industry and architectural and engineering firms, can the First Minister confirm that when he met with representatives of the Manitoba Association of Architects or members of that organization, that he indicated to them that there was in fact no prospect of a lifting of the freeze on construction?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I will have to say to my honourable friend that I have no recollection of having met with the Manitoba Association of Architects.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, to be more precise, does the First Minister recall a recent meeting in which he met with several architects who were sounding him out about the prospects of lifting the freeze on construction and at that meeting that he indicated to them that there was no prospect in the immediate future.

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only refer my honourable friend to the answer that I gave to his first question.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, a second question. Does the First Minister recall indicating to a couple of architects recently —(Interjection)— Well, in the Manitoba Club. Does the First Minister recall indicating to several architects recently that he also believed that there were too many architects or too many firms of architects in the province and that he, for one, would not be saddened if those firms were wound down or if those architects left.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Housing. Considering that the official announcement was made on Thursday on the new low income housing program

**Monday, May 8, 1978**

requiring the signing of master agreements between the Federal Government and the Province, can the Minister of Housing indicate does this province intend to sign those master agreements and can he tell us when and could he also tell us the number of units that he would be proposing to sign for under the new agreements?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister in Ottawa, the Honourable Mr. Ouellet, made an announcement in the House on Friday. The text of that announcement was in my office at approximately 10 after 4 Friday afternoon delivered to me from CMHC's office in Winnipeg. Our officials had the opportunity to look it over briefly then and we're studying it now. The telegram itself is a telegram that, or the announcement is an announcement in principle. We have been working on an agreement with the Federal Government as all provinces have been for the last month and a half. I have informed the regional manager of CMHC here that our officials are ready to sit down at any time after he receives the guidelines from Ottawa to discuss this with him. I have also told him that we will, in Manitoba, do our best to extract as much out of the Federal Government as we can in the negotiations and we are ready to sit down any time with him. We expect to be doing so this week.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister, in signing the agreement, is the government prepared to make an announcement very soon concerning the number of low income housing units they expect to provide in the forthcoming fiscal year in view of the fact that the construction season has now started and any new buildings or accommodations would have to be planned now almost immediately in order to be available this year? When can we expect an announcement or a decision by the Minister on that very important item?

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, we are presently in the midst of some construction which was announced the beginning of this year. It's proceeding this year, and I can assure the honourable member that construction by this government on public housing of any kind will be done in a planned area according to need which is what our department is instructed to do, and that's what we are working on. **MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Okay, Mr. Speaker, just in respect to the last answer, would the Minister confirm that in fact the construction that he has initiated was part of the previous program? I'm asking when can we expect to have an announcement concerning the program of this government and how many units they expect to make available for low income purposes in the province for the forthcoming year?

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the member is incorrect in one regard — that the previous government had only applied for \$6 million worth of construction when we took office. We did announce \$22 million after we took office.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the numbers are concerned, the numbers will be according to studies of need within this province which is being carried on at the present time.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** My question is directed to the Minister of Renewable Resources. Can the Minister of Renewable Resources confirm that farmers in the Municipalities of Rockwood and St. Andrews have not received compensation for duck or geese damage to crops since last September, October, 1977?

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

**MR. McMASTER:** I'll take it as notice and get back to him.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Would the honourable member also take as notice my question as to whether or not funds were allocated for the payment of such damage within his Estimates.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether he can confirm that he gave a commitment to the adjusters of the private insurance industry that they would be ultimately taking over the adjusting of general insurance claims within this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

Monday, May 8, 1978

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend can refresh my memory — I don't recall speaking to the adjusters of the private insurance industry in Manitoba. If he has any specifics I'd be happy to try to illuminate.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'd then like to ask the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation whether he has given any commitments to the private insurance agents that they will be taking over the adjusting of general insurance claims.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corp.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I have had conversations with some representatives of the private adjusters' group within the Province of Manitoba who have asked that they be considered for some work — as they are now and have been considered for some work during the life of the corporation. There seems to be some concern by the members of that group that additional work could be forthcoming in particular instances. The current policy of the Corporation is such that in certain circumstances the Corporation deemed it advisable to use a private adjuster and I have advised the group in question that no specific change in policy is being contemplated at this time.

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

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Finance and it arises from his commitment to the House about five weeks ago to provide details of the bids received for insurance on government buildings. Would the Minister be prepared to table a list of the five bidders and the amounts that each had bid?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, the information I tabled the other day last week was in response to the initial question and I indicated to the member at that time that public information had been issued at the time of the tenders and that information I have already passed on to him. If he wants further in-depth information I would suggest to him that the usual procedure would be for him to file an order for return.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I had asked the Minister for details of the unsuccessful bidders. The Minister tabled in the House a copy of the News Service dated November the 19th and that was the source of the question in the first place. If the Minister will insist upon receiving an order for return I will submit one if he is not prepared to give the information without one.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I undertook on Friday last to answer a question previously put by the Member for Selkirk as to whether I was in a position to confirm or deny reports that the RCMP had been investigating allegations pertaining to a break-in by the RCMP of the offices of one Julius Koteles in the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate that with respect to the information available to the department to date the RCMP are continuing a general investigation in respect of the relationship between Mr. Koteles and the Folk Arts Council, particularly in respect to financing and records.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I delayed giving this answer because I hoped that the investigation would have been completed and I'd have been able to give more information to the Member for Selkirk in the Legislature.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney-General whether the RCMP are in fact investigating the allegations pertaining to the break-in of the RCMP of the offices of Mr. Koteles or whether there are some other individuals performing that investigation besides that of the RCMP.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, there was an allegation by a lawyer in the City of Winnipeg that the RCMP had in fact committed the break-in themselves within the members of the force. That allegation has subsequently been withdrawn by that solicitor.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I want to address a question to the Minister of Health. Could

**Monday, May 8, 1978**

he indicate who are the persons who are representing the government in discussions with a consultative committee recently set up with Manitoba Medical Association?

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the government representatives are Dr. George Johnson, who's the special medical advisor to the Minister, Mr. Reg. Edwards, who's the Chairman of the Commission, and the NMA representatives are Dr. Robert Meyers of Brandon and Dr. Henry Krahn of Winnipeg.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister confirm that important areas being considered by the consultative Committee are the assignment of patient benefits from the Manitoba Health Services Commission and renewal of the formal contract for a letter of understanding from the government?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, examination of those topics are within the committee's terms of reference.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister firstly confirm which of the doctors on that consultative committee are opted-in or opted-out and whether or not it is government policy to pursue the question of assignment of patient benefits and to give a formal undertaking of consultation with the Manitoba Medical on program.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to take the first part of my honourable friend's question as notice, the opt-in, opt-out part. The second part, it really represents in my view or my understanding of the situation, very little change in procedure from the past when subjects of this nature have been explored, examined and discussed both by government and MMA representatives, perhaps not in a formally structured committee but it was our view that the a committee of this kind would be valuable for ongoing communication. We'll see how it works out.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a fourth question.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** It's a supplementary, yes, a new question, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Would the Honourable Minister be prepared to keep the Legislature aware of the discussions that take place in the consultative committee established with the MMA?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, I can do that certainly to a considerable extent, Mr. Speaker. I imagine that when recommendations come forward from the committee that have some merit from the point of view of government planning and policy, that those would find their way into the general arena of debate particularly during the Estimates process and at that time certainly I'll supply all the information that I have.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Tourism in regard to the proposed condominium development in the Whiteshell. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that the building capacity in the area and the boating capacity on the lake have already been reached in that region.

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, that's part of the review.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell the House if he has answered any of the numerous briefs, letters, etc. from numerous groups throughout the province expressing their concern about this development, whether he has answered those letters and other submissions to this date.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I try to answer most of my correspondence and in the correspondence I indicate that the matter is under review and that I will be reporting.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, a final question. I wonder when the Minister will stop stonewalling and table that report. Could you give us a date by which we might expect that report in the Legislature?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, as soon as the study is completed I'll report to the Legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.



**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the National Energy Board has decided not to hear an application from Polar Gas Pipeline at its next hearings in October, and in view of the fact that significant new sources of natural gas are being found in Alberta, will the Minister please advise the House whether he expects the Polar Gas Line to be built through Manitoba before the 21st Century?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, that's a very good question.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate the Honourable Minister hasn't provided us with an answer. A related question, Mr. Speaker. Because Manitoba has experienced shortages of gas supply a few winters ago while Canada exported 40 percent of its production to the United States, would the Minister please advise the House whether Manitoba will present a brief at the National Energy Board hearings in October opposing applications by Alberta producers for increasing levels of exports to the United States?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I dealt with that question on Friday. I would add to it though, to the first part of the question which is new, that the shortages two or three years ago were not related to the U. S. exports but to other problems that existed in the pipelining and in the securing of supplies in Alberta. I think that the member is somewhat aware of the particular problems that existed at that time. Our hope is that we will not face that and the indications are that at least until the mid-1980s, we're not faced with any substantial concern about gas supplies for Manitoba. It's beyond that point where we have concern.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, is the Honourable Minister telling us that even though 40 percent of Canada's natural gas production is being exported to the United States and even while this was happening we did have a shortfall of gas in Winnipeg a couple of winters ago, that he is convinced that we need not fear a situation that did arise in the City of Winnipeg about three winters ago? We have no fear of that and he's not concerned about that.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, just to repeat, Mr. Speaker, the shortage two or three years ago was not equated to the supplies to the United States. It was for other reasons.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism. Will he be calling public meetings to allow for a public input into the proposals for the developments in the northern half of the Whiteshell Provincial Park?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, we have asked for public submissions through newspaper ads and have also been in contact with different groups such as the Naturalists, the Whiteshell Cottage Owners Association, and they have been making presentations. There will be a general master plan which will then go to the public for discussion.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary to the same Minister. So apart from the questionnaires and dealing with some established interest groups, do interested individuals or groups in the Whiteshell area or people who are interested in the Whiteshell development, do they have any other recourse apart from answering newspaper ads or providing a public input into development plans of the government for the northern half of the Whiteshell?

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have met several times with the Eastman group involved in development, the entrepreneurs in the area. I have also met with concerned citizens from that area. I receive letters very often from concerned individuals, not only from that area but from Metropolitan Winnipeg, and all that information is being channelled to the group that is doing the review to ensure that every person's concerns are dealt with.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A final supplementary. Can the Minister confirm that there will be advertised public meetings so that people can present their views on the proposed developments of the northern half of the Whiteshell area?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I think once we have the master plan ready, we will establish a form to deal with this particular situation to ensure that all people do have proper input and can register either their concerns or their complaints at that time so that we can come up with something that will meet the needs of all Manitobans.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the 27th of April, I addressed a question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation in which I asked him if he could advise how many applications for the Critical Home Repair were being processed and delivered on a weekly basis and on a monthly basis. I wonder if he's able to provide that information yet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I told the member when he asked the question, we'd be happy to provide that information and I have asked for it. I haven't got it as yet, and I will give it to him as soon as I receive it.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism pertaining to the review he was mentioning in response to the Member for Transcona. Can he indicate if he is progressing on this review with the same assumptions that were contained within the newspaper advertisements, that the only alternative to the existing use of the lakes in question in the northern part of the Whiteshell is a greater use, that is, a greater use with more intensive development than is there presently?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rupertsland whose constituency lies within the boundaries of the proposed Atikaki Park, and the member has dealt with that particular problem for the last three or four years; there's the Nopiming Park, I think it's time that we develop a policy which will finally tell people what direction we are going on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and that's what we're trying to get public input on. The Member for Rupertsland, when he was Minister, did not reach a decision with regard to Atikaki and the whole Eastman area, so we are looking at it and we're hoping to have input, and I think during the Estimates I would appreciate if the member opposite would tell us what he feels his constituency wants with regard to that, and I hope we can have a good debate during the Estimates on that, so we can get the feeling of that.

**MR. BOSTROM:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing the Minister's non-answer to my question, I'd like to know if he is seriously proposing, or his department is seriously proposing under his instructions, to proceed with similar types of development to that which he had instructed his Deputy Minister to sign an agreement with a Mr. Jarmoc in the Whiteshell Park. Is his department considering similar type developments in other areas of the Whiteshell or in other areas of Manitoba generally?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, if anybody has interested areas, I met with people from Lake of the Prairies the other day, they are interested in getting some more tourism going down there. They have certain ideas. We are talking to people constantly and we will be trying to not only increase some of the infrastructures throughout the province but also to try to create facilities which will attract more tourists to this province.

**MR. BOSTROM:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given again that the Minister did not answer my question, can he tell us if he has instructed his department to enter into agreements similar to the one which he had instructed his department to sign with Jarmoc?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that repetitive questions are not in the best interests of the House. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is again to the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General confirm that the lawyer in question in connection with the break-in did not so much as withdraw his charges but was unable to proceed with proof of his allegations in view of the fact that the RCMP investigator, who was investigating the alleged RCMP investigation, insisted on having the lawyer's source of information, which was a senior RCMP officer?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, my advice was that the lawyer who made the allegation withdrew his allegation because he could offer no support for that allegation.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my information is that he was required to name his source within the senior ranks of the RCMP, would the Attorney-General be prepared to take my question as notice, and advise?

**MR. MERCIER:** Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Would the Attorney-General attempt to arrange for independent investigations, independent of the RCMP, in such instances as this, where the RCMP are the subject themselves of the investigation?

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I confirmed to the Member for Selkirk that the McDonald Inquiry would be a topic on the agenda of the Provincial Attorneys-General Meeting in June of this year in Edmonton and I think that the suggestion of the Member for Selkirk, one which I have discussed with him in the past, is a matter that should be discussed at that meeting in order to attempt to obtain a consensus among all provinces as to how they wish to approach the subject of alleged break-ins, or other allegations against members of the RCMP police force, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Did he recently attend a meeting with members of the architectural profession concerning the problems of the profession in relation to the freeze on construction?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would put that same question then as a supplementary to the Minister responsible for MHRC; did he attend such a meeting?

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I've had several conversations with different architects in this province, but I have never attended a meeting of the type that the member refers to, and if he wants to continue trying to start rumours, let him.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, there's apparently a —(Interjection)— Well, I already did ask you, and you said "No" — during our Estimates. Mr. Speaker, I would then put this question to any member of the government front bench —(Interjection)— Yes. They think it's very funny, but somebody — a series of people in their midst, including the First Minister, the Minister of Finance and others, are apparently being widely discussed in the architectural profession as having told members of the profession they will not lift the construction freeze and they do not care about the problems of people in Manitoba, and they believe that the firms are too widespread. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Elmwood have a question to ask?

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is, did any member of the government front bench attend the meeting with members of the profession at which they gave that indication to them?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Can the Minister of Urban Affairs advise us whether he has been approached by the City of Brandon for some kind of joint funding of public transportation for handicapped persons in that city?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. EVANS:** Could the Honourable Minister advise whether his government is prepared to provide joint funding for such transportation for handicapped persons in Brandon similar perhaps to the joint funding in the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, that matter is presently under review and I will undertake to report back to the Member for Brandon East hopefully early this week.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To follow up on the question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, when he replied to my earlier answer about his discussions with private agents, could he indicate whether the nature of the discussions that he held were primarily dealing with out-of-province claims or was he specifically referring to in-province claims in the general insurance field?

Monday, May 8, 1978

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I should indicate for further clarification that it was simply I believe one or two representatives, or one or two private adjustors, that approached me, as indeed anybody can approach me requesting that consideration by the Corporation be given for some additional work. My understanding is that the Corporation uses the independent adjustors in a minimal way, sometimes when they feel that there is advantage to the Corporation to do so, either because of a conflict of interest or because of out of province jurisdiction difficulties. That was the nature of the discussion and I agreed that I would indicate to the Chairman of the MPIC that the adjustors be given whatever consideration the Corporation give them from time to time.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, then the Minister is confirming that there was no firm commitment given to private adjustors that they ultimately take over the general insurance adjusting within the province.

**MR. ENNS:** No such commitment was given.

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the Day, I'd like to announce that Public Accounts Committee will be meeting on Thursday at 10:00 o'clock.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that you, Sir, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Education and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Public Works.

### SUPPLY — PUBLIC WORKS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Committee come to order. We are on Page 71 dealing with the Department of Public Works. We are on Item 3. Supply and Services, (b) Central Provincial Garage, Salaries. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, could you give us a breakdown on the salary component, the SMYs?

**MR. ENNS:** The SMYs stand at 50.31. I believe there is no change in the SMYs. There's a modest increase of \$4,700 in this vote which provides simply for the general salary increase and the annual merit increment.

**MR. USKIW:** Is that the same . . . .

**MR. ENNS:** There is one, pardon me, there is one SMY for which there was no salary provided so while the SMY positions requested remain the same, one vacancy for which this vote provides no moneys for.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering whether the Minister could indicate whether or not this is the same level as it was a year ago or whether it's down or up.

**MR. ENNS:** It is exactly the same level, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. USKIW:** Then the next question is, I presume this is the appropriate place for it, is to deal with the question of the new garage and what is to take place or what is taking place with respect to occupying the new facility and if so, what is to be done with the existing facility?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would be the first one to recognize that the question of occupying and utilizing the new facility is one of concern to the immediate staff involved. One can hardly fault staff for looking forward to moving into a new facility. The question that undoubtedly — and I'm not prepared to dispute — that among other reasons which I am prepared to dispute that led the previous administration into erecting the new garage and the structure, is one I suppose of overall policy direction and what one accepts as reasonable in growth in government in general and in this particular area of the number of cars run by the department specifically as it relates to the then need for the staff of the provincial garage to be able to look after with the quality in which we demand.

**Monday, May 8, 1978**

I might point out in this respect that in 1969 the Provincial Government ran in their car fleet some 1,200 vehicles. That increased in the ensuing eight years to some 2,400 vehicles and I, from this point of view, cannot hold or do not hold the previous administration responsible or indeed the staff advising the previous Minister on the need, the necessity, for building a new facility.

I haven't extended what kind of growth rate that represents per annum in new vehicles, and if that growth rate would have proceeded in the same manner for say, another four years, then the facilities that currently serve as the Provincial Garage would have been under tremendous stress and the new facility undoubtedly required. But, Mr. Chairman, we question the advisability or the need for that number of vehicles within the government service. There are a number of in-house, inter-departmental and outer-departmental studies going on, the government fleet appears to be a reasonably favourite target these days of investigation and of review.

And there are, of course, different options open to the government and different governments and different jurisdictions have taken different approaches to the matter of the number of cars necessary to carry out the function of government. Governments have changed their attitudes on this. The Government of Manitoba has chosen, and over the years has opted for, within a prescribed level of usage, when certain number of mileage has been driven on behalf of the public or the government by a civil servant, we have found it expedient to provide that person with a government car. I believe the range right now, or the break-even point, stands at about the 12,000 mile limit; that is, when a job being carried out by a civil servant requires him to travel in the order of 12,000 miles per year, then our experience — and this goes back over many years and spans several administrations — our experience has indicated that it becomes economical to provide that position with a government vehicle. Whether or not the tremendous growth in the last eight years, from 1,200 vehicles to 2,400 vehicles, is justified, that of course is part of the concern of the new government.

But in bringing this to the specific question asked by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I think he can acknowledge that if, in fact, a substantial reduction in the government fleet should take place, then the justification or the rationale for moving into the new facility comes under a whole new set of questions. And that's the process that we are presently in. I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that this process cannot take too much further time, that some decision will have to be made relatively shortly. We are expending certain dollars in terms of heat and light for the facility, and providing minimum security in the facility. We are using the facility currently for the storage of some redundant or surplus vehicles at the moment. We have received, partly because of the speculation, or because the coverage that the media has given this matter, many interesting offers and many interesting suggestions as to what the facility could be used for in the event that the government chooses not to use it for the purpose that it was built, but I can assure the honourable members at this particular time that no commitments that have been made, — the situation is a very open-ended one that will be resolved within a very reasonable period of time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet, then the Member for Wolseley, then the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley):** Well, I wanted to make an observation pertaining to the 12,000-mile policy. I wondered if the Minister would consider this policy possibly flexible, in light of the fact that one year the particular position might call for extra travel. If someone was doing a study in a remote area vis-a-vis an urban study, and if there would be any indication — as I say, I was very critical of the former Minister, when it was brought to my attention of a number of hearings in the country where because of the high mileage rate we were paying — that nine cars took 13 people out to Steinbach where two cars of three, a car pool system would have sufficed. I am wondering if we couldn't swing towards a moral attitude of recognition by the peer group of this type of responsibility, and if we could maybe get back to better control of mileage, then there would be a need not to buy so many government cars. And if we weren't rigidly flexible on the 12,000 miles — maybe what I am asking is, is that 12,000-mile policy flexible or is that the particular yardstick, that as soon as someone reaches 12,000 miles, they would get a government car because then there might be an incentive — for those that might be in a particular border area — to put on the extra mileage in order to qualify for the car. I'm just trying to get in my own mind what the present policy is.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the 12,000-mile usage is used as a yardstick. It isn't automatic that person driving those miles, you know, then just automatically slots into getting a car. The appropriation or the assignment of a car then goes through numerous other steps of approval within the department initially and then within management group in terms of allocation of these kinds of dollars to that job. There is also the use, for the member's information, of the pooling system within the department; most departments or groups will have a car pool for use of people that don't travel these kind of miles; nor should they be assigned a car, but can be called upon for that afternoon's necessary trip, or that one or two days a month trip where pooling of these kinds of vehicles can be utilized. What the member suggests certainly can't be taken lightly; I think it's a matter that's really being looked at right now as to whether or not we can't come up with a less costlier, that is, less costly to the public, means of moving civil servants around the province. I have asked the department and I have invited from the outside the sector, the bringing up to date what is happening in the world of leasing. Some governments have opted to go that route as in fact have some private business

Monday, May 8, 1978

corporations because of its seasonal nature. I can assure the honourable member this one thing, that we do, whatever we end up with, want to be satisfied and I would want to be able to satisfy all members of this committee and be able to show it to them in black and white and my staff will have to show it to me in black and white that the route that we choose is one that provides with the greatest degree of economy in terms of the public purse.

**MR. WILSON:** I have two more questions. One, does the Manitoba Government Employees' thing have parking as part of their working agreement or is this something that is at the discretion of the department head? My second question is, if the courts only allow 15 cents a mile, would you be able to tell me the government mileage allotment that the former Minister of Public Works allows government employees, do they get 25 cents a mile or 22 cents a mile? Is the criticism from the private sector that government is leading the way with mileage allowance one of the reasons that we're having problems in the private sector with car allowances for employees?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I can provide that information for the Honourable Member for Wolseley. I'm advised that it's on a sliding scale. I don't know whether the member was at the committee sitting when I gave a breakdown of the fleet, the different types of vehicles used from the compacts to the 9-passenger station wagons. There is a sliding scale that I can provide that information for him. I'm told that it is essentially set by Management Committee and then applicable to all departments, it's not set as such by the Department of Public Works.

His other question with respect to parking privileges being part and parcel or being part of the negotiated package with the MGEA employees, while it isn't singled out as such in the negotiations to date, I am convinced in my own mind that any sudden change or withdrawal of current privileges would likely make it into an issue around the negotiating table. The short answer to the member is that no, it is not written into the MGEA contract as such. It is one of those things that has carried over over the years which I suppose, and I would think, management side of the negotiating table should remind MGEA negotiators from time to time as being among the benefits of being employed by government because certainly, in this day and age, anybody working in the downtown area is looking at anywhere from a \$35.00 to \$50.00 or \$60.00 parking bill.

**MR. WILSON:** Right. Just to close then, the question I had, I raised it with the former Minister, is the suggestion by the private sector that government in the past has led the way with mileage allowance pertaining to the use of their automobile. I'm wondering if a study could be conducted so that government would cease and desist from leading the way and maybe follow the private sector rather than lead the private sector.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I think that among other things will be part of resolving the decision as to the future make-up and size and operation of the government fleet.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wish that the Member for Wolseley would quit attacking the Minister; it's rather embarrassing. He has one point; he seems to be arguing that the government and the department is paying too much money to individuals to operate their cars. That's what he's suggesting. And I have the figures here, they're in the Administrative Manual, that up to 4,000 miles, — there's a division between the north and the south, the 53rd parallel — up to 4,000 miles, civil servants are paid 21-½ cents; from there to 10,000 they're paid 15-½ cents; and over 10,000 they're paid 13-½ cents. But my understanding is that the department's effective rate, considering all factors, you know, gas, oil, maintenance, trade, etc., etc., is 12 cents and therefore it is worthwhile for the department to provide vehicles to individual civil servants at a particular point.

Now I'm glad that the member raised that because that's the area that I wanted to get into. The Task Force makes a recommendation that the fleet be cut; the fleet is now at some 2,400 vehicles and the Task Force says it should be reduced to 1,700, which is some 750 vehicles down. And my argument is this, Mr. Chairman, that to do this it will become more expensive, and that this is not a very good recommendation. I have a bit more to say on this, but I want the Minister to address himself to that particular point, because he has suggested in this debate, going back a month or so into early April, that he is considering reducing the fleet. Now, superficially that sounds terrific; say that to any man in the street and he'll say, "That's really good." But you know, think of what that means. If you reduce the fleet I suggest to you that two things happen; first of all, you will pay more money — and I'd like to give a specific example of that — or secondly, if you aren't going to provide either vehicles or money to civil servants to operate their vehicles, you are in effect going to reduce government services. You are going to say, in effect, that people should come to the government or that the government should not have, as part of its service to the people, going out into the area in which they work and live to communicate with them. Now, I assume that this is particularly difficult in the rural areas; in Winnipeg, presumably — or in Dauphin, if you live in the town, presumably you can find your way a mile or half a mile or a quarter of a mile, or a couple of miles to that person in the government you want access, but I assume that there are employees in the Department of Health and in Agriculture, etc., who have to do a lot of driving, and you know, Mr. Chairman, occasionally we — it came to our attention there were people putting on 30,000 miles a year and more, and one would wonder what on earth they were doing in the sense of apparently spending all their time driving their

Monday, May 8, 1978

cars. So I say that I assume that the Minister does not intend to develop a policy whereby people will come to the government as opposed to the traditional policy of representatives of the government working for Agriculture, Health, etc., go out into the community. I assume that he intends to continue that.

But I would like to focus on this one point about cutting the fleet, because cutting the fleet is something that seems to be self-evident, a good idea. And I submit that it is a very bad idea and that it will wind you up in a more costly and inefficient kind of operation than any other kind that you could have. So you know, it depends on where one wishes to start, and if the Minister, as he appeared to do some four or five weeks ago, is bent on demonstrating that the Provincial Garage isn't necessary, that will lead him into a whole series of problems. One is, he will have to dispose of a facility which was specifically designed for his own operation; secondly, he will have to pay for the operation, maintenance and upkeep of that facility until such time; third, he'll never get the price because he will have to sell at a loss initially, because it was specifically designed. But worse still, he'll cut the fleet, and if he cuts the fleet by 750 vehicles, which he's talking about, then I say that this will cost him half-a-million dollars per year more to operate. And I'll tell you roughly how I get this; I'll tell you roughly how I get it. The Task Force people — whoever put this together, this one-page feeble effort on the part of the Task Force — these people do not know what they are talking about. They simply say baldly that — it says they could theoretically reduce the size of the fleet. "Theoretically" is the word that they use — from 2,450 to 1,700, but that maybe they should aim at 1,900, and that employees should be encouraged to use their own vehicles for government business and then be reimbursed on a mileage basis. Well, I tell you if you do that that you are going to pay a half-million bucks a year more, every year that you do that in a reduction of 750. And therefore if you want to talk about a stupid policy and an expensive policy, that's the way to go.

And then there's this sweeping conclusion that comes out of nowhere about "Well, if we operate out of the present garage, blah, blah, blah, and if we adopt this kind of a policy, it would appear that the new garage is redundant." Well, that, to me, Mr. Chairman, was not a logical deduction; it was a political position. Somebody wanted to substantiate that position and then they went scurrying around trying to find some kind of a policy that would justify that so they said, "Well, let's cut the fleet. If we can cut the fleet, then we'll show that we don't need the garage." And that's how they started, and then they got themselves into that box.

I would like to give you my figures, and I give these to the Minister, and I give it to his Deputy, and I give it to his ADMs who sit behind, that if our price . . . I make a couple of points here; first of all, the average car does not travel 12,000 or 15,000 miles — if you look at the Annual Report, the average vehicle in the fleet is averaging 20,700 miles' 20,000 miles. So if you want to really have a big impact and cut the fleet significantly, then you should make it a requirement that somebody should be driving around 20,000 miles before they get a government vehicle. Because to raise it from 12,000 to 15,000, you're not going to take up 750 vehicles, that is not what is going to happen. And then, if you start paying people to drive their own vehicles, again, you pay them on the first 4,000 miles, 21-½ cents; in the north, 24-½ cents. Then to 10,000 miles you pay them 15-½; in the north, 18 cents. And then over 10,000 miles you pay them 13-½ cents and that gives you 16-½ cents in the north. So you're paying this premium over the 12 cents that we pay; it costs us 12 cents to provide a car, and many of those cars are shared by people. Many of them, when they come into their offices, as they do in the Public Works Office on Portage Avenue, 1700 Portage Avenue, those cars are, nearly every one of them is available to other members of the staff. The keys are put out and someone else can take them. They are in effect pool cars whether they are called pool cars or not.

So, whereas we pay 12 cents, in some cases you're going to be paying 21 cents, in other cases 15 cents, in other cases 13 cents, etc. etc. So you want to cut the car fleet by a third? Then that means that another 17 million miles — 16, 17 million miles — will be paid for by this method as opposed to the 12 cents. That means you're paying so many cents per mile — 3 or 4 or 5 cents per mile more to each car times 17 million, so by one calculation I get a half a million dollars. Now maybe you can get more than that. Maybe it's going to cost more than that. Let's say if you did it for a quarter — I think that's the figure I wanted originally — if you cut it by a quarter, which would be about and ½ million miles times 3 or 4 cents — let's say 4 cents — then you get up to half a million bucks a year. So, you know, this really would be a backward step. What would you do by it? You would create the impression that you have cut the number of government cars. You know, people would be impressed. They'd say, "Oh, they've cut the fleet by 700. This is really terrific. Three cheers for the Lyon Government and the Minister of Public Works." You'd be a momentary hero until you started submitting your bills for the cost of paying people to operate their private vehicles and then all of a sudden you wouldn't look so good.

So I would ask the Minister if he would like to comment on that; namely, that I suggest that this Task Force recommendation should be rejected out-of-hand, and that if he doesn't have the figures yet, if his staff hasn't had time yet, his Director of Finance hasn't provided him with this information, that he call for an immediate study, and it will be shown in black and white that this is a false measure and the wrong way to go. Now I have other questions but I'd like to hear the Minister comment on that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, this is an area where we can deal at some length in terms of what is

Monday, May 8, 1978

happening and what ought to be happening or what will happen if some particular action is taken. I reject the idea — particularly in the area of service to people — that the difference in terms of the Ag Reps' capability of servicing the public, the public health nurse, whether it's throughout rural Manitoba, northern Manitoba, has doubled in those eight years as would be suggested in the increase of the cars — from 1200 to 2400 cars. I believe that the final answer to the question and the goal that we're seeking is quite the contrary to what the Honourable Member for Elmwood is suggesting; namely, that I'm building into my Estimates an additional half million costs in excess of what our current costs are.

**MR. DOERN:** If you adopt that policy — if you adopt that policy.

**MR. ENNS:** If that's his arithmetic then I would suggest it's not much better than the arithmetic that he arrived at in determining how much Highways is going to be spending this year. But, Mr. Chairman, I think that the debate on this issue — I'll accept the critical comment from one of the members opposite to say that the facility ought to be occupied and ought to be used. That's fair game. I am suggesting to the committee that the matter is under intensive review, that no precipitous decisions are being made by this Minister or by the department with respect to the immediate future use of the facility. There are serious problems of having a facility that is, at the moment, with the reductions in the fleet apparently taking place and, you know, the member will recall that a little while ago on another matter he questioned me about what impact staff reductions have had with respect to my Estimates generally. Well, I can report to him that in the area of the car fleet some 65 to 70 vehicles have in fact been turned in and are currently in storage. A number of them perhaps belong to some of the departments that were specifically reduced in terms of staff. Some of them belonged, I suppose, to — cars that were assigned to contract employees whose contracts were not renewed.

My personal feelings in the matter are such that, along with the general re-assessing of the necessity for vehicles — and the former Minister knows full well, and I know full well — that in some instances vehicles are being assigned and they're still being assigned, I might add, to people who simply don't need them, but in some instances whose position sometimes tends to be the qualifying factor. I am not going to name individual senior personnel but I can name you a few for starters if I were pressed.

There is going to be a hard rationalizing of the need for cars. Certainly the Department of Public Works is not going to be the initiator or changing of policies as to how government services reach out to people and service people. I'm sure the individual client departments are going to insist on and demand that that service be continued in a manner acceptable and handled within the capacities of departments to carry out those programs.

I think what the honourable member should also know — and I'm prepared to speculate with the honourable member to this extent that the facility that has been built — it's built in a cadillac fashion that I would have to say the honourable former Minister of Public Works approached things, whether it was in the collection of art, or sculpture, or building of garages for Civil Service cars. The fact of the matter is that that new facility can handle some 200 cars per day, and for that reason in the original submission to move into that new facility the request for 16 additional personnel was asked, and that coming at a time when we are asking all departments to restrain their requirements, when we are in fact effecting some reductions in departments where the hurt is visible, how do you justify 16 more employees to look after, you know, increasing an unacceptable growth in the government fleet? So for these reasons a decision was made that this was certainly a subject worthwhile of study not just by the Task Force, which I remind the honourable member is a recommendation and will be treated as other recommendations, but the department within itself has gone through this merry-go-round before; I've only asked him to go through it again, keeping in mind that there have been some changes in the outside world. Some of the leasing arrangements that are now available weren't there ten years ago, and they may not be acceptable today. The honourable member shakes his head and I may well agree with him. All I can assure the honourable member is that come a year from now this appropriation will be smaller.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass; the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister, you know, is waxing eloquent but he's not answering some of the questions. I want to ask him specifically, does he intend to cut the fleet and pay private individuals to operate their vehicles? Is that going to be his solution — fewer government cars but more money to individuals to operate their cars?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am now repeating myself and there's a rule against that, I believe.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There is.

**MR. ENNS:** But I have indicated, and in fact my actions have indicated better than anything else that I am not prepared to act in a hasty manner on this subject. I'm not prepared to make decisions without the benefit of the evaluation that is currently taking place, the evaluation that I have referred to on several instances. I will also throw on the table for consideration, among the considerations is the recognition that with the increased capacity in the new garage it may be possible that in consultation with some of our other Crown agencies that are also using — and I'm referring specifically to their



Monday, May 8, 1978

passenger fleet — Hydro, Telephone, MPIC, which operate in addition to our fleet and not figured in the numbers that I've given you, and I haven't got that information yet but I'm getting it. I know that MPIC, for instance, runs an additional 55 to 65 cars which are being serviced in an ad hoc manner by individual service stations. It may well be that I will, if I can get the time to knock a few heads together at Telephones, at Hydro and at Autopac, and then say combined with the government fleet that justification can and ought to be made for the utilization and the occupancy of that garage. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I haven't any closed mind on this subject matter. I just believe that that facility with a fleet of cars, whether it's reduced to the extent that the Task Force recommends or whether it's reduced simply by the extent of tightening up of government operations by the . . . It's already been reduced by some 65 to 70 cars with no policy directions, simply because of the matter of less staff, less cars required.

**MR. DOERN:** It's a long way from 700.

**MR. ENNS:** If a further rationalization of car use within the present policy or perhaps a minor extension of when a car be allocated, say from the 12,000 mile limit to the 15,000 mile limit and we end up with a 1,800 or 1,900 car fleet as opposed to the 2,400 car fleet right now, then I would find it more difficult and more difficult to move into that 200 car a day facility, \$3 million garage, that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has left me with to worry about.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister some other points, maybe go back to that one. Was there recently an inspection by the Fire Commissioner's office or the Winnipeg Fire Department of the existing Central Provincial Garage?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman, the answer is no.

**MR. DOERN:** There was no investigation by the provincial or civic authorities in regard to the Central Provincial Garage since you came into office?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the latest inspection by the group mentioned by the Honourable Member for Elmwood took place in 1974.

**MR. DOERN:** Is it true that the existing garage at present is contrary to National Building Code requirements?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member I think himself stated at the outset of these Estimates that virtually every building, not only the government buildings but most private buildings, are contrary and not in compliance with the stringent new Manitoba Fire Code.

**MR. DOERN:** Yes, I assume that the building is in fact probably in violation of some code requirement, I'm now talking about National Building Code requirements as well.

**MR. ENNS:** I suppose the same answer would apply, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, just to anticipate future questions or further questions along this line, the decision if it were to be made to remain in the present facility would have with it some attendant costs in terms of bringing up to standard the facility to comply with these codes but, you know, the Honourable Member for Elmwood knows full well that the question is a multi-faceted one in the sense that other departments have designs on that facility. The member is aware that there has been some re-thinking again, not initiated by this Minister or this department but by the Attorney-General's Department, with respect to a possible or potential site of future new Law Courts facilities, somewhat different from those in mind by the previous administration. And perhaps the member will acknowledge that even during the course of his period of office there was always some resistance on the part of the A-G's office to move to the downtown section. That is being expressed again. There's a concern for the capability of providing a remand centre away from, and distinct and separate from the police station or the police offices. All these matters have to come into some consideration in terms of the eventual disposition of this question.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, I would just say this, Mr. Chairman, that none of those considerations would preclude using the facility, using the new facility, and I would again say to the Minister that that facility was designed in consultation with all the senior personnel in the department and with the superintendent of the garage. That garage was not designed by an architect for an architect. It was designed on the basis of need as indicated by the department and in particular by the people in the garage.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clear up some other questions that are left hanging from a month ago. I assume that most of these remarks were made in jest so, if so, I would like the Minister to clarify them because I assume he was pulling the leg of myself and members of the House and so on but I wonder if he could clarify a few points for me.

He indicated at one time that the provincial garage was going to put other garages in the area out

Monday, May 8, 1978

of business because it was going to compete with them. I assume that that was said in jest.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, knowing the bent of the previous administration, the temptation of having a facility that can dispense gasoline in a much more convenient manner than it now is convenient with a one-pump operating here and a congested downtown area with little or no room for approach or parking, it would not have surprised me, it would not have surprised me had the facility been used to retail gas.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I know now that the member was only joking. I deduce that he was only joking and I guess the other point is that I guess he now understands that there are in fact four gas pumps there, not six, that he referred to.

**MR. ENNS:** I was able to deduce that on my inspection trip of the garage and . . .

**MR. DOERN:** Your eyeball inspection.

**MR. ENNS:** . . . and I have deduced that there are four, not six.

**MR. DOERN:** Right, right. Has the Minister taken a look, has he inspected with his entourage, including members of the media, the present existing facility? Has he had a close look at that?

**MR. ENNS:** Yes, I've been in that facility numerous times since my assumption of this portfolio.

**MR. DOERN:** And did the Minister feel that, or was he not aware of the fact that there is considerable crowding and inefficiency in those quarters?

**MR. ENNS:** There is quite a bit of crowding. It would be less crowding if we didn't have those electric cars hanging around there that nobody needs.

**MR. DOERN:** Well when those are removed, would it then not still be as crowded as it was before?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the present facilities are being taxed to their limit, and that there would have to be some specific changes made within the structure itself if they were to be used for another period of time, and/or a substantial significant reduction in the amount of service they are required to do, namely a reduction in the fleet.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Well again, I would simply ask on a general basis. The Minister says that he's considering this whole question in relation to a number of variables: one is the requirements of the A-G's department, another one is the size of the staff, and I threw out a figure to him last week of \$1,500 and he didn't accept that figure. I think he felt that was too high. He now indicates that there were 65 vehicles brought in the door, and my recommendation is that he should get them out as soon as possible because he'll save money on every one of them. But again, can he indicate some time frame, because he sees this in rather simple terms ultimately, and so do I, and that is that there is a facility of \$3 million in terms of a \$2 million facility with land and so on and so on, and he's paying a rental fee of \$3,500 or \$3,600 a month to keep it empty. Is he going to make his decision in a few months, or in a couple of years? Because, if he is going to wait, until a decision is made in regard to the law courts, this could very well take a couple of years. These are sort of age-old problems. You know, when I think that the First Minister, when he was A-G was being pressed to build a law court, or extend the law courts, because of a case backlog, etc., and I'm saying, how long other than soon or some day has the Minister given himself and other factors to access the garage?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that with some of the associated studies and evaluations that are taking place, that it's not out of the order for me to have deferred making this decision. On the other hand, I am very much aware that there cannot be too much foot-dragging on this decision, because of the fact that the facility is there and not used at all is costing public dollars. I have, in my own mind, and I would hope to be able to carry that out and have the matter resolved by the end of this month.

**MR. DOERN:** By the end of this month? Okay, I believe that this could be one dealt with briefly later, so I'll let it go for now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, there's one other question there again. I'd like to know about staff.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** On (b)(2)?

Monday, May 8, 1978

**MR. DOERN:** Well, could the Minister give us the breakdown under (b) about how many SMYs last year and this year in the garage?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I gave that to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, but it's short, I can repeat it.

SMYs are constant, the same, 50.31. There is one vacancy, no increase, one vacancy for which salary is not provided. The rather modest increase of \$4,700 provides for general salary increase and the annual merit increments.

**MR. DOERN:** And the other expenditures are up about \$800,000.00?

**MR. ENNS:** In the Other Expenditures under (2) the increase is \$858,600.00. These are attributed to rise in the cost of gasoline and lubricants, general automobile repair parts, tires, Autopac premiums related to replacement vehicles. They total out an increase of \$313,900.00. In addition to that the requirement to bring the 1978-79 budget in line with 1976-77' actual expenditures required is an additional \$421,100 and net additional cost of operating new provincial garage is \$123,700 provided for in this Other Expenditure vote combining for a total of \$858,600.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(2)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** I simply say there again to the Minister that if he continues the present policy, vis-a-vis the fleet on providing vehicles at a certain breakeven point, that he'll be able to get by, but if he reverts to a policy of allowing people to drive their own cars and paying them for it of the order that we've talked about, he's going to need another half million dollars that won't be recoverable for his Estimates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(2)—pass; (c) Office Equipment Branch (c)(1) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Could we have the SMYs?

**MR. ENNS:** Page by page, Mr. Chairman?

SMYs in this appropriation is 19.37. There's been no change recorded in this appropriation. The nominal increase of \$2,100 again accounts for the general salary increase and the annual merit increment.

**MR. DOERN:** Any vacancies?

**MR. ENNS:** One SMY, although the SMY position remains as again, no funds provided.

**MR. DOERN:** I asked the Minister the other day, again, about some requirements that we had in our caucus, and I assume that he is going to, because I was asked about this today by one of my colleagues, that he's going to give the go-ahead for that Centrex System, the telephone system, and if possible, maybe give us a couple of typewriters. I mean soon, I mean like in a week or two rather than in a couple of months.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could appeal to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and if he allows me speedy passage of these Estimates, I can address my full attention to the matter, which I promise to do. That facility will be installed, workmen will be there tomorrow subject to the actions of the Honourable Member for Elmwood and the passage of these Estimates. But seriously, the question raised by the honourable member has got full clearance by staff, and I am advised that staff welcome the attention or the presence of the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and I am advised that staff is now awaiting instruction — although it makes me somewhat nervous that my staff should be awaiting instructions from the Honourable Member for St. Vital — but nonetheless they are awaiting instructions from the Honourable Member for St. Vital as to the exact placing of the new telephone facilities that we have agreed to provide for the NDP caucus rooms in the basement. The staff, Mr. Chairman, have been attempting to contact Mr. Walding for the last number of weeks — it says here — unable to do so.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, he is a very popular speaker and has quite a busy engagement calendar, so that's probably what he's doing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)(1)—pass — The Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope my name was not taken in vain in my absence, but maybe I can assist the Honourable Minister in shedding just a little light on this. I understand that the responsibility in this particular area amongst his staff has changed, that the previous man who was attending to it has either left or is not in that particular department any more.

When he did speak to me originally, and told me what the arrangements were, and how much money he had to do this particular job, and what the alternatives were, we discussed it at some length

Monday, May 8, 1978

on the phone and I came to an agreement with him as to just exactly what it was we wanted.. I understand it was a logic 20, something like that, which would enable one telephone line to go to each office downstairs through a switchboard or this logic 20 up in our caucus room office, that there would be a further three lines in our caucus room. That was the way it was left with him, when I first spoke to him a month, two months ago. I assumed that it was going ahead right from there, and it was simply a matter of waiting for them to come around and do it. And that's how it was left with us. If the impression was different from the other end, then it appears our wires have been crossed somehow. A phone call was left for me just this afternoon, to contact the new man in charge of it, and I've been attempting to do so, at least this afternoon without any luck. I hope to speak with him tomorrow to confirm the arrangements I made with his predecessor.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, all I can suggest is that the Honourable Member for St. Vital avail himself to staff here, and arrange for that meeting to take place at his convenience so that in fact the work can proceed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)(1)—pass.

**MR. DOERN:** One point here is there was talk in the Task Force about charge back systems. This seemed to be something they thought was the latest fashion, and I would just point out in passing there are a number of areas in Public Works where there is a charge back system that's been operating successfully for a long time. One is here; one is the garage, and so on.

**MR. ENNS:** No change contemplated in these Estimates, Mr. Chairman, in this respect.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)Other Expenditures—pass; (d)(1)Purchasing Bureau.

**MR. DOERN:** What are the SMYs here?

**MR. ENNS:** In (d)(1)? SMY situation here, Mr. Chairman, is 42.42, no change in the SMY situation, an increase of \$18,900 which again reflects the general salary increase and annual merit increment. No vacancies in this SMY position.

**MR. DOERN:** One question here I think that's of some interest is whether the government has any intention — I don't know if they've had any time to think about it, but they've given some contrary impressions — but do they have any intention of using the purchasing policy I suppose in a political and economic way, meaning do they intend to adopt a Manitoba preference, do they intend to encourage manufacturing in the province or producers in the province by giving a preference to locally made products? Can the Minister comment on that?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, in general, we will continue to show preference of substance to the particular area where it doesn't account for a great deal of purchasing by government, but has a particularly meaningful impact in the services provided by some of our handicapped shops and workshops and these kind of workshops, but in general, the policy of showing preferred treatment to Manitoba made products, is one that we are not prepared to pursue or follow. We do not believe it's in the public interest in terms of gaining for the public the best value for public dollars spent. I appreciate that this can be argued in terms of using the economic clout of the government to spur on or support local industry, but this tends to have as many reverse effects in the overall relationship with other provinces and with our country at large.

We on the one hand are actively attempting in many areas to be able to export our goods and services to other provinces and we generally get into a very vicious tit for tat kind of economic backbiting and fighting when this is incurred. In provinces that have adopted very distinct preferential treatment, perhaps the most notable one is Quebec, this in my judgment has cost the Quebec taxpayer dearly over the years.

I am charged with the responsibility of getting the best dollar value for goods and services required by government and I have asked the department through the Central Purchasing Bureau not to indicate any preferences. I have asked and taken particular effort that no biases and prejudices be exhibited within the department's purchasing policies, particularly those that have been drawn to some attention such as the case with Morden Fine Foods, for the purchasing of food commodities, that favour or prejudice shown by the use of brand names be not tolerated within the purchasing practices of the department. I have had discussions and indications by the department that this in fact is not taking place. But in general, the short answer to the question is, no, Manitoba does not have a preferential policy in purchasing.

**MR. DOERN:** So I assume the Minister is going to apply this policy in every aspect of Public Works, so that if a tender is called and it's one cent more for an out of province contractor, or if they're buying bulk quantities of vegetables and it's a nickel more from Newfoundland, or whatever, it doesn't matter what the item is, there will be no preferences of any kind, it'll all come down to dollars and cents and as long as one firm is one cent higher, they will run second in the competition.

**MR. ENNS:** You know, Mr. Chairman, I have gotten myself into some little difficulty with this before.

Monday, May 8, 1978

Although it's not written in the Purchasing Act, it's not graven in stone anywhere — if I can use that expression — I am a Manitoban and will show preference to Manitoba whenever I can, and I have done this in my past experience as a member of the Treasury Board during the Roblin administration where tenders can be deemed to be equal. I have had some discussions with staff — in general the honourable member is correct, but on some major and specific construction contracts — many of these, mind you, I recognize, don't fall into the area that we are now discussing. I'm talking about substantial, say, road building contracts, or waterworks contracts. I have just as my own guideline accepted where it can be reasonably argued that the tenders can be deemed to be equal, local preference will be shown.

**MR. DOERN:** Could the Minister care to quantify that within one percent. . .

**MR. ENNS:** I quantify it at one percent, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOERN:** Not five or ten?

**MR. ENNS:** No.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (d)(1)—pass; (d)(2)—pass; (e)Materials Branch, and it's now 4:30, Gentlemen. In accordance with Rule 19(2) the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour. The Committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. with the Honourable Member for Gladstone as your Chairman.

## SUPPLY—EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** I would direct the honourable members to Page 28 under Department of Education, Clause 6. Universities Grants Commission, Resolution 46. Clause 6—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Since the commencement of the debate of the Estimates of the Department of Education, we have been repeatedly asking the Honourable Minister to indicate to the Committee the new direction in which he and his government is moving in matters related to education. And, generally speaking, the Honourable Minister's answer was . . . you will recall when we dealt with the first item, that is administration, he said to us, "Wait, wait till we get down to the specific programs, we can talk about that then." Then we got to the specific programs, and the Honourable Minister on occasion said, "Well, it's really difficult to indicate the exact new or different thrust in those particular areas but again we should be patient and observe the gradual implementation and the unravelling of the various programs." And if he was pressed a bit harder, then the Minister would say to us that our question is one of a philosophic nature and that he would rather debate that under his salary.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that last Friday we heard another horror story from the Minister, and at that time the Honourable Minister did indicate the general philosophy of his government with respect to post-secondary education. And in a nutshell, what the Minister said — and he may deny that as much as he wants — but I will also attempt to refresh the Committee's memory on some of the points that he made in support of the statement because by and large what he was saying is that post-secondary education ought to be a privilege reserved for the rich and to the exclusion of the poor. And that, Mr. Chairman, is another horror story that we have heard from this government. —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Roblin again is speaking from his seat, and I am sure that he will have an opportunity to participate in the debate of the estimates of this department. And, Mr. Chairman, I say this to you because not only is that the conclusion that one could draw from what the Minister said, but it was reinforced by — and the Minister presumably is speaking for his government — but is also reinforced by two members of the backbench who, even though they do not have the direct involvement in government, are members of the Minister's caucus, the Member for Pembina and the Member for St. Matthews.

What did the Minister say, Mr. Chairman? Well, he said, "You know, the fee increase is going to hurt the rich more than the poor and it's going to hurt the rich more than the poor because there are more rich people than poor people attending university, so therefore it will hurt them more." Well, Mr. Chairman, in the twelve years that I've sat in this House, I have never heard a more ridiculous rationale than that presented by the Minister on Friday. It's very much like, as if the Minister were to say that girls lead less moral lives than boys, because statistics show that there are more girls than boys that get pregnant.

And then the Minister went on to say, "Well, if the poor can't afford to pay the increase in tuition fees, they can always get aid." And then in support of what the Minister said, two members of the backbench said, "Well, . . . And he alluded to that too, he said, "You know, a student will be more appreciative of what he receives if he has to pay for a portion of it directly." And then of course, the Member for St. Matthews got up to speak and he says he has a report that shows — a report of a study — that the cause for low attendance of the poor at post-secondary institutions, that there are many

Monday, May 8, 1978

causes other than just financial, that there is a cultural problem, that some of the poor don't really appreciate what a post-secondary education is all about, and therefore the children of the poor never reach there because some don't even appreciate the value of a high school education, hence the drop-out rate that we have.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let's take a look at some of these arguments that were put forth by the Minister and by his colleagues from the backbench. He said there are more rich than poor at the universities. Well, he's right, of course there are more rich than poor, and that's what the debate is all about, Mr. Chairman, the very fact that there are more sons and daughters of the rich than of the poor at our universities, despite the fact that the population ratio of poor to rich is quite the reverse. That's what the debate is all about; about equality of educational opportunity; equality of accessibility of our post-secondary institutions to all. And it was for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that the previous government, the New Democratic Party government had brought in a whole host of programs designed to assist the disadvantaged, to assist the native people, to enhance their employment opportunities, to train them for meaningful jobs, and thus to correct the imbalance which we had found when we became the government.

Granted, Mr. Chairman, we did not correct the imbalance in its entirety, but we sure as hell moved a long way toward correcting it, and moved a long way on programs. Mr. Chairman, I will try my best not to transgress the rules, I won't deal with this now, but will come to this later, and perhaps even during this appropriation, when we will see that this government has either cut back or scrapped in their entirety, programs designed to assist the disadvantaged.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I would suspect that one of these days, in the very near future, a student may appear on the Minister's doorstep telling the Minister that he cannot finance his way through university next year, because he needs a pair of shoes to go to university, and he may have found that the price of shoes has also increased by 20 percent, and he has no job to go out and earn himself a dollar to buy himself a pair of shoes. Well, I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister, in following the same rationale as he followed in this committee on Friday, will say to this student, "You know, young fellow, that this increase of 20 percent for the price of shoes really hurts the rich more than the poor, because look around you — all the rich people are wearing shoes, and all their sons and daughters are wearing shoes, but look at the poor people — very few of the poor people are wearing shoes, so really the increase in the price of shoes is hurting the rich more than the poor, in the same manner as the increase in tuition fees," according to his logic, is hurting the rich more than the poor. And he says, "Look at the poor people, very few of them buy shoes, like very few poor people go to university, they go bare feet, so it's the rich that are being hard hit."

And he will probably go on to say that the rich people are also being hit harder by the 20 percent increase in the price of shoes, because, look at all these rich people — they're buying \$250 a pair custom-made shoes, so 20 percent on \$250 is a \$50 increase. But look at these poor people, they're buying \$10 second-hand shoes, the increase on that is only \$2, so he is going to say that it is the rich that are being harder hit, in the same way as tuition fees are, according to his logic, hitting the rich harder. And then he's going to say, "Now, look, young fellow, if you can find the bucks to buy the pair of shoes you're going to appreciate them more, if after freezing your feet during the winter, you still have feet to put shoes on." And he will no doubt support what the Member for Pembina said, "You have to make sacrifices, you have to make sacrifices. If you find that the price of milk has gone up beyond what you can afford to pay, don't drink milk, drink water." And then he too will say, "Look, because the increase in the price of milk is hitting the rich harder than the poor, because all the rich people are drinking milk, and very few of the poor people are, so it's hitting them harder the same way that the increase in tuition fees is hitting the rich harder. And not only is the increase in the price of milk hitting the rich harder, but the price of other dairy products has gone up, and the rich people, they're eating strawberries with whipping cream, and they are eating ice cream — all of them are, the poor people aren't, so it's the rich that are being hit harder. Make another sacrifice. Transit fares too high? Well, then walk, walk from Burrows constituency, walk the 12 miles a day, walk the 12 miles there and back, walk — don't ride the bus."

Your landlord managed to get out of rent controls, well then move out, move into a vacant boxcar in the CPR yards, and sleep there. —(Interjection) — The Honourable Member for Roblin says, "Ridiculous."

You are concerned about the implementation of a User Fee in Medicare, well then, you can damn well suffer." That's going to be the Minister's reply, because that has been the reply of this government in all their actions since October 24th.

And then the Minister will probably also say, "Well, you poor people don't really appreciate the benefits and the comfort of wearing shoes, because it's not really part of your culture." And the report of the MLA for St. Matthews shows that, you know it's a cultural problem. So he's going to say, "I should start up an education program to teach the poor the benefits of wearing shoes and the comfort of wearing shoes," and perhaps he may hire the Member for St. Matthews to run that program for him.

And I should say to the Member for St. Matthews, how little he does know about his constituents, that he thinks that the reason why the sons and daughters of the poor in St. Matthews aren't attending a post-secondary education is because of some cultural problem, that they don't really appreciate what an education is all about. I'll make a deal with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, and the deal that I'm prepared to make with him is this. I'm prepared to publish his report from the Legislature to his constituents on a number of conditions: that I could include his last Friday's speech in that report, so his people know what the member whom they elected says in this House, and I want to

Monday, May 8, 1978

distribute that report to his constituents. I'll pick up the tab for the publication of it, and I would like the honourable member to come into my riding and tell my people, "Look folks, the reason why the sons and daughters of many of you have not attended a post-secondary education is because you, yourselves, don't really appreciate the value of it, don't know what it's all about, and therefore didn't give your sons and daughters the type of encouragement and motivation that they needed in order to continue with their schooling.

I want him to come into Burrows and tell my people that. Mr. Chairman, I assure you, that if he were to attempt to come into my riding and tell my people — offer that same explanation as he did in the House on Friday — he'd be tarred and feathered, and driven out the on the rail within 15 minutes after setting foot in my riding.

And the Minister of Education says, "You know, you become more appreciative of what you receive if you pay for it directly." But you know, in the same breath, he also told us that there are more children of the rich attending university than there are of the poor, so if there are more of the rich, the sons and daughters of the rich, with whose money are they paying the tuition fees? Where do they get the money to pay the tuition fees? Mr. Chairman, you and I know that it's their parents' money. So you know, that argument that that somehow contributes toward developing a greater appreciation of one's education, it just doesn't hold water.

Not only have those children paid with their parents' money, but you know, they and their family, they reap a double benefit. The father, the parents, they have already received a tax benefit from this government. They are in the \$20,000, \$25,000, \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 income bracket; this government has already looked after them and has given them a tax benefit. Then, in addition to that, that student who probably was fortunate enough in getting a job, because I'm sure that the private sector will look after him this summer, you know, with the grants that the government is offering the private sector to create jobs, or if not, in the father's own company he will get a job — so he shows a taxable income, and he will deduct the tuition fees which he didn't have to pay with his own money from that taxable income and thus reduce his taxable income, so he reaps another benefit because by the increase in the tuition fees it gives him a greater reduction from his taxable income which again is worth \$20 or \$30 or more in total tax reduction, federal and provincial to him. In the meantime, that poor kid, coming to the Minister's office, complaining that he can't buy a pair of shoes, he's got to pay the whole shot.

You know what that government's been saying when they brought in their income tax bill? They said that even an amount as little as \$500, you know, they have to pass this legislation because if they don't, over a matter of 500 bucks we're going to find droves of businessmen leaving the province. Well, has this government thought about that poor student who probably in the forthcoming year will be faced with increased expenditures of at least \$500, at least \$500, on zero dollars income, on zero dollars earnings. The price of milk is going up, tuition fees are going up, transit fares are going up, the student aid entry level has been increased, not to mention the fact that he'll probably want to save a few bucks in case he takes ill, because if he takes ill he knows that his laundry isn't going to be washed and the bedding isn't going to be washed, so he'll probably have to pick up the tab for the laundry bill to wash his own sheets, because the Minister of Health isn't going to wash them all that regularly. So he'll want to put away a few bucks.

But the government isn't concerned about that fellow; not concerned about the possible — are they asking themselves if the \$500 tax benefit is going to keep that businessman in the province? Well, by not extending similar benefits to the person at the lower end of the scale, maybe he might up and leave the province, maybe he might leave and thus deprive the province to that extent of the human resources that it had. Are they concerned? No. Why are they not concerned? Because they know damn well that the poor people are stuck, that's why they're not concerned. The businessman is in a different category, the businessman can up and move if he wants to. Not that he's going to move for that \$500, if he wouldn't have got the \$500 tax break from this government. But they know that it's easier for him, that he is more mobile than that poor student is. And so the government knows that as far as that poor student is concerned, the government can screw him all it wants and he's going to be around because he doesn't have the resources, the funds with which to move.

Now, if that student still insists that he needs a pair of shoes to go to university, the Minister will tell him, "Now, look, young fellow, you can apply for shoe aid, you know. We can give you aid, you can go to any bank and apply for shoe aid. You can borrow." Now, it's true that a portion of the Student Aid Program is forgivable, that is, the bursary portion, but nevertheless, after all is said and done, depending on his level of need, he is still going to be saddled with a debt upon graduation. Whereas the sons and daughters of the rich are off scot-free plus the tax advantages that they have gained along the way.

Mr. Chairman, this has been the philosophy demonstrated by this government, typical of all their programs. So it's becoming increasingly apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the objective of this government is to provide more for the rich at the expense of the poor. And we'll be watching, Mr. Chairman, as we move through this item, as we move through the remaining items, and we'll see further evidence of it, and it's that type of treatment of the people of Manitoba that is the horror story. That is the horror story, Mr. Chairman. That's the new direction of this government, that's the new direction of this Minister. That's the new direction of this Minister as far as post-secondary education is concerned, to reserve it as a privilege for the rich.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister continues in this same vein, it wouldn't surprise me one of these days to find him give a capital grant to the universities to enlarge their parking lots, to enlarge the stalls in the parking lots to make room for chauffeur-driven limousines driving the students to and

Monday, May 8, 1978

from university, because those are going to be the only ones left. The Honourable Minister told us on Friday that as far as the poor student is concerned, well, he can borrow, and secondly, there's very few of them who go to university so it's not really that great a problem. So it's going to become a club reserved for the rich, so then he'll have to provide proper accommodation for them.

So, it's very obvious that that is the priority of this government, to look after the needs and interests of their friends and their supporters who obviously are not the poor but the rich and it is in that fashion that this government is moving. And as I said at the outset, the rationale that the fee increase is going to hurt the rich more than the poor because there are more rich students than poor students attending university, you know, that just shocks and appalls me.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 6—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to address a few comments in a general way to the Grants Commission. Later on I would like to address some comments on the Inter-Universities North Program but I will let my colleague from Churchill lead off on that subject.

The Minister of Colleges and Universities, or Continuing Education, has a very real problem. I am sure that he does not want to see students not have the opportunity to go to university; I am sure he does not want to see universities provide less than a full university education, and yet he is part of a government that could care less, that could care less about these things, whether everyone has an opportunity for further education, whether the university education is at a reasonable level or not in the Province of Manitoba. So he is caught up in a government that has that kind of attitude, and some day he is going to have to face up to the fact that he is now that government, that he is part of that government, that he is the Minister responsible for the reduction of education in the Province of Manitoba, that he is the Minister responsible for the fact that fewer people have access to the educational institutions in our province. Some day when that realization hits him, that he is carrying out a policy that is going to hurt education in Manitoba, perhaps at that time he will look at his position and decide if that's what he really believes in, if that's what he wants for education in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard considerable discussion on the tuition fee increases and how those fee increases relate to middle and lower income people, to the children of working people in the province of Manitoba, and I think that it's fairly correct to say that for the most part students from working families, students from poor families have not had full access to the university system although I don't think it's quite as simple as the Member for St. Matthews who wants to believe something, who wants to believe something, that somehow the policies of this government will not hurt the poor students and the students of working class families in this province. He seizes on a report and closes his mind and there is nothing else can enter it now because he has one piece of evidence to pin his anxiety on, that in fact there may be some effect on working class students and working class families.

But there is some validity to the argument and I think that the . . . But if this government were pursuing an avenue whereby more and more people would have access to university, more and more people would be able to go to university while having this small increase in tuition fees, then I don't think that the overall effect would be that bad, would be that negative. But, at the same time they are pursuing this policy that causes an increase, creates an increase in tuition fees, they are also cutting other programs, reducing other programs that make sure people get to the stage where they are able to use that university education. Such programs, Mr. Chairman, as the Focus Program, or the Extension Program, or the Metis Federation Education Program, or Assistance to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood in terms of education, or the Inter-Universities North Program, or the Confluent Education Program, or the Special Mature Students Programs, or the Regional Psychological Services for schools. If all these programs weren't being similarly affected, then perhaps you might have some optimism and you might have some belief that they weren't harming the opportunities of the young people in the Province of Manitoba or the opportunities of the older people of Manitoba who wish to return to university as some of us elderly ones decide to do from time to time.

But then they come to another stage. Well, the fee isn't going to hurt that much because we have the Student Aid Program and the Student Aid Program surely will pick up those people that are not able to afford these tuition increases. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, there are certain restrictions being applied to the Student Aid Program as well. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from an editorial in the Manitoban of Monday, March 27th, 1978.

"Student Aid Soap Bubble — Fiscal responsibility can take on weird and wonderful forms, especially under the present government. Few can be as strange though as the current policies in Student Aid and the justifications that the Student Aid Branch uses for them. It now seems almost lost amongst the forms and recipients and red tape that a student has to go through but Student Aid was originally designed to help students to get to university. It had this high-sounding purpose, that no student should be denied access to post-secondary education for purely financial reasons. It was going to ensure that universities wouldn't remain the sole abode of the well-to-do but would even admit a few working class students. The myth has been growing more and more insubstantial over the last few years despite student efforts to humanize the Aid system. The current government cutbacks are really only the final gust that blew it apart. Sure, low income students can still go to university if they are willing to assume a crippling debt load after graduation with no promise of a job (much less a high paying one) and if they are willing to amass the absurd amount of documentation Student Aid requires. But I doubt if very many are willing to surmount those barriers and I would



question why they should have to.

"Red Tape: First the documentation. Certainly no one supports those who rip off the system and use their Aid money to go skiing, however, how far is Student Aid justified in finding who these cheaters are? If the current administration was asked, they would probably say, "To any lengths." In saying that, however, they ignore the effect that this protection has on the great masses of students who don't cheat. Over the last few years, the amount of paper students have had to send in to justify their application for aid has been steadily growing. Last year, for instance, single students had barely started when they finished filling out their four page application form. Then if they were considered dependent upon their parents, their parents would have to fill out a form P to show how much they would support the student, would have to fill out a form TR to allow Student Aid to see their income tax records and would have to . . ."

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, on 7.(b) Student Aid, are we on that particular line at this time?

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, certainly we're under your direction. The arguments that I've used in terms of the reduction in funds to universities that have caused a cutback, that have caused a cutback in the university program and that have caused an increase in student fees, in tuition fees, the members opposite have justified on the basis, "Well, they can still pick it up through Student Aid." I'm showing them the problems there are in picking it up through Student Aid. I'd be quite willing to repeat these comments again when we get to the Student Aid section if the Minister so wishes. So, Mr. Chairman, if it's agreeable to you that it relates to the debate that's been going on for the last two days, I'll continue from the editorial if I can find my place.

"If the parents were self-employed, they would also have to fill out Form X to give their self-employed income. It's unfortunate for some students that their parents do not wish the Student Aid Branch to look at their tax records. If these students were able to get anything from Student Aid, it would be only after an extremely protracted struggle. After finishing all this, the students then had to trek down to the university to have the Registrar's office complete Form A to show that they were really enrolled. After this, one must pity any students who become entangled in the coils of Student Aid Audit Branch whenever by random audit or by an aid officer's hunch they even have to provide more documentation. This may be a bureaucrat's dream but it appears differently to the harried student. What's even more worrisome is that this trend is continuing. Next year's students will have their employers complete a form stating their summer earnings. The form must be completed and sent off to Student Aid by a month after the student finishes the job. I pity any student who can only find temporary work of one or two week's duration next year. It would be fun for them to collect their six or ten statements of earnings from their different employers. The students who worked up north won't have it much easier. If they forget to get that form filled out while they are still up there, they may have problems ever getting it filled out. But the Student Aid office will, of course, justify all this red tape with a tag of fiscal responsibility. They can't allow cheaters even if they do hassle all their true clients unreasonably. One could even draw an interesting parallel between these students and many of the government supporters from business. They are complaining bitterly of excess government regulations and form filling. If the government considers their complaints, they might also consider those of the students.

"Loans: Secondly, loans — Student Aid director, Rick Kleiman, has told me that he does not believe loans are a deterrent to coming to university. So far as he's concerned, that's just off the mark. In saying so, he does contradict a study done by his department last year which concluded that the aversion to taking out loans were the main reason for a 12.4 percent decline in applications in 1976-77. Kleiman pointed out that students from lower income families will get a greater amount of Student Aid. Quite true, but that's not the point. He said that student loans are a far better deal than those usually available to students from banks. Again true, and again not to the point. The point is that a student, especially from low income families, question having to borrow \$4,000 or \$8,000 for an education especially when they have no guarantee of a job at the end. Their degree may even cut them off from jobs if they are considered over-qualified. It takes an awful lot of motivation to take on that kind of debt. Even those who want an education and may benefit exceedingly from it, might quail at the prospect.

I asked Kleiman whether he thought students would be able to repay these kind of debts given the current economic situation and the availability of jobs. He pointed out that students have ten years in which to repay these loans and said that his economic optimism was such that I think they should be able to repay it in ten years. So I projected a mythical Art student who took a B.A. honours in philosophy wishing to expand his or her mind. After four years this student had taken out \$8,000 in aid, about half of which was given as deferred bursary. Like many students these days, this student wasn't able to find a job immediately. He or she had to use the deferred bursary money for food and rent, as Kleiman suggested could be done. Eventually after a year, this student found a job as a check-out clerk at the U of M libraries. Now, library workers at the U of M are not extraordinarily well paid. In fact, this student's job didn't pay much over \$7,000 a year. On this salary he or she is not looking forward to paying nearly \$1,000 a year with interest for the next ten years. Unless the student can find a better paying job soon, he or she won't be living very comfortably at all or maybe, unlike Kleiman's optimistic forecast, he or she won't be able to repay the loan at all.

"What makes this even worse is the recent changes in the bursary to loan ratio which means that

students will be able to take out an even greater amount of loans for the same amount of aid. Kleiman said this compensates for inflation. I say it compensates by putting the burden of inflation on students but again this is fiscal responsibility. I think I am beginning to dislike that phrase." So reads the editorial in the Manitoban.

So there's one aspect, Mr. Chairman, of the other options to deal with the fee increase at the Manitoba universities and at the Manitoba community colleges.

Although we've discussed quite a bit the effect of the this government's program cuts and financial cuts on the student and the student tuition fees, I don't think we've dealt enough on how it's going to affect programs and programming at our universities. Will our universities still be able to provide the type of education that they have been providing in the past to the young people of the Province of Manitoba?

Again, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to call upon the University newspaper for some discussion of this particular subject and I'll start with another editorial, this one in the Manitoban of Monday, April 3rd, 1978.

"We Have to Process, by Elaine McGregor. The Board of Governors displayed its supreme talent for getting trampled on Tuesday when it approved a 20 percent tuition fee increase for students and a cut in funding for faculties. It knows perfectly well that some students won't be able to afford to come to university with the increased fees. UMSU president, Carol Dubrough, has pointed out to them numerous times, including at the board meeting itself, even President Ralph Campbell has said that any increase above 18 percent would have serious social cost of discouraging enrolments of students, especially those from university families." Mr. Chairman, that seems to go against what the members opposite have been maintaining in this discussion. "And it knows perfectly well that the cuts in the faculty budget will mean program and course cuts, loss of professors and support staff and an inability to start new programs and to encourage innovations. It knows that ultimately this will affect the quality of university and decrease its excellence. One can sympathize with the plight of the board though. They found themselves in an untenable situation. They couldn't run a deficit and they didn't have enough grant money from the government. What they should have done was throw the grant back in the government's face and tell it it had the choice between closing the university or funding it adequately. They didn't have a enough guts. Instead they chose the easy way and started us down the road to becoming a Canadian cow college. This lack of intestinal fortitude makes it all the more urgent that students, faculties, support staff, administrators, everybody on campus, be out on April 6th to show the government that we don't stand any longer for their idiotic meat chopping. (It is no longer fat cutting because there is hardly any fat left to cut.) Unless we get out there and protest the government will think we can be as easily sat on as the board."

So, Mr. Chairman, that's an editorial in relation not only to student fees but in relation to the level of program, the level of opportunity at the universities within the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, the Minister had the audacity to attend a meeting at the University of Manitoba and apparently he said that the grant really isn't a cutback because there was a slight percentage increase, therefore it wasn't really a cutback, ignoring the fact that all programs at the university will be at about 97 or less percent that they were formerly at in the past. But, Mr. Speaker, maybe we'd better deal with the Minister's comments again from the Manitoban and this time Monday, April 3, 1978.

"Grant Really Isn't a Cutback — Cosens, by Doug Smith. At a Campo forum on Friday, the impact of the province's grant to the U of M, Education Minister Keith Cosens reprimanded a student who called the grants a cutback. The students replied that Cosens must realize that 1 percent increase amounted to a decrease when inflation is considered. To this, Cosens replied, 'Well, we gave you an increase in dollars.' Cosens, who was booed when he rose to speak, said, 'The government did not take any pleasure in the restraint measures it was being forced in to, but it had to in light of the deficit that had been left by the NDP.' He said, 'Education had received the same level of funding increase as Health Services and was one of the government's priorities.' Cosens also said, 'The government might be reconsidering an earlier decision to cut summer jobs for students by 38 percent.' He said that while the province intended to remove the rent control program, it could ensure that people on low and fixed incomes would not be hurt by the increases the landlord made."

Well, Mr. Chairman, when the New Democratic Party was in government, there was a small protest out here from the various universities because the universities had hoped for some increase in funding, some increase in programming, some increase in expenditures to further improve the quality of education available to the people of Manitoba. And, Mr. Chairman, everything they wanted was not granted. There was restraint in effect, but Mr. Chairman, what we are looking at here today is ridiculous, it's ridiculous. A one percent increase is a decrease in the funding available to universities, and that funding is going to affect the quality of education available to students in the Province of Manitoba. And, Mr. Chairman, somehow a few of the Ministers in fact were even fooled by their own colleagues — "Look, you guys, we know you don't want to do this, we know your Minister of Education, we know your Minister of Health believe that your programs are worthwhile, believe that these programs are necessary to the people of Manitoba, but because of this huge NDP deficit, we're going to have to reduce these programs."

And, Mr. Chairman, I wonder how those Ministers feel now, when finally it comes out, it's worked out, it finally slips out from the present government, that they weren't really talking about a deficit, they weren't really talking about the kind of deficit they had pretended and played with in order to cut the programs, in order to do the kind of program cut that they wanted to do. So, Mr. Chairman, I think

it's up to those Ministers who might be a little bit progressive, who might believe that some programs should continue, who might believe that some programs are a benefit to people of Manitoba, that they now stand up to their colleagues, who really want to cut back on programs. And, Mr. Chairman, they have a problem, because there are some of those members opposite there that just don't believe in education. They don't believe that education is a good thing and they have quite a hangup that there should be people who are well educated and better educated than they are. And this is one reason why it's not hard for the First Minister to cut budgets in the area of education, because many of his colleagues think that's a good thing. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I think with some of the education cutbacks that affect northern Manitoba, I think that it reflects a basic Conservative election program, a basic Conservative policy to get elected, because they seem to believe that if you keep the people ignorant, they'll vote Conservative, and that's a philosophy they seem to be following in northern Manitoba, cut all the programs of adult education, cut all the educational programs in the north, and therefore we'll keep the people ignorant and they might vote Conservative. And I think there is some validity to that, because the more and more people learn about the world around them, the less and less likely they are to vote Conservative because the Conservatives represent a very small and elite group within the Province of Manitoba, and within Canada as a whole. And people are going to learn that, and maybe the Conservatives are very smart in not letting people learn that, to cut any educational programs that might help them to learn that.—(Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, the budget cuts at the University will affect all the sections of the University, and again I would like to . . . I am assuming that the Minister is very busy and he doesn't have time to read all the materials that come to members opposite, and we have an opportunity to read, because he's so rushed in his job, and since we have him trapped in here right now and he has to listen to what is being said, I would just like to review for him some of the material he has probably already received but probably hasn't had time to read yet.

Mr. Chairman, this comes from the Manitoban of Tuesday, April 11th, 1978, "Budget cuts will hurt everyone. It's going to hurt. That was the reaction of most deans and directors to next year's budget cuts in a survey by the Manitoban last week, and although some expected to be able to maintain the quality of their programs, others were less sure.

Administrative studies — there will probably be fewer sessional lectures and teaching assistants in administrative studies next year because of the reductions, according to Dean John Mundie. 'However,' he said, 'the Faculty does not plan any layoffs of full-time professors or support staff.' He said, 'He did not believe the faculty's research or its quality would be immediately affected though he thought in the long run, sabbatical leave for professors might have to be curtailed.

"Agriculture — in Agriculture the cutbacks will mean layoffs of almost all special academics including graduate TAs, one or two extra teaching staff and two technicians according to the Dean. The layoffs will be the equivalent to three of four full-time positions, he said, and since the faculty's enrollment is still growing, he said it makes it that much more difficult to maintain the quality of our program. Anytime you reduce the total number of staff, you automatically reduce quality to a certain extent. However, the expected quality would probably not decrease this year, saying it hinges upon the faculty's research support. Both the National Research Council and the Canadian Department of Agriculture, have slightly increased their funding this year, and if the Manitoba Department of Agriculture at least maintained its grant, they expected the grants would take up some of the faculty slack."

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Department of Agriculture maintained its grants, but the feelings expressed by the Dean of Agriculture are somewhat like those expressed by the First Minister.

"If people are unemployed in the Province of Manitoba they could go on Unemployment Insurance. Unemployment Insurance is paid by the Federal Government, and therefore it was a reduction cost to the province. Reduce education costs and perhaps they can pick up some of these lost funds from the Federal Government and again transfer problems to the Federal Government from the Provincial Government.

"Architecture — According to Dean G.M. Anderson, there won't be any layoffs of full-time staff next year in Architecture. However, we expect fewer teaching assistants and special academics. He did not expect any cuts in courses next year but said that this was the next step. With another few years like the next one, he said, the Faculty would look to eliminating whole programs, not just courses. The Faculty's capacity for undertaking research will also be affected by the reduction, Anderson said. However, he said, the Faculty was suffering more from cutbacks in capital funds than from the loss of operating funds. Our big problem is space, we're being hung by capital and not by operating budget at this time. The Faculty has been cramped into trailers and odd spaces around campus for many years now, and Anderson said it had hoped the current budget would give it some relief. But now this seems less likely than ever."

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Faculty of Architecture would probably be quite wise to reduce its programs, because there is just not that much employment for architects in the Province of Manitoba, since October 11th, 1977.

"School of Art — the cutbacks will cause the School of Art some difficulty according to Director A. Hammer, but he did not expect any layoffs because of them. The main reason for this, he said, was that a senior faculty member of the school was retiring this year who will not be replaced. We should be able to end up in the position where we are now except for one less staff.

"Arts — According to Dean F.G. Stambrook, Arts will lose three part-time Faculty, five to six full-time Faculty, and one support staff member next year, all by attrition. It will also have eight to ten percent

Monday, May 8, 1978

less money to spend on teaching assistants. Ongoing research, especially in anthropology and psychology, will be affected by the lack of money for equipment. Some courses in French Canadian History will not be offered because that specialist has left, he said, and the several courses, especially those in German, may have larger numbers of students in each section.

"Dentistry— Dentistry will lose three support staff positions and most of its funding for special academics because of the cuts, according to Dean S.M. Borden. He doubted they would affect the Faculty's accreditation, but said they would mean fewer dental assistants which is bound to affect the quality of teaching. Although we can absorb it this year, it's very unlikely we can absorb a cut of this magnitude next year and still function.

"Education — Education will lose the equivalent of three Faculty positions, according to Dean E.D. MacPherson, and will have to discontinue part of its basic program in Music because a professor is leaving and cannot be replaced. As well, he said, we'll lose four to five teaching assistants and will tighten supplies and equipment considerably. No staff cuts are planned, he said, because they have already been cut in the last two to three years. Budget cuts are acerbated in Education, MacPherson said, because the Faculty's enrollment have been growing rapidly at the same time budgets are lessening.

"Engineering — The Dean of Engineering was not available for comment.

"Graduate Studies — Grad Studies are hurting, says Dean M.S. Aftanas, it's at a point where it's more than tightening the belt. The Faculty has been cutting back for the last two or three years, he said, and has already laid off staff. One problem he mentioned was budgeting for outside assessments of new programs which have to be made before a new program can be approved. Each assessment can cost four to five thousand and the Faculty has no control over when a department or Faculty asks for a program. Thus, he said, this might really squeeze the grad studies budget.

"Home Economics — Research and Community Service in Home Ec will suffer because of the budget cuts, according to Dean B. McDonald. That's because one part-time Faculty member and an unknown number of teaching assistants will probably have to be laid off, he said. If there are less teaching assistants, he said. . ."

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member has one minute.

**MR. McBRYDE:** The budget cuts affecting the University of Manitoba, similarly affect the other universities and maybe I'll have a chance further, Mr. Chairman, to comment on some of the effects of these budget cuts.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 6.—pass; Resolution 46—pass — The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

**MR. LEN DOMINO:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been listening to the Member for Burrows and the Member for the northern constituency, and what they have said has interested me to some extent, but I think that the whole House should be aware and we should take their comments in the context of what the Member for Inkster, he's a much more prominent member of their Party and I think who lays down Party lines for them, what he said last week in response to some of my comments. He said that I was a fool for assuming that it was possible to discuss issues in this House to try and approach them in a non-partisan manner, so that we might come up with some better answers to some of the questions we're asking. They laughed at me, and he said, "You should remember one thing, that every word said in this House is said in terms of the context that we're fighting the next election now." And that's the only way I can accept the members opposite what they've said, other than the fact that they may just be completely ignorant of the education system in our province.

Now the former Minister of Education got up and I think he distorted what I said. Now I'm not sure that I wouldn't want to accuse him of deliberately distorting, I think part of the problem may be that he just doesn't understand the basic social economic structure of our province and what's happening here in terms of education and what's happening in this province in terms of University students and who goes to University. Let me repeat for him, let me try and summarize what I said because I think it was clear and simple and wasn't at all the way he interpreted it. I said in effect that most University students at present come from upper and middle-class incomes. Okay? And I said that reducing or, if you reduce tuition fees to nothing, you would not substantially change that. What this government has done, is we have reduced the subsidy to those upper and middle-class or middle income students, we've reduced the subsidy from 91 percent to about 96 percent for their education. And at the same time we have increased and we have supplemented the Student Aid Program on the basis of need. So, he says things like, that everything this government has done, has done more for the rich at the expense of the poor.

I spoke last Friday because I think that this particular education debate points out the fact that we're asking all sectors of society to take some restraint. We're asking everybody to take a bit of a burden. There's been a lot of talk of the architects; we're asking them to bear some of the brunt of restraint. I'm not getting a salary increase this year, and if it must be known, I'm working a lot harder than I worked last year for the same salary.

**MR. LAUNT L. DESJARDINS:** You just started working. You're overpaid now, for crying out loud.

**MR. DOMINO:** The effects of the tuition fee increase hit the upper and middle income families. Take

Monday, May 8, 1978

a look at what they did in England, they reduced tuition fees completely and they did not substantially change the income level of those who go to university.

I spoke to Professor Rennie, head of Sociology at the university. He told me the same thing. It's not just one article, one report I pulled out like the Member for The Pas suggests. I think it's a basic fact accepted by most educated people, most learned people in this province, that the tuition fees, difference between \$400 and \$500 will not substantially change the kind of person that goes to university. All we're doing is asking those who can afford to pay a little more, and when we've increased the bursaries, the bursaries and the grants and loans on the basis of need to try and help that small percentage of the families who are low-income people so they can go. Now as a person who is still paying for his university loans — because I don't have rich parents — as a person who still pays every month to pay off my university education I don't think that's so heinous or so horrible.

There was also some comments made about the Student Aid Program, and there are lots of problems with the Student Aid Program and I realize it, and most of those problems stem from the fact that some of those upper and middle income children get student aid, and it results in bitterness amongst the children who are low-income families who say, "Damn it, if we could have stopped Johnny whose parents make \$40,000 between them, if we could have stopped Johnny from getting Student Aid maybe there would have been more to help me." And lots of those kids in my constituency have come to me and said things like that, and I would think that there's a good reason for the bureaucratic red tape that some people have to go through.

Now it just happened that there were a couple of university friends of mine in the House today who were watching from the gallery, and others who were visiting me today, and I sent a note out to them and I asked them when the member was speaking about university red tape and reading from the Manitoban, a newspaper that has a reputation for exaggeration. I could read to you articles about the previous government that wouldn't make you very happy. That newspaper — it's a university newspaper — and university students are known for exaggeration and for being a little flamboyant. I asked the students who were out in the corridor, I asked them and they sent a note back into me — they said to me, "It didn't take us longer than 20 minutes to fill out the form and that was the extent of it, and damn, we're glad that we're able to fill out that form and get some help from the government."

Now, there was talk about the university and how the universities are going to suffer from the cuts. I think we should understand first that university is still basically a place for middle and upper income people, not the poor. I think that's accepted by everybody. I would like to see that changed, but I don't think you'd do that by reducing tuition fees. You take money from somewhere else and you pour it into other programs to encourage children to go to university. You improve the education system in the core area. You improve the whole community in the core area and you might help a little bit.

Now, I think that when you're talking about university professors and people who work at the university you're talking about people in many cases — in most cases — who, if you combine their university income and their income they receive in the five months of the year they don't teach, you combine those two incomes and most of them would fit the Member for St. Johns' definition of upper and middle income people — over \$25,000 a year.

Another group of people were asked if they could put up with a little restraint. We're not asking the person working at \$12,000 a year to put up with restraint in this particular case; we're asking a university professor who works seven months of the year for a salary much larger than mine, in most cases.

Now, he quoted from some students at the university and a university newspaper article about how horrible the cutbacks would be. There would be a part-time lecturer let go here, there would be a part-time person let go here, one staff member out of 37 might have to find a job somewhere else. I want to quote from Dr. Hugh Sanderson, a man who was the president of the University of Manitoba from 1954 to 1970. I want to quote what he says about this. First off, he says that universities don't always spend their money wisely, and we accept this, and that there is waste in universities, and there is fat that can be cut. But let's go on. He says further, "Universities have built up expectations of continual largesse from governments that aren't now being realized, but if they can't live on what they're getting they have no business being in operation." And that's a man who ran a university and continually improved the quality of education in that university from 1954-70, some years when there weren't always large increases. He goes on further to say "The quality of education won't be drastically reduced unless the members of the faculty decide they want to drastically reduce it." These are quotes, April 24th, the Winnipeg Free Press. —(Interjection)— Fine, the Free Press is biased. I think it has a better record of objectivity than the Manitoban.

Now we heard some comments in this House which I have to think are electioneering and distortion because the member opposite couldn't possibly believe them — things like, I have to imply that my constituents were ignorant for electing a Progressive Conservative. My constituents have a lot more intelligence than most members opposite. They realize what's good for them. They realize that unless we have a strong economy there's no help for the low-income people. That's the only help. The only other alternative is to live on government largesse and to be at the continual whim of these bureaucrats. And you think the government Student Aid Program is bad? Wait till you have to get all your income year after year and your house and everything else from the government — see how many forms you're going to have to fill out. The people in my constituency are hard-working people and what they want is a little more efficiency out of their government. That's all they want and that's why they voted for me. And if the Member for Burrows is so confident I would challenge him to

Monday, May 8, 1978

leave that little rotten borough of his and come run in St. Matthews next time and we'll see what happens. Make room for one of the women that should be in this House. Give them a nice easy ride for a change.

Now we heard talk about the Conservatives being anti-education. No party in the history of this province has done more for education in Manitoba at the community college level, at the university level, and at the public school level. We have a long and proud history. We did a good job. — (Interjection)— Anti-women, someone says. Huh, the only members of this House who have been women sit from our side. You people are proud of giving women the nomination — yes, in places like River Heights where it's difficult to win. I would suggest that most comments made opposite, the members are simply hurting their own credibility, and I would ask them again if they want to make a real contribution to this debate they're going to have to temper some of this rhetoric. They're going to have to try and make some realistic criticisms. If they want to make the point that we're a party of the rich, not a party of the poor, they're going to have to find some more substantial evidence because the evidence cannot be found in the Estimates of this department. They cannot be found. So if you guys are fighting hard, fighting hard for the next election — great! But I'll tell you one thing, people don't appreciate politicians that play games all the time. They want some politicians that are seeking to solve the problems of the people of this province; not their own personal problems. They're not thinking to get back into their \$33,000 a year jobs. Keep that in mind if you want to come back, or else we may just have to fill up the rest of the House with our members too.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Member for St. Matthews with great interest and he has a — I have to compliment him — he has a very good faculty for twisting things around to suit his purposes, and he does it very successfully. He says correctly, which no one denies, and has never denied, and this is not unique to Manitoba but throughout the western world, that students from middle income and upper income groups are the ones who, in the majority, attend university. That's right. They are the ones whose home atmosphere and the aspirations of this is taught from childhood, think in terms of the maximum education possible because of family background, because of family motivation. But he's satisfied with that apparently. He's saying. "Yes . . ."

**A MEMBER:** He didn't say that!

**MR. MILLER:** He is saying, they're the ones who go anyway, so we're simply saying instead of . . .

**MR. DOMINO:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege — (Interjection)— . It is so. I didn't say that!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The honourable minister on a point of privilege.

**MR. DOMINO:** I did not suggest that I'm satisfied with seeing only the rich in university. I suggested you have to look for different tools of getting the poor in there. Cutting the tuition fees is simply a simplistic vote-getting type of approach.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, I repeat. He said the upper and middle income groups have traditionally gone to university in the majority, that they will continue to, and in his opinion tuition fees are not a deterrent. And therefore he is saying that if they raise the tuition fees nothing will change; the upper and middle will still go, the lower income will not go because they haven't gone in the past.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that they haven't gone, and how do you get them to go? How do you change it? And, of course, it's not that simple as simply raising or lowering your tuition fees. I know that and he knows it as well as I. It's far more of a social problem than simply the raising of tuition fees. But, Mr. Chairman, what is happening by raising the tuition fees is that it is a deterrent to another marginal group who can and will be deterred because it isn't just the increase of \$100.00 in tuition fees. That isn't what the cost of going to university is. It's textbooks. It's getting to school every day. It's the fact that there's no income flowing into that family home when a son or a daughter goes to university. Now maybe my son can go to university and I don't care if there's no income flowing into the home due to his efforts, but there's tens of thousands of people in this province who, if their son or daughter goes to university, are therefore giving up the income which that son or daughter might contribute to the family home and which they need because there are other children coming up, particularly one of the older children. So to say that it's not a deterrent is absolute nonsense. It is.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind people here that a few years ago something was done in Manitoba — it's not unique Manitoba — where previously Grade 11 was the level from which people could go to university, and then it was found that the need in our modern technological society for higher and higher levels of education, Grade 12, which became first something of choice, a voluntary thing — you could go go Grade 12 in order to save the cost of university — you could take it at high school, and, of course, you could save yourself a year at university therefore, it became a standard, a norm, and Grade 12 became a necessary level in the high schools in order to qualify for university entrance. And that was done because it was recognized that there was a need for the

**Monday, May 8, 1978**

general population, everyone, to try to get that level up. And we know that there are children who drop out at age 16 and never go on to Grade 12, but that didn't alter the fact that it was felt necessary, desirable, for society as a whole to raise the level of education for young people leaving high school, and not just Grade 11 but that Grade 12 would be the desirable level. And in order to make it possible, in order to make it acceptable, they simply moved to put it into the high schools. There was no suggestion that everyone should therefore go to university — they moved the other way — Grade 12. Maybe the Member for St. Matthews thinks that the next step will be a Grade 13 in Manitoba for those students, as in Ontario, for those students who find it very expensive to go to university, could then get another year of their university credit by taking Grade 13 and thus qualify.

But to suggest that it is not a deterrent is absolute nonsense. To say that, well, Student Aid has been changed by the bursary loan ratio and therefore they can take out greater loans and that's going to be a help to them — does he really believe that? Does he really believe that a family of \$15,000 income, faced with the possibility of their son or daughter ending up after four or five years at university with perhaps — what is the maximum now — \$1800 a year loan — is that the maximum now — of about \$9800? Does he believe that's not a deterrent? Of course it's a deterrent. It will not be a deterrent maybe to the Member for St. Matthews when he has children going because maybe he'll feel, well, the son will take out a loan and, if he can't repay it, well, poppa will help him.

But there's a lot of people in this community and in Manitoba who cannot, and their children will not, assume this kind of debt because they know that the parents cannot help them in paying it off. And that is a deterrent whether he likes it or not.

And let him not forget that this bursary we're talking about, and I didn't want to make reference till we got to it, but it's been used so I'll talk about it too — sure, they've increased the amount of loan that they can take out, but they also increased the threshold level, they also increased . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. In accordance with Rule 19, Section 2, I'm interrupting the proceedings for private members' hour and will return at the call of the Chair.

### **PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR**

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are now on Private Members' Hour. The first item under Private Members — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to request that this matter stand until next day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I was given to understand this is a typographical error. In fact, that Resolution I believe has not even been distributed yet.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, Mr. Speaker, it has not been distributed, but it was printed in the Order Paper I believe Thursday last, but if the member doesn't want to proceed with it, well that's perfectly all right.

### **PRIVATE BILLS — SECOND READING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for St. James (Bill No. 10) — the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin (Bill No. 13) — the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Stand also.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for St. James (Bill No. 16) - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate St. John's-Ravenscourt School — the Honourable Member for St. Vital. (Stand)

### **PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson (Bill No. 5) - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. Stand?

**MR. MILLER:** Stand, Mr. Speaker, unless someone else wishes to speak on it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Bill No. 6) - The Freedom of Information Act — the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** (Bill No. 8) - An Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Charter — the Honourable Member for Portage. (Stand)

### ORDERS FOR RETURN — DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface — the Member for Roblin has 13 minutes.

**MR. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have completed my remarks regarding this Resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Order for Return is then open. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Roblin has completed his remarks, I might make a few. I can understand the government taking the position that consultants were taken on and have made a report to government, and that that report was for government, and therefore is something that only the Cabinet has, and until they act on it, is simply a document for their benefit.

But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is this. The Task Force has made recommendations based on what they perceived as certain information and certain facts — facts with regard to government expenditures, facts with regard to government debt, facts with regard to government mismanagement, fat, and so on and so forth, and there is references to this all along.

The way we view this Task Force Report, it was an attempt to justify what this government has done since taking office, and in this particular Session. The government desperately needed a rationale, an excuse, if you would call it that, a justification for vicious cutting of programs. They needed someone to reinforce their arguments, the arguments that they made all through the campaign. The arguments that there was so much money around that was misspent, that they could come into office, get everything straightened out without really in any way affecting programs. We now know from a review of a number of departments that the mismanagement referred to isn't there. Maybe they did expect to find pots and pots of money that they could shift around — well, it just isn't there to shift around.

So they are using the Task Force Report to justify, as I say, vicious cuts in programs, introduction of user fees, which is really a tax, but they are shifting the tax. They are shifting it from the higher income to the lower income, and that is what they call equal sacrifice. So that when we on this side ask for this information we did it because we felt very strongly that the government in publishing, in making available to the public, the recommendations, the report of the Task Force were in fact using that as a scapegoat, as an excuse, as a justification for all that flowed in this year's Budget, in this year's programs. It is because they are hiding behind this Task Force Report that we object.

It has been pointed out that if you were paying for this Report and you paid anything at all, you would be over-paying, because this was not a study in depth, this was a subjective view by a few people who went around and spoke to some civil servants, some others, got a few letters or a few reports, put them together, and came to some very subjective opinions, where they said further studies should be made, should be looked at deeper, more consideration should be given, but always in a negative way, that what was existing was wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no one questions that every number of years there should be a look again at administrative procedures within a government. When we took over we were faced with a quarter-of-a-million dollar report by P.R. Ross and Associates, a productivity study that had just been decided to be introduced, and we continued in that same manner. And ten years later there is nothing wrong with looking at structures, and even during the course of our years in office we did change structures periodically.

We do object when they on the one hand publish a Task Force Report and say, "See, we told you," and then they say, "Well, this is really a report for the benefit of Cabinet and government. It is really just a report and we can't give you any back-up material. Statements are made but we can't tell you on what basis they were made or why they were made or what justification there was to make them. We can't tell you any of this." So, Mr. Speaker, it is a charade. It is a bit of, they are acting out a play, where they have these groups of people, and I don't question the individual ability of these people, and perhaps if they had been at it for maybe six months to one year, they might have been able to come up with some good solid recommendations. I think they should have been a better mix than that on the Task Force, but putting that aside, some of these people have ability. But no way can they examine the administrative, programmatic operation of a government in four months and come up with their recommendations. No way, it can't be done, not in the casual way it was done. So we question the validity of the Task Force Report for that that reason.

But why was the government that anxious to publish it so quickly. To say to them, "This is your time limit. You have got to come in by this and this date." Instead of saying, "Take your time, this is important, consider it, check back, look into all aspects of it, if you can't finish it by March, finish it by



Monday, May 8, 1978

June, finish it by July." The fact of the matter is that the Estimates for this year were prepared anyway, we know that, we are in the House now, and it is obvious that the Estimates were prepared before the Task Force Report was considered. Because as I understand it the government hasn't considered it yet, even to this date, they may be in the process, so it wasn't going to affect the 1978-79 Estimates. So what was the rush?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the rush was they wanted it in now when they did in order as I say to justify program cuts, the cutbacks, user fees, the pushing on to the average person greater and greater costs so government could spend less. It is simply a transference. It isn't that there is going to be less costs, they are just simply passing it on to the user, whether it is the Transit, whether it is the City of Winnipeg in assisting them in various programs, they simply needed this as their justification, their screen behind which they could hide, and therefore we question the validity of this Task Force Report. We question it because it was glib, it was shallow, it was not a professional piece of work, and it was hurried. It was hurried to suit the government's purposes.

So we have asked for the thinking behind the Task Force Report. The report of the review teams themselves, the special study groups, how did they get to these particular recommendations, on what grounds, on what basis did they come to this opinion? And, you know, I studied consultant's reports and when they give a recommendation they usually say, "We recommend this because we found the following, because in our view having looked at the particular matter we are studying, there is a weakness here and a weakness there, there is strength here, there is strength there, and this is how the two can best be melded." But we don't get that in this kind of Task Force Report, and we can't because it was so quickly done, so rapidly done, that at best it is a surface-scratching. It is what I would call not a Task Force Review, but an overview, a very quick, glib, glossing over, looking at, going into an office and saying, "What do you do here?", and somebody telling them what they did or didn't do, and coming to a snap decision.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that when there is a change in government it is inevitable that certain people who were passed up in previous years, who felt that maybe they didn't gain the promotions they should have gotten, the kind of internal politics that goes on within every bureaucracy, whether it is in the private sector, in the public sector, where people are jockeying for position, it is inevitable that what is going to surface are the people with criticisms about some of their fellow workers, about another branch, trying to push responsibility or blame on somebody else and away from their own particular little bureaucratic empire, or if you won't call it empire, the little bureaucratic pocket that they have there.

So in order to really do an analysis of government organization and economy it takes doing, it takes study, it takes in-depth study, and not the kind of shallow study that is done here. We still don't know now, to this day, what the government is going to do with this Task Force Report. We have the Estimates, and some of the things in the Estimates seem to fall in line or seem to reflect what the Task Force has come out with, and I am wondering what came first the chicken or the egg? Because again the Estimates were prepared some time ago, and did the Task Force simply reword some of its recommendations so it would somehow jive with and be parallel to what the government in fact is doing, in order to justify what the government is doing.

So when we are asking for this we recognize that reports, studies, internal documents, that have in the past been ordered by government, undertaken by government, but there is a difference between this Report and others. This is a very political document and let's just not kid ourselves. It is a document to justify the kind of policies that this government is undertaking, to justify the kind of policies that this government was criticizing all through their campaign, to justify the charges made by this government all through the campaign, and this Task Force Report is supposed to justify all that has happened. That is why we not only wanted this background information, this justification for some of the recommendations that are made in this Report, but we also felt that there had to be some rationale, some explanation of why did you make this recommendation, what is your basis for doing it, how did you get there? Not just simply the subjective opinion by somebody that this is what they think should be looked at or this is what they think should be done.

You know, as I said earlier, the makeup of the Task Force was loaded. It was loaded in favour of the corporate sector. There is no question about it. The very nature of the people there, and it was not balanced, and these people are not evil people, but they are biased in their thinking. They reflect they are human. If you get someone who is active in the Women's Movement, she is favourable, and will look at things through a certain perspective or certain bias, if you want to call it that, because she accepts certain assumptions as being valid, the same way the majority and the leadership certainly on this Task Force were people who are biased, who start from certain assumptions and the assumption is, what's good for corporate business — what will save corporate business money, what will shift from the broad general tax to the individual, that is good. It's good from their perspective, and so we were critical of the Task Force personnel; when they were first appointed, we voiced that at the time, and we are even more critical now we see the report because we think that it is lacking in any sort of indepth analysis, it's lacking in the kind of explanation within the report itself which would give it some credibility.

And it is for that reason that we have asked for this particular return, but it is obvious that the government has decided not to grant that particular return, at least they have said, "No," and I suppose when it comes to a vote they're going to stick to that particular position. But, it's regrettable, because I think if the government could give this Task Force some credibility, if they didn't on the one hand try to hide behind it, and on the other hand refuse to give the public and members on this side of the House the reasoning behind many of the recommendations contained therein. And so they are,

Monday, May 8, 1978

frankly, in my opinion, they are destroying the credibility of their own Task Force, and to the extent that it has any credibility left, it's rapidly disappearing — I think it's rapidly disappearing not only to members on this side of the House, but generally throughout the Province of Manitoba. It was a group of people put together to do a hatchet job, to do a job of papering over and justifying the vicious kind of programming that we are now seeing taking place in Manitoba; the kinds of policies that we are seeing being introduced in Manitoba; the redistribution and varying of costs and the income, and they are guilty of redistribution.

We are usually criticized for wanting to redistribute income; the Conservatives have really gone much further than we have in redistributing income in these past few months. They have redistributed it in the other direction, they have redistributed it from the lower income to the higher income, by the introduction of these programs and policies which apparently the Task Force, without knowing what the government was going to do in its Estimates, obviously, the Task Force was somehow suggesting should be done. And it is because of these factors that we have asked for this information, and in refusing to grant this information to make it available, not just to us but to the public, the credibility of the Task Force has been destroyed and the purpose of the Task Force has now been established, and the purpose was as a screen — a device for the Conservatives to justify probably the most negative and vicious policy changes ever seen in this House in the last 8 eight years.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time in support of the motion for an Order for Return that's on the Order Paper before us, and in addition to the reasons as outlined by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, when he spoke, and the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks today, I have one other concern and because of it, Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with the Task Force effectively in my role as a member of the opposition, I feel I need all the information that I could get, because you see my problem is, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the Executive Council in the Estimates book, there is one line for the salaries of the three Ministers without portfolio, and it may well be that after dealing with the Task Force Report, when we reach that item Item on the Estimates, that I may want to bring in a motion to reduce that Minister's salary to \$1.00. Now, you will appreciate the problem that will put me in, because, being only one line, to reduce one minister's salary to \$1.00 would mean that I'll have to bring in a motion reducing the figure to \$33,201.00.

But that leaves me with another problem, Mr. Speaker. I'm not the Minister of Finance, I don't sign the cheques, I'm not the First Minister. It may well be that the First Minister may take whatever's left in the appropriation for the Ministers without Portfolio, and reduce the salary of one of the other three Ministers without Portfolio, but pay the Minister who was responsible for the Task Force the full amount. Now I wouldn't want any of the other two Ministers to suffer, but it appears that they will have to, so when we reach that point, if we will have to bring in a motion to reduce the salary, Mr. Speaker, it will have to be \$1.00 for the three of them, and then they will have to be satisfied with 33 1/3 cents each. It's regrettable that the Government House Leader, the Minister responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation will have to fall with them, but that's the way the government set up the Estimates, so thus it will have to be.

Now, my main reason, Mr. Speaker, for supporting this motion for this Order for Return is the fact that earlier this year, in early March, about the 8th of March, one of the Review Committee Chairmen, did go public, and did comment upon some of the recommendations, and did volunteer other information. And when I read these stories in the press, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that they appeared in both — I have one clipping before me of March 8th this year in the Free Press — and Frederick Fulcher, who chaired the Education Review Team, did comment upon the recommendation re the future of Brandon University, and Keewatin and Assiniboine Community Colleges, did comment upon the recommendation re the increase in fees, and on other matters, well, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to be aware of the recommendations of some of the review teams, then to consider them properly, we have to be aware of all. So it prompted me, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that I had tabled this letter on another occasion, because I had made reference to it, I think it was in the Speech from the Throne, and at that time the letter was tabled, so this prompted me to write a letter to each of the Review Committee chairmen. And the reason I wrote to them was because. . . well there were two reasons: e(1) I know the Review Committee was supposed to be answerable to a member of the government, but you recall, Mr. Speaker, that the government did appoint two co-chairmen, and we don't know to this day just the exact area of responsibility of the Minister without Portfolio, who claims to have some responsibility for the Task Force, so really we don't know what issues fall within his jurisdiction, and what we could ask him about.

(2) As was admitted by Mr. Fulcher, that some of the recommendations may never see the light of day.

So, therefore, we don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether the recommendations that we see before us are, in fact, the Review Committee's recommendations, which constitute or are associated with the Task Force, or whether they are Mr. Riley's recommendations, or whether they are this Minister's recommendations, or whether they are somebody else's recommendations, because you will know, Mr. Speaker, that Great-West Life is quite heavily represented on the review team — Great-West Life and related companies, Investor's Group, and so forth.

So, for all we know, it could be the recommendation of the Investor's Group, maybe of the Power Corporation, I don't know. So therefore I wrote to each Review Committee chairman, pointing out that a news item in the March 8th issue of the Winnipeg Free Press indicates that a chairman of one of the review teams has commented publicly, and in fact disclosed some of the recommendations of his group.

Then I went on to say that although it was reported that this chairman, Mr. Fulcher, was reluctant to comment in detail because of the confidential nature of the team's work, but nevertheless the point is now established, Mr. Speaker, reluctantly or not, one of the Review Committee chairmen did, in fact, publicly disclose and comment upon some of his committee's recommendations.

I went on to say in the letter, that I am certain, in writing to each of the Review Committee Chairmen, I am certain you would agree that that act, by one of you, removes the cloak of confidentiality from your deliberations.

Then the letter goes on as follows: "If you felt free to disclose some of your recommendations, I feel that it is unfair not to disclose all. In fact, I think it would be only proper and essential that you do so to enable the public to examine and to assess all your recommendations in their full context and proper perspective. This becomes all the more essential in view of the fact that, as one of you had stated in the newspaper story herein referred to, that many of the sub-committee's reports may never get beyond the discussion stage. Therefore, not only may the public never be apprised of some of your recommendations, but entire reports may be scrapped. I am certain you would agree, that I am entitled to the same access to information as that enjoyed by any other citizen of this province including a newspaper reporter.

"In view of the urgency of the matter, in that the next session of the Legislature is about to open," — and may I pause here and remind you, Mr. Speaker, that this letter was written on March 9th, and I'm continuing, "and recognizing the fact that your recommendations will undoubtedly have some bearing on the Speech from the Throne and on subsequent proceedings of the House, I request that you attend on Monday, March 13th, 1978, at 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon, in Room 228, Legislative Building, to meet with me and with other members of my caucus, who may wish to attend, and with others whom we may invite, and to bring with you all relevant documents and reports in order that we may have a full discussion of: (a) those recommendations already publicly disclosed; (b) the remaining 120 or so recommendations contained in the said report; and (c) all recommendations and all other reports that you will be submitting, and this meeting will continue from day to day, until we shall have completed our business." —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brandon East reminds me he was there and he is right. He was there, I was there, and we waited all morning, and they didn't show up. Later that day, and within a couple of days following. . . . no I'm sorry, in fairness to the Review Committee chairmen I must indicate that I did receive a telephone call from one, from an executive assistant of one, to extend the regrets of that individual, of that chairman, because he was down in Barbados or Bermuda at that time, and I suppose I can well understand. Well, it was probably inconsiderate on my part to call this meeting at that time, knowing that at that very point in time the review chairmen were busy pulling all the odds and ends together and getting their report in the final form and it's rather difficult to concentrate and ponder over the problems and affairs of the province on Broadway Avenue, and it is much more conducive to that type of thinking on some pleasant beach, somewhere in the Caribbean, so I should have been aware of that fact, that that could have occurred.

Another chairman was out of the country until the beginning of April, and the third was simply out of the — well, that one was out of the country, I don't know where, and the third was in Geneva until April. Mr. Chairman, I think it's rather significant that at that point in time, just at the point in time when the Review Committee Chairmen ought to have been finalizing their recommendations to whomever they're reporting to, whether it was to the co-chairman who sits in this House or to the other one, Mr. Riley, I don't know. But at that crucial point in time three of the eight Review Committee Chairmen were out of the country on business other than Task Force business, so I was advised.

And then, from one of the Review Committee Chairmen, I did hear after his return to Winnipeg some time in early April, and in writing to me he revealed another interesting point. What he said in his letter was that at no time did he meet with or discuss his recommendations with any of his colleagues, the chairmen of the other review teams, of the seven review teams remaining, which is rather strange, Mr. Speaker. You know, one would have thought that at some point in time the chairmen of the various review teams would have an opportunity to get together and examine their recommendations or their findings firstly, as they relate to the province in its entirety, in all aspects of our operations and not just looking narrowly at the delivery of health services, education services, agriculture and so forth, each in its own neat little compartment, but would recognize the fact that there is an inter-relationship and that therefore the people charged with this responsibility ought to look upon their recommendations in total as recommendations of one group may relate to those of the other. So that having occurred, you know, by an admission of one of the Review Committee Chairmen, then I think it makes it all the more essential that we do be provided with the background information that this resolution asks for.

We don't know, Mr. Speaker, to whom did the review teams or the Task Force, to whom did they speak? Who did they consult with? In fact, we have had it indicated to us, Mr. Chairman, and I would rather suspect that you may have received a copy of this brief as well as other members of the House, from the Manitoba Teachers Society, we know that no one from the Task Force or anyone in the employ of the Task Force spoke to the teachers. And it really strikes me as strange, Mr. Speaker, , how

Monday, May 8, 1978

could one evaluate an education program without talking to the people who have the ultimate responsibility for the delivery of it?

We also know, Mr. Speaker, that by and large the Task Force did ignore or overlook the consumers of a whole host of government programs that were reviewed and in relation to which certain recommendations were made. Mr. Speaker, I think it's just plain common sense that if one does a certain study and makes certain recommendations that one includes within that study two essential features. One indicates what groups or individuals made representations to it; one also indicates the data that one has collected on the basis of which one makes certain recommendations. Well, in this case, Mr. Speaker, we do not know to whom the Task Force spoke, nor do we know what evidence does the Task Force base its recommendations on. And that type of information, Mr. Speaker, is common to Task Force Reports in general. We're not asking for something out of the ordinary, anything unusual, and it's the type of information that if the report is to have any credibility in the minds of the public, the government should be willing and glad to provide us.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to be quite brief as the case has been made why this particular request is on the Paper and I support the motion. Ordinarily, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't support such a motion, but nevertheless it's somewhat analogous to the situation in 1968-69 where the government had the authority and had the prerogative to exercise that authority in the level at which they flooded South Indian Lake. Nevertheless they chose to bring into the Legislature a bill which necessitated some action by this particular group and after having done that then they refused to provide the information relative to that decision on which the members of this House could make a responsible decision. The situation is somewhat analogous in this sense, that the government has gone through the province purporting that this Task Force Report is an analysis in depth and that they're going to ask this Legislature to govern their votes for moneys to be spent relative to that Task Force Report to a large degree.

The Member for Fort Rouge in his remarks the other day put the question before us very well I thought. But I want to underline what is happening in this particular consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to analyze anything, even if you want to analyze a beam of light, if you put it through a prism everyone realizes that the light itself will be separated into red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo and violet. And if you want to bring it back together again you put it through a reverse prism and it will bring it back. The imperfections in the prisms will determine the fidelity of the colours you separate and the colours that you put back together again. If you want to have a green filter to take out green light you put in a green filter and you won't get it back. If you want to take out blue light you put in a blue filter and you won't get the blue back. But Mr. Speaker, the case has been made, and well made, that the information which has been analyzed in such a brief time by a rather select group of our society is analogous to that which I have described relative to the separation of light. The information has been filtered through a particular segment of people in our society and they have come up with certain recommendations.

I think the best summation of that with which we are involved is put forth in the position as forwarded to the government, a copy of which I have, Report on Government Organization and Economy, submitted by the Manitoba Teachers Society, April 1978, in which they say: Section 3(b) of Order-in-Council No. 1196 states that the Task Force should, "... determine past, present, and probable future costs and benefits of programs. The Society submits that the Task Force did not consider the benefits, did not consult any of the groups that were aware of the benefits and did not commission any studies to determine the benefits of the program which it recommended be deleted."

Now, what this House is asking for is for some glimmer of light that the recommendations that have been forwarded to this government which they accepted the responsibility of promulgating through the province and tabling in this House. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the government intends to use its majority to deprive the House of this information, so I would suggest that the matter go to a vote and we get on with the business of the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended to participate in this debate, but having heard some of the comments opposite and also listening to some of my colleagues, I thought I would add one or two words of my own to this particular request by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, that the supporting documents, the various sub-committee reports and so on, be made available to members of this House, which really means, being made available to the media and to the people of Manitoba.

I say that there is a need for this, not because of the curiosity that exists in the community at large, and particularly on this side of the House, but also because of the importance that this document was alleged to have been, or was and is alleged to be. This document is alleged to be of fundamental importance to this government and therefore of fundamental importance to the people of Manitoba, that it was to contain some very critical, very fundamental programs for change, very critical suggestions for re-organization that would affect the lives of thousands of people in this province. And because of the terrific emphasis that's been placed upon this, particularly by the Minister without Portfolio, the Member for River Heights, who is the Minister responsible for the Task Force, because of the high profile that he has given it, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, this is in typical fashion of that

**Monday, May 8, 1978**

particular member, of that particular Minister. It reminded me of his performance when he was Minister of Industry and Commerce back in the late 1960s, and was responsible for the TED Report, the Targets for Economic Development, and when we had drummer boys, and other paraphernalia about the great economic future of Manitoba and how he was charting a course for development, economic development at that time for this province. And this exercise reminds me very much of that. You know, a lot of smoke but very little fire.

This fantastic documentation, this fantastic report that was not — maybe fantastic isn't the proper word — this report that was supposed to be of fundamental importance to government, to the economy that was to be achieved in government, and here we have it, we've read it and we've looked at it, and I must say that most of us are very disenchanted with what is in it. We're disenchanted because there are many recommendations that are made but there's very little support given, very little supporting arguments, very little supporting data given for the major recommendations that have been made in that report. And in many, many ways it's characteristic of the Minister Without Portfolio, the Member from for River Heights, that we have a big PR job. I could be less charitable and call it a snow job, because I really think that that's all this Task Force, or as the Member for Inkster calls it, the task farce, is nothing but a snow job. You know, this government is trying to make the people of Manitoba think that they're going to do terrific things; they're going to re-organize government; they're going to save money for the people; they're going to do a fantastic job. The only fantastic job they've done is to snow the people of Manitoba. We've had a terrific snow job and that's typical of the Member for River Heights, because we've seen him giving us a snow job back in the 1960s.

The fact is that governments are re-organized every year. Every year. I was in government for eight-and-a-half years, Mr. Speaker, and I don't believe a year went by when there wasn't some change that went on in government organization, when some department wasn't amalgamated or a certain branch changed over or ministerial functions were changed, and this of course goes on in all Provincial Governments, it goes on at the federal level and it occurs in every government organization, I would dare say, in the world. So re-organization of departments, branches and so on are not necessarily that critical. I would suggest that you can slice a cake, or slice a pie, in many, many ways but nevertheless — (Interjection) — yes, slice a chunk of baloney, as the Minister Without Portfolio — he's pretty good at that. I think that's what this report is, it's a good chunk of baloney, I think he's giving us a good description for it. Good chunk of baloney, and at any rate, the fact — (Interjection) — Thank you, I need all the help I can get from the Minister Without Portfolio.

I think that the emphasis that was supposed to be placed — I heard members opposite say, "Well, organization isn't the big thing, it's the economy that's the important thing." Well as we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, what we're getting in the name of economy, the economy that was supposed to ferret out the excess number of civil servants, that was supposed to look for the fat and cut out the excess fat, well, really, Mr. Speaker, it isn't fat that is being cut out. Incidentally, as a footnote, who is against cutting out fat? I mean it's like being against motherhood; we're all in favour of motherhood, we're all in favour of efficiency; we're all in favour of prudence in spending, but I say, Mr. Speaker, the evidence of the last few weeks with regard to hospitals, with regard to nursing homes, with regard to many of our fundamental health institutions, it's very clear that what this government is about is not cutting fat, but cutting into the flesh and bone of very important programs, social service programs and other kinds of programs for the people of Manitoba.

So what we've had here is not only a snow job but it's an insult to the people of Manitoba, because here is a document with so many fundamental, presumably fundamental recommendations, and they have been based on really no consultation or very little consultation with the many groups that are affected. Indeed, I would say that what we have at best is a very superficial job indeed, a very very superficial piece of work.

The Manitoba Teachers Society issued a report the other day which was given to the government. My colleague, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, referred to it and he only referred to one small part of it but if you look at and read other parts of this document, you will see that the teachers of Manitoba have many mixed feelings about the Task Force Report and they are very concerned that the government and the Task Force was looking at the cost side of things but was not very concerned about the the benefits that accrue from the various spending programs of government.

It's rather interesting, as an aside, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers of Manitoba, through the Manitoba Teachers Society, detected a centralizing tendency of this government, the fact that one of the major recommendations was to set up a small inner sanctum type of Cabinet or Super-Cabinet, and they refer to the Super-Cabinet in this document. They say, "Developing legislation and policy in such a system would become unnecessarily lengthy," this is through the reorganization of departments that are suggested, "requiring channelling through line ministries to Super-Cabinet thereby slowing down and further complicating the decision making process."

This is something that we just don't need in this province, a further complication of the decision making process by government. But not only is it more complicating, it is centralizing and, if anything, I think this Task Force is probably a clue to the people of this province of what kind of government they are in for now and the next few years, and that is a government that is going to provide more centralized authority than has ever been seen in this province before. We're going to have decisions, and we are having decisions made by very few people, not even by a caucus over there. I'm sure some of the most frustrated people in Manitoba today are members of the

Monday, May 8, 1978

Conservative government caucus because they don't have, I'm convinced that they have very little, if any, say in the legislation and in the government administration of this province.

The Member for Minnedosa has indicated publicly his frustration by saying that he is seriously considering running for the federal seat of Portage-Marquette. I think maybe one of the reasons he's prepared to do that is because he's finding it very frustrating to be behind a certain First Minister, a Mr. Lyon, that certain First Minister of this province, a very frustrating experience for all the members of that caucus I'm sure to find that they are really part and parcel of what is almost a personal dictatorship in this province.

I think that the teachers of Manitoba have detected a tendency that we're going to see more and more, a centralized government, government by the few, government by a select committee with the chairman of that committee being the premier of this province who is going to call the shots. — (Interjection)— Yes, the Member for Minnedosa should get out on the hustings because time is fleeing.

I really believe that the teachers have put their finger on a characteristic of the task force when they say, on Page 3, "Thus, during the entire tenure of the Task Force neither the Society nor any other group representing educators or school boards was ever consulted on any of the recommendations. At the very least, these groups should have been consulted prior to the formulation of recommendations on field base programs which directly affect teachers and students."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think what you'll find here you'll find in other areas of this report as well. I think the report dealing with university affairs, either no consultation or very meagre consultation. Likewise with other programs in other areas of government administration where there was no consultation if any, very little consultation with the various groups involved.

To do I suppose a report on government organization and economy, a study of this kind, there are merits from time to time to have such studies but if you really are serious in this matter, if you really want to do a job worthy of the taxpayers of this province, you will spend the time in going around this province, not only in the City of Winnipeg, but in all the regions of this province and not only talking to the people that work for Great-West Life or the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce but to all the groups in this province. The unions, the various teachers' groups, the various groups concerned with health care, the nurses, the doctors, the dentists and many many others and take time and do adequate research. Instead of that, we have got really a PR piece of work and as you examine the document, each day as you look at this document, the two volumes, you very quickly come to the conclusion — and each time you do it you come to it more quickly — that it is indeed a very shallow piece of work.

The real truth is that there isn't any supporting documentation. In fact, that's why I really think, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that the Minister without Portfolio doesn't want to give us the background reports or studies is that maybe those background studies and reports do not exist, or at least maybe they do not exist certainly in some instances. I suspect that there isn't the supporting documentation, there aren't the facts and the figures to support the conclusions and the recommendations. What we really have is a compendium of opinions, compendium of opinions that is biased, very right wing, very pro big business and very narrow in perspective.

As you have more experience in government, Mr. Speaker, members opposite should realize that government is a very complex field and a field that involves all segments of our community, our provincial community, involves all facets of life virtually whether we like it or not, and that in order to come forth with a document and with a report that is worthy of consideration, that time has to be spent and people and groups have to be consulted. So I really fear, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little supporting documentation and maybe this is the real reason the Minister doesn't want to table it because he's got so little to table.

I believe as the Member for Inkster indicated a few weeks ago that as the months go by the real fight is going to ensue. If the government is at all seriously taking these recommendations there is going to be a real fight ensuing between the Cabinet and the Task Force itself.

As a matter of fact, I was rather amused by a comment the other day that I read in the newspaper attributed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with regard to the future of the Department of Co-operative Development. We read that the Deputy Minister of Co-operative Development, Mr. Gauthier, has resigned partly because of the recommendation that the department be phased out as such. I found it rather amusing that the Minister indicated that this wasn't necessarily government policy so it's going to be interesting to see in the months and the time ahead whether the government will act on that one recommendation and that is to phase out the Department of Co-operative Development.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has five minutes.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the government is going to be very reluctant to act so quickly on that recommendation of eliminating Co-op Development because, if anything, the existence of that department is symbolic of the support for co-operatives in this province and I would daresay that a good number of the members opposite on the government side are members of co-operatives of one kind or another, they're certainly members of credit unions. Many on this side are members of co-operatives or credit unions and I daresay that a diminution in the role of that department or those people would be a signal to everyone who is involved in co-ops in Manitoba that this government really doesn't care about the development of co-operatives. I think there is a symbolism that's involved here and I think this is probably why the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who is also in charge of that department is rather

**Monday, May 8, 1978**

reluctant to act upon the recommendation of the Task Force. I think as the Conservative government examines this one particular recommendation they too collectively will have second thoughts and we may not see that particular recommendation acted upon.

I think so it will be for many of the other recommendations included in this report. As the members of the Cabinet, as the members of the government take the time to sift through the various pages and realize what is being suggested here, I think they too will realize that many of these recommendations simply cannot be implemented because of the drastic consequences. They too, I believe, will come to the conclusion that what has been offered to them by the Minister without Portfolio is really a PR job, really a very superficial job, a compendium of recommendations that frankly in many cases aren't worth the time of day.

It would almost be a laughing matter, Mr. Speaker, if the subject matter itself wasn't so serious because as I indicated earlier the lives of thousands of people can be affected by these recommendations. There are thousands of people — I'm not talking about civil servants or employees of Crown corporations — I'm talking about all of us, I'm talking about the people in the provincial society, in the Province of Manitoba. There are thousands of people that might be affected in one way or the other by the implementation of these recommendations. Therefore, I say that it is only fitting and becoming, it is in fact absolutely necessary if the government and if members of this House are expected to give any credence whatsoever to these recommendations that they have the supporting documents, that all members of the House have the supporting documents, that the people of Manitoba see this supporting evidence so that they can treat these recommendations with some seriousness. I think it's an insult to the people of Manitoba that a vast number of serious recommendations are made, serious in the sense that they can have very detrimental effects in many cases if they are implemented, that they are presented to us and that we do not have the supporting evidence, the supporting data, to make us feel that that particular recommendation or conclusion is worthy of our attention.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will resume in Committee of Supply at 8 o'clock. I want to point out to the Member for Brandon East that he has one minute left.

The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair.