

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 11, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the M members' attention to the gallery, where we have 50 students of Grade 11 standing of West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Penner. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

We also have 14 students of Grade 11 standing of the St. Mary's Academy, Speech and Debate class, under the direction of Miss Janet Duddin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.
Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts met on May 11, 1978, and resumed consideration of the Public Accounts of the Province for the fiscal year which ended the 31st day of March, 1977.

Your Committee received, or has been assured that it will receive, all information desired by any member from the Minister, Heads of Departments and members of the Provincial Auditor's staff with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the Province. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Transcona, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, it's not a Ministerial Statement but I wish to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 43 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and a Return to an Order of the House No. 44 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, it's not a Ministerial Statement but I do believe that I owe the House an apology because of a procedure that I followed or a set of circumstances I allowed to happen in relationship to the conversations I had with my very inquisitive press in regard to the Northern Student Employment Program before I made reference to it here in the House. For this I apologize. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne) introduced Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Real Property Act, and Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Human Rights Act, and Bill No. 33, The Venture Investment and Research and Development Corporations Registration Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that on Monday, March 27, 1978, he told The Thompson Citizen that he and the Education Minister had met with the Grants Commission during the past week and reached an agreement for the continuation of the Inter-Universities North Program next year? I wonder if he would confirm that he made that statement to the press, as quoted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think we could take up an awful lot of the time in this House if we repeatedly debated the merits of statements that are particularly made in the press, and I'm not prepared to debate them at this particular time.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it would take less time if the Minister would say, "Yes, I made that statement," or "No, the press has once again misquoted me." I wonder if he could clarify his answer yesterday in regard to my question about the Native News Service; I wasn't sure of his answer because it went on for a long time. Did he say that he was misquoted or that he had not told the truth to that news agency?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I guess when we're talking about answering questions we could also talk about how we ask them. The statement that I made in reference to the particular publication that the Member for The Pas refers to, I said, and I think I'm correct, that at the end of last year there would appear to be an \$84,000 retained earnings figure, but that in itself could not be totally accepted because there had been in the neighbourhood of three-quarters of a million dollars put into the particular operation in question, which is the Minago Construction outfit, in the last two years, in the form of grants. And I believe that's what I said yesterday, and I don't know if there's any controversy about that particular statement that I made here.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, rather than refer to the news story, would the Minister tell the House whether or not he and the Minister of Education met with the Universities Grants Commission on the Inter-Universities North Program?

MR. MacMASTER: I did not meet with the Universities Grants Commission, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if the Attorney-General would confirm that the government has decided not to proceed at this time with the development of the unified Family Court in St. Boniface, and not to proceed at least until 1979 or later with that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the decision has been made to defer that particular project until the next fiscal year. We have communicated with the Department of Justice who have confirmed that the funds will be available to proceed with that particular project next year, and I might point out that it has not been usual for any of these projects to be deferred because they have been deferred or delayed in a number of other provinces because of difficulties in getting them under way.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might respond to a question that was asked by the Member for Fort Rouge on April 19, who asked: In view of the report that was issued nationally concerning the substantial increase in the number of wiretaps across the country, can the Attorney-General indicate whether that increase, the two or three multiple increase in wiretaps is also taking place in the Province of Manitoba, and has he issued a report concerning the incidence of wiretap use in the province lately?

Mr. Speaker, a comparison of the 1976 and 1977 statistics reveals approximately the same level of applications in interceptions in both calendar years, and the report covering the period from January 1, 1977, to December 31, 1977, pursuant to the provisions of the Criminal Code will be published in the Manitoba Gazette shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. On the question of the Family Court, could the Minister now confirm that he has received a communique from the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, that the Federal contribution to the unified Family Court is going to be transferred to another province.

because of the deferral of this province and its refusal to go ahead as announced and as on schedule?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: If that is correct, the Member for Fort Rouge obviously has better means of communication with the Federal Government and the Department of Justice than I have, because I have not received such a letter, and I repeat that officials in my department have dis: during January and cussed this matter sometime ago, February, with officials in the Department of Justice, and those officials in Ottawa confirmed that the moneys would be available for the project in the next few years, and quite possibly for a full three-year project.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, it may just prove that the mail service is more efficient in this building to the Liberal office than it is to the Attorney-General's office. I expect he may want to clarify with his office, but considering that the Federal Government is going to, or has communicated with the Minister, as of April 30th, that the funds will be withdrawn or transferred to another province, is the Minister prepared now to undertake immediate action to see that the Family Court will still proceed, and that the government will rescind its decision to defer or delay that proposal so that Federal funds can still be used?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, what I would first of all like to know, is how the Member for Fort Rouge communicates with the Department of Justice and the Minister of Justice and receives information prior to when a provincial Minister responsible for that matter receives it. I'm very concerned. . . Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Member for Fort Rouge and the government in Ottawa — the Liberal Government — will go to no lengths to intrude into the operations of provincial governments when an election is before it.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that when I receive the letter, if there is such a letter, that I will deal with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General advise the House why in the instance of the development agreement between the Province of Manitoba and Mr. J. A. Jarmoc, the agreement was approved as to form on December 21, 1977, some five weeks after the execution of the agreement by the parties thereto?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that question previously, but I would again point out to the Member for Selkirk that, as he well knows, members of the Civil Litigation Department, in the Attorney-General's Department, advise every other department in the Provincial Government and deal with them directly, without in every case dealing through the Minister. They respond to questions and requests for advice, and my information is that I believe the Minister of Tourism and Recreation will deal with that particular aspect when he reports to the House.

MR. PAWLEY: My question to the Attorney-General however is, is it standard practice within the department of the Attorney-General that agreements are approved as to form after they've been completed and executed by the parties thereto?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, it is not the practice under our government; obviously some members of the department acted under the practice of the previous government.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney-General can advise the House as to what undue haste caused the approval as to form in the manner which I earlier described and the execution of this document five weeks prior to the approval as to form by his department.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that will have to be more appropriately put to the Minister for Tourism and Recreation, one which I believe he will deal with when he presents his report to the Legislature.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: My question is to the Minister of Health. Is the government or the Manitoba Health Services Commission for the government still negotiating with the Federal Government for the take-over of Deer Lodge or has that been frozen temporarily?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: There's been no change in that situation since the change of government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, several days ago there were questions directed with regard to the senior citizens' extension of school tax rebate and! principally from the Member for St. Johns and I think the Member for Brandon East. Mr. Speaker, in summary the extension of the rebate program will provide for an additional 7,848 pensioner homeowners who will have their full school taxes covered by the provincial assistance, and of these 3,845 or 49 percent have income under \$5,000; 6,405 or 82 percent have incomes under \$10,000; 7,453 or 95 percent have incomes under \$15,000 and the remainder, 395 or 5 percent would have incomes over \$15,000.00.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister for his information. May I clarify? Are those the statistics as they apply to the present legislation? Legislation that we now have which does not include the Provincial Government's budgetary announcement on the increased amount for pensioners.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the numbers referred to, as I said, the 7,000 are the additional numbers who will have their full school taxes paid for.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information given by the Honourable Minister. May I ask him if he would not consider responding to the several repeated requests for information on the statistics according to income of those benefits that have been received by pensioners under the existing legislation, that is, under the pre-budget formula.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it may be possible to gain these. I understood the question to be what the new provision would make for in the way of extended benefits to senior citizens. I've attempted to answer that question and I've put it as concisely as possible.

With regard to the total numbers, there have been total numbers given and the total numbers, as I indicated before, were that 95 percent of those in rented accommodation are covered by the pre-existing legislation; 57 percent of those who were in their own homes were covered. This raises the number from 57 percent to roughly 75 percent of those in their own homes and those receiving the benefits are in the income category I've indicated today.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I request the Honourable Minister to look back at the questions which I believe were accepted for information to give us a statistical analysis by income of the people who had their school taxes paid under the legislation which existed prior to the budget. It seems to me so very clear. Maybe the information is there but, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received it and I would request the Minister again to give it to us and maybe have the temerity to suggest that the document he's reading from may contain the information and rather than a summary, maybe he could give us that document.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I presume that information was possibly put on the record last year when the program, as it pre-existed under the former government, was discussed and some changes were made last year in the rebate program itself. I presume it's already on the record.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the Honourable Minister that I'm not aware that it was there and I'm not presuming that it was. I'm asking the Minister whether he's prepared to give us that information and frankly, Mr. Speaker, if he says he's not prepared to, I'd much rather he said so rather than talk around the subject. It's a simple request that I've been making all along.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if the member wishes to look in the records, I can only presume that it is in the records from his administration. If he wants further information and detail, he can file an Order for Return and we'll have a look at it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I have not had any administrative responsibility for at least three years so I don't know what he's speaking about when he's talking about my administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there was a series of questions from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland in relationship to freight service for the people within the Bloodvein and Matheson Island area:

(a) If there would be a freight service provided this year — and the answer to that is yes.

(b) He wanted to know what type of proposals had been forthcoming and I told him that we had received a variety of types from two private individuals who were prepared to provide this service and, in addition to that, were prepared to consider leasing the Edgar Wood barge.

The last question I believe he asked in this vein was if the community leaders had been contacted, talked to about the possibilities of them leasing the barge and going into business themselves. I had

said I thought they had and now I've been assured that three at least have: Mr. Bill Bennett, Chairman of the Northern Association of Community Councils; Frank Magnusson from Princess Harbour and Chief Harry Cook. I've now been told that not only have they been contacted but they are seriously considering putting together a proposal for our consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to contradict the Minister's statement. I can only assume that his staff have made an error in reporting to him . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. BOSTROM: I'd like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the use of language that he is using, he should consider very carefully. Maybe the member would like to rephrase his statement.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I believe I did give the Minister the benefit of the doubt in saying that I hesitate to contradict his statement and I can only assume that he was misinformed by his staff. I have been in communication with the Chief of the Bloodvein Reserve as early as this morning and I am informed that no one from his department had contacted he or, to his knowledge, members of his band council. So I would ask the Minister to recheck with his staff and be assured that someone is, in fact, giving the Bloodvein Band the opportunity to bid on this proposal to operate the Edgar Wood barge this summer.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to file a letter that was sent out not asking specifically if they wish to participate in the freighting business but certainly asking them to notify our departments of their needs and that was where, technically, the Member for Rupertsland and I had our difference of opinion I suppose. I had thought that meant informed. In addition to that, I again say I have been informed — and I'll further check it out — that Chief Harry Cook himself and Frank Magnusson and Bill Bennett have all been approached within the last few days as to whether they were prepared to put a proposal together. I have further been led to believe that they are considering that so we're a fair ways apart but I'll get back to you on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for St. Johns asked me whether there were terms of reference regarding the work of the consultative committee which has been set up between the Manitoba Medical Association and my office, the office of the Ministry. I told the Honourable Member for St. Johns that yes, terms of reference for that committee were being put together. I now have in my possession, attached to a letter dated May 8th of this year, from the secretary of the MHSC, Mr. Speaker, those terms of reference so my answer to the Honourable Member for St. Johns is yes, the terms of reference have been agreed upon; they are laid out in specific format and I can certainly convey them to the Member for St. Johns.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Corporate Companies Act. Is the Government of Manitoba in favour of Versatile Corporation moving its headquarters to Vancouver from Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Speaker, the function of the branch of my department is purely one of administrative function and regulatory and does not include offering opinions as to whether or not certain corporate moves are good or bad.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the First Minister. In the light of the fact that the Versatile Corporation will have to apply to the companies branch director in order to have the head offices moved to Vancouver, is the Government of Manitoba in favour of this move or is it prepared to use whatever powers are at its disposal to ensure that Versatile remains in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, it may come as a bit of a surprise to the Honourable Member for Transcona, but we are not yet in a totalitarian state, although we were approaching it when his party was in office. But I can say to him, if I may, seriously, that I know discussions have been held between the Minister of Industry and Commerce and representatives of Versatile. No government in any province wants to see any head office leave the province at any time,

but my understanding is that there will be expansion, or the potential for expansion, in the operation of that particular company in Manitoba notwithstanding the fact that a head office cadre will be moving to Vancouver.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to inform the First Minister, who occasionally has been accused of having a faulty memory, if he would consult with Premier Lougheed of Alberta, Conservative Alberta, a province which he would consider a totalitarian government, to determine what that government did when Pacific Western Airlines . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to draw all honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 23 pupils of Grades Seven to and Nine standing from the McKenzie High School of Dauphin under the direction of Mrs. Oresko. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

Likewise, we have 50 students from Keewatin Public School, under the direction of Mr. Merredew. This school is in the Province of Ontario, and we welcome you all here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to complete the question that I didn't have the opportunity to complete just now. I'd like to ask the First Minister if he will consult with Premier Lougheed of Conservative Alberta, to determine what that government did when Pacific Western Airlines threatened the economy of Alberta by announcing that it intended to move its head offices from Calgary to Vancouver.

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

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Health flows from what I will term as an apparent, perhaps not real, contradiction between two Ministers of the Crown. It is to ask the Minister of Health if, the other day when in reply to a question from this side, he indicated that the general policy and practice at area hospitals was to have, or cause, a change of hospital linen. Mr. Speaker, the question is not to be guffawed at, because what is involved here is perhaps contradiction arising out of confusion between two Ministers of the Crown, or dishonesty; it's one or the other. —(Interjection)— Well, I'll be very blunt. When the Minister of Health, in reply to a question from this side, said that the practice was —(Interjection)— There's no desperation, Mr. Speaker — there is desperation which arises out of a mean, tight-fisted policy that doesn't seem to care about some of the more important . . . —(Interjection)— And then to pawn it off as professional discretion! Professional discretion with what, Sir, when budgets are overcut? —(Interjection)— The only demeaning, Mr. Speaker, that is taking place, is that of the First Minister, with apparent small-mindedness on his part. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the Honourable Government House Leader a point of privilege?

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): No, it's not a point of privilege, it's simply a question of order. This happens to be the oral question period, and I wish that the Leader of the Opposition would confine himself to asking questions of the Minister, and not making speeches. Why doesn't he come into the House when the time arrives for making speeches, and make them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware that I'm out of order, but I tell you, Sir, that as long as there are interjections, there will be digressions from me, in response to every single . . . —(Interjection)— And as long as there are no interjections, I will pose the question in conventional fashion; as long as there are interjections from the seat of the pants of the First Minister, I will continue to digress; let that be clear.

I'm prepared to ask a conventional question, but not if there are interjections. —(Interjections)— Well, the rules are there to be enforced, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope all members of the House will allow a courtesy to any member of the House when he has the floor.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: My question, Sir, is to ask the Minister if he can clarify, so that there need be no need for questioning integrity or honesty, whether the other day in reply to a question from this side he indicated that the general policy and practice, as he was advised, was to have a change of hospital linen in area hospitals on a frequency of Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday — that he meant that to mean four days a week, or two days a week, meaning Monday and Thursday of one week, and Tuesday and Friday of the following week? If that is so, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Health how he can account for the Minister Without Portfolio, in a public statement, saying that the policy is to have a change of hospital linen four times per week. Obviously one Minister is

contradicting the other. May I ask the Minister of Health to simply clarify that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that I should have the responsibility for accounting for my colleagues . . . —(Interjection) — That question would be better put directly to my colleague, the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio. But to answer the question from the Leader of the Opposition that is relevant to me, and to my information, let me say, Sir, that it is quite possible that the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio drew an incorrect conclusion from my remarks. The Winnipeg Tribune drew an incorrect conclusion from my remarks; there may be many people in this House who did. If that's the case, I sincerely apologize for having created a situation which prompted them to draw that conclusion. My information from the hospital, Sir, was based on a series of interviews, a series of discussions, in which I undertook in response to the questions originally put to me by the Leader of the Opposition. And if I'm not mistaken, Sir, the questions originally put to me by the Leader of the Opposition had to do with whether or not the frequency of linen changes in major hospitals in this province had been reduced as a result of the budgetary initiatives of this government to a point that was less than acceptable to me, as Minister of Health, or to a point that reasonable men and women would consider less than adequate for patient care.

My answer to that question, Sir, - was, "No." I'm advised by the Winnipeg Tribune, and I'm advised by the Administrator of the Health Sciences Centre, that the rotation of the schedule for routine linen changes at the Health Sciences Centre is Monday, Thursday, Tuesday, Friday, but the information I gave to the House, Sir, did not, nor was it intended by me, to specifically designate what the rotation was. The answer I gave to the House was that linen changes take place on four days of the week: Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, with wide discretion left up to the head nurses of the wards, based on the conditions of individual patients, and that that schedule was invoked last June, during a budgetary audit review implementation by the hospital administration, and has not changed since that time. —(Interjection)— If the Minister without Portfolio, the Leader of the Opposition, the press, or anyone on that side or this side, or anyone else drew incorrect conclusions from that statement, then I must accept full blame for not having been more specific in my remarks, Sir, but I was addressing myself to the questions originally put to me by the Leader of the Opposition, and I believe that the answer, "No," still stands.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for making it quite clear that the policy with respect to schedule and rotation is Monday, Thursday, Tuesday, Friday, as opposed to Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, which obviously has left different connotations in the minds of a number of people, including the Honourable Minister's own colleague.

My question, then, is to the Minister of Health to ask him whether he is in a position to give an assurance that the policy with respect to rotation and frequency, with respect to these standards, will not be in need of further revision because of budget levels that are imposed upon the operating budgets of the hospitals? Can he give us that undertaking?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister on a point of privilege.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, in his preamble to the question, used the word "dishonest" with reference to contradictory statements on the part of two Ministers. —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the interpretation, and for the record, Mr. Speaker, because of the reference, I believe I do have a point of privilege, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister consider his statement and review it, and possibly alter it on the basis that the Honourable Minister of Health has indicated that an interpretation was made by me, which has been made by others, which could be made, Mr. Speaker. But of course the issue that the First Minister has not addressed himself to, which was the issue in the first place, Mr. Speaker, was that the suggestions of the restraint program and with respect to the nonsensical debate on bedsheets, has in no way affected health care in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, if the point that has been raised with you, Sir — it hasn't been raised by me — by the Minister without Portfolio, is that I suggested that it was necessarily a case of dishonesty, I think Hansard will show that I indicated that it was either a case of some confusion or of dishonesty. There has been acknowledgment now that there was an incorrect interpretation taken, the Minister of Health having confirmed that himself, that there were incorrect interpretations taken of his statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't responded to the Leader of the Opposition's second question yet. My response would be that I don't think as Minister of Health that I can give that direct assurance. The conduct of the affairs, the scheduling of programming, the ordering of budgets are the individual responsibilities of the individual hospital administrations, as he knows. But I reassure him, as I have earlier in this session, that I do not, and this government does not intend to stand idly by and see

health services or the quality of health care suffer. We believe that the program that's in place at the present time is a realistic and a practical one, and that quality service can be maintained within those constraints. I'm monitoring that daily. I welcome the advice, the comments, the reports that the Leader of the Opposition gets on the same situation, whenever he wishes to offer them, and I will investigate each one of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Since the City's Executive Policy Committee passed a motion this morning in line with D. I. MacDonald's recommendation that the City now is going to accelerate public works projects in relation to a stagnant construction industry, will the province now do its share by lifting the freeze on construction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question of the scheduling of provincial capital works is under regular review, and as and when the financial position of the province permits, there will be other projects freed-up from the freeze, when it's consistent with fiscal responsibility.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, since it's crucial at this time of year to make that decision, I ask the First Minister whether he has any concern for the welfare of construction workers, architects and engineers, or is he the Minister who indicated to members of the architectural profession that they should either wither and die, or leave the province?

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

MR. DOERN: I would like to ask the First Minister another question, which I see he has had time to reflect on. Is he prepared to admit today that the Roblin administration built the Norquay Building, a statement that he denied Tuesday night?

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture undertook to provide some information on Monday in regard to a meeting at Elkhorn sponsored by local area farmers with Mr. Church in attendance. The question that the Minister was supposed to provide for me or investigate for me was, was there a resolution passed unanimously at this meeting opposing an introduction of a check-off on beef without a referendum? The Minister undertook to provide this information, and I'm just wondering if he has that information now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I believe the question was asked, "Could I proceed to look into whether there was a resolution came forward from that meeting?" I have not received the information at this time in writing. As I said there was some verbal discussion with the person from the department there and I will provide the information when it is received. — (Interjection)— No, very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: I move, seconded by the Minister of Public Works, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. We are on Page 61, Municipal Affairs. As the Minister of Highways and Public Works often said during his Estimates, "We'll go page by page."

Municipal Affairs, Item No. 1, General Administration, (b) Administrative Salaries. The Minister of

Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps first of all I can confirm, because there has been some confusion, I think. At one stage it was indicated we were prepared to proceed with Urban Affairs last Tuesday, but the debate on Public Works carried on for some time. It is my understanding now, and just to confirm it with you, that we will go ahead with Municipal Affairs and then Urban Affairs will follow immediately thereafter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as we don't get tied up with the jails, and how they are run.

MR. MERCIER: I shouldn't expect we'll even be all afternoon on this set of Estimates, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, if I may make some introductory comments and indicate that since my appointment as Minister of this Department I have had a considerable opportunity to meet with municipal councils and with representatives of the two municipal associations, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Association of Urban Municipalities. I had the opportunity of addressing the Union of Manitoba Municipalities last fall, and on numerous occasions I have met with municipal councils and delegations from councils. I would like to express my appreciation to all those persons involved in local government, both municipal councils and municipal employees, who have worked so conscientiously and so effectively during the past year in serving the residents of Manitoba in the area of municipal government. My past experience in municipal government, plus the discussions I have had with representatives of municipal government over the past few months, has given me an even greater appreciation of some of the current problems facing local government.

I would like to express my appreciation to the staff of my department for their dedication and service to local government. I don't know to what extent I am indebted to my predecessors, but I have been fortunate, I believe, to inherit an experienced and efficient staff which permits the department to meet its objectives of maintaining a close relationship and understanding with municipal councils and the staff of municipalities. I will do my utmost to see that this close and harmonious relationship is maintained.

In the past year, October 1977 was the first municipal election when all councillors were elected to a three-year term of office. Starting early in January and continuing over the next six weeks, we held two-day seminars at Gimli for approximately 300 councillors, most of whom were newly-elected in October of 1977. My understanding is that this seminar was very well appreciated by those who attended and will no doubt contribute to greater efficiency at the municipal level. We found that these courses have given newly-elected councillors a real advantage in understanding their duties and responsibilities as municipal councillors.

If I may comment on the Municipal Employees' Pension Fund, which was established by legislation a few years ago, and operative from January 1st, 1977. It has just completed a very successful year and they have now enrolled 165 municipalities, that is incorporated rural municipalities, villages, towns and cities. In addition, the employees of 18 weed control districts have entered the employees' benefits fund and the employees of 13 other corporations incorporated under provincial legislation are also enrolled. These corporations range from recreation commissions to planning district board employees to regional library board employees. The total payments into the Fund as at December 31st, 1977 amounted to \$1,337,000.00. The board has entered into an agreement with the Civil Service Superannuation Board to provide administrative services with regard to the pension plan and group insurance plan operations. This seems to have been a satisfactory arrangement for both parties.

The present membership of the board is composed of Mr. J. S. Richmond, chairman; Mayor Lloyd Wersch of the Town of Selkirk representing the Association of Urban Municipalities who, unfortunately, will have to resign shortly because of his move from Selkirk to Brandon; Reeve Chapman representing the Union of Manitoba Municipalities; Frank Woodmass the treasurer of the City of Brandon representing the Secretary-Treasurers' Association and Mr. Tom Clarke, representing CUPE.

Turning to the Estimates of the Department, you will note an increase of \$7,170,800 over the 1977-78 Main Estimates. The reconciliation statement on Page 60 of the Estimates book reveals that \$7,229,600, or more than the net increase, can be accounted for by the transfer of the Northern Affairs Planning Branch from the Department of Northern Affairs to the Department of Municipal Affairs \$544,600; in the transfer of the provincial job office from the Executive Council Estimates \$170,000 and the transfer of \$6,508,000 from the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower. This latter expenditure from Manpower and Education can be found in the Municipal Budget and Finance Branch Estimates and is the grant in lieu of taxes payable to municipalities on university properties. For the past few years, this grant has been shown as part of the Estimates of the Department of Education and Manpower and was part of the annual operating cost to the universities and therefore 50 percent recoverable from the Federal Government. I am advised that this is no longer a shareable cost and it therefore makes sense to show this expenditure in the department which records the province's payments of grants in lieu of taxes to municipalities.

A glance at the expenditures of the other branches in the department will reveal that there is either a decrease or, at most, a minor increase in the Estimates of the various branches. For example, under General Administration, the increase is approximately \$6,000.00. This is attributable in part to a decrease in administrative salaries. Two research assistants in the Provincial Employment Program were shown in the Department of Municipal Affairs last year but are now shown under the Provincial

Job Office.

1.30 The increase under (c) Other Expenditures, is approximately \$13,000 attributable mostly to incremental increases in such matters as postage, travelling, etc. The Municipal Board shows an increase of approximately \$20,000, partly attributable to incremental salary increases and partly attributable to Other Expenditures, especially travelling. Municipal Budget and Finance, as mentioned earlier, the amount paid as grants in lieu of taxes on university properties is almost one-half of the total provincial real property tax bill. Aside from this substantial increase as a result of the transfer of these funds, the expenditures in the Municipal Budget and Finance Branch was a minimal increase.

Municipal Assessment, there is no change in the level of staffing, and the increase in the cost of the Municipal Assessment Program over the last fiscal year is approximately \$125,000.00. The increase of costs of \$125,000 can be attributable to \$84,000 for salary increases and the balance of \$40,000 is attributable to incremental increases in a number of areas such as travelling expenses, printing, etc. I should point out that the Municipal Assessment Program is a cost-shared program with 75 percent of the cost recovered from the municipalities, the recovery based on equalized assessment. The net cost to the province, therefore, of this program is \$489,000.00.

Municipal Services and Research; this branch provides services to municipalities in the areas of municipal administration. It is staffed with former secretary-treasurers with considerable experience with a chartered accountant to assist municipal secretary-treasurers in specific accounting problems. You will note the total operating costs of the Municipal Services and Research Branch is actually reduced by \$50,000 in this fiscal period.

While there were incremental increases in a number of operating expenditures, for example, travelling, postage, computer storage costs, etc., the reason for the overall reduction can be attributed mainly to staff decreases, two positions; the transfer of one person to the Department of Labour. This person had been on loan to the Rent Review Board for approximately a year-and-a-half. The other staff reduction occurred from the retirement of a resident administrator of a local government district, and we propose to fill this position by having the new administrator employed by the local government district directly rather than as a civil servant. This is the policy which has been followed during the last few years, looking forward to the day when a number of the remaining local government districts are able to move to full municipal status.

In Municipal Planning Services, this branch, of course, provides planning advice to municipalities in Planning Districts, and commencing on January 1, 1976, assumed responsibility for administering the subdivision regulations throughout the province. It is hoped that as the Planning Districts form and adopt development plans, that the administrative responsibility for subdivisions will then rest with the Planning Districts. The Estimates for the Municipal Planning Branch show expenditures, \$125,000 less than the previous fiscal year. Approximately \$80,000 of this reduction is attributable to a decrease of five staff man years, three term and two permanent positions. I point out these positions were vacant and did not involve the release of any personnel. It was felt we can maintain a reasonable level of service to the municipalities and the Planning Boards with the existing level of staffing.

The other areas in which savings can be effected will be a greater economy or efficiency in travelling, printing and outside consultant fees.

Five Planning Districts have been formed, boards established and agreements entered into between the Minister and the Planning District Board. The districts established to date are the Selkirk and District Planning Area incorporating the Town of Selkirk, the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews, and the Rural Municipality of St. Clements. The Thompson Planning District, incorporating the City of Thompson and the LGD of Mystery Lake, the Brokenhead River Planning District comprised of the RM of Brokenhead, the Town of Beausejour and the Village of Garson; the Cypress Planning District comprised of the Town of Carberry, the Village of Glenboro; and the RMs of North and South Cypress. The fifth is a Planning District comprised of the Town of Morden and the Town of Winkler and the RMs of Stanley and Thompson. In addition to the Planning Districts which I have just mentioned, which are operational with district boards and budgets established and with agreements for cost sharing entered into with the province, there are a number of possible districts which could be formed during 1978.

At the provincial level, the sub-committee of Cabinet known as the Provincial Land Use Committee has been meeting regularly since early January considering provincial land use policies. A number of these policies have been adopted by the committee on an interim basis and we hope to have public discussion and input on these policies later this year.

Provincial Planning Branch first established in 1977 with a staff of four acting primarily in support of the Interdepartmental Planning Board and the Provincial Land Use Committee has had a slight incremental increase in the operation of this department.

Northern Planning — this branch was moved to the Department of Municipal Affairs and for the purposes of the 1978-79 Estimates, the operation of this branch is shown as a separate program although, in the long run, it would make sense to integrate this operation with the municipal planning branch. The branch was formerly with the Department of Northern Affairs and will be operating in the next fiscal year with eight staff man years instead of the 17 staff man years in the previous fiscal year. When the branch was transferred to Municipal Affairs it had been operating for a number of months with a staffing level of 12. We feel confident we can maintain a reasonable level of service with a staff of eight. The principal reduction in the operation of this branch comes under those services carried out under the Manitoba-Northlands Agreement. One of the major programs was the community

based mapping program and this has been substantially completed permitting a reduction of approximately \$125,000.00.

The Provincial Job Office was formerly under the Executive Council and has 13 employees, 4 permanent civil servants and 9 contractor term employees. The operating costs of this Provincial Job Office are up slightly over the previous fiscal year.

In summary, you will note that out of \$20 million in the proposed Estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs, almost \$14 million is for grants in lieu of taxes payable to municipalities. This represents almost exactly 70 percent of the budget of the Department of Municipal Affairs. Of the remaining 30 percent, there have been slight increases in some branches and slight reductions in others and in total, including the grants in lieu of taxes, a slight reduction in the overall operations of the department for this fiscal year.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George and then the Member for Seven Oaks after that.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his comments in the introduction of his Estimates. I'd like to ask the Minister, he has given us figures of staff from the various component parts of his Estimates, has there been an actual reduction in staff in this fiscal year or is the reduction primarily of a closing off of vacant positions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: They're primarily in the area which was formerly comprised of the Department of Municipal Affairs, a reduction in the vacant positions. There have been some reductions in the area of the Provincial Job Office, I believe the number — not the Provincial Job Office, of Northern Affairs . . .

MR. URUSKI: Northern Planning? Four staff? Of actual four staff?

MR. MERCIER: Northern Planning, of four.

MR. URUSKI: In respect to the administration of the department, the Minister's Salary as shown here, is it being picked up by the Department of Municipal Affairs in his office, or what does that include?

MR. MERCIER: I believe it is being paid out of the Attorney-General's Department. If you'd like to pay me twice, I am inclined to accept it. It is in the Attorney-General's Department.

MR. URUSKI: On the Administrative, are there any portion of your office paid out of the Administrative Salaries that you now have?

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. URUSKI: The entire staff within your office is covered under the A-G's Estimates?

MR. MERCIER: No, that is not correct. There was one administrative, one secretary was paid out of Municipal Affairs, and one Administrative Assistant for a period of four months is being paid out of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: My colleague has requested that if you have a flow chart of the staffing pattern of the department, if that would be available it would be appreciated.

MR. MERCIER: Yes. We'll provide the Member for Wellington with that.

MR. URUSKI: That's fine. On this area that's . . .

MR. MERCIER: The organizational chart?

MR. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. MERCIER: We'll give him one right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington on a point of order.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: On a point of order, I was just going to ask whether the Chairman would like to take a poll to see if any other members of the Committee would like copies of this flow chart, and perhaps the Clerk could undertake to provide copies to those who do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's the general consensus? The Member for Selkirk and the Member for Seven Oaks, would you like copies?

members; Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, then we'll ask the Clerk if he would make sufficient copies for most members. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: That's it on this area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks, then the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am curious about what capital carry-over there still is in Municipal Affairs. In the statement distributed by the Minister of Finance on May 2, he indicated a carry-over of \$1,661,600.00. There was no Capital vote for Municipal Affairs in 1978-79, and I'm wondering whether this amount has been expended or whether simply allocated, and is there any further unexpended authority from previous years, or unallocated from previous years?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the commitment carry-over comes about as a result of the transfer of the Job Office to the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the commitment carry-over is \$1,661,000.00.

MR. MILLER: Well, is that Capital, or is that Current? And is that Capital money?

MR. MERCIER: Capital, I believe. Capital carry-over.

MR. MILLER: All right, so it's carried over into 1978-79.

MR. MERCIER: That's correct.

MR. MILLER: And has it been allocated for a specific purpose? Is it going to be spent? Or has it been spent?

MR. MERCIER: It hasn't been spent. There are sufficient applications in under these programs to cover the full amount of the capital carry-over, but the final decision on whether or not they will be expended has not been made.

MR. MILLER: All right, then this \$1.6 million is to cover certain projects which were under the Provincial Job Office, which is now under your domain, and this is Capital moneys which may or may not be expended, this is what you're saying. Is there any . . .

MR. MERCIER: They're committed, but not spent.

MR. MILLER: Yes, committed but not spent. Are there any carry-overs from previous years, 1976, 1975, which were not committed and not spent?

MR. MERCIER: No, that's the total amount the Minister of Finance reported in the document that he tabled in the House.

MR. MILLER: Yes. The document does include certain 1978-79 current capital vote and the carry-over authority from the previous year. The question is, is there any from previous — going back, because we know that in some instances it goes back to 1975, you know, little bits and pieces, about \$30 million.

MR. MERCIER: There is not to my knowledge any . . .

MR. MILLER: Not in this.

MR. MERCIER: No, this is what the Finance Department has reported to us.

MR. MILLER: I see. Okay, fine. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think I'll let it go at the moment; I've got the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. 1.(b)—pass. 1.(c)—Other Expenditures —pass — the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: . . . on 1.(b), I was wondering if that organizational chart could be returned, there may be some questions. It's very difficult to put things in perspective without the chart.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The Clerk has given it to staff to have copies made. They'll be here shortly.

MR. WALDING: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If you would permit any members to go back to that particular appropriation once they receive this particular chart, maybe we could proceed in the meantime.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as the Member for St. Vital is aware, we will at least hold 1.(a), so there's always a chance to go back. (b)—pass; (c)—pass. 2. Municipal Board; the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister as to the numbers of hearings that are before the Board in the last year; whether there is an increase in appeals from the planning process, and what types of hearings are held, and what is presently as a backlog in terms of hearings before the Municipal Board? How far back are they in terms of rendering decisions on planning and assessment? Could we have that broken down into the various groups?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the report was tabled in the House which would contain all of that information, and unfortunately I don't have a copy of that report with me. If the member doesn't have one, we could get one for him but I understand there is no significant increase in planning appeals. The backlog is running about two months behind on decisions.

MR. URUSKI: Have there been any changes in respect to the composition of the board?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, there have been, Mr. Chairman. Those were announced, I can run over them if you wish: the chairman has remained the same, Mr. Achtm; Mr. Forrest's and Mr. Penner's terms were extended to March 31st of this year, and were extended a further month because of cases which they had participated in; then in addition, I appointed Mr. Tom J. Farrell of Thompson; Mr. Cecil Ferguson of Gladstone; Mr. Kenneth Galanchuk of North Kildonan in the City of Winnipeg; Mr. Garnet M. Kyle of Dominion City; Mr. Eric Lansky of Carman; Dr. Helen F. Marsh of Dauphin; Mr. Clarence W. Patterson of Portage la Prairie; Mr. Carl Weido of Reston; Mr. J. Paul Marion of St. Boniface in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. URUSKI: I presume from the list that the Minister has given us that these members would be involved primarily in regional meetings. They would not all be sitting at the same time in terms of the board here.

MR. MERCIER: It is my impression from reading the decisions of the boards that they are basically sitting in panels of three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from Selkirk, then Lac du Bonnet, then Wellington.

MR. PAWLEY: I just wasn't able to follow the numbers, but it seems to me that there's a net increase in the numbers appointed to the Municipal Board from that number which existed a year ago.

MR. MERCIER: I don't think that would make any difference, even if there has been an increase in the number, because they are only paid for the number of sittings that they sit on. My general view was that we should attempt to have people from as many parts of the province as possible who would be familiar with local areas and which would cut-down on travelling expenses.

MR. PAWLEY: So they are paid solely on a per diem basis, now, not per item.

MR. MERCIER: Per diem. Per meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister could tell us whether there has been any change in the terms of reference with respect to the operations of the Municipal Board, as a result of a change in government?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman, there have been none.

MR. USKIW: The functions are identical as they were, nothing new added or taken away?

MR. MERCIER: No change whatsoever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, my . . . is with respect to the function and jurisdiction of the board. In the past there's been a lot of call particularly in the urban centre of Winnipeg for more autonomy, which was indeed given, with respect to planning matters, to planning process. I'm wondering whether or not, in view of the Minister's past pronouncements, statements and observations in that respect, whether the Minister would be of a mind to discontinue the planning review processes of the Municipal Board, in order to give more authority more autonomy to local municipal councils, in this respect?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think we will see that develop as the planning districts develop, because once the planning districts are formed and they adopt a development plan under the Planning Act, then the only appeal to the Municipal Board is, as I understand it, on the basis of whether or not the application for a subdivision, or whatever, is in compliance with the Provincial Land Use Policies. So as the districts develop, the appeal process to the Municipal Board will be cut down significantly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there are two areas in which my question would apply, and I think it's better for the purpose of discussion to raise it on the first instance, and that is whether there has been any thought given to changing the present Act with respect to appeals on planning decisions. I know we've had this discussion before, the idea being that once you have local planning decisions made, that the matter should rest there. The other argument is that sometimes you have personality clash at the local level, which may result in a negative decision from time to time, hopefully not frequently. But in that instance, what recourse does John Doe citizen have in order to seek his justice, so to speak, at least in his own mind he would feel that he was not properly handled? That does arise at local levels for obvious reasons, from time to time, and I'm wondering whether it isn't worthwhile considering putting back, under this authority, the appeal provisions that were taken away when the new Act was brought in.

MR. MERCIER: Just if I might clarify the question, Mr. Chairman, I take it the member is referring to a situation where a person applies to the local council for approval of a plan, and it's turned down by the municipal council, and he has no right of appeal to any body; that is very opposite, probably, of what the Member for Wellington might say and frankly, what I would say is my own personal position. I believe that the council should have that final determination with — and we may get to this in Urban Affairs. Under the City of Winnipeg Act, under the amendments that the previous government introduced, the City of Winnipeg council has the right to refer a matter to the Municipal Board for advice or comment. That might possibly be the kind of provision that would allow the flexibility for a council if they so felt, for whatever reason, for lack of information, for something else, to give them the right to refer a matter to the Municipal Board for its advice if they wish. But I think the decision for that, as to whether or not they take that procedure, should be the right of the council, and if it is not handled properly, of course, there is always elections that occur every three years.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think that's just probably a very good point that the Minister raises, that last point, the question of resorting to the election process to correct what is deemed to be wrong, and it seems to me that that very process in itself sometimes lends itself to prejudiced decisions being made. The whole process of local elections sometimes puts people one against the other in a very small community which then results in some handicap to the individual on the one side of the ledger to process an application. I know that this isn't as apt to happen in large corporations such as the City of Winnipeg. It could happen but it's not as likely as in a situation where you have a small incorporated village or a small municipality where the two opposing sides may be next door neighbours and have never gotten along sort of thing on other matters. That's the kind of thing that I'm trying to get at.

MR. MERCIER: The Member for Seven Oaks is taking great glee in hearing this discussion because it was something that we went through for a number of years when I was a member of City Council and he and other members of the previous government were members of the province's Urban Affairs Committee. I think certainly your previous government determined in the City of Winnipeg Act that the Council should have the right of the final determination. I've certainly not seen anything from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities or the Association of Urban Municipalities in which they have indicated any concern over granting to people who were unsuccessful at the local level the right of appeal. If they did, I would certainly be prepared to consider it or perhaps consider the kind of amendment that is in the City of Winnipeg Act where the council has the right to refer the matter to the Municipal Board for advice. But until then, I would be inclined to agree with the consensus that the previous government and the City of Winnipeg I think arrived at in that the council should be the final body to determine those matters.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I know that we had this discussion before and the Deputy Minister is well aware of the point that I am trying to make. We did feel — at least our government did — that that was adequate but I think it's fair to say that at least, at least, there should be the possibility of having a matter referred and if we would go that far with the Municipal Act and make it possible for a council to

then refer a situation further on, that would go a long way. But at the moment, as I understand it, the rural municipalities are not in that position. I stand to be corrected but I believe I'm right on that.

Where there is an obvious personality conflict situation, it could be that in council the majority of council would find their out by saying, "Let's refer it elsewhere," you know, it gives them a way of handling a situation like that whereas, at the moment, they don't have any facility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, as far as this matter is concerned, there may be some value in making it possible as under the City of Winnipeg for the council to refer for advice to the Municipal Board; so much perhaps where there's individual friction between some sitting member of council and a citizen but where it's a very close decision and the council is split and it's dicey — they're not sure themselves — and it creates a situation where it might occur where half the council is one way, half the council is the other, the Reeve may cast the deciding vote and the council itself might be happy to get off the hook and say, "Okay, we'll seek advice." It could be a sticky matter, not necessarily because of individual differences but because of the nature of the application and the implications of it, maybe some day they want to seek guidance about future costs and so on. So that that could perhaps take it under consideration.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we will seek the advice of the Union of Municipalities and the Association and see what their views are on the subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope this is the right place to bring up a particular little problem that a constituent of mine has had. If it's not the right place, I'm only going to ask the question once of the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

This constituent of mine owns a little property along the Winnipeg River and he's been trying to get approval for subdivision of this property for at least five years and he runs into interminable delays with different departments and agencies and he has a file of correspondence and reports a foot thick on it. From time to time he gets new resolutions from the local council. It's been referred to the previous Minister on at least two occasions and still, to my knowledge, has not been resolved. I wonder if the Minister could look into it — I don't expect him to be familiar with the particular case — and perhaps report back before the end of his Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member like to give us a better description of the property, like the municipality that it's in, etc?

MR. WALDING: The property is known as the Fijal and Thompson property. It's in the Lac du Bonnet area on the Winnipeg River. I know that the department has a file on it. Perhaps if the Minister would look into it and maybe report back to me I would appreciate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: We will review that matter and respond to the Member for St. Vital. I would point out that not all — in fact, probably not even most of the delays that do occur are the result of Municipal Affairs Department but as a result of comments received from other departments to whom applications for subdivisions are distributed for comment.

MR. MILLER: You're finding that out.

MR. WALDING: I thank the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass; 2.(b)—pass; 3. Municipal Budget and Finance — the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on the grants to municipalities in lieu of taxes, I notice the amount is identical — \$13,808,000 and \$13,808,000 — and that includes the amount that was transferred from Education. The only other explanation perhaps is that last year it was over-estimated, in which case although the print shows \$13,808, there was so much less spent that \$13,808 may be adequate this year.

MR. MERCIER: That would probably be accounted for by the reduction in taxes in the City of Winnipeg last year, so it's quite probable that it was over-estimated last year.

MR. MILLER: That may have happened; so that could be the cause of it. Otherwise, the \$808 would have to be adjusted upwards.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before we carry on to the next speaker, or questioner. Resolution 87: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$224,000 for Municipal Affairs — pass.

The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, on the area of Municipal Budget and Finance, I wonder if the Minister could give some comments to this area. I have looked at the financial estimates of the Province of Manitoba of revenue, wherein they show that the individual income tax receipts from Ottawa are, of course, because of the federal changes and because of the sales tax reduction, have gone down, and will show a decreasing amount in the notes in the municipal share of revenues. However, in the corporation income tax, there is approximately a \$10 million increase from 1978 to 1979, and yet in the net of municipal share there is a reduction of approximately \$1,200,000 in the revenues paid out to the municipalites. Could the Minister elaborate on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the unconditional grants which are paid out as a result of the revenue from those income tax points are not shown as expenditures in this department but are shown as expenditures — not as expenditures, but show up in the Finance Department.

MR. URUSKI: The expenditures you show here are then direct grants in lieu of taxes?

MR. MERCIER: Direct grants in lieu of taxes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, this too may belong to another area or department, but this morning I heard an announcement by the Minister responsible for Housing, that grants would be paid to municipalities in lieu of tax, grants in lieu of payment of full taxes, in connection with the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation housing. There was an indication in his announcement that there would be more moneys paid to municipalities than under the system of payment of full taxes. Now, I'm just wondering if the Minister of Municipal Affairs can advise us how that could be, or whether I misunderstood the announcement, because it has been my understanding that we have been paying full taxes to municipalities in connection with the MHRC housing, and I can't fathom how changing the system could render additional moneys to the municipalities.

MR. MERCIER: My understanding is that MHRC has been in the practice of paying grants in lieu of taxes when the buildings have been erected. If there has been a change in policy by the Minister responsible for MHRC to the effect that greater amounts of money will be paid out to municipalities as a result of some change in policy, as Municipal Affairs Minister, I would welcome that because I have had a number of municipalities complain to me that these properties are being taken off the tax roll in their municipalities and affected their revenue, and they would, of course, as any municipality, would welcome any increase in revenue. But I think the actual question will have to be directed to the Minister responsible for MHRC.

MR. PAWLEY: Then, I would just under this section, ask the Minister to assure the Committee that in respect to grants to municipalities in lieu of taxes, that the system will remain payment of full taxes pertaining to government buildings. Once there was a ceiling that was imposed in centres such as Portage, Brandon, Selkirk, The Pas, even Winnipeg — well, Fort Garry, Fort Garry municipality, based upon the amount of taxes not exceeding a certain percentage of the assessment within that municipality. That was changed in 1971 and I would just ask the Minister to assure us that there will be no return to that type of policy.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, those grants in lieu of taxes are paid by virtue of legislation, and there has been no change in the legislation, and I would not propose any change in the legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; 3.(b)—pass; 3.(c)—pass. Resolution 88: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$14,049,600 for Municipal Affairs—pass.

4. Municipal Assessment; 4.(a) Salaries—pass — the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, just a number of questions in connection with this area. Could the Minister advise us the staff complement in the Assessment Branch this year compared to this time last year?

MR. MERCIER: No change.

MR. PAWLEY: No change. Now . . .

MR. MERCIER: I think I covered that at the beginning, there has been no change.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm sorry, I missed the earlier part of the announcement. Mr. Chairman, the Minister is facing the same problem that certainly his predecessors had faced, so I don't want to appear to be overly critical of him because we faced the same problem of trying to deal with the assessments, particularly in the areas where there is rapid growth residential development. I suppose the Minister has the lists of municipalities and that list indicates the last time that a reassessment was done. I know for example that St. Andrews municipality was reassessed quite some years ago — I don't know whether it was 1969, 1970, 1971 — and there's been rapid growth of all types in the municipality since. There's been a sharp escalation in land values, and we're over the five-year period that is established by way of statute by which the reassessment is to take place.

So my concern is, for instance in St. Andrews — it would be true in other municipalities where there's rapid growth — that we're going to have a very very radical awakening some morning when the residents all receive their new assessment notices. So that in those rapid growth municipalities — I must admit, this has been a continuing problem — we don't seem to ever be able to reassess soon enough to minimize that impact in order to ensure equities from one property to the other property, in a rapidly changing municipality transforming itself into an urban type of municipality. So I would like the Minister first to indicate, by way of some examples, the last reassessment in the municipalities of Springfield, St. Andrews, St. Clements and Rockwood, and when he expects that those reassessments will be completed, and does he agree that there is a serious problem that's being confronted in those municipalities because of what will be a radical change in the individual assessment results.

MR. MERCIER: St. Andrews will be done this year, Mr. Chairman. I'm trying to . . . You mentioned Springfield?

MR. PAWLEY: When was it last reassessed, Mr. Chairman — St. Andrews? If I could get that information in each case.

MR. MERCIER: Well, we'll try and look up that information, Mr. Chairman, but I think as the Member for Selkirk will realize and the Member for St. George will realize, assessments are way out of whack and have been for a number of years and there is no question that this is a legacy of the previous government that we have to do something about.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, it was a legacy to our period from the Roblin-Weir period.

MR. MERCIER: It may very well be, it may have been a legacy from then and it probably was a legacy from before then. Obviously a sensitive area but it's one in which I feel that the whole Assessment Act has to be reviewed and a method established of being able to maintain assessments in force because the members will realize there are a number of communities who have not been assessed for longer than the five year statutory period. I would hope to be able to report at next year's session that we have been able to take some steps to help solve this problem.

MR. PAWLEY: At least I must say this to the Minister, I believe that there was some increase each year during our term in government — 14 last year — increase in SMY and that wasn't enough but certainly with the increase in the total numbers of parcels, there's need for increase each year so that I say to the Minister that to freeze the staff level in the Assessment Branch at the same this year as it was last year, he's inviting even worse difficulty than what we were in when we were in government. He'll be contending with a widening of that gap, the number of years in which the reassessment takes place from the time of the earlier assessment and all the implications that that generates. So I say to the Minister that in freezing the staff level — and I know the overall problem he's confronted with — but he's going to find himself in worse breach of the statutory requirements than even the Member for St. George and myself had found ourselves in.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the Member for Selkirk. Unless it were possible that by means of perhaps a more modern method than sending out a horde of assessors, for example, a computer operation, you would be better able to maintain the assessments and we are looking at that and will take some time but I would hope by next year we'll be able to outline the results of that study.

MR. PAWLEY: Two other questions if I could also raise with the Minister. One is — and here again it's not that easy a problem — but we were gradually trying to pave our way towards doing this, trying to work in consultation with the Urban Association, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and that was full value assessment in order to eliminate the inequities that exist property to property. I must say that we didn't accomplish as much as I would like to have accomplished because there was certain lack of — how shall I put it — distrust on the part of some municipal leaders that this might in fact mean in some way or other a hoisting or an increase in tax expenditures throughout their municipalities. So we didn't accomplish it but we were trying to move in that direction. I'm wondering if the Minister could advise us of his policy position in connection with full value assessment.

Thursday, May 11, 1978

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we are presently reviewing the effects of the possibility of that kind of an assessment. We haven't yet reached a conclusion but the whole question of assessment is under review in the department because a number of municipal organizations, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Association of Urban Municipalities, the City of Winnipeg, have all requested a review of the Assessment Act and the procedures under there which, of course, involve the value system that you use. Again, I hope by this time next year to have that matter completed and to be able to fully report on the policy and the procedure that we will be adopting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few questions. It's been a few years since I've been in the municipal life. I wonder if you could give me a breakdown on how the assessment is done. I'm getting sort of back to the full assessment. At the present time, does the same thing still apply that two-thirds on buildings, full value on land?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, and try to relate it to similar properties.

MR. DRIEDGER: We've brought this question up before at the municipal conventions and . . .

MR. MERCIER: What year was that?

MR. DRIEDGER: —(Interjection)— Yes, they didn't do anything either. I was wondering, is this matter under consideration at all to bring it up to the full assessment level?

MR. MERCIER: Well, the whole question of assessment and the value method and the procedure is under review by the department. We've not yet been able to —(Interjection)— Well, it's six months by me and I guess eight years by the previous government and I guess eight or ten by the previous government.

MR. DRIEDGER: Because it creates definite inequities the way it is set up right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2) the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I'm interrupting proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour. I will return to the Chair at 8 o'clock but I might warn all members that we may go through the Private Members' Hour rather quickly and reconvene the committee before 5:30 so maybe they can stand on guard and come back to work.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats would direct the honourable members to Page 28, Department of Education. We are at Resolution 47, Clause 7, Manpower Planning and Development. 7.(a)(1)Salaries—pass; (2) — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: It could be, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister of Highways wishes to enter into the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter the debate. I would recommend that due consideration has been given to these highways, Mr. Chairman, and that we should consider the passage of these Estimates as expeditiously as possibly, and my suggestion to the Committee be that we deal with them on a page by page basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, after that profound statement from the Honourable Minister of Highways perhaps we can get down to a line by line consideration of the Estimates before us, or until such time as we may be interrupted by the Honourable Minister of Highways again. Mr. Chairman, once again when you called out Item 7.(a) I had hoped that on this item in particular the Honourable Minister would have taken the lead in the debate and indicated to us his rationale for reorganization of the department in this particular area because, as you will note, apart from the — oh, I suppose under 1.(a) where there was some significant — or 1.(b), rather, where there was some significant reorganization because there we have the amalgamation of the two departments at that level . . . But in this one where we have the grouping together of a number of branches which formerly were within the one area of administration; namely, Student Aid, Youth Services, formerly known as Youth Secretariat, and in fact the items following, those were not all related. I thought that the Minister perhaps would have explained to us his rationale for doing this, and it was also my hope,

Mr. Chairman, that the Minister — and perhaps he will, and I'm asking him to — in explaining his rationale for this reorganization that in doing so that he would do more than merely talk about efficiency of administration, or ease of administration, or whatever else, but I would hope that in explaining the reorganization that he would give us some indication of the new directions, the new thrust that he proposes to give the education program in the Province of Manitoba as it relates to these particular areas of activity.

Now, I know that in the past, upon asking the Minister questions of this kind, his answers generally were, or one of his frequent answers was that I should know having been Minister of this department. If I were to ask him to explain the function, the role of a certain branch, I should know. Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that I — and I'm sure that you recall very distinctly that six or seven months ago during the election campaign one of the planks in the Conservative Party's platform was a change in the education program so, therefore, I do not know. Nor do any of us on this side of the House know what the function and the role of the various branches in his department are as he perceives them, and what his goals and objectives are as set out for the various branches of his department.

Now, if on the other hand this is the Minister's way of saying that the government is continuing with the education program as it was conducted by us, that all programs are continuing, business as usual as it were, then really, Mr. Chairman, I'm at a loss to see how that squares with his party's election slogan which was, as I recall it, "Time for a change." Now, if all the educational programs are continuing as instituted by us, then to some degree that pleases me and also at the same time it surprises me. It pleases me to see the host of excellent programs initiated by us being continued, but it surprises me that the Conservative Party is, in fact, continuing our programs in spite of their earlier proclamations that education is a shambles and a mess and time for reorganization and redirection.

The other day, Mr. Chairman, the Minister expressed pleasure at hearing what he thought was a non-political speech on education. I believe it was in response to the contribution to the Estimates Debate by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and I believe that at that time one of the backbenchers indicated that in our Estimates Debate we're fighting an election campaign. Well, Mr. Chairman, that member was right when he said that we're fighting an election campaign; I've been fighting the next election campaign from October 12th, since the last one. Yes, all of us are fighting the next election campaign, as the Minister is fighting the next election campaign, as he is fighting for his political survival and as he is fighting to remain in office. To the same extent, we are fighting to defeat him, and to defeat all the members on that side of the House. Of course we're fighting an election campaign, that's what this business is all about; that's what this business is all about.

You know, Mr. Chairman, seven months ago, the Minister had no hesitation making education a political issue. Now he wants to remove it from the political arena. Education was a plank in his election platform. Perhaps he drafted it; I would like to think that he participated in the drafting of it, he, along with the Member for St. Matthews and perhaps the Minister of Finance, who at one time was Minister of Education for a brief period of time prior to the defeat of the Roblin government of 1969, and perhaps a few others on that side of the House; but perhaps he didn't participate in the drafting of the education planks of their election platform, I don't know, I don't know.

Anyway, he was able to get away with platitudes such as — meaningless platitudes — you know, education is a mess, no direction; no control; it's a shambles; it's sloppy; need for new direction; new thrusts; need for the establishment of standards; the education program must meet the needs of the people of Manitoba; and on and on and on. But, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister cannot continue making meaningless statements of that kind. He has to remind himself that he is now part of the government; now he has to deliver programs to give effect to those comments that he made about education during the election campaign.

It appeared, Mr. Chairman, that when the honourable member went to the people in October and did get the support of the minority of them, he made it appear that he knew what the goals and objectives were that he has set out for the Education Program. Well, Mr. Chairman, if he knew what the goals and objectives were at that time, he should know what the goals and the objectives are for his Education Program today. Now we hear from the Honourable Minister: Oh, it's too early; I've only been in office for six months; I'm reviewing this program and that, I'm studying this and that, time will tell, and as the programs get on course and unfold themselves, then our government's philosophy of education will become apparent to everyone, and so forth, — and, Mr. Chairman, that simply does not wash. If the Minister were to say, "These are the goals and objectives that we have set for ourselves," and defines them — and then if he were to go on to say, "But I'm not quite sure of the exact route that we must follow, the things that we must do to reach those goals and objectives, because firstly, I would want to get a reading on, an assessment, an overview, of where the department is at the present time, and once I have established that, then I will be able to plot the course, the route, that I should follow to get to my goals and objectives — " that, Mr. Chairman, I'd be able to accept from the Minister. That, I would understand. But when he says that the ultimate, the end goals, the main goals and objectives of his Education Program are uncertain, that he doesn't quite know what they are or that we will become aware of them as time goes by, then that type of explanation, Mr. Chairman, we cannot accept.

So it would appear, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister is really saying one of two things. He's either saying that he has found — when he was elected and assumed the responsibilities of office on October 24th of last year — he is saying that either he has found the Education Program to be meeting the needs of the people of Manitoba, being the type that fulfills their needs, being the type that the people of Manitoba want, and that hence it would harm him politically to change it, and

therefore he must live with it; and if he is going to live with it then of course that puts him in a bind because he had committed himself to change so therefore he is going to go through the motions of bringing about change, but in actual fact it's not going to change all that much because he is aware of the political consequences, because he is well aware that he has inherited an Education Program that the people of Manitoba are satisfied with; or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would like to remind the honourable member that we have gone through Clause 4., Program Development, and there has been reference to program development for most of the time that the honourable member has been speaking. We are on Clause 7., which is Manpower Planning and Development, and I would hope that the honourable member would stick to the clause that we're on.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You will recall that under Clause 4., we were dealing primarily, in fact exclusively with Program Development at the Kindergarten to Grade XII level, now we're dealing with the second phase, Manpower Planning and Development, which relates to Program Development as it relates to manpower training in general which is really what education is all about at the post-secondary level.

So, Mr. Chairman, either the Minister has found himself inheriting a satisfactory Education Program, and now he's caught in this bind because of having committed himself to make certain changes; or really, Mr. Chairman, he is walking in circles in search of that new direction which he still can't find, or perhaps he is a victim of both. Maybe that's what it is; that he has inherited a good program and really, he doesn't know what to do with it and how to continue from here on in. So once again, Mr. Chairman, with specific reference to Manpower Planning and Development, I would ask the Honourable Minister to indicate what the new directions are that he has in mind for this whole area, which is a very important one — which, by the way includes the majority. Most of it, certainly three or four items contained in here are programs which we take great pride in having initiated so I think it's very important that the Honourable Minister do indicate the new directions that he has in mind for this particular item. And to help him along, I would ask the Honourable Minister, within those parameters of what the new directions are, if he would indicate what he considers to be the features, the ingredients of a satisfactory Canada Manpower Training Agreement that would best meet our needs vis-a-vis federal responsibility for Manpower Training.

The Honourable Minister has just announced that he has entered into a new Manpower Training Agreement; I would like him to tell us whether he is satisfied with that agreement; whether that agreement will enable him to do what he hopes to do in the area of Manpower Training; and then of course to talk about that, he will have to tell us what his goals are in the area of Manpower Training. He would have to identify the Manpower Training needs as he perceives them and then indicate whether the agreement will enable him to do that or not; and if it's a bad one, why he considers it to be a bad one.

Also, I would like the Honourable Minister to indicate to us whether the post-secondary Education Program which he has inherited, and which he will be responsible for conducting, whether he feels that there is a mechanism established to make it responsive to the needs of the social and economic development of the province. Is it geared in such a fashion that it will be able to respond and be in step to the social and economic needs of our people?

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the first session of this government last fall, the government rushed in to pass legislation offering some tax relief to a small percentage of our people. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce has certain plans for the industrial and economic development of our province — well, they're desk mates, so certainly at least in the House they have an opportunity to. . . —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Elmwood says it doesn't mean they're friends well, he's right too.

But is there an education plan that will fit in with the economic development plans that the Department of Industry and Commerce may have. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce talks about the tax law that will attract new business into the province, of which we still have no knowledge. We heard mention of one which indicated notice of a desire to locate in southern Manitoba, but it hasn't located there yet; this planning had commenced under our administration. But surely if there is going to be industrial development, the community colleges will have a role to play and I would like to know what it will be. The Manpower Training Program in general should be geared to meet those needs, Mr. Chairman, as it will relate to the Manpower Training Agreement for which the Federal Government pays a good portion.

How will his Manpower Training Program respond to the needs of the Minister of Tourism, who happens to be one and the same individual? He talks about increasing the tourist industry. What will the Minister do in the area of Manpower training to respond to that need and provide us with properly trained personnel? The Honourable Minister of Education is aware of the fact that there is, despite our unemployment problem, a shortage of trained craftsmen and tradesmen. What does the Honourable Minister plan to do under his Manpower Training Program to cope with that problem and to attract more people into the indentured trades? Perhaps the Honourable Minister should be listening to the Minister of Health who put out a call for more volunteer help in the delivery of health services. Mr. Chairman, there may be many people who might want to help the Minister of Health along in order to keep costs down, would like to, as volunteers, help in the most effective manner. Perhaps the Minister of Education ought to be considering some program of training for volunteers in the delivery of health services, also related to Manpower Training, Planning, and Development.

And you will note, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of immigration falls within the area of responsibility of this branch. I'm not talking about immigration from Newfoundland, because I believe, if my recollection of history is correct, that Newfoundland has been a province of Canada for well over twenty-five years. —(Interjection)— I wasn't aware that one needs a passport and visa to enter Manitoba from Newfoundland.

Well, Mr. Chairman, then as it relates — and I'm talking now under 7.(a) Division Administration and Support, which has the ultimate responsibility for the seven or eight programs that fall in this area — the six programs — five, if one looks at Division Administration, the overall responsibility — I would like to hear the Honourable Minister's description of what he would consider to be a suitable and ideal Student Aid Program that would serve the needs — that first would define the needs or the role and function of a Student Aid Program, and how he would want to run it.

The role of Youth Services — we notice, Mr. Chairman, that Youth Services is now integrated into the department from its previous arrangement. And there was a good rationale for the previous arrangement. I will tell the Honourable Minister what it was — from time to time situations did arise where there was need to suddenly make a quick decision to mobilize labor forces, to put them to work on various projects such as in case of flooding on Lake Winnipeg. I am sure the Honourable Minister is well aware of, that a couple of years ago during the flooding in McCreary, Ste. Rose, we were able to put hundreds of people to work in a matter of days assisting the people in flooded homes, and so forth. And there were other reasons for it — but I note that now the Youth Services is integrated into his department, and I would like the Honourable Minister to explain the rationale for that and also explain the role of the Youth Services Program.

I would also like him to explain to us the role and function as he perceives them, of the Special Programs. And when I'm talking about Special Programs, I'm really talking about the balance of this appropriation because it's split in two, and essentially they're similar programs, except that under one appropriation they're for southern Manitoba and under the other they're covered under the Northlands Agreement. So I would like the Honourable Minister to express his views on the role and function of the Special Programs, and the future that he sees for them as they relate to Manpower Development.

Perhaps he could also tell us, because he did indicate to us earlier in the Estimates when we were dealing with Item 2., Research, that this is a branch serving the entire department; I would like him to explain to us in what manner the Research Branch will serve education at the post-secondary level. Because you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the linkage within the department — the Research Branch reports directly to the Deputy Minister and there doesn't appear to be any line for liaison between the Research Branch and Manpower Planning and Development. So will there be any direct communication between the two, or will there not? Perhaps the Honourable Minister would explain that, and not only just explain whether there will be any direct communication or not, but also the role and function of the Research Branch as related to Manpower Planning and Development. He did indicate that his purpose in consolidating the two was to bring about some greater measure of unity to the entire education program and reduce costs, so I would like him to explain that.

So in answering those questions and not being desirous to limit him only to those, I would hope that he would feel free to comment on all other matters that he may feel he should, in order to indicate to us what the new directions of his government are with respect to Manpower Planning and Development as he perceives them, the new directions that he's been talking about during the election campaign, that he's been talking about in his government from October the 11th up until the present time. And I posed the questions that I did with the hope that if he should choose not to respond to the general question that I posed to him, that hopefully in responding to the specific questions that I have posed that the new directions of this government as related to Manpower Planning and Development will become apparent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows, he constantly dwells on the theme of new directions, and I think that's quite understandable. I'm sure that he has an interest there. I would suggest that as we have been moving through the Estimates there have been a number of new directions and a number of new policy decisions that have affected some of the old directions that have become very apparent. I don't know if he was not present at that time or if for some reason has not heard about these things. However, I can assure him that before we're finished here I'll be glad to repeat those and emphasize them for his benefit and for any others who may be interested. He, I think, is perhaps prepared to take the suggestion of my colleague, the Minister of Highways, who said we should consider these a page at a time because in his remarks he suggests that he would like to look at this whole area of Manpower and, of course, Mr. Chairman, I'll be quite prepared to go into many of his specific questions. When we get to Student Aid I would be quite prepared to go into Student Aid in whatever detail is necessary — the same with Youth Services, the same with Special Programs, and so on.

But let me just reflect a minute, Mr. Chairman, on what the Member for Burrows has mentioned. He has some problem understanding what the rationalization would be for this particular department, Manpower Planning and Development. He wonders why certain programs have been placed in this area. This is an area, of course, that deals with post-secondary training, and I think with that as one of its chief goals that the area — he would have no problem in understanding — that the area of Student Aid would rather logically fall within this particular sphere because, after all, it is aid chiefly for post-

secondary students, although some secondary students qualify.

The area of Youth Services, again having many of its activities directly associated with the post-secondary area, seems to fall rather logically into this particular area. Special Programs, again dealing primarily with teacher training, although not completely, but primarily with teacher training and with the training of adults, it would seem to me should fall within this area quite logically, because that's what Manpower Planning and Development is all about.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with the rationale for the different departments that fall within this one major area. I think that they are quite logically there and I think it really should increase the efficiency of the total operation in this area by having these particular sub-departments under this heading.

The Member for Burrows also, of course, made some remarks about volunteers again. He has a certain hang-up there I would suggest, because he keeps coming back to volunteerism as if it's a dirty word, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, the volunteerism brings out one of the finer qualities of the citizens of our province and of our country and I have some trouble understanding his obsession with why volunteerism should occur anywhere in our society, and I suggest once again one of the finer manifestations of man's consideration for his fellow man.

The Member for Burrows, of course, is interested in what has happened with the Training Agreement. I appreciate that interest because if we had stayed under the old Training Agreement, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba would have received some \$10 million this year. Under the new agreement, which I think shows some faith in the future of this province and in the development of this province, Manitoba will receive something like \$12.7 million. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Burrows may consider that a new direction. It's an expansion, a development in our province, and I think a healthy one, and the fact that Ottawa also considers it this also reaffirms my point.

The Member for Burrows mentions immigration, and I would suggest that this is an area that, for perhaps the first time — and maybe this is a new direction by his definition — for the first time, Mr. Chairman, the provincial government will be taking some part in the immigration area. It will have some say in immigration and I can inform him that in the few weeks that I will be taking a proposal to Cabinet for a draft agreement on immigration with Ottawa, that negotiations have been carrying on over the last few months on this theme and that, in all probability an agreement or an understanding between the province and Ottawa will be forthcoming. There are three other provinces that have signed agreements at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Well, the Member for Burrows is also concerned about the research function. He is quite right that we have centralized that research function in one department, and we believe that we are going to achieve a great deal more from the centralization. In no way at all will this harm the efficiency of the research in connection with the Manpower area, and the Manpower area does do a considerable amount of research in its projections — projections, Mr. Chairman, that are absolutely necessary for us to have in our negotiations with Ottawa on the Manpower training. I can assure him we have the staff there to handle that and that they are carrying on that type of continual research that produces a number of employment opportunities as opposed to the number of training days that we would allocate for any particular area.

So, in fact, Mr. Chairman, I would admit to the Member for Burrows that, yes, in Education it's business as usual, and the new directions that he's looking for I would suggest are coming forth as we move along. I don't know whether he expects a revolution in Education. I would suggest to him that that is not what is necessary, but what the people of the province want, and I would concur with him that the people of Manitoba I think are reasonably proud of their education system and have been for many years, but they also have been concerned at different times as to what they saw happening in some areas, and they have been concerned with what has happened as far as government participating in the educational picture, and I think that concern manifested itself last October the 11th, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest that to the Member for Burrows also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Manpower Training Agreement the Honourable Minister indicated that it will provide for an additional \$2.7 million, I believe, from \$10 million to \$12.7 million, so an increase of \$2.7 million in the area of Manpower Training, and that that is a new direction. Well, to a degree I suppose he is correct, that that is a new direction, but my question to the Minister was, is he satisfied with the new agreement that's been entered into? It's true, that it provides for more than the previous one did. But can the Minister say that, yes, this agreement will enable us to do all that must be done in the area of manpower training for the people of Manitoba, or, is he saying that, well, it's better than the previous but it still has certain deficiencies within it — that there are still certain problem areas in manpower training that it doesn't provide for. I'm also thinking, in terms of, well, an additional \$2.7 million may sound very good but what will it enable the Minister to do? I think that the Minister knows that one of the problems over the years has been the desire on the part of the provinces to have a greater measure of freedom, autonomy, flexibility, call it what you wish, in the utilization of manpower training funds. I believe that the Minister's aware of the position that has been and I believe still is taken by the provinces, that the provinces, the Ministers of Education, Continuing Education, whatever title they may bear, are in the best position to identify manpower training needs because they're closest to the scene and that therefore they ought to be in

the position to determine how Manpower Training funds are being allocated.

So really what I'm asking the Minister is, will the Minister have any increased measure of flexibility in the utilization of Manpower Training funds or is everything cut and dry and prescribed by the Feds, and if he's going to spend that initial \$2.7 million it must be spent in a certain fashion as dictated by the Federal Minister of Manpower, or will he have some control over that? And if he will, you know, if he could indicate to us, you know, the involvement and the amount of control and jurisdiction he would have over the expenditure of Manpower Training funds.

With reference to immigration, the Minister did indicate that the provinces will be assuming a greater role in immigration. I would like the Honourable Minister to explain what that greater role in fact will be. In fact, he did indicate that he is taking or he is proposing to take a paper to Cabinet dealing with the matter of immigration and the province's role and function in this — and I'm not asking the Honourable Minister at this point in time to indicate to us the contents of the paper that he's taking to Cabinet because I know that he wouldn't, and properly so — but I think that the Honourable Minister could indicate to us what some of the problems and concerns that he has with respect to immigration that is prompting him to do whatever he proposes to do via Cabinet. In other words if he could tell us, well, I'm going to Cabinet to deal with the matter of immigration because — here are the problems and issues, matters of concern that I have identified that I would want Cabinet to deal with. I'm not asking him at this point in time, not unless he chooses to volunteer the information, in which case we'll certainly welcome it, but I would like him to tell us, you know, what issues he has related to immigration he proposes to deal with.

With reference to the second question, I want to make it clear to the Honourable Minister and impress upon him that I have no hang-up about volunteerism. In many areas of social activity the role of the volunteer has been a commendable one over the years. There's no question about it. I made reference to volunteers in the delivery of health services as one of a number of examples. I simply asked the Honourable Minister — I said — well, suppose I would want to volunteer my services in the delivery of health care. Well, I'd like to be the best volunteer that I can. Will the Minister provide me with some training program to enable myself to do my bit as a volunteer? But anyway, the point that I really wanted to make to the Minister, and I'm sorry that it missed him, and this refers primarily to the economic growth and development of the province. I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture — I would hope that he has some plans for the agricultural development of the province. The Minister of Industry and Commerce, I would like to think, has some plans for the economic development of the province, as in his capacity as the Minister of Tourism, he has publicly indicated that he would like to see the tourist industry expand. And the point that I am making, if we're going to do that, then the Minister will have to gear up his Manpower Training Programs to train the people to do the jobs that his colleagues would want to see done in the field. That really is my question to the Honourable Minister, and I would like to know what steps the Honourable Minister proposes to take to be in step with what his colleagues appear to be saying with reference to the economic growth and development of the province, as it relates to his department; as it relates to Manpower Training and Development.

Well, at this point, if the Honourable Minister would wish to comment or respond to the questions that I have put to him now. I have some others which will follow later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, as far as the Manpower Training Agreement is concerned, the Member for Burrows has asked me to refer to any areas that he feels that I am unsatisfied with, that I am concerned about in this agreement as in comparison to the one we have had in the past, I can say to him, certainly, that we are never completely satisfied, that any agreement does not completely fulfill all our expectations. But that generally, this one is most encouraging and should, although it is very difficult, Mr. Chairman, to project three years ahead in the very rapid age that we live in, but should enable us to meet the needs of this province — and the very optimistic needs — because if we need more manpower training, I'd suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the industrial growth of this province will be improving, and if that is improving, Mr. Chairman, it suggests that the economic picture of this province will be improving. And I can assure the Member for Burrows that the Manpower Needs Committee is continually doing research and studying new developments as they come forth, and often before they happen, so that very accurate projections can be made of particular employment and training needs in specific areas, Mr. Chairman.

And so let me allay any fears he has in that area; I think we have the capability and the capacity to meet those demands. We will welcome because it certainly will suggest I think to us and to all Manitobans that our province has an optimistic future.

The other item that I wanted to talk on at this point, Mr. Chairman, was this whole area of flexibility, the Member for Burrows refers to. Built into the agreement is an ongoing facet of negotiation. In other words, as he may well know, is not an agreement that is signed and at that point, negotiation stops; negotiation continues during the three years of the agreement, and Ottawa continually looks at new needs that may be developing in the province, new needs that our Manpower Committee identifies, and there is a flexibility there that allows us to move from areas where the need drops to areas where the need increases. So I can assure the Member for Burrows there is flexibility there and we are quite pleased that we will be able to avail ourselves of that flexibility.

There are certain areas, and there were certain areas in the original agreement that concerned us,

however, during the meeting of the Ministers concerned with Manpower that took place in Victoria last January, we had the opportunity to discuss many of these concerns with the Federal Minister, Mr. Cullen, and the final agreement I believe reflects that discussion because some of those areas of concern have been omitted and some of those areas of concern have been rectified, and I am very pleased to see that has come about.

So I can assure the Member for Burrows that we will keep our Manpower Training in tune with development in this province, and I would hope that development goes ahead to such an extent that all sorts of pressure and strain is put on us to meet that particular development, because if that happens, Mr. Chairman, and I am very optimistic that it will, then I think it reflects something very great for this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass — The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could the Honourable Minister indicate the present status of the plans for an interprovincial Education Manpower Ministers Conference. I am sure that the Honourable Minister is aware that plans had been under way for such a conference for some time, and I think that the need was felt particularly by Ministers' from those provinces where there was a division between education per se, including post-secondary education where that fell within the realm of one Ministry, and then there was another Ministry of Manpower, and there are two separate ministries. And it was felt by the Education Ministers there would be a desirability, for the two groups of Ministers to meet although, granted, from some provinces it would be one and the same individual, but not necessarily from all — but for the two groups of Ministers, all the Ministers responsible for Education, and all of those responsible for Manpower, to meet in one group to deal with issues of common concern, of common interprovincial concern in relation to Manpower Training. So I would like the Honourable Minister to indicate whether plans are still being proceeded, whether in fact the two groups of Ministers now talking to one another are interprovincially, and if they are, if he would tell us that; and if they are not, are plans still under way to get the two groups together to talk to each other.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, let me assure the Member for Burrows that the two groups did get together in January, in Victoria, and he is quite right that in some provinces one Minister handles both areas and others this is a split responsibility; in some provinces the Department of Labour represents the manpower concerns. This is my first experience with that particular type of meeting; I had not realized that this had been a first across Canada, but I think the opportunity for Ministers with these common concerns to sit down together and go over the common problems that they have, and in some cases the unique problems that they have, is a very worthwhile undertaking indeed. And it is my understanding that another interprovincial conference of Manpower Ministers is being planned for this fall as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass — The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Was the conference that the Honourable Minister referred to, was that strictly an interprovincial conference or was this a Federal-provincial conference, in the sense that the Minister of Manpower was meeting with the Ministers of Education and Manpower.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose you could say it's both when you do have the Federal Minister attending perhaps for one afternoon, or for two hours, or for one session, but it was basically an interprovincial conference with that opportunity to meet with the Federal Minister concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass — The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, in reply to the Honourable Member for Burrows, stated that he was going to take to Cabinet a proposal dealing with immigration into the province, I believe that was the thing. This is an interesting feature and perhaps we could get a bit more information from the Minister on this. As my understanding is now, that people who migrate to Canada as far as the straight academic education is concerned, is strictly still the responsibilities of the provincial departments of education. And is the Minister looking at perhaps getting the financial funding from the Federal Government on this facet of our education, and I speak now mainly for the central core area of Winnipeg where we have, and I realize this is post-secondary but in the main also applies in many cases to our basic educational system in Manitoba where we have many immigrant children coming into the province, and with very little knowledge of the English language or none whatsoever. And speaking of volunteers I might say that my wife for two years was a volunteer and was quite happy to do so, in an English program with children in the central core area.

But the unfortunate thing is that these people have been admitted to Canada, and I'm not against immigration, don't get me wrong, but the responsibility for these people coming in was not the responsibility of the province and I feel, and perhaps the Minister feels the same, that there should be some money coming forth, especially when we have extra costs put on school divisions for this type of training. And it also applies in many cases to native children who come from northern Manitoba, who have a very sketchy knowledge of the English language and they are transferring from a federal responsibility to a provincial responsibility. And in the field of the academic education, as I

understand it, there is no federal responsibility, it's only when we get into Manpower Training, vocational and technical education that we can get federal money into this program.

But I am quite interested because the Minister said that he is drafting a proposal¹⁸ that he is going to take to Cabinet, and I don't expect him to tell me per se what he is going to recommend, but I just would like to pick his mind a bit to see what his thinking is, especially on this facet of education.

I might return now to the Manpower Training Program, which is the one we're under now, Manpower Planning and Development. It's still my understanding that the academic upgrading that is required in many cases for people who have to go back and be retrained to different skills and technologies, the academic upgrading is still the responsibility of the provinces, and I feel that especially since they are post-secondary, and in the universities there is federal money available for academic upgrading, and I think that there should be in the Manpower Development, and I hope that the Minister, when he makes his proposal to Cabinet, also takes this into consideration.

Also, I would like, while we're on this same topic, to ask the Minister if there has been any increase of staff under (a)(1), because I see there is an increase in the expenditure from \$135,000 to \$161,000 approximately, but basically what I'm interested in because the Minister mentioned it himself I think in reply to a question from the Member for Burrows, and if he could just expand a little bit on that I would be quite happy to hear what the Honourable Minister has to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Logan, I think certainly highlights a couple of the areas that create concern with immigration. I've had the pleasure of meeting with people who have just experienced the immigration process, and others in different ethnic communities who have real concerns in this area, in talking with them, and of course the areas that he highlights are more to do with the strain that this sometimes places on the local economy to absorb people into the educational system. Now let me assure him that I take his concerns under advisement and this is something that has been brought to my attention previously. I think he's highlighted it again; it's one that the Federal Government has not been really dealing with. People come into the country and then they are more or less left to the fortunes of the particular province or area where they settle. There are conversations and discussions going on in regard to this situation, and I would hope that we will see some sort of solution to that particular problem.

In the whole area of immigration — and once again, I appreciate that he understands that I can't get into policy before policy has been decided — but some of the moves that Ottawa has made with their new Immigration Act have all sorts of ramifications, I think, for the provinces, and one area the province is going to have a great deal of say in how many people come into the province each year. In another area, they have changed the student visa arrangement. Where before you could come to Canada and apply to attend any educational institution once you arrived here, even on a visitor's visa, now, under the new regulation, students will only be able to obtain student visas from outside Canada. And also, those visas will now be institution-specific, meaning that foreign students will not be automatically allowed to change to another institution after they have arrived here. And of course, supposedly if they did so, they would be deported.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I know we could discuss even that particular point at some length, but this is a part of the legislation under the new Act. I think it's a rather interesting bit of legislation; it certainly limits the movement of people within the country. It had been customary for people to go to one educational institution in one province, and then, for some good reason, to see fit to move to another to finish their education. Under the new regulation, that would not be possible. It has considerable implication in that student area; it has some implication as far as university teachers are concerned, and I think for the first time, it is going to require that the province play a larger role and have a larger say in the whole immigration process. And I would hope that would be to the benefit, not only of the province, but also to the country, and by the same token, Mr. Chairman, to the people who have decided to choose this as the land where they would like to become citizens.

One other point, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Member for Logan. He mentions the staffing in this particular heading; there is an increase there and for the reason that we have moved the Student Appeal Board into this particular department, and two staff moved with that particular Board that was down with Student Aid moved up into this Division Administration and Support. And also, there are two staff with the immigration sub-branch, that fall within this area. So we are looking at four more people in this particular area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Honourable Minister for his very frank answers and I can assure him that we will be looking forward with interest to the new agreements when they are worked out with the Federal Government, and I hope that the Minister will definitely keep in mind the fact that even though we are going to get some say in this, that we certainly should be looking for some financial help in the cost of this education of the people who do immigrate and make this country their home. Because, as the Minister has said, and I agree with him, it definitely places a very heavy burden, especially on areas where people tend to immigrate, and Winnipeg School Division No. 1, unfortunately, because it's the central part of the City of Winnipeg, and in the Ward Two area of the central core area of the city, this is where these people tend to gravitate to, and of course, as they become more affluent, they move out and other people come in and fill their place. And so, there

always seems to be an extra burden upon the area, and of course upon the division as a whole. The Minister, I think, agrees with me that Ottawa hasn't been pulling its fair share of the load there, because I think that is really one area I think that we could certainly stand with some financial help outside of what we receive provincially and from the school division concerned. I thank the Minister very much for a frank discussion of this topic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(2)—pass. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that immigration is an ongoing process and for the Minister to indicate and tell us that he is unable to state the policy of the government when no policy has yet been made, I believe that's the comments that he made, seems to be quite peculiar in view of the fact that it's an ongoing process, and one wonders why the government does not have a policy on immigration. I would like, as a rural member, to ask the Minister how the provincial policy will affect our rural areas, and what ramifications — I don't know whether the immigrants that come in eventually stay in the country. There are reports from all across Canada that students immigrate to Canada and they just stay on the loose here; they never get back home. And there's a lot of them, as far as I know, still running around all over the place. But I would like to know whether the immigration applies only to students, or whether it applies to all immigrants?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Ste. Rose, I would point out, of course, that if the province has not had a high profile in immigration before, it's because this was looked on as a federal responsibility and was treated that way, and it's my understanding — I don't know if there was one person in the government, one employee who was responsible in that area, or perhaps there were none, and if there were matters that dealt with some aspect of immigration, they were handled either through the Department of Labour or perhaps in some instances, through the Department of Continuing Education. The part that Agriculture played in this probably was reasonably minimal because we have never had a great influx of farm workers into the province. However, at the point where farm workers would be brought in, and of course we have had examples of that, and will have, I suppose, then the Department of Agriculture does become involved, as do many other aspects of government and labour in the province.

I have some figures that the Member for Ste. Rose may be interested in. Out of a total of about 114,914 immigrants to Canada last year, 5,058 stated Manitoba was their intended destination. Now of that total, that put Manitoba in the position of taking about 4.4 percent of the total immigrant population in 1977. That ranked us fifth as a province; however, if you want to look at it another way, we are perhaps ranked fourth per capita, because we had one person coming into our province for every 204 people living here. I just throw these figures out to the Member for Ste. Rose as I think he has some interest in the area. Perhaps this information is even more pertinent to his concerns: approximately 41.7 percent of Manitoba immigrants were destined to the labour market — that's about 41 percent, Mr. Chairman.

On top of that, and I believe this is another area that he has alluded to, there were some 3,023 temporary employment visas issued last year — and the figures are for 1977, Mr. Chairman. Now, of those temporary employment visas, I think it's rather interesting that 809 were in the performing arts area, entertainment people. Another area where we have a large number fall into this temporary employment visa is the recreation and sport area, some 313. And the third-highest number of people falling into that category were teachers; some 312. I thought I would give those figures to the Member for Ste. Rose; I don't know if those deal with the particular area where he has his highest concern; I have no figures as to the number of people who came in and went into agriculture, for instance, as I realize that's an interest, a prime interest, of the member. But I would give him those figures as some indication of where the emphasis has been as opposed to the permanent immigrant and those coming in on the temporary employment visas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the main area of my concern, of course, would be in the farm labour market, because we do have a high rate of unemployment in our remote areas, particularly in our native people, and I'm just wondering whether there is any on-going discussions with the native groups, the Metis Federation, the MIB, in regard to recruiting people of native descent to work on farms in the summer months? I know there are immigrants coming in from Mexico, and perhaps other areas to work during the summer, and one wonders why we promote this, or allow it to happen, even, if we have so many people here who are unemployed. I refuse to accept the premise that these people are lazy and don't want to work, and I would think that we should be looking at this abundance of resource that we have in our remote communities where I am sure that in some areas 80 percent of the population is unemployed, maybe on welfare. And it seems to me that we should be looking in this direction.

I would hope that the Minister would use his influence and his good office to bring to the attention of the Cabinet that we should be looking in this area. I know that the policy of the Federal Government, on certain occasions, is to ask the provinces to accept a certain number of immigrants right across Canada, and this applies primarily when there is turmoil or unfortunate happenings in other parts of the world, and I know that we are on occasion asked to take so many . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. In accordance with Rule 19, Section 2, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour, and will return at the call of the Chair.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading, Public Bills. On Bill No. 5, An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act, the Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stand)
On Bill No. 6, the Freedom of Information Act. (Stand)
Bill No. 8, An Act to amend the Portage la Prairie Charter. (Stand)

SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 10, An Act respecting the Royal Trust Company and the Royal Trust Corporation of Canada. (Stand)
Bill No. 13, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited. (Stand)
Bill No. 16, an Act to amend An Act to incorporate St. Johns Ravenscourt School. (Stand)

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has four minutes.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, this will probably be the first time in my career in this House I've tried to give a speech in four minutes but I'll nevertheless try to set a new standard or record. I just simply wanted to complete some remarks on this whole question of jobs and unemployment and take a look at the basic issue that we are facing as to what degree should the public sector of this province be involved in stimulating job opportunities in the Province of Manitoba. I think we suggested that the approach being followed presently was not working, was not going to work, and that there had to be very specific, targeted groups that the public sector aimed at in order to ensure that they got some opportunity to become employed. If you'll recall, I did mention the necessity of dealing with the whole area of inner-city economic development.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are some other very important areas where activity could be sponsored. One is in the area of apprenticeship training and in the application of work-study programs in the province. One of the real pressing needs, surprising enough, in the next five years from now, is we will not have enough skilled people. The peculiar aberration that we're going through now with an enormous number of young people out of work five or six years from now will turn into a deficit, rather than a surplus, and we should be using this time to ensure that young people are getting the skills and training that they need in order to be in a position to fill those skill requirements when the demand appears. One of the things if you'll notice that we are not — we literally have very few programs in this province where young people could maintain an educational role working, say, in schools or colleges, universities, at the same time having a work experience either in government itself or in private business. In some cases there could be internships, in other cases there should be a combination of work-study programs. I know of some successful examples in the University of Lethbridge, the University of Windsor where this has been tried out, where there's an opportunity to make some money, get some skills, get into a job track immediately, at the same time improve one's basis.

So it seemed to me that here is another area where that partnership between the public and private sectors could be really worked and, rather than taking a total hands off, do nothing attitude, the attempt to bring some new approaches and some new innovations in the area of employment would provide for some very beneficial results.

So what I'm simply saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this resolution deals, I think, with an ad hoc temporary movement, an idea of getting public works, constructions, and things like that going, and I agree with that. But I do believe that we have to take one step further and begin putting in place some new sort of means of supplying employment for young people and bringing them into the work force, developing a skill, so that when the time comes five or six years down the road when we really need their skills they will not have moved to some other province or gone somewhere else or will not have the skills that we'll all need. This is a time to invest in the future rather than simply to be looking at the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question — the Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to add a great deal more to what has been said on

this resolution, but simply to indicate to honourable members opposite that I don't find the resolution difficult to accept and I would suggest to the members of this side of the House that we in government should indeed consider the advisability of this resolution, and facilitate the passage of this resolution through the House.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we have been getting involved in some semantics, I suppose, with respect to the amount of public sector involvement or private sector involvement, but let me for the record indicate, Mr. Speaker, that a substantial amount of public sector construction and building is taking place, is taking place this summer — many millions of dollars. What the new government has, I think quite appropriately, said is let's take a look at each project in terms of its need and in terms of its requirements within the total overall needs of the government. I just simply cannot buy the kind of utopian concept that some members opposite suggest, for admittedly very good reasons — the development of skills, the providing of jobs — that public construction enterprises ought to be undertaken. They have been undertaken, they will be undertaken, and they are being undertaken this summer. Substantial construction work is being undertaken in the Department of Highways. Substantial construction work is being undertaken on behalf of the Department of Education. Substantial construction work is taking place on behalf of the hospitals. Substantial construction is taking place in the area of public housing sector. —(Interjection)— Yes, there is. The difference is this, that essentially the program that was earmarked by the previous administration is being carried on. What isn't being — you know, some of the outrageous and out of touch with reality electioneering promises in terms of expansion of certain areas of activity aren't taking place and, Mr. Speaker, let me be the first to suggest that if the First Minister was in this House — that is, the First Minister of the previous administration, the Honourable Member for Rossmere — his administration, the previous administration would, in fact, be deferring, would, in fact, be re-evaluating many of the projects that have in fact been put on a temporary freeze situation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the resolution suggesting that government consider the feasibility of adequately funding employment programs — well, Mr. Speaker, we're doing that. The other day the Minister of Finance indicated, you know, the remarkable degree of success that the program instituted by this administration is having, and in fact also indicated to members of the House that while a limit of some \$2 million was placed on that particular program, that limit is indeed flexible, and that if that grows to \$3 million or \$4 million it will be used providing that meaningful employment opportunities can be found for our students.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what I find rather amusing is that, while we have now been subjected to a pretty massive and concentrated propaganda attack on the basis that the actions of this government have brought about a massive unemployment problem in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, the facts provided not by this government, but by Statistics Canada, prove that that simply isn't the case — simply prove that isn't the case. That we have unacceptable levels of unemployment in this province, that's quite true, but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, you know, having been singled out and having been identified as being the government of all provinces of Canada that has had the guts, that has had the courage to bring about some return to responsibility and accountability in terms of the overall public expenditure, that that action, quite contrary to what honourable members have been saying in this House, saying to the media, and that has been widely trumpeted by the media, simply hasn't been borne out by the cold hard statistics — as unacceptable as those statistics are. But the fact of the matter is unemployment is dropping in the Province of Manitoba. Unemployment was higher last April under their administration than it is this April, and that, despite the fact that we are admittedly not building quite as many of the public buildings that the honourable members are asking for us to do; that, despite the fact that indeed there's been some contraction within the civil service.

Mr. Speaker, what is really, of course, of great concern to the honourable members opposite is that I hope, and I think all members opposite share my hope, that, providing that we can bring the economy in Manitoba back on rail, that those unemployment figures will shrink to 6 percent, to 5 percent, to 4 percent, to 3-½ percent, which most economists call full employment and that we will be back in that position within a 12 or 18-month or 2-year period. That's what's worrying the honourable members opposite. What's worrying the honourable members opposite is that that may just well happen and, of course, if that happens what happens to their case? You know, it just about puts the honourable members opposite in the position that they groan and they complain quietly every time the employment situation improves in this province. That's a rather sad case to be in, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I simply rose to indicate that I have no objection to the passage of this resolution that the government consider the advisability of adequately funding employment programs, with particular emphasis on jobs for young people, and in the north and for the inner core of Winnipeg. We're proceeding with some of the major construction programs that were on the drawing boards; notably the Environmental Lab, which is a six to seven million dollar building. We hopefully will be able to continue with some additional construction buildings in concert with some of the plans that the City of Winnipeg is hopefully indicating and, in addition to that, the normal heavy involvement. . . . You know, Mr. Speaker, we've gone through a very funny circus here. Initially there was outright screams of outrage on all the members opposite because of the cutbacks and the contraction in government spending. Then, Mr. Speaker, it became apparent that, well, actually we're not cutting back at all. In fact, it became apparent that we are spending more money than the last previous administration was spending. We were spending more money than the last administration was. Now, they caught themselves in that go-around and then the last month, starting with the Estimates Debate on my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture, my own Estimates on Public Works and Highways, the theme changed all of a sudden, not from criticizing the new government for

spending too little — no, Mr. Speaker, we're spending too much.

Well, Mr. Speaker, somewhere inbetween, of course, the truth lies. The fact of the matter is we are spending more money than the previous administration. Every university is getting more money than they got from the NDP administration. Every hospital is getting more money than they got from the NDP administration and certainly the City of Winnipeg is getting more money for the maintenance and the building of their Capital Roads Programs, and so, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation. There's absolutely no difficulty for us to accept this resolution and hope that the economy generally will improve so that the public sector can continue to play its rightful and meaningful role in the provision of jobs and the provision for economic stimuli in our province, but, Mr. Speaker, what we are not prepared to do is to allow that to be a one-way street, erosion of the private sector, the continual growth of the public sector to the detriment of the private sector.

We do believe in a mixed economy on this side of the House — something that we haven't heard from honourable members opposite, something that we haven't heard from the honourable members opposite. Mr. Speaker, I challenge any of the members opposite to find in the course of the Hansards of this session, or indeed of the last minisession in September, one kind word about the role of the private sector. I would ask them to judge — I would ask them to read through their own speeches because I've listened for it, and Mr. Speaker I'm researching it but I have yet to find one supportive statement made by any members opposite, both within the Liberal group — well, Liberal group, that's being overly generous — but with the NDP group and the Liberal member. So, Mr. Speaker, we believe in a mixed economy. We think that that is the healthy and the most correct position for a government to take and I simply indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to support the resolution before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few short comments based on the few minutes that I heard the Minister of Highways speak. He says that we somehow are playing two tunes at once. On the one hand we're decrying the protracted restraint which Manitoba has been treated to in this last while and that is still the fact. He talks about the universities getting more money and everybody getting more money. If you talk in terms of simple figures, yes, there's a slight increase, but he knows as well as I do and all of Manitoba knows that percentage increase is not even nearly enough to look after inflation, let alone an actual increase to the establishments, be it the hospitals, be it the municipalities, be it the universities — it just isn't enough.

But then he says, on the other hand when we went to Agriculture and his own department, we were saying you're really spending more and he admits he's spending more and I'm delighted to hear that because the point we've been trying to make was this: that the present government inherited voted capital authority and because of that the printed figures they show on the right-hand side are misleading. I'm not even suggesting they did consciously nor willfully. I think that this was because of the transition it was presented that way. The authority does not lapse. In my opinion when they went to a new system they should have said, "All former authorities lapse; all former Capital Loan Acts lapse and we're starting afresh," and then it could have been comparable but they didn't do that. Instead, they simply printed a set of figures on the left-hand side last year, right-hand side this year, and the increase isn't that much.

The argument we are making is this: that the figures shown in the Estimates are misleading because they don't give the full picture. In fact there is approximately \$30 million-odd that will be spent over and above that printed amount and it will be spent simply because the former government had the authority voted for that kind of capital if needed. It doesn't mean that they're going to spend it but the authority was there and so when he says we are somehow playing two tunes, on the one hand we're saying we're not spending enough; on the other hand we're saying you're spending too much, you're spending more, both are right. You are starving many areas that require service; you're putting the squeeze on them; you're introducing user fees; you're doing all the things that we on this side take exception to. On the other hand, the attempt to show this government as the lowest spending with the Minister of Finance saying, "The spending this year will be lower than ever before and it's so very very small and insignificant almost," it's somewhat misleading because, in fact, we know that there's at least \$30 million-odd and maybe another \$30 million on top of that because we still haven't found out how much of previously approved vote authority, capital authority is still lying around from 1976, from 1975. I know there's some that I have knowledge of but we don't know the full picture yet so that in fact by the end of this fiscal year we're in now, the amount spent may hold no relationship to the printed book at all. I'm not talking about special warrants; I'm not talking about new announcements that have been made about new programs or CCIL guarantee or other things; I'm not even talking about that.

The Minister also commented about the question of private investment and he believes in a mixed economy and so on and so forth. In the last few days, I believe it was the Member for St. Matthews or Emerson, I'm not sure which, they also referred to the lack of private investment in Manitoba. Well the fact is that Statistics Canada — not I — Statistics Canada disproves that totally. The fact is between 1969 and 1976 — and that's the last figures I have — the spending by institutions and government departments from 1969 to 1976 rose by 33 percent, 32 percent to 33 percent — but the investment by the private sector under those terrible years of the NDP, the investment by the private sector from 1969 to 1976 doubled, it went up by about 100 percent so to say that during our term of office the private sector languished, the private sector didn't invest, the private sector was fearful of investing is

just so much hogwash. As I say, I'm not saying this, Statistics Canada has the figures to prove it. Government expenditures rose, the investment by government and government agencies, Crown corporations, whether it's government departments and institutions, they went up by one-third; the private sector investment rose by 100 percent in those seven years. So I wanted to put that statement to rest because I heard it today from the Minister of Highways and Public Works, I heard it the other day from one of the two gentlemen — I'm not sure whether it's St. Matthews or Emerson — but it's misleading and it's wrong; it's simply wrong. —(Interjection)— Oh, I'm sorry, the Member for St. Matthews wants to take credit for the authorship of that statement and I attribute it to him. I will not attribute it to Emerson. Well then he's wrong — I thought both of them were wrong — now it's only he's wrong. The fact is that public sector investment, through government, went up one-third; private sector investment went up 100 percent in the same period of years from 1969 to 1976.

So how the Minister of Highways can say that this government, with the election of the Conservative government, a new climate has developed, that in the past the private sector was discouraged, was frowned upon, was simply not allowed to expand — this is just so much hogwash. Business will go where there is a return. The corporate sector is in the business of making money.

I saw an interview with a vice-president of General Motors about four months ago and he was asked about the car business and so on and so forth and he ended up, very interestingly, making a statement, "We're not in the business of making cars; we're in the business of making money." The fact that they use cars with which to make the money is incidental and he's right. Business will go where they can maximize their profits. If there is a profit to be made in Manitoba they will be in Manitoba. If this government thinks that the private sector can be depended upon or can be relied upon or should be leaned on to create employment in the Province of Manitoba and that they are the main generators by which we stand or fall, then they're really skating on thin ice. The idea that somehow this government by talking nicely can entice business to Manitoba in competition with let's say Alberta, is absolute nonsense. You can't do it. You will not match them in the low taxes; you will not match them in their give-aways; you will not match them with the resources they have; you will not match them with the funds they have. If you start on that route of trying to, with incentives, enticing them to come here, you're in a losing battle, it's a game you can't win.

I know that in Newfoundland, for example, they have probably the lowest minimum wage in Canada. Has it helped Newfoundland? No. They still have the highest unemployment in Canada so it isn't any of these simplistic things that we hear from that side which they're trying to create a picture that somehow with their administration things are going to be different. We, on this side, made no bones about it. We feel the public sector is absolutely essential, particularly in the construction industry. Without the public sector involvement in any jurisdiction anywhere in the western world, or for that matter in the world, without their deep and constant involvement — whether it be in housing or public buildings or hospitals or schools — then the construction industry will languish. It has to. There just isn't enough in the private sector, unless you're prepared to turn everything over to the private sector. Unless you say a school should be private sector built and owned and rented out, rented to governments, or maybe Hydro should be private sector, or Telephones should be private sector. I don't believe you'd do that although that is a way of doing it, of course. That way you will certainly attract investment. If you want to sell the Telephone Company to me I'll gladly put together a consortium and buy it from you and I can tell you I will be able to retire and my children will be able to retire and my grandchildren will be able to retire on the return they're going to get — guaranteed — no questions asked. Just look at the rates from Bell Telephone because they have to pay shareholders and get a return on their investment.

So, Mr. Speaker, my comments really are just very few. I feel the resolution is a good one; I'm pleased to see the Minister of Highways saying that in fact they see no reason why they shouldn't support it because it's true, it simply says, "Consider the feasibility," but I hope it's not simply to vote for it because you're considering the feasibility but, in fact, you do recognize that in every jurisdiction in Canada and every jurisdiction in the United States and every jurisdiction in Germany, the public sector involvement in the 1970s and 1980s must be greater by far than it was 50 years ago. Where they have chosen to draw back, the result has been a decline in total employment — it's inevitable. So I hope that in fact they will take this resolution seriously and not simply pass it because it's the right thing to do but simply say, "Well we're considering it or we did consider it and we've done our duty; that's the end of it."

I was pleased to hear the Minister now mentioning that in fact some of the plans of the former government are being moved forward and he knows, as I do, that some of those buildings that were mentioned in the past, like the Environmental Lab, as one of the items which could be built and for which capital authority was voted, and they will be using that capital authority, that the decision to build them was made but, in addition to that, the former government went further than that. It proceeded to draw up plans so that they could launch a construction program without the long delay of designing of the architectural drawings and so on. In many cases, these plans, the drawings are all ready to go; it's simply a matter then of tendering it and you can move very quickly. I hope that what the Minister said today was the signal in Manitoba for the thawing of the freeze and I'm sure the construction industry will be glad to hear it and that Manitobans generally will be pleased to hear it because if there's any industry that has a multiplier effect, it's the construction industry. They have a massive effect on the economy and, as a result, hopefully the construction industry can get into this even within the next 60 days rather than having to wait.

So I welcome that particular announcement and therefore I am pleased to see that the present government is backing away from its very dogmatic, rigid statements it made in the past that the

public sector is doing too much, the government is doing too much, society as a whole, through government, is doing too much, we have to leave it to the private sector. Now they talk in terms of mixed economy and I suspect we're going to hear more and more of mixed economy. I'm curious, later on, to see what they mean by mixed economy because there are various methods of mixing the economy but at least it's a step forward from what we heard for months and months and months prior to the election and even since the election. The protracted restraints that were promised and delivered, all on the excuse that there are no funds, but in fact we know that the funds are there, they're going to be spending them. The capital authority was voted; it simply isn't shown in the book but it's there to be used whenever the government wants it and obviously I'm pleased to hear that they are now going to avail themselves of it and I'll be curious to see how much of it is used. I certainly do hope that whatever — even this year's too late — but that we start next year by lapsing all previously voted capital, we start afresh so that when we talk in terms of combined current and capital, we are in fact talking about the same thing.

MR. SPEAKE: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my comments are finished.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the two previous speakers, I can only say that I can hardly believe my ears. When I just listen to my colleague who is, I believe, a man of his word, I think he's been somewhat taken in. He's not naive by any means but he seems to have swallowed some of what the Minister of Public Works said and that, to me, is a very dangerous thing because I believe that the Minister of Public Works is one of those who believes that words speak louder than actions. That is his philosophy, that if you posture and perform . . .

MR. ENNS: Somebody else said a pen is mightier than a sword.

MR. DOERN: . . . Right. I believe that the Minister really believes that by effecting a powerful pose or talking in a sincere voice that that, in effect, is more important and will carry the day against actions.

Mr. Speaker, today in question period, a couple of hours ago, I asked the First Minister whether he was going to follow the lead of the City of Winnipeg hardly what I would call a radical administration, an administration that is run politically by Liberals and Conservatives, and a Chief Commissioner, D. I. MacDonald, who is a very respected and respectable gentleman, hardly what you'd call a radical in any way, shape or form — I asked whether they would follow the city's lead, because the City of Winnipeg did the following: Chief Commissioner reported to the city, that it would be a good idea if urgently needed capital works were moved ahead, because of all the unemployed tradesmen, and he expressed a concern for the unemployed construction workers in Manitoba, said there was a danger they would leave the province, that there was a waste of manpower, and that the city should help take up the slack. He then proposed a number of projects that could be accelerated, and he even went further, and he said that the city should contact the CBC to commence construction at the St. Paul's College site and encourage the C.N. and Great-West to commence construction at the east yards.

Now, this morning, the Executive Policy Committee of the city passed a motion in favour of that, because I think it is obvious to anyone that there is a very serious problem in the construction industry as a whole, and I asked that question of the First Minister, and the First Minister gave a very vague, airy-fairy answer about how, well, you know, given the fact that they might look in the cupboard some day — the cupboard that is bare — might look in there some day, find some money — they found a couple of million dollars — and no doubt they would do something, Mr. Speaker. That was the kind of attitude I picked up from the First Minister.

Now then, a couple of weeks ago — there was a meeting held October 20th, by the architects of Manitoba, which was written up in the column by Frances Russell of the Tribune, and I obtained a copy of those minutes that were fairly widely circulated in the profession, and here is the kind of information that architects are giving to one another as to the attitude of this administration. This is what was said by a couple of gentlemen, one whom I believe is the president of the association, they reported as follows to their colleagues — their colleagues had a special meeting, Mr. Speaker, attended by 15 to 20 architects, on April 20th, about three weeks ago, to discuss the effects on the profession of the freezing of many institutional government projects, and to propose a course of action. That was the subject of the meeting, and this was reported by two architects, the general statement was as follows: "The attitude of the government had not been encouraging," and the first architect "had been told that architects had had it too good." The second architect said that he was concerned that architects might have to leave the province in order to have work. He was told by a government Minister that that was a good idea, he should move to another area. You know, if you don't like it here, you don't have enough work, you don't like the way the government's operating, take off. Fold your firm and take off.

Then somebody spoke to the Minister of Finance — somebody was having conversations with the Minister of Finance — and it said that he was focusing most of his attention on hydro matters, 66 percent of the total debt in Manitoba is hydro, and it was hard to get him to give some attention to the problems of the construction industry. —(Interjection)— Well those were the reports, those are the reports of architects, and you know, Mr. Speaker, you can count the NDP architects on the fingers of one hand.. The predominant majority of members of the architectural profession, the engineering profession, are Liberals and Conservatives, and they go to meet with members of the government to express their concern about their profession, the construction trades go and talk about their concern — the government of course would never listen to the president of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, or to the representatives of the construction trades, and so on. But here's a whole group of people going to the government, not only are they being told that there is no lifting of the construction freeze, they are being slapped in the face, injury is being added to insult. They are told, if you don't like it fold or leave, that is the attitude.

Now I asked the four Ministers responsible, that I felt were contained in this particular meeting. I know that it was among the four: the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Finance, the First Minister, or the Minister responsible for MHRC. They didn't know about this, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't them, it wasn't them. Well, then all I can conclude is either they are embarrassed at having given this information or impression to members of the architectural profession, or else the members of the architectural profession are liars. Those are the basic things, and whoever gave these reports gave false information and false impressions, and conveyed it around a table to their colleagues, which is, you know, a pretty serious matter, Mr. Speaker. Now they could have forgotten, that is one of the problems that we're having here in the Chamber.

Now the Minister of Public Works says that there is some construction taking place, and there is some job creation, but in relation to the public projects, to the needs of our society in terms of schools, hospitals, and other buildings, in terms of employment opportunities, they are not even scratching the surface.

I'm not interested in what the government is doing per se, the fact that they may have increased certain expenditures, I think you have to look at the problem, Mr. Speaker. You have to look at the size of the problem, and then you have to look at the government effort in relation to that, and see whether they are, in fact, rising to the occasion or whether they are really doing very little indeed. And the Minister of Public Works takes some pride in saying that employment statistics are going down at this point in time. Well, it's traditional that at about this point in time, there is an improvement in unemployment statistics, and that in the summertime you have, of course, the fullest employment that you will have at any other time of the year.

What has the government done? What has the government done to help employment in Manitoba? Well, I know they've fired a lot of people, that's one thing they did, that was one contribution that they made and they are also driving people out of the province, or letting them go out of the province, telling architects to take off. Nurses are being recruited by the dozens or the hundreds; teachers are unemployed and looking around for employment elsewhere; you know, that is certainly not to the credit of the administration. That is what they've done, but you don't add that up and say, "This is what we have done to alleviate unemployment."

You know, Mr. Speaker, I gave a lot of thought to the Lyon administration in the last couple of days, trying to figure them out — maybe second guess them, or trying to read into their minds — and I think their minds are most accurately expressed by the backbench. We know that they're the greenhorns who tell it like it is. The boys up at the front, they are a little suaver, they don't sort of spill the beans, they know how to present a better impression but we listen to the boys in the back, and they tell us what they really think, and where this Party is really at. —(Interjection)— Sure the Member for Pembina, the Member for St. Matthews, and then the old — I think they used to call that old burned-out volcano in Java Krakatoa — the Member for Wolseley, he's a mere shadow, a mere shadow of his former self, but in the old days he used to tell us where things were at, but we don't hear from him anymore.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I believe— this has been said before, but I want to develop a thesis for you — I believe that the Lyon government, and part of what I say will not be new, but part I believe is new, that the Lyon government is like the Campbell administration.

Now I want to talk about an area that interests me the most, and we talk about job creation, and so on, that is construction of public facilities and assets, etc. I say that Lyon, the Premier of this province, is like the Honourable Doug Campbell, in that he will not construct — this is his policy, differs from the Roblin administration, differs from the Schreyer administration — he will not construct any public facilities or buildings or assets other than the absolute bare minimum. That is going to be the policy, and that wherever possible, they will lease any requirements from private developers. I tell you this, Mr. Speaker, if this government could, if they could allow hydro to be taken over by the private sector, they would, because they believe in that. They would roll back the clock, they would go back to the days of R. P. Roblin, and they would allow somebody to take it over; they would. In terms of highways, the only reason they build highways, is because they're stuck, because they know that it would be political dynamite to allow some private people to build highways, other than Mr. Jarmoc, but they know that as a general policy, that if they allowed private people to build highways, and to charge tolls, and to build private bridges, and to charge tolls, they'd get killed. But barring that, that political reality, if it wasn't for that, they would allow it.

And similarly, I think, this would apply to hospitals, and it would apply to every other kind of public facility, including schools. They would let private developers build the schools, and they would lease

the schools, or they'd let private developers build the schools and run the schools, if they could do it, but they are blocked by political realities.

You know, when the Honourable Duff Roblin came in, he had a clear field. It wasn't very hard, Mr. Speaker, to show-up the Campbell administration, it wasn't very hard — oh, I'm sorry . . . — (Interjection)— . . . I have to be careful of one of my colleagues, in that regard. It wasn't difficult to do things, given the fact that for ten years and longer, if you want to go back to the days of Bracken and Garson and so on, it wasn't very hard to look good, because of the fact that so little had happened for such a long period of time.

You know, I had an argument two days ago with the First Minister. He is against construction so much, he is against public works so much that he wouldn't admit that his administration built the Norquay Building, because he finds that embarrassing. They have a provincial garage, they have to leave it empty, they have to try to sell it, they have to try to convert it to something, because they're embarrassed, Mr. Speaker. It's a public facility, it's a public asset. And so when I said to him, he was making some comments behind me in Committee on Public Works — and when I said to him, "Your administration built the Norquay Building," he said, and it's written in Hansard, "No we didn't". And I said, "Well, weren't you in office in 1959 and 1960?" and he said, "Yes." Because he doesn't remember, he doesn't want to admit that they built a government office building, it's such an embarrassment. —(Interjection)— When did he say that? Tuesday night.

Mr. Speaker, what happened was the Campbell Government, which did nothing for ten years, decided one Friday at five o'clock, this is a story that some of my friends will not be familiar with, they decided that they had better do something. There was an election brewing in 1958, they called up a firm of architects, and they said, "We want to put up a building, we've got to show something." They phoned a firm of architects, and on Monday a sketch was presented to them — a sketch. And then of course, later an election was called, and they lost the government and in came the Roblin government and they decided that they would build that building. They changed it completely, they added three stories, and they built it 100 percent, Mr. Speaker. It was built from the first shovel to the cutting of ribbons, to the opening of the building, 100 percent under the Roblin administration.

The First Minister has the audacity to say that they didn't build the Norquay Building. Well, I think that this is some kind of a mental block that he has about admitting that these things were done under the Roblin years. So I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with a very peculiar government, a government that would buy and rent all of its requirements, when it comes to construction, roads, hospitals, hydr. They would rent everything from the private sector, they would ask the private sector to build everything for them. The only thing that is preventing them is political reality, and if they could get away with it, they would get away with it. They would grind this government down completely, because that is what they want to do. They want to minimize the public sector, and that is the particular approach that they take. And Mr. Speaker, when you compare that to what our government did, to the efforts of the Winter Works Committee, to the efforts of Urban Renewal, to the decentralization of government offices around Manitoba, to hydro development, northern roads and urban development, it's a pretty shabby effort that is being made by this particular government. The City of Winnipeg can recognize it; our government recognizes it and tried to act to build public assets, especially at a time of high unemployment or downturn in the economy, but this government is trying to build the private sector up by tearing the public sector down. And I think that what the Minister of Public Works has said today about this resolution are mere words; we want to examine their record and we want to see what they will do. But I also say this, that his words stand in direct contradiction to the First Minister as little as a couple of hours ago today.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Highways, I will be supporting the resolution, but with some reservation. I might point out — I want to make it very clear, while I'm voting for the resolution that I don't believe that I will be doing so in violation as an MLA with a conflict of interest, because while I am an engineer and a contractor, I have no intention of ever doing any business with the government of the day while I am a member of this Legislature, so that the resolution, in my belief, will not affect me personally.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize until now in the last week that the Honourable Member for Elmwood is actually a Liberal, not a New Democrat, because I can long remember, the former Honourable Minister of Public Works, I can remember very strongly, promoting government-owned construction facilities, government-owned operation, government-owned design, and in fact, I believe, under his administration as Minister of Public Works, developed and created quite a large in-house design of engineers and architects, which, I might add, took away business from the architects and engineering firms from the private sector. Now we have the Honourable Member for Elmwood standing up, being the saviour of the engineering profession and the saviour of the Architectural Association of Manitoba. So, if I don't call that being someone trying to walk down both sides of the line, Mr. Speaker, then sometimes that's being defined as a Liberal. So that's why I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Elmwood is now being considered a Liberal in this particular Legislature by myself.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was the Honourable Honourable Member for Brandon East indicated the major economic problem of the day was unemployment and I have to agree with him. In addition to that, there also is the matter of inflation, and coupled with that is the ongoing problem of productivity of Canadians, productivity of Manitobans. And I say, I would support this resolution with

reservations in that building government buildings, or Public Works construction, while it creates the employment during the construction period, it is a short-term approach to a long-term problem, and I think it's been verified through the past few years that the Federal Government has literally spent millions of dollars, millions of dollars to try and create a long-term employment situation in Canada, and have failed. We now have the highest unemployment situation in recent years, as far back as I know in history, in Canada at the present time with a government federally, who took the approach that by building and giving out money and having things built, that they would overcome the problem of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, the other problem that I can see with the resolution, of just holus bolus of constructing public works and buildings, is that one gets trapped into an ongoing expenditure, a commitment. Once we open the building, we have to man it, and that is where the productivity falls down, because in the overall economy government does not create productivity; they do not create productivity, Mr. Speaker. They create employment to construct the facilities, but once the government puts staff into that particular facility, they do not create productivity to the overall economy. And Mr. Speaker, that is why this government has taken the approach that, in addition to the employment problem, inflation is a major problem, not only Manitoba but in Canada, and that government is a major contributor to that inflation problem, and has been through the years. And Mr. Speaker, we believe that a properly managed type of government with a properly managed growth in public works and facilities is the right approach to solving this problem of unemployment, with the approach to solve it on a long-term basis, not on a short-term basis. And I believe that the rest of Canada, and governments in Canada, will follow us, and recognize — and in fact, many of them are — with the idea in mind that we cannot just create employment for six months of the year, and then watch the curve of unemployment again rise for the remaining six months.

And Mr. Speaker, this is why, with some reservation, that I support the bill. I believe we have to look at continuing ongoing works, but managed properly, not just holus bolus, saying that by building a building, or putting in a new highway, or putting in this and that, that we will create permanent employment. Because, Mr. Speaker, while I'm an engineer and in the contracting field, I've had the opportunity to talk to many architects and engineers in the past year, and particularly in the past six months, and I can't agree with the Honourable Member for Elmwood when he says that they are going to leave, and they are just going to close up shop and go, because the architects that I have talked with, they've tightened their belts, and many of them, I will admit to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, to some degree have been lulled into the acceptance of ongoing government business — they just sort of automatically thought it was going to be there every year — and some of them got very dependent on government business. But they, being good free enterprisers, saw the situation changing, tightened their belts, and they're going out and they're getting work, they're keeping busy. And I have great confidence in the architectural profession, and also the engineering profession in this province, that they will go through these hard times like they have in the past and they will correct the situation by going out and finding the work elsewhere, rather than just having an open hand, that the government will continually feed the work to them. Because, Mr. Speaker, they recognize that we're not a government that believes that we should own everything, or that we should employ everybody, or that we should continually build government buildings for the sake of creating employment, or for the sake of building an empire.

And, Mr. Speaker, they have recognized it, and the ones that I have spoken with and had contact with, they are getting by, they have tightened their belts, they're encouraged, they believe that the horizon is coming up and that things are changing, and in fact they are changing. As a contractor, I can tell you that there are more and more items coming out to tender on and bid, and they are not government facilities that are being bid on.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the approach that our government has taken with the control of government spending and the managing of capital spending, that in the long term, this is the approach to overcome the unemployment situation in Manitoba and in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, why I believe it's so important is that as a province where a major part of our economy is exportation, that we have to become competitive again, and we cannot rely on the drop in the Canadian dollar to make us competitive. It's more than that, Mr. Speaker, we have to improve our productivity as a province and as an industry in this province by convincing our people and convincing our workers that we have to pitch in and start to produce so that we can export these goods. Because, Mr. Speaker, that is why Manitoba has, I believe, a good way of life here, and a good quality of life, primarily because of the profits that have been made from exportation. Because we cannot just survive within our own particular boundaries by changing money continually within the boundary; we have to make a profit by exporting the goods and services outside our boundaries, and that is how this government, and the former government, particularly, benefited so much, was the fact that they could continue to tax these industries that were making these profits, the mineral taxation, and the taxes from agriculture and so forth, because we are one million people, and we are very dependent on exporting our goods to create a better way of life here, and for that reason we have to become more competitive. And we believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the ways that we can become more competitive is by cutting down government spending and cutting down government taxation, and leaving more money in the people's pocket, hopefully, creating more productivity right here within the province and therefore becoming more competitive in the export fields.

And, Mr. Speaker, we don't believe that the way we become competitive, as I said earlier, is depending on the drop in the Canadian dollar so that we will pick up productivity through devaluation in our dollar. That is not the answer, because it creates inflation at home as well when we

Thursday, May 11, 1978

have to buy imported goods. So, Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution because we hope that we will see an improvement in the employment situation, not only in the youthful ages in our society, but all ages, and that through managed development of Public Works expenditure and capital spending, that we will see that long-term result of more employed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, the honourable member will have 10 minutes to complete his remarks when this item next comes up again.

I am leaving the Chair, and the House will resume at 8:00 o'clock in Committee of Supply.