

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, April 26, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 25 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing from Prince Edward School. These students are under the direction of Mr. A. Smith. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

We also have 50 students of Grade 8 standing from Hugh John Macdonald School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Fedak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

We also have 30 students from William Morton Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Pallister. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

## PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

**MR. GEORGE MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the St. Johns Ravenscourt School praying for the passing of an Act to amend the Act to Incorporate St. Johns Ravenscourt School.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Public Schools Finance Board for the year ending December 31st, 1977.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

Before we proceed to the Question Period, last week I was asked to look into a matter of House privilege. On Thursday, April 20th, the Member for St. Vital raised the matter of privilege of the House at which time he indicated that an Order-in-Council No. 396/78 signed by W. K. Ziprick, Acting Clerk of the Executive Council, might in fact be jeopardizing the independence of the Provincial Auditor, who is a servant of the House.

I have carried out a fairly extensive investigation. I have interviewed Mr. Ziprick. I have sought the advice of Legislative Counsel, as well as members of both sides of this Chamber. In essence, this matter is probably a matter of potential conflict of interest. I am satisfied in my own mind that no conflict of interest has occurred as yet. I was assured by the Provincial Auditor that he never has sat at an Executive Council meeting in the role of the Clerk of the Executive Council. The Order-in-Council referred to above was signed by Mr. Ziprick only as to form. The advice I have received from Legislative Counsel, who also interviewed Mr. Ziprick, substantiates my conclusion. While I recognize that at some time in the future there is a possibility of a possible conflict of interest arising, I believe the individuals involved would deal with the matter when necessary. I have been assured by the Provincial Auditor that he would never compromise his role as Provincial Auditor by taking an active part in the deliberations of the Executive Council. I have been asked to report to the House my findings which I am now doing. I feel it is beyond the realm of my jurisdiction to make recommendations. I wish to thank the Honourable Member for St. Vital for his diligence and his concern for the privileges of the House. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, I'm not entirely sure just offhand whether it is appropriate for me to say anything just at this stage in direct relationship to your statement, but if I have your indulgence and that of the House I'd like to say, Sir, that I agree and concur wholeheartedly with the statement and commend you, Sir, for the very concise way in which you have articulated the problem, to the extent it is a problem, that there has been no real problem but that, in terms of format, there is the potential for one, and probably the government would be well-advised to consider making that change. There is no gravity or urgency but just as well to avoid a future, largely theoretical potential problem.

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, I think the point was well-known to him and to previous administrations that this was in effect a secretarial type of appointment only for certification of documents. It had been carried on for a number of years not only with the present Provincial Auditor but with a number of his predecessors through, I presume, two, at least two administrations of governments and we are certainly taking a look at it because I think there are a number of other senior civil servants who are quite capable of carrying out that same secretarial function without appearing to offend even the rule against Caesar's wife.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I direct to the First Minister the question as to whether he has been able to obtain any confirmation or information with respect to whether or not Manitoba is being called upon, or has been called upon, to go into close consultation and liaison with the Government of Canada with respect to the request by the United States for systematic consideration of major blocks of electrical energy interchange being built up in the years ahead?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to take that question as notice and report to my honourable friend or the Minister of Finance will report on his return shortly.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes. My question to the Minister of Northern Affairs flows from the fact that we are to understand from press releases that another asset owned by the province will be sold, and probably on three days' notice, and I'm asking the Minister of Northern Affairs if he can indicate whether it is the government's intention to sell Pakwagan assets, and if so, can he assure us that it will not be on three days' notice?

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the specific question as notice, and give the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the details and the methods under which we're dealing with that particular question.

While I'm on my feet, I understand that the Leader of the Opposition asked a question in relationship to Manitoba's participation in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, and if in fact there were some options being presented, by the Federal Government to Manitoba, I think was his major concern, but to the participating jurisdictions. For quite some time, possibly the last two years, there has been a growing dissatisfaction and lack of understanding of the operation of the FFMC within the five participating jurisdictions, being Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Territories. We find ourselves — in Manitoba in particular, what I'm fairly familiar with — where both ends of the scale are in question. The marketing end of the FFMC and their procedures and their systems are of great concern to myself as a Minister and to the fishermen generally throughout western Canada. On the other end of the scale, Sir, there is the lack of understanding — and I think that's the kindest word I can use at this moment — by the fishermen of the operation of the FFMC. There seems to have been a distance created, either by choice or otherwise, where we now have a situation where a major marketing corporation does not really, in fact, have the faith and understanding of the producer, and that, I think the Leader of the Opposition would agree, is not a healthy situation.

I am reasonably pleased that with the support of the fishermen of Manitoba and a great deal of work by the government staff, we've been able to bring the Honourable Romeo LeBlanc, Federal Minister for Fisheries, to Manitoba, to Winnipeg, as a matter of fact, and a week ago he agreed to have a meeting with the Ministers of all five jurisdictions.

At that particular time, he said that if there was that much irritation by their participation in the FFMC, they were prepared to walk away and the four provinces and the territories could take over the entire operation. My answer to him then was the same as it would be today and the same as it will be in the future, that I feel that the Federal Government has a very real responsibility to the industry and to the people involved in western Canada. That, I suppose, was the first hour of the meeting and approximately 12 or 13 hours later we came to an agreement on two particular statements, one being that a committee of the board itself would review the marketing procedures. This is a very significant step because at all times the chairman of that corporation and the Federal Minister claim there was never any need for review. They have now agreed that a committee of that particular board would review the marketing procedures and they have the opportunity and the support of all jurisdictions,

Wednesday, April 26, 1978

including the Federal Government, where they can call on for information relating to marketing and our questions of marketing. They can also call on, if they wish, additional outside help to resolve that particular problem and to come up with the recommendation on how they see the marketing and how it possibly could be going by July 15th.

The other group that is of just as major concern, the Federal Minister has agreed to accept as a negotiating base, whatever the five-year restrictions come up with or a new form to the FFMC where the participating jurisdictions will, in fact, have more say. Manitoba is very interested in having more say in how the FFMC runs fairly basically because we have 55 to 60 percent of the produce and we have one representative on the board. It is, I suppose, a little selfish on my part, but I believe we're entitled to more than one when we compare ourselves with for example, Alberta, that produces two percent and they still have one.

The Federal Minister has agreed that he'll look at whatever proposals we present to him and that is to take place sometime in early September.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before we proceed, may I suggest to honourable members on all sides that lengthy questions do probably generate lengthy answers, but I would also suggest to the Honourable Ministers that where they do have a long answer to a question that has previously been asked, it might be better to provide that answer in written form. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, on that statement, my honourable friends do have the opportunity to seek answers by placing questions on the Order Paper and getting it in written form.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** I don't wish to engage in a procedural debate. If the Honourable House Leader will look at Hansard, when I posed a question in the initial instance, he will find that it lent itself to a relatively short reply.

I am by no means suggesting that I am unhappy with the Minister's answer. It was very long but, quite frankly, I was pleased with the answer because it makes it clear that most serious consideration be given to the publicized statement of the Federal Minister that Canada would divest to the Province's responsibility for the board. I thank the Minister for the reply.

I ask him, by way of supplementary, whether he can indicate if he has had any opportunity or his officials have had any opportunity to try to get Ottawa engaged in systematic and serious consideration in discussion and planning for the establishment of a rough fish industry? Given the large quantities of mullets, marias, suckers that are an inevitable part of the fishing industry, and which take up time and expense and which are thrown away, but which have protein value and presumably some market value.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I'll keep it short. That is precisely to be a very intricate part of the marketing study. I am convinced, myself, and so are others, that the marketing corporation is really not exploiting the at-home market, for one, and certainly the market of the rough fish, and I am quite convinced that recommendations in relationship to at-home marketing and rough fish marketing will be part of the recommendations of the review.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, given that in previous months in the last couple of years, that certain members who now occupy the treasury bench were in those days making representations to the government of the day, that the Province of Manitoba should invest equity capital up to \$5 million in Polar Gas as a means of inducing Polar Gas to follow an Interlake Mid-Manitoba route rather than a Northeastern route, can the First Minister indicate whether, in fact, such a possibility of a direct investment by the province into corporate endeavour is being seriously considered.

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

**MR. LYON:** In response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, he will be aware of the old aphorism, the more things change the more they remain the same. In terms of what happens to people who are transmitted from one side of the Chamber to the other, I mention that merely by way of an introduction to his question to indicate that the Minister of Finance, who is responsible for energy matters, has had the superintendents of discussions and negotiations with the Polar Gas people in recent months, and I would prefer that he give any answer at all with respect to the matter. I can only say to my honourable friend, that the state of the treasury being what it was on the 24th of October, that we weren't. . . —(Interjections)— no matter what suggestions might have come from

some of my colleagues, at an earlier time, we might well have been precluded from following through.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can the Minister of Industry and Commerce tell me whether there is anybody in his department who a small business man or a big business man can approach for assistance on how to make an offer on a multi-million dollar gross corporation, which was advertised on Tuesday, which you will pay \$3,000 to get statistics for, and which you then have to have an offer in on Monday. Is there somebody in the Department of Industry and Commerce who provides that kind of assistance to businessmen?

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

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, let me say that if the member has any questions he should contact the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation, Mr. Parsons.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, that was not my question. I do not have a question to the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation. I am asking whether the Minister of Industry has any expertise in his department that could be of assistance in accomplishing the following: being able to get papers from the Manitoba Development Corporation concerning a million dollar, in any event, gross operation, much more than a million; get those papers, deposit \$3,000, peruse the papers, make an offer to the Development Corporation on the deadline date which is Monday — that is, in three days. Is there such expertise in the department to whom a businessman, wanting to deal with that question, can seek advice?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, advice such as that might be forthcoming, but the member could also probably get it privately.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, can we assume that there is already an offer before the Manitoba Development Corporation — and the Minister would be aware of it — and that the purpose of an ad saying that offers will be received up until Monday, which is effectively three days, is merely to have window dressing to enable the Board to deal with somebody that they're already talking to?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, as the member is aware, the Manitoba Development Corporation is the one that is handling the sale and the one that is placing the ads, and I would suggest that if he has any questions along those lines when we meet in the Economic Development Committee hearings he can ask the Chairman.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports and who has, under guidelines which have not been changed to my knowledge, the final authority as to whether a business will be sold. Does the Minister believe that an ad placed on Tuesday inviting offers for a deadline on Monday is a satisfactory way of disposing of a business asset of the people of the Province of Manitoba? —(Interjection)— No.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, if I may, Sir. A supplementary to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would he give us a solemn assurance that no significant Crown assets will be disposed of by means of bid tender arrangements that are of six days duration or less between notice and the opening of tender?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, the sale and the placing of the ads and everything is being handled by MDC; I will undertake to check into the matter, but the sale is being done by the Development Corporation. And if the Development corporation has a recommendation which they wish to make to Cabinet then I will look at that recommendation. But I have not received such a recommendation.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister, who indicates that there is autonomy on the basis of the Manitoba Development Corporation, whether his government is satisfied to permit the sale by the Manitoba Development Corporation and will give no direction when they know that the Manitoba Development Corporation advertised Morden Fine Foods Limited on Tuesday with offers to come in no later than Monday. Is he satisfied with that?



Wednesday, April 26, 1978

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to say that if I'm not satisfied with the way the MDC is handling its matters, and this is the way the member opposite has dealt with that particular company, we'll have to change the Board of Directors. Mr. Speaker, that's the way this matter has worked; that's the way the other companies have been disposed of, and that's the way we will continue.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the member has indicated what he will do if he is not satisfied. I ask the Minister whether he is satisfied, and I also, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, wish to say that that is not the way it worked in the past. We did have guidelines which the Board and the government came to as an understanding as to what would be done. Now, I ask the Minister, who says that if he is not satisfied he is going to dismiss the Board, is he satisfied that that is the way in which a public asset should be dealt with?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I see that the Member for Rupertsland and myself have finally got together. We keep missing each other on a particular question he was asking. He asked whether ferry-barge service would in fact be in place this year to Bloodvein and to Princess Harbour. I am pleased to report to him that we are presently discussing the needs of those two particular communities and I am reasonably assured that the required ferry-barge service will be in place this particular year.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the Minister's answer. I thank him for bringing the answer back to me. Just on the point of us missing each other I am sorry to hear of his misfortune that has kept him out of the House in the last few days.

Further to the question, however, I would like to ask if the Minister can give a definite date as to when he will provide a definite answer on this since the fishermen in the area must make plans for transportation of their fish in advance of the fishing season which is opening on June 1.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say within 10 days I'll be able to definitely tell him.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Energy Council, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Last week the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada urged the Federal and Alberta governments to allow increased exports of natural gas to the United States — this is increased exports over and above that permitted thus far by the National Energy Board — and there is evidence that the Premier of Alberta favours such increases.

In view of the need to assure adequate future gas supplies for Manitobans would the government undertake to oppose such an increase in exports to the United States at this time, and would they make such views known to the National Energy Board and to the Federal Minister of Energy?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to take that question as notice for the Minister.

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that the Board of Legal Aid Manitoba passed a resolution just recently at its last meeting confirming the independence of Legal Aid Manitoba from day to day interference by the Department of the Attorney-General?

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

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** I cannot, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Can the Attorney-General advise whether the Board of Legal Aid Manitoba has requested at a meeting with himself as Attorney-General to discuss future funding of Legal Aid and increases in such funding?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, that matter has not yet been communicated to me. It may be in the mail this morning but I haven't seen it yet.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General as well, and I'd like to ask him whether he is continuing the efforts to have the Federal Government change their position with respect to assistance for the community of Churchill in respect to their commitment several years ago about what population would be in that community insofar as their cost-sharing in the funding that they provided for Churchill?

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works has recently travelled to Churchill to review that situation with elected officials in Churchill, and we have this week a meeting scheduled with Mayor Osland from Churchill and some of his officials.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, in case the Department of Municipal Affairs was involved with the Federal Government in terms negotiating or renegotiating a commitment made by the Federal Minister of Public Works, I'd like to know whether he can assure this House that that effort is continuing.

**MR. MERCIER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that effort will continue.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Tourism. I realize his estimates have not come up, but I've had inquiries from constituents wanting to know and not being able to get any comprehensive information from his department. What is the intention of the government — how many cottage lots are going to be put on stream this coming season and is there any chance of them opening any lots at Grindstone Point?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I haven't got the exact figures. There are several areas which are being looked at at present and as soon as the department has made a determination as to where we will be opening some of these — some are in eastern Manitoba, some are I believe, in the area the member mentions — but I will have to take the question as notice and report back.

**MR. JENKINS:** A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister when taking this question as notice, would also look at Beresford Lake and see if there are any lots going to be opened in that area as well.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, when I was referring to the eastern area, I think that's the particular area that I am talking about, but I'll get more information for the member.

**MR. JENKINS:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, but it's not really a supplementary, it's a question to the Attorney-General. First, I want to thank the Honourable Minister of Labour for the report on the fatality at Redekopp Lumber and the last lines of the report say, "At this date no decision has been made by the Attorney-General as to whether an inquest will be held into this matter, and no further information should be released until this decision has been made." Has the Attorney-General taken this matter under consideration under the Fatal Inquiries Act to make a decision one way or another, whether an inquest will be held into this fatality?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I would assume that matter is being reviewed by Dr. Parker and I will undertake to review it with him and advise the member.

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in response to a question put to me yesterday by the Honourable Member for Transcona, I would like to indicate to him and the House that I have had an opportunity to speak to management people at Autopac, who indicate to me that, yes, they did change the security arrangements with Autopac at their compound yards on Panet Road for reasons that the senior management at Autopac saw fit — mainly they were not satisfied with the security arrangements with the existing company. I'd like to invite the honourable member to raise the matter and raise whatever other matters he wishes with the management of Autopac. Probably the more appropriate opportunity which is when the corporation will be answering to the Committee of this House during the consideration of their annual report. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I will be passing on the recommendations to senior management at Autopac, and I invite the honourable member to join me in recommending to management that when hiring services of this nature that the usual tendering out procedure be followed, whether it is a matter of hiring security firms or issuing towing contracts, or auctioneering purposes. However, this is an eternal management decision by Autopac and that is precisely the way the decision was arrived at. I want to assure the honourable member and members of this House that the government had no hand in this matter in a sense that it is strictly an eternal management decision by senior management at Autopac.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Tourism and perhaps the Minister of Mines and Resources, and that is to ask whether they can confirm that with respect to the hunter safety and firearm training program which is presumably important to quite a number of Manitobans, especially younger Manitobans, in safety and use of firearms in hunting, will not be required to proceed or to pretend to exist, when in fact there are no longer the two persons fulltime assigned to that function. I am advised that the two people involved have been transferred to other duties. Can the Minister confirm if this is correct and is it in the intention to eliminate or phase out any semblance of a firearm and hunter safety program?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well in this particular case, it's the Minister of Renewable Resources, and that particular program is within my jurisdiction, if you wish, and I would like to assure the Leader of the Opposition that program will in fact be in place this year.

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

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would he indicate whether his office, or any office under his control, will be open on Saturday and Sunday of this weekend, of this week, to offer the type of information that the advertisement advertising Morden Fine Foods indicates will be available to prospective bidders?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, as the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce knows, we have some very dedicated staff and if there are people out there that need assistance in one way or another, I am sure somebody would be willing to talk to them.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister of Highways, the Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, for his answer. I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister in this respect. Will the government be issuing guidelines regarding tendering for government departments and Crown agencies? Will you be issuing guidelines to all Crown agencies to cover future developments that might occur of this nature?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Public Works has already indicated what his own wishes are in that regard and those would reflect the wishes of the government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona with a supplementary.

**MR. PARASUIK:** A supplementary to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. He invited me to make my comments known to the board; I certainly intend to do that when the Committee meets. At the same time, legally he is responsible for the Corporation and has he in fact made the position of the government known explicitly to the management of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the House that I will be passing on a specific recommendation in that regard. The management at Autopac has no difficulty in accepting the general basic approach that this government takes with the desirability of tendering. In fact, they've experienced that process in the running of their own corporation that we believe wherever possible the market place should be able to function and whatever economies can be arrived at under this system should be to the benefit of the public as indeed was the case of the insurance tendering for public buildings not so long ago. But, Mr. Speaker, there will also be time and occasions where, for specific reasons, and they'll have to be justifiable reasons, why that practice is not adhered to. But in general, I have today passed on my recommendations to the General Manager of Autopac asking him and his board to consider that these kind of services ought to be tendered out.

**MR. PARASIUUK:** A supplementary to the Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation. Is he satisfied with the justification given to him by management of the Corporation for their not following normal tendering procedures and if he is satisfied with their explanation, can he make that explanation public?

Wednesday, April 26, 1978

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I invite the honourable member again to ask that question of the General Manager of MPIC at committee. Certainly I am satisfied in the competent way in which the General Manager of Autopac handled this matter on this particular occasion.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, this is to ask the Minister of Tourism whether he can now indicate in response to my question of several days ago, as to whether it is correct that the Province of Manitoba, Department of Tourism, is proceeding to lay off or terminate the employment of two staff man years, two staff, and then, however, to provide dollar equivalents by way of a transfer payment to the Manitoba Hotel Association to carry out the same function?.

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question a number of days ago that there were certain negotiations going on with regards to that particular function. The individuals in question were laid off as of March 31, 1978 and my latest report is that there are negotiations going on.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, well I suppose my question is redundant only for the moment. The Minister said he replied; in fact he said that negotiations were going on. I gather they are still going on. Will the Minister undertake to report to the House when those negotiations are concluded?

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

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

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Could the Minister advise the House whether it is still the policy not to receive new applications under the Critical Home Repair Program from pensioners and persons on low incomes. I am referring to the Honourable Minister's announcement, I believe of last winter, at which time he said no further applications would be received after December 31st. Is this policy still in effect?

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

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, the same policy applies. We are now in the position of having about 4,000 applications or being behind to the total of 4,000 applications, that's dropped considerably since the announcement was made. We are also examining any applications that have come into us or anybody that calls us that says that it's not only critical but an emergency. When that happens, we have our staff go out, examine it very closely, if there's an emergency such as heating, electrical wiring, danger of fire or anything of that nature, it is acted upon immediately. Other than that, we are working down the backlog of applications.

**MR. EVANS:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister for that information. I'm sure many people are interested in his statement. Could he advise whether it is possible, or would he consider the possibility of adding further staff to that program in the corporation so that these backlog of several thousands of applications can be processed more quickly? There's a great deal of interest in this program. Many MLA's receive phone calls day by day on whether they can apply so therefore I ask the Honourable Minister whether it would be possible to either redeploy or add new staff to help cope with the backlog of those applications.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, it isn't the problem of staff. You know, you could have a hundred more people and it wouldn't probably be all that beneficial. One of our biggest problems is finding the people to get the work done, getting quotations on work being done. It's a time-consuming thing. You have to have two quotes from contractors. The prices have to be examined and we are following the procedures that have been followed for years, set up by the previous government, which I am not criticizing but it isn't a thing that you just do overnight. The number of staff doesn't mean it's going to happen faster. It's the people available to do the job when we approve it to be done.

**MR. EVANS:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister whether he would consider — I appreciate his statement about difficulties of processing although I find it rather interesting at this time of high unemployment that the trades people are not around, if that was the implication. But, I wonder whether the Minister is giving consideration, or would he give consideration, to opening up the program to new applicants at some time in the near future, backlog or not, is the government prepared to open up the program again to new applications?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, this government has never, at any time, said the Critical Home Repair Program would be eliminated. During our campaigns, we said we believed in a Critical Home Repair Program. It will be opened up again but there may be a change in the way applications have been handled. Maybe the applications will be handled through banks or something of that nature that



**Wednesday, April 26, 1978**

we can do it more efficiently but that's policy and it's being worked on. There will be a program.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I address my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Earlier this session, the Honourable Minister took as notice a question concerning the status of the Lynn Lake Counselling and Resource Centre. Can the Minister now indicate to the House his findings?

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I can't do that. I would request additional time from my honourable friend to provide that information.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, I thank the Minister for his intention to undertake that as soon as possible. I would ask him, while he's doing so, if he would please ascertain what services or agencies, if any, in that community will be willing to fill the void that will be created by the loss of that centre if it has been disestablished.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member recognizes that he is putting a hypothetical case. I'll have to answer the first question for him first. Hopefully that answer will be satisfactory.

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

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I took as notice a question relating to the effect on the operators' staff at Thompson of MTS brought about by the traffic operator position system program we're now approaching the second year of. I believe I didn't give this information and it's very brief, Mr. Speaker.

As a result of possible changes, the current operators' staff of 34 at Thompson may be reduced in January 1979 to 30. Perhaps only temporary staff or term employees, will be affected. Any permanent staff that might be affected by that possible reduction will be offered employment in other MTS departments, and this of course, this projection as to the amount of the reduction is always subject to the volume of calling at that point.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READINGS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading, Bill No. 2 An Act to amend The Distress Act. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 3 - An Act to amend The Provincial Judges Act. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 4 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 9 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY — CHAIRMAN'S RULING

Department of Agriculture — Resolution 18

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** Last evening, the Honourable Member for St. Johns proposed a resolution for consideration by the Committee of Supply which reads as follows:

"THAT the Government give consideration to the advisability of increasing the amount in Resolution No. 18 by \$3.5 million to \$3.875 million and lapse the sum of \$5.134 million now in the unspent Capital Authority for this resolution in previous Loan Acts."

O I have now had an opportunity to consult the various parliamentary authorities and would direct the attention of Honourable Members to our Rule 54(l), which reads as follows:

"A resolution may be moved contemplating a possible future grant without being recommended to the House by a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, if it is couched in such general terms or language as merely to express an abstract opinion and is not binding upon the House."

In view of the foregoing, I rule the motion of the Honourable Member to be in order.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I was not in the other committee last night, I was not a member of the committee discussing the Agricultural Estimates, but I understand that members came here for a vote. There was a ruling of the previous Chairman — not our Chairman who is in this House but the Chairman who was presiding in Room 254 — and I understand that there was to be a vote on his particular Ruling, and it was simply a matter of carrying out that vote. Are we having rulings by two Chairmen then?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All those in favour, please rise.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 14. Nays 24.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I declare the motion lost. On a point of order, the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, usually when division is called, even in committee in this House, the bells are rung. —(Interjection)— Well, then I say Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman, on division.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I rule the vote has been taken and is completed.

On a point of order, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I seek clarification. Isn't it an understanding, if not in the rule books, that when Committee asks for a vote, the vote will be taken in the House and that the bells will be rung to notify the members? Were the bells rung in this case?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, when the members want a recorded vote they ask for it. No such request was made of the Chairman so the vote was just taken.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** On a point of order, the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Since we aren't proceeding totally according to the regulations or the rules that we have, I believe in committee we ask for a show of hands for Yeas and Nays. That was not done in this case. A vote was taken by you asking the members to rise. In all respect to your position, as Chairman, it should not have been done that way. It should have been asked for Yeas and Nays after the vote had been taken in respect to a show of hands. Now I request officially that we have Yeas and Nays.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** One other point, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I wasn't in the House when this was done but was the Chairman's Ruling appealed from?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Yes, the motion was ruled in order, the vote was taken on whether or not the House would accept the amendment that was proposed.

With the greatest of respect, when the Chairman rules a motion in order it is my impression that there must be an appeal from the Ruling of the Chair, and when the House is sitting in the committee of the Whole it has to go back to the Speaker.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, the motion was ruled in order, and it was accepted and the vote put on the amendment that was proposed in the committee.

**MR. GREEN:** Is the motion then in order?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes.

**MR. GREEN:** And then it was voted down?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I think that all that has been requested is that on the vote on the item that there be Yeas and Nays. That's all that the Member for Kildonan wants.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, if my honourable friend had been here it probably would not have happened because he would have probably asked for Yeas and Nays. It was not requested, so the vote was just taken.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** On the same point of order, the resolution was presented last evening to the committee which I was a part of in Room 254, and the first recommendation was that a vote be taken in that committee, now a count of the committee members there, and I believe the reason we decided to come back to the House was to have a recorded vote of Yeas and Nays, and therefore the request was made last evening, Mr. Chairman, before your recorded vote right now.

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, just to make sure that my honourable friends won't waste the whole bloody afternoon arguing on this we will allow them to call the Yeas and Nays and we'll have a recorded vote if that's what they choose, but I don't want that to be established as a precedent, that after a vote is carried they can then complain because they were not on their toes and asked for a recorded vote.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Opposition House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Honourable the Government House Leader for his grudging generosity but there is another problem, and it's raised by the Member for Rupertsland and I don't want there to be any misunderstanding.

In the Committee of the Whole House, when there is a vote requested, it is the rule that the vote is taken with all of the Members of the House and that is the reason there was a move to this Chamber. It could just as well have called the members to the other room, but you do not count the votes of the members around the table or that happen to be sitting in the House, it is the votes of all of the members. But since the Government House Leader has been so kind as to not want to waste the bloody afternoon and take a vote, then why can't we have Yeas and Nays on that question?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Call in the Members. All those in favor of the motion please rise.

**A COUNTED VOTE WAS TAKEN with the following result: Yeas 18; Nays 27.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I declare the motion lost.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Committee come to order. We have a quorum. Item 11. Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister is requesting the amount of \$375,000 under this item. We have been informed after two days of questioning that there is a carry-over of \$5,134,000 from previous years, of which \$3.5 million is already committed in this year's expenditures, leaving \$1.6 million or thereabouts still a carry-over from last year. So therefore, I cannot see any reason why we should be asking for \$375,000; we have a carryover of \$1.6 million from last year which will be again in limbo and afloat. It's uncommitted at this time and we don't see any reason for this \$375,000; you already have \$5.134 million in the kitty.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The comments of the Member for Ste. Rose are quite appropriate in this case. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he is aware, or can he inform this Committee whether, on the basis of the Premier's statement that this is the last year that this type of accounting will be done, whether there is a move to present legislation to the House in terms of lapsing authority that goes beyond this year, in terms of the additional amount over the \$3.5 million.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Chairman, because that very carry-over of previous voted authority will be handled by the Department of Finance that would be the time to ask the question, and if that were the case, moneys were to be committed for new year if it were to lapse, then it would have to be newly voted estimated money for the next year's estimates.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it appears now probably the Minister could not be in a position to answer the question that I posed of him. It certainly appears by the statements last night of the Premier in terms of him acknowledging that the practice, although they were changing the accounting system, they wanted to continue the practice of keeping on the authority that had been granted to them by previous legislation, thereby creating the impression — and there's no doubt it has been created — that the spending estimates, that the actual spending of the government this year would only be some 2.9 percent higher than that of last year. But in fact, the Department of Agriculture this year, is spending in excess of 10 percent over their printed estimates, and the Minister certainly, if he is going to have, as the Member for Ste. Rose indicated, a carry-over in excess of a million dollars, he certainly does not require the \$375,000 of capital requirements this year; none whatsoever, if he is not going to utilize the capital of \$5.134 million carry-over from previous years. There is just no need for it.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the previous administration had committed the \$5.134 million in authority to projects that were ongoing and as I have stated because of the nature of them, they will be completed over the next year or two. The carry-forward that we are discussing here is really nothing to do with the new money that we're asking in the voted Estimates. That will be explained in . . .

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that's my very point. The fact of the matter is, it has something to do with the way the estimates have been presented. It has to do with it because of the change of accounting that the new administration brought in, they indicated they would now combine all capital and current into one lump sum and that by doing that, all the authority they had received in previous years or any authority, everything that they would not spend in that current year would lapse. But the fact of the matter is, by making that change, they did not lapse the authority that was already existing on the books even though they are going to do it with this year's Estimates with the new changing in accounts. So they are playing both sides of the fence, so to speak.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Members of the Committee. I am of the opinion that if we keep our discussion to the \$375,000 in the Estimates for this year, that I am quite willing to let the conversation and questioning carry on. But I think with the motion from the Member for St. Johns last evening which was just voted on in the House, which referred to the methods of accounting both from the former administration and the present administration, that I would think I would have to rule out of order any further discussion on previous methods of accounting and I think that we have been fairly fair on this. We spent all yesterday afternoon, the previous afternoon and all last evening, just talking about the accounting methods. Last evening for example, we had twenty-four times the members of the opposition spoke on the methods of accounting alone, and not on this actual resolution, and I am quite prepared to let the Minister and members of both the government and the opposition talk about the 375,000, but I don't think that we have to go back into the accounting methods.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I don't believe that you, Sir, are serious about the proposition that you might want to curtail the debate on capital spending, capital or current for that matter, on the basis that there was some vote taken which in your mind is a resolution to the discussion, or the impasse of the last two days. Certainly I think it's reasonable for anyone who has further comments to make on the method of presenting Estimates, that they can make their point every time on every motion, Mr. Chairman, and they can make it a thousand times, unless there is a measure to preclude that, unless there is closure in debate introduced by the government. If that is their preference, that's fine, we will have to vote on that. But I don't believe, Sir, that it is out of order to discuss any item having to do with the format of the Estimates, having to do with the amounts and the program contained with respect to every specific resolution.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, I just might point out to the Member for Lac du Bonnet that in the Rule Book, Rule 64 (2) states, and this is Committee of the Whole, Committee of Supply, and Committee of Ways and Means. No. (2) of 64: "Speeches in a Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to



the item or clause under discussion." Now, one's interpretation as to how and where and when are we sticking to the item can vary, your interpretation and mine. I'm just asking the members of the Committee, based on the hours that we have spent talking about Capital and Current Estimates and the manner that the government is presenting them, I'm just asking them for their co-operation. You last evening, Sir, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, were not present, but the Member for St. George I think had about four opportunities, the member for —(Interjection)— Yes, I'm not saying that he can't have 24 if he wishes; I'm just asking the members of the Committee to be reasonable in trying to get off this item, and then the next item is the Minister's Salary. Again, you can have another whack at him. But I'm trying to speed up progress and ask for co-operation.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** On a point of order. If we were precluded from discussing anything but \$375,000, that would indicate that we couldn't discuss the whole Water Services Program, because the program is essentially funded by capital that is left over from previous years, so we can't discuss how much we're going to spend. We wouldn't be able to discuss which communities are going to be benefitting from the program. It would wipe out the whole discussion on the Water Services Board, with the exception of a minor amount of \$375,000, while we are spending over 3 million. Mr. Chairman, surely you don't want us to do that?.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'm just asking, to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I'm just asking members of the Committee, both from the government side and the opposition, to show some reason as to how long they think we should stay on an item, that's all I'm asking for. And I asked the Member for St. George if he could keep his comments relevant to the item before us and he nodded an agreement to me that he was more than pleased to do that. That's all I'm asking for.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, let me then, in a kind way, indicate to you that I don't want to challenge your statement, but history has it, since I recall and long before my time, that when you get into the Estimates debate that there are no limits as to the number of hours you spend on any item, unless you prescribe those limits somewhere in the rules. And as I understand it, we could sit here for three months debating the Agricultural Estimates, and we could speak a million times, according to our rules. I don't believe that we are precluded from speaking many times on any of these resolutions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I agree with the Member for Lac du Bonnet, although the Rule Book does say that the conversation on any item must be strictly relevant and we must not have repetition. Now, who rules on that is a matter of another opinion, but I'm just asking generally for the co-operation of the members of the Committee.

The Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I certainly appreciate your comments, in fact, I appreciate them so much that they amuse me. You, Sir, are quite perturbed, or have been quite concerned that there have been speeches here for two days, the last couple of days on the method that the government has presented its Estimates and how they relate specifically to the Department of Agriculture. We have heard over the last year and in fact, the entire last Session of the now First Minister going about this province talking about how the previous administration was spending money — and I use his words — "like drunken sailors," how they were giving away money, and how his administration, if he was elected, would be able to manage the affairs of this province. He went around for almost a whole year and he made those kinds of speeches all over the Province of Manitoba and in this Legislature, on every set of Estimates that there were in this House, commenting on the numbers of staff within the departments and the type of spending that was going on. And he did leave the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the spending of the previous administration was out of control and that if he was elected he would be able to tighten up the budget and tighten up the spending of his government.

Then we had the Minister of Finance of this province bringing down his Estimates into the House and setting forward a press release which indicated that the spending Estimates would be held to 2.9 percent increase over the last year's spending, Mr. Chairman, but now, after several days of questioning, we finally found out that the spending Estimates of the Department of Agriculture as one department, are not in fact what they are stated in the Estimates book, but they are some at least \$3.5 million more and could be as high as \$5.134 million more. Certainly, I believe in, Mr. Chairman, and want to be in a position to tell the people of this province that the now Conservative Government really hasn't laid the cards on the table, shall we say. They have really not laid all the cards on the table. Even the First Minister admitted that last night, although he did not want to back off and indicate that he would lapse all the previous authority to make the accounting system at least fair and comparable, he admitted that what he was doing wasn't that accurate in terms of presenting a full picture.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that we here on this side of the House cannot support the resolution of \$375,000 when in fact the Minister really does not require that amount of money because he has the unused capital carry-over from previous authority. Had the government accepted the resolution from the Member of St. Johns, certainly then I believe that they would have done as the First Minister last night alluded to, that they would put the books on even keel and present the Estimates in a much more fair light.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order that you raised with the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I think it's very relevant that the \$5 million be discussed at this point in time, because the left hand column does show the \$2,365,000, and that is where we can discuss the \$5.1 million, because that's where it is. I see no reason why we can't discuss that amount at this particular time, because we want the people to know that the true figure is not \$29,829,900 for Agriculture, but could be as high as \$5.134 million. Now I believe that the Minister undertook to provide us a list of which towns would be receiving assistance, which areas. There was an undertaking to provide a list to us on where this money was going to be spent. Is the Minister going to be pork barrelling with this \$5.134 million? Well, since the Minister doesn't want to lie his cards on the table, I'll lay mine on the table, and ask him directly point blank, does he intend to pork barrel with this \$5.134 million? Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what projects are on the list for this year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I have indicated the authority carried forward is moneys that were in past years voted to specific projects which I am sure were entered into by the past administration. There has been no changes to delete any of the projects that were approved and so it will be a continuation of the projects that are in place.

**MR. ADAM:** I am wondering if the Minister is prepared to provide us with a list of towns; when can we get the list? Could you give us a list so that we could go over this to see.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I could read the list that the Water Services Board have provided for me. Altona, Arborg, Boissevain, Carman, Deloraine, Elm Creek, Emerson, Ethelbert, Foxwarren, Grandview, Greta, Gimli, Ile des Chenes, Kleefeld, Lorette, Manitou, McCreary, Minitonas, Minnedosa, Morris, Neepawa, Ninette, Plum Coulee, Portage Water, Portage Sewer, Roblin, Rossburn, Ste. Anne, St. Adolphe, Sanford, Selkirk, Souris, Starbuck, Swan Lake, Treherne, Tyndall, Virden, Vita and Winnipeg Beach.

**MR. ADAM:** Are these the number, first priority, second priority, or third priority?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, they are all in high priority for this year.

**MR. ADAM:** So is the Minister telling us that second and third priorities will not receive any of this slush fund this year?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there is no slush fund and. . .

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, there is \$5 million floating around and we would like to get some into the third priority. We would like to see some of this money go into the second and third order towns, towns of 300 it's never possible for them to get into any of these kinds of programs and the list that has been. . . I'd like to know when these applications were made, the towns that the Minister has given us. When were these applications made?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Ste. Rose is right in trying to get a commitment from the government with respect to what we're going to do with the lower priority communities. We dealt with that to some degree the other day. I am wondering if we couldn't get a commitment from the government, that since they don't intend to use up all of the surplus capital from previous years, but only about three and a half million out of the \$5.1 million, whether it would be reasonable to suggest that we allocate the remainder of that unused capital strictly for the lower priority communities and put them on the waiting list with that capital, so that as soon as it's feasible in terms of the mechanics of the program, to plug them in, that we do so. And it may not be this year but at least give them the hope that they have a block of money there for that specific purpose.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman. The moneys that we're talking for those future projects for this year and next year is carried forward, the majority of it is committed for these projects, as the. . .

**MR. USKIW:** The whole \$5 million.

**MR. DOWNEY:** That is correct.

**MR. USKIW:** Then you need more money, is what you are saying.



**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, now we're finding out something. Up to this point in - time, Mr. Chairman, we were told the Minister was asking for \$375,000 and that he had committed \$3.5 of the carry-over from capital and that there was a \$1.6 odd million left over for perhaps a carryover into the next year. Today we hear that it's all spent, it's all committed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is all committed with the projects and agreements that have been entered into. It might be completely expended .

**MR. ADAM:** Is it all committed to the towns that have been itemized or listed? —(Interjection)— That is it. Well, at least we're finding out what is happening. I would urge the Minister to develop a program as soon as possible to set up a third order, so that these small towns can. . . I'm thinking of the town of Laurier, which is about 300 population which has been trying to get water for the last three years and haven't got anything yet.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Finally they got the government that might give it to them. Whose riding is that in, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. ADAM:** Well, if you want to become political, the list you gave us I think outside of one town, every town was in a Conservative riding, if you want to get political.

**MR. ENNS:** That happens to be the voting pattern of rural Manitoba, unless you haven't found out yet.

**MR. ADAM:** So even the Minister of Highways is political. He agrees to it.

**MR. ENNS:** You're darn tootin' I'm political and I've never made any pretence of hiding it. I ran as a politician, I was elected as a politician.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 11—pass. : Resolution 18d Resolvethat there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$375,000 for Agriculture—pass.

We turn back, members of the Committee, to Page 8. Item 1.(a) Minister's Compensation — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we certainly have had an interesting debate over the last several days, and in particular over the last two or three days, having to do with the new method of accounting on the part of the government and I would hazard a guess, Mr. Chairman, that in the public interest it was time well spent, because we were able to demonstrate that people involved in bookkeeping could do all sorts of things. And we were able to demonstrate that this government was in the process of attempting to convince the people of Manitoba that last year's expenditures were extremely high and that their expenditures are going to be much lower but we were able to expose, Mr. Chairman, the fact that that is not the case at all, that their true expenditures for this year really are not what are shown in the Estimates as they are printed. So I think that is in the public interest and I think that the opposition, on that basis, has done its homework.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we don't have in future years too many changes in the method of accounting because it makes it extremely difficult for the purposes of debate and certainly makes it difficult for public reporting of what really is going on and what is the economic position of the province and the logic of government priorities because it all ties in together. If we're going to proceed in what would be considered a logical fashion basis, the principle of the need for restraint, then I think it's incumbent on any government to present their statement in a way in which it can be properly understood by all members of the Legislature and certainly the media and the people of Manitoba, if it is to be a document that is to be at all interpreted as being a statement of facts and an honest presentation.

Unfortunately, this is one year in our history in which we are not going to be in a position to attribute honesty with respect to how the government's program is going to be presented but hopefully that is a lesson for this new government, Mr. Chairman. I am surprised that they fell into this kind of a situation having had a number of years of experience previously. But it does indicate what kind of traps one can spring on one's self once one attempts to tamper with bookkeeping.

Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the committee that we are not at all happy with the policies as they appear, although somewhat unclear, but as they appear to us, of this government; that we are now back to the same philosophy that existed in the 1960s with respect to rural problems, rural development; that we are now back on the tangent of ignoring the economic problems of rural Manitobans on the theory that we have to further depopulate rural Manitoba on the basis of what Conservative thinkers would call "higher degree of efficiency in agricultural production." I think, Mr. Chairman, that is something that we will live to regret sometime in the future. It was our hope over the

years that we could seriously reduce the level of rural depopulation and in fact, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether it has much to do with our programming and policy but hopefully partly, to do with it, but in the last census period, we find that we have more stability with respect to the rural population question, much more than we've had since the war, or since the Thirties. Perhaps that could have been looked upon as sort of the turnaround towards the stability of rural Manitoba. With the policies that have been announced by this government — at least as I interpret them, Mr. Chairman — it seems to be inevitable that we are back into the area of the TED Report, we are back into the philosophy of rural depopulation and the transferring of people from the countryside to the cities.

In the event that this Minister and the government believe that that is perhaps a cheap way of responding to income problems of rural residents, I believe one could dig up all sorts of research material that would indicate that there are tremendous costs in relocating people from the rural areas of the province into the City of Winnipeg or Brandon or other towns. There are tremendous costs because you have to abandon assets that have already been paid for in terms of public services, whether they be roads or hydro services or telephone services and you have to reinstall those services in the towns that these people would be moving to. Not only that, you have to perhaps even abandon some homes and build new homes in new locations. So it's not without its cost, Mr. Chairman. We have always looked upon that particular situation as one which warranted a great deal of consideration in the area of priming incomes to keep people out in the country a little longer as opposed to transferring those costs onto the urban communities and indeed governments in the transitional period from the countryside to the cities.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, the previous government attempted in many ways to stabilize prices to the extent that was possible. Sometimes by direct subsidization, as in the Beef Income Assurance Program. Other factors such as the rural water services was an attempt to improve the quality of life for people in the countryside to make it less attractive for them to move away, to relocate in the city. A whole host of other programs that were introduced were geared to the idea that we should make life a little more meaningful to the people where they were out in the countryside and that there were two approaches to that — one was through community services and the other one was an attempt to improve their incomes by way of a very significant amount of public support in the field of education, special education programs such as what we had in the Farm Diversification Program, special emphasis on the material needs of those farmsteads to bring them up to a higher level of productivity and therefore income.

This government, in that regard, has taken a much more ideological approach. To suggest that there is something socialistic about subsidizing farms is nonsense, Mr. Chairman. That indeed is a very Conservative approach because you are really subsidizing private enterprise. That's what we were busy doing in the countryside over the last eight years, we were subsidizing private enterprise, we were not introducing what my friend, the Minister, would like to suggest as "doctrinaire socialism." All of the programs that were introduced were introduced in such a way that they amounted to nothing less than the subsidization of communities, subsidization of individuals for their particular well-being. It has nothing to do with dogma, nothing to do with socialism; it has to do with the desire to maintain a better balance in populations as between rural and urban Manitoba and a desire to do it while improving the quality of life at the same time. So it was more of a human approach to these problems, Mr. Chairman. I suggest that because there are some people here around this table, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps didn't fully appreciate the motivation of the department and the government in these programs. I suggest that the Member for Swan River is one of those who didn't fully appreciate the thrust of the department when he was working for it, that that became very evident and certainly more so since he has assumed a political role himself. That to approach agriculture on the basis of strictly a commercial balance sheet without looking at the overall problem of income dislocation adjustment, is really a policy of neglect, Mr. Chairman.

The idea of responding to only those people or to emphasize the government's programs for those people who are already in a fairly healthy position to look after their needs again indicates a philosophical, ideological withdrawal from dealing with the human problems that exist throughout the province.

And of course it has to be said, Mr. Chairman, that that has been demonstrated by this government, not only in rural Manitoba, but in the urban policies as well. So that, you know, it is a consistent pattern, I have to give them that much credit for it. It is consistent but it is certainly not the most humane approach to Manitoba's social and economic problems.

One would have to assume, Mr. Chairman, that in abandoning the rural Manpower component in withdrawing from rural Manpower training, that the job is all done, that there is no further need in rural Manitoba on the part of a number of people for continued Manpower training activities that really we have reached the point where we can just sit back on our laurels, Mr. Chairman, and allow the private marketplace system to function.

You know, if that were true, Mr. Chairman, it would be a fairly healthy situation, but I know, Mr. Chairman, as well as I'm sure all of the people in this committee know, that that is far from the truth. We have horrendous human problems in many parts of Manitoba, even in the cities, problems of income, problems of standard of living that have to be dealt with by government because there is no other agency that can deal with those problems. And a shrinking of government and a withdrawal of government is not the answer to those problems, Mr. Chairman.

The posture of the government with respect to the marketing legislation that is now on the books, is one that has to be described as shocking. Certainly it is undemocratic if the government proceeds in the way that it has announced that it is intending to proceed, and I'm not referring merely to the



method of assisting a particular commodity group through some sort of a check-off on beef sales, but I'm referring to the principle of denying a sector in Manitoba an opportunity to use legislation to their advantage, which is available to other sectors. That is the undemocratic approach that I am referring to in particular, Mr. Chairman, because I never believed for a moment that any sane individual would want to discriminate in that way. That if the people choose to use our legislation for their advantage, they will do so. And if they wish not to use it, they are not forced to and therefore the legislation that exists now is adequate for both those who wish to do something about the marketplace and those who do not wish to. It is entirely in their hands and does not need the intrusion of government.

I regret that this government has embarked very much on that undemocratic approach with respect to the rights of Manitobans as to how they may wish to market their product.

With respect to legislation dealing with land ownership, I think we are in a position today of not truly knowing what the government's intentions are, excepting that we can perhaps read the signals — and I don't know, perhaps I might read too much into them or not enough — but I'm not of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that one or two people are going to be able to handle the Farm Lands Protection Act, unless of course there isn't anything to do, you see.

**A MEMBER:** There's nothing to protect.

**MR. USKIW:** So I have to say that at this point this Minister has not earned the respect of the committee with respect to where he is going with a number of these programs. To date he has not told us what he intends to do while at the same time he has asked for support, he has asked us to vote for sums of money to support those programs that he has not given us any information on whatever.

Now I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that it's a new government and it's a new Minister and I'm not going to belabour that point, but only to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that before long hopefully we will have some clearer statement of policy, both with respect to the land legislation and the Agricultural Credit Corporation and its activities and with respect to where we are heading in terms of a new agreement — rural development agreement — with the Government of Canada. All of those things we were unable to get answers to, but I'm not suggesting at this point Mr. Chairman, that that is going to be a reason for me to vote negatively on the Minister's salary. I say that only in the context of this Minister being in office only a few months.

But let me indicate, Mr. Chairman, that that would not be the case in future years. In the future I think that we are going to demand a lot more in terms of answers from the Minister of Agriculture with respect to his program and his spending Estimates when they are presented.

You know, there's one thing that one has to observe, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to make too major a point out of it, and that is that before the Estimates were introduced, this Minister along with a number of other ministers in answer to questions raised in the House, said to us, "Wait for the Estimates. We're not ready to tell you yet." And I don't know whether the other Ministers, Mr. Chairman, have followed through in the same pattern in the introduction of their Estimates as did this one; that is that the answers are still not forthcoming in a whole host of areas.

So let it be notice to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that we intend to pursue his program a lot more vigorously in the next set of Estimates that are presented. I suggest to him that they clean up their act with respect to their method of presentation so that we don't have to go through two or three days of laborious discussion in trying to find out just what the government's program is as we had to do in this case. So, Mr. Chairman, my comments rest on that note. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

Just before the Member for Ste. Rose makes his remarks, the Clerk has asked me to find out from members of committee regarding Private Members' Hour. I'm told by the Clerk that the four items that are on the Orders of the Day, those who have it in their names are not prepared or interested in carrying on. Are any members present wishing to speak? If not, then we'll carry on with Estimates, provided the same thing is the case in the House which I believe is the case. Okay? Nobody here wants to . . . All right, we'll carry on with Estimates then.

The Member for Ste. Rose. Thank you for waiting.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In summing up on the Minister's salary, I think that what we have seen in the debate on the Department of Agriculture has been quite a revelation. Certainly the old philosophy, the old Conservative philosophy is coming forward as it has in the past and I believe that the Conservative Party and Conservative members of this House, the new members and the older members will some day have to come to realize that people cannot live in isolation from one another, and that the well being of our fellowmen is important to everyone. It's sad that I feel that many members around this table show a disregard for those who are less fortunate in our society. This has been demonstrated clearly with the policies of this government and I believe in this department, this Minister as well has demonstrated a disregard for those people who are less fortunate in farming, in agriculture, as in other sectors.

It was disappointing for me to sit yesterday — when we were discussing a sum of \$5,134,000 of capital carry-over — it was disappointing to hear the Member for Pembina, you know, say, "Pass, pass, pass this item" forget about the \$5 million, you know, sweep it under the rug, something that even they themselves knew nothing about. Unless we had questioned very severely, repeatedly, for five or six hours, this information would not have been known to them either.

The people of Pembina should know that their member sits here in this House and disregards \$5

million — it doesn't have to show anywhere, they don't have to answer to anyone for it, it floats around and you do what you want with it — and I think people should be made aware of these facts.

I believe that the policies — it is becoming apparent now — we don't know all the answers. We haven't been able to get the Minister to commit himself too clearly on many of the programs that concern us. But I believe that we have to try and discourage the forces that encourage regional disparity. We must do everything we can to resist this trend that leads to rule the population.

I believe that is why the previous administration applied itself to resist these economic forces which eventually lead to a rural wasteland and towns become no longer viable, they wither on the vine and disappear.

So I think that I would encourage the Minister and members of the government to consider this very seriously. Many of you come from rural areas and I know some of you come from richer areas that are well established and have a good sound agriculture base; but on the other hand there are some constituencies which depend for their livelihood on agriculture; and of course agriculture is responsible for probably 55 percent of all economic activity in the province. So those areas where the land is perhaps marginal or not as good as in other areas, it seems that we should not just disregard these areas, that we should apply ourselves to programs that will try and lift up those areas which are not as wealthy and not in as viable a condition as other areas, and I refer to the constituency of Emerson.

The Member for Emerson said here at this committee that his farmers have an average income of \$5,000 per year, and this is sad, Mr. Chairman. I, therefore, ask the question, what is he doing supporting policies which will work against what he would like to see happening? He wants the universal policies that apply to everyone rather than those policies that would try to help the bottom rung, to try and bring them up to the level of those other better off communities and better off farmers.

I'm surprised that the Member for Emerson would take that position since we know that the average income of the farmers, according to Statistics Canada, is around \$10,000 a year; and we're appalled to hear that 60 percent of that comes from non-farm income. It's unbelievable that agriculture should be falling into this state of affairs where you no longer have a viable industry or a viable occupation, but you have a part-time industry.

This is a situation that we may be looking at the last generation of farmers, as we know. Even with the small efforts that we made in the last eight years, while it has helped, it has not solved all the problem — the marketing problems — which is at the root of most of the problems.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We have to quit. Can I interrupt the Member for Ste. Rose and say I'm sorry to interrupt him' but unfortunately the other Committee rose and by regulation we have to rise.  
Committee rise.

## SUPPLY — EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'll direct the members attention to Page 25, Department of Education, Resolution No. 41, Clause 1. Departmental Administrative Support Services I.(a) — The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** I would like, Mr. Chairman, to review the highlights of the Estimates for my department so that the members will be informed about the main activities which we will be carrying on during the fiscal year. I'm sure members will wish to ask for additional detailed information as we deal with the separate votes and I shall be happy to provide it.

I should like to draw members' attention, Mr. Chairman, to the organization diagram which appears in the report of the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower for the 1977-78 fiscal year. This is the organizational structure of the new Department of Education. In all sections of the department there's been careful scrutiny of the procedures, in order to look closely at what has been done in the past, and what needs to be done this year. The general policy of restraint has affected our operations as it has all departments. As the year progresses, we expect to continue to look closely at our operations in the light of the report from the Task Force on Government Organization and Economy.

I expect, also, that there may be some restructuring as the integration and reorganization coincident with the amalgamation of the two departments proceeds.

I should like to mention first the External Administrative Support Unit in Item 16 I.(d). It seems essential to me that the department must have a field service which can serve a liaison function for the department throughout the province, and can help to make available to the schools the expertise which exists in the department and in the unit itself.

One important job to be done by this unit will be to help evaluate departmental services and operations as they function in the field. In doing this the consultants will bring to the rest of the staff the needs of the schools and the school divisions so that these may be considered in departmental operations. To the extent to which the schools wish it, and within the capability of the unit, consultative service will be provided by the members of this unit assisted by other staff from the rest of the department where needed. In co-operation with other units and other activities in the department I expect this unit to provide me and the department with assessments of the effectiveness



of the educational process as it functions in the province.

One place where an integrated effort can be very effective, is in the general area designated as research. This unit is a consolidation of the various research functions that have existed in both departments in order to strengthen the total effort, and to eliminate any duplication or overlap. This unit will perform a service function for the whole department. It will not operate any programs and it will report directly to the Deputy Minister. Much of the work of this unit will be to carry on the existing assignments which the various sub groups have always done. As the unit settles down I anticipate that it will be able to carry out studies that will be beneficial to all the facets of the educational system as well as to the department. I should like to stress that this group will be doing down-to-earth, feet-on-the-ground work. A number of the projects previously carried on by the Evaluation Research and Policy Analysis Unit of the Department of Education have been terminated or are being phased out.

I should like to amplify, Mr. Chairman, the announcements which have already been made to school boards about school grants. The increase in financial support by the government which amounts to approximately \$11 million will be reflected in a number of grant areas although mainly in the grants for pupils, transportation of pupils, administration, maintenance and supplies, and equalization. The block grant of \$2,090.00 per authorized teacher for administration, maintenance of buildings, and instructional supplies, is being combined with the general grant of \$125.00 per pupil, and the resultant single grant is being increased to \$260.00 per pupil. This change provides a substantial increase in financial support and also by limiting the administration, maintenance supplies grant category provides school boards with a greater degree of fiscal autonomy.

The library grant, which was at the rate of \$90.00 per authorized teacher, is now to be determined on a pupil basis at the rate of \$5.00 per pupil. This change provides an increase in grant support for libraries but the conditions under which the grant may be earned remain unchanged.

The 1977 transportation grant of \$215 per transported pupil is being increased in 1978 to \$240 per transported pupil. The costs of transportation of pupils have been escalating and the increase of \$25.00 will provide relief for those school divisions which, because of low-density population and long distances, are unable to keep the costs below the 1977 grant limit.

The Equalization Grant, which in 1977 ranged from \$25.00 to \$215 per pupil has been increased to range from \$28.00 to \$268 per pupil. In establishing the 1978 Equalization Grant scale recognition was given to enrolment decline and assessment increase, the two factors which would have had a detrimental effect on equalization grant payments had the 1977 scale been retained. The declining enrolment grant and the northern allowances grant, both of which were for the year 1977 only, will be provided again in 1978 and on the same basis as in 1977.

From the reactions I've had from school boards and school personnel generally I'm confident that the increased assistance thus provided will assist them not only to carry out programs which will meet the needs of pupils but which will also maintain the local levies at a reasonable level.

The Program Development and Support Services Unit is, Mr. Chairman, a very important area in the department as far as the schools are concerned. It is my view that the people of Manitoba, and this includes those in education, feel the need for a more firmly structured approach to education. It is my intention that the department will direct its efforts to this goal. I do not favour narrow prescription in the curriculum but I think everyone, and especially students, can benefit from some solid indications of what constitutes useful programs of study in the various subjects and at the various grade levels. The department will continue therefore to develop curriculum guides with the help of practicing teachers.

In the field of measurement and evaluation it is my intention that we will see what kinds of materials can be produced which will prove useful in this area of education. It seems to me that students, teachers, and parents can make good use of the results of testing and assessments that can help to indicate levels of achievement. High school students and their parents can use this kind of information to assist students to make choices in careers or in further education.

Assessment programs based on samplings of students across the province can be useful to indicate levels of achievement which can serve as guides both for teachers and curriculum developers.

I hasten to say, Mr. Chairman, that the total funding being requested here will not go far, and will certainly not answer all the needs, but we will do the best we can to get moving in this area.

In the Bureau de l'Education Francais there has been a consolidation of funding in the post secondary program of the community college level which operate at St. Boniface College.

I know that members are aware, Mr. Chairman, that for the last three years provincial grants have been made to local school boards offering Francais or Immersion programs. The costs of this grant program have been fully recovered through formula payments and payments for special projects approved by the Federal Government under the Federal-Provincial Agreement on Bilingualism in Education. For the year 1977-78 the amount of grants to school boards under the French grant formula has been approximately \$2 million. Further, the province distributed \$360,000 in grants to school divisions in the Core French program. I expect that enrolments in the French Immersion courses will continue to increase as more parents wish to take advantage of the opportunities for their children to become bilingual in French and English.

Recently the Bureau concluded a program of reorganization. This reorganization recognized the fact that the Manitoba situation requires the progressive development of new operational methods centered on the special needs of French language teachers both in their relationship with their communities and in meeting the demands of their discipline. Through this new structure the Bureau is now in a better position to respond effectively to demands in the area of French language



education programs and services to both its French-speaking and English-speaking clientele.

he need continues for the kind of services provided through the facilities of the Child Guidance Clinic in Winnipeg and the child development services in the rest of the province. In addition departmental staff will continue to provide consultative help to schools and teachers in developing special programs for children with special educational needs.

All members are aware, Mr. Chairman, of the important role played by our community colleges and similar institutions in every province in Canada. From the beginning our colleges in Manitoba have developed their programs in relation to the job market. They do not offer programs in general education and so do not compete with the universities. Because they are so directly related to the job market and to employment graduates have a high degree of success in obtaining employment. In a period of restraint the college programs, like all others, have been carefully examined to produce a high cost-effectiveness ratio. This can mean reducing enrolments or dropping courses in areas where job demands and student interest fall off. New courses can only be offered as a result of these and other economies. It has been the practice for some time for follow-up studies to be made of college graduates as a part of the total process of examining the value and relevance of college courses both to students and to the world of work. These studies have shown a consistently high rate of employment for graduates and an improvement in earnings for those who were taking retraining or upgrading.

The Federal Government has indicated to all provinces its desire to bring about some changes in the kind of training it purchases and discussions will continue as both sides try to adapt training to the changing needs of trainees and the working world.

In reviewing the appropriation for the Universities Grants Commission I should like to mention that this appropriation has been reduced from the amount approved last year by the removal of approximately \$7 million which has been included in recent years for grants in lieu of taxes. Because of the removal of direct federal support for post-secondary education it is no longer necessary to show this amount in these Estimates. It now appears in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Members will already be aware that the universities have been provided with an aggregate increase of 3 percent for this year. At the same time it was suggested to them as a result of the indications of the Task Force on Government Organization and Economy that they should consider raising their fees by an aggregate of 20 percent, and that a common fee for all universities for the Arts program should be \$540.00. For some time the revenue from tuition fees has been a declining percentage of operating revenues for the universities. Last year it was 9.56 percent. This year's increase is expected to bring the percentage to 10.95 which will be below the 11.1 that existed in 1976-77 and the 11.5 percent in 1975-76. The increase of 3 percent plus an increase of approximately 2.1 percent in fee revenue will increase university funding by 5.1 percent this year.

For this year \$2 million will be provided for the universities for miscellaneous and special capital purposes. In addition because the renovations to Tache Hall residents at the University of Manitoba will be funded by borrowing and will not cause any cash flow drain on the government in 1978-79 these renovations will proceed. In this period of restraints it is not possible to proceed with other capital projects but the government has confirmed its obligation ultimately to fund the centennial project at the University of Manitoba, the recreation complex at the University of Winnipeg, and the addition to the music building at Brandon University.

Members may be interested in a few statistics: From 1960 to 1970 university enrolments grew from just over 6,000 to nearly 17,000. By 1977, due to the flattening of the growth curve — that is, the population of young people — enrolment had levelled off to just over 17,000 and for 1978 it is estimated to be back to the 1970 figure of under 17,000. In the same period part-time enrolments grew from over 4,000 to over 17,000, and by 1977 reached nearly 22,000. In roughly the same time-frame gross operating expenditures were over \$11 million in 1960 and are estimated to be \$110 million in 1977-78. Of course inflation is a factor in this increase. Fee revenue increased from just over \$2 million to over \$11 million in the same period — over 400 percent, while provincial grants rose from over \$4 million to just over \$89 million counting this year for an increase of over 1900 percent. As will be the case with other areas in the department the University Grants Commission will be examining carefully the recommendations of the Task Force in relation to the mandate of the Commission as expressed in the governing Act.

I should like to conclude this section by noting, Mr. Chairman, that research activities continue to be an important part of the activity of all universities. Some of the research is carried out by faculty members as a normal part of their activities and funded directly by the universities. In addition it is estimated that in 1977-78 the universities received approximately \$14 million through grants for research. This funding and the total activity has a very important beneficial effect, not only on university operation, but on the province as a whole.

In the next section, Manpower Planning and Development, several areas have been consolidated which relate to one another. I've already spoken about the Review and Development section which has become part of the research operation. A new adult occupational training agreement came into effect on April 1st for the three-year period. Because the Federal Government buys places in training programs for one year or less, and pays training allowances for students they share with our staff the development of the training schedule. All students in the two-year diploma courses, and many in the shorter courses, are regular provincial entry students who pay their own way and who may be eligible for student aid.

A new responsibility in my department is that of Immigration, which is to be located in this section. As a result of recent federal legislation the provinces are now to have a more direct input in this field.



There is a sub-committee under the Federal-Provincial Manpower Needs Committee which is responsible for Immigration. The provincial representatives on this Committee will consolidate provincial activity. We will be trying to deal with this area with a minimum of staffing.

Student Aid is anticipated to be at last year's level although this is a rather difficult area to predict. Members will be aware that we have changed the distribution of provincial student aid to require students with lesser needs to borrow more through Federal-Canada student loans before getting provincial assistance. For those with higher needs, we are providing more provincial assistance to help to reduce borrowing as far as that can be done with the new higher maximum of \$1,800 as compared with \$1,400 for provincial assistance.

In keeping with the restraints program, funding for Youth Employment has been reduced but the Youth Services Division has been provided with extra money this year to extend local job offices distributed over the province to assist young people to find work in the private sector. This effort will be co-ordinated with the operation of the local Canada Manpower offices. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance mentioned in his Budget Speech that we will be instituting, and have instituted, a private sector Youth Employment Program which we are confident will more than make up for any deficiency that may exist in the employment in government programs.

As I indicated at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure members will have many questions to ask. This review has been very brief with the intention of dealing only with some of the items contained in the Estimates.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Honourable Minister's introductory remarks or rather the remarks introducing the Estimates of his department. Of course, you will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that for this year anyway, it's somewhat more difficult comparing the Estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year with the Estimates of the fiscal year just ended because of the fact that there were two departments amalgamated into one and with the amalgamation, some changes in the role and function of its various branches. But I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that as we proceed through the Estimates that we will obtain answers to those questions. Also, as we proceed through the Estimates, no doubt, Mr. Chairman, we will have comments to make and the position to state, the position of this side of the House on a number of issues related to school finance, related to the education program, related to student employment, student aid and the funding of post-secondary education, the post-secondary education program and in particular that which comes under the jurisdiction of this Minister, namely the Community College Program with particular reference to the Manpower Training Agreement. The Honourable Minister may recall that I had asked him on Questions before Orders of the Day, for some of the highlights, the more significant points contained within the Manpower Training Agreement just recently entered into by the Province and the Federal Government and at that time the Minister's response was that the agreement was essentially accepted in principle by both sides but there were still some details to be worked out and therefore I had left the question at that but I understand that now those details were worked out so when we reach that item on the agenda, we would want some explanation from the Minister on that point.

At this point in time, Mr. Chairman, I have one question which I think may have a bearing on many items contained here and it is related to General Administration. I note that in the Estimates Book, the last line for this department for the year ended a month ago, that is March 31st, 1978, totals \$351.4 million. Now, looking at Page 1, the summary of the Estimates, and adding together . . . I'm sorry, if we were to look because Page 1 doesn't show that, but the 1977-78 Estimates Book which does show two departments and it shows, there's a column for the Main Estimates, the Supplementary Estimates and then the total. Well the total that is shown in last year's Estimates Book for the two departments is a few million dollars higher. Just in rough figures, Mr. Chairman, \$140.3 million for Continuing Education plus \$192.6 million for the Department of Education, plus \$7.5 million by way of Supplementary Estimates, which totals up to something in the order of \$340 million. Could the Honourable Minister explain what appears to me to be an \$11 million difference between the figures shown for the last year's Estimates in the current Estimates Book and the figures as are shown in the book titled Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue for 1977-78?

**MR. COSENS:** I'll have that information for the honourable member in a minute, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few general comments and then one specific one. I hope that I am more successful in my encounters with the new Minister than I was some twelve years ago when we sat in this House with the Honourable George Johnson because at that time I attempted to get answers from the Minister and all that I received was fog. So I'm hoping that with some specific questions, we might get some specific answers.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make one suggestion to the Minister and that is that he should find himself a new speech writer because I read with considerable interest his remarks that were made on March 18th when he made a speech to the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and there was some pretty high-flown rhetoric in that particular speech, references to "slack and sloppy attitudes towards a curriculum" and another comment that "there is no money available for imported messiahs

who have pet schemes which they want other people to finance," and a third, that "the branch provided a hostel for a number of wandering minstrels who were piping songs of dying permissiveness."

Well, you know, that was pretty dramatic stuff, Mr. Chairman, pretty dramatic, but it didn't sound like the Minister to me. I know him somewhat. I did teach with him for a year. It didn't sound like he was speaking his mind but rather that he was reading from a prepared text from someone who was carried away with their own rhetoric.

I wanted to deal with one particular issue and ask the Minister if he could comment on it and indicate what direction the department is going to take in the next three and one-half years. I refer essentially to recommendations in the Task Force Report which in effect called for some drastic changes in the method of dealing with local school boards and school divisions. I think that it is clear from the Task Force Report and from the reaction of people who are trustees and who are leading spokesmen for the trustees, like Allan Rouse, that they are somewhat distressed by the recommendations in the report and by the supposed direction which the department will be taking vis-a-vis school boards.

For example, it sounds like the Minister is going to effect some stringent controls on the boards. He's going to withhold funds; going to interfere with their local autonomy, and that he may in fact be introducing a new version of big government that sounds somewhat contrary to the so-called Conservative philosophy of sort of an anti-government pro-individual type of approach. So I am interested in the question of local autonomy in terms of school boards. What is going to happen to it if the Minister follows the recommendations in the Task Force Report? I would just quote briefly, Mr. Chairman, from that report. It said that public school education in terms of general financing is in a chaotic state; it said that there should be a "control in spending;" should be a study on financing, and perhaps the most important reference, that the Public Schools Finance Board which is an agent of the department and the Minister, should be able to withhold grants to a school division to require more efficient operations and further talk about external management, etc., etc.

So I have a number of points here but I would just ask specifically at this time, Mr. Chairman, whether this isn't in effect the adoption of what you might call a punitive approach rather than a positive approach, all sorts of formula and all sorts of controls and all sorts of province-wide standards that will be applied to the individual school board. I ask the Minister whether this is the route that he intends to go, how he intends to balance between, on one hand too stringent controls and on the other hand a *laissez-faire* approach. Perhaps the solution comes in a middle way whereby the department should adopt a positive program of leadership and direction and I would ask him just what he intends to do vis-a-vis the autonomy of the school boards, vis-a-vis the problems of school boards in terms of managing their financial affairs and vis-a-vis the recommendations of the Task Force Report.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I think, Mr. Chairman, before the Minister gets up and replies, further to the question which I asked him, I would just like to add a comment or two.

I believe that if one looks at the Reconciliation Statement on Page 24, there is some explanation of the difference because it would appear that in the total figure of \$351 million for the Department of Education, there is approximately, well, bordering on \$19 million or maybe it is \$19 million, yes, about \$19 million of capital included in there which formerly was shown as Schedule B, \$8.6 million for Education and \$10.276 million for Continuing Education. So therefore I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we're to get a proper handle on the Estimates and make a fair comparison from one year's operations to that of the next, what we will have to know — and I'm not expecting the Minister to answer this question today or at this point in time because he may not be able to — but I would hope that while we're going through the Estimates he would be able to indicate to the Committee appropriation by appropriation wherever the capital expenditures may be found; the number of dollars spent within those appropriations which we have shown as capital and now the present administration incorporates that into the ongoing operating expenses because the way the Estimates Book is set up that figure is not shown.

In fact, looking at the total figure of \$352.5 million, and even subtracting last year's capital, which is as I've indicated about \$19 million, one arrives at a figure fairly close to our last year's expenditures. So I would like the honourable member to offer that information when we reach the appropriate items dealing with capital expenditures in our Estimates.

At this point in time, Mr. Chairman, if we could get down to some of the details of Item 1.(b) — are we on, Mr. Chairman? 1.(b), I believe.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes we are on 1.(b) (1).

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the — and I'm sure that this falls under the purview of general administration — if the Honourable Minister would undertake, as his colleagues have, to give a breakdown on — I believe it was done on a branch by branch basis — just totals? Was it totals? Very well, we'll be satisfied with the grand total of the number of permanent staff, the number of term, the number of contract staff, as at March 31, 1977 and March 31, 1978, and the number of

vacancies for each of those dates. For the benefit of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if I may repeat myself, the number of permanent, term, contract, and the number of vacancies for the two dates — as at March 31, 1977 and March 31, 1978. Now it may be that the Minister is prepared to answer that now because he may have anticipated this question and may have come prepared with this information. If he does have it we'll certainly appreciate receiving it, but on the other hand if he does not we will certainly appreciate receiving it as quickly as possible.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, a number of questions I'd like to respond to. First of all, to the Member for Elmwood, I would assure that member that anything that he has read from one of my speeches that I agree with wholeheartedly, and even though he claims to know me reasonably well, obviously he is not aware that I am quite capable at times of that full-blown rhetoric that he refers to and perhaps that will become more obvious as we proceed.

The Member for Elmwood had a question regarding my feelings regarding the Task Force Report and some of its recommendations and I would inform him at this time that I have not had the opportunity to study at length or depth the recommendations because I have not had that opportunity at this time, I do not intend to remark on those particular recommendations anymore than to say that some — such as a study on financing of education — are timely and I'm sure would meet with the approval of all persons regardless where they sit in this House. Demands have been coming in this area from all parts of the province for a new look at educational financing so some of the recommendations, I think, are quite obvious and are very easy to react to. Others will take study.

In the reference to school boards and trustees I would assure the Member for Elmwood, Mr. Chairman, as would all members present, that having had the pleasure of working very closely with these people for some 25 years I have the highest respect for their capabilities and their dedication, and generally I feel that they do a very admirable job. There may be exceptions but as I say generally I respect the job they are doing. I think the restraint that the school boards of this province have shown this particular year, as is reflected in the rise in mill rates throughout the province, attest to the fact that perhaps with the odd exception, boards are handling their business reasonably well.

Going back to the first question asked by the Member for St. Johns — Burrows, pardon me, to reconcile the difference between the \$340 million and the \$352.1 million, I believe if you deduct the grants in lieu of taxes which are some \$6.7 million and add the \$18.8 million for capital that you arrive at that figure, and I believe this is the figure that the Member for Burrows was questioning.

As far as the grand total of the staffing for each department, Mr. Chairman, I have the comparisons here and I can read them to the honourable member. In 1977-78 the total staff — and I don't have it broken down right here and he required the breakdown by category; I can give him the general totals and if he requires the breakdown by category then we can refer to that later — in 1977-78 in all departments, the 7, starting from No. 1 through, a total of 1,695.44; vacant, 138.17, and total staff for the year of 1,555.27. — (Interjection) — First figure? 1,695.44, and the vacant, 138.17 — those represent weeks, the .17 out of a possible 52.

And moving to 1978-79 on the basis of those three figures the total, 1,624.49; vacant, 162.31 and the total staff for the year, 1,542.43. Now of that vacant in 1978-79 some 79.32 are in the category that probably will be filled.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I again would like further clarification from the Minister. The Minister says he hasn't had time to study or perhaps make up his mind on the Task Force Report, but let's hold that aside and let's ignore it and ask him what he thinks, or what direction he intends to take vis-a-vis school boards and school divisions in Manitoba? Over 90 percent of the Budget of his department is passed on through school divisions and to school boards to allocate and oversee and direct, and therefore it has to be his largest and most important concern, I suppose, or at least one of them.

He has to determine whether he's going to accept the present system or change it, and he is a man of considerable experience in the profession and I know he has opinions on this and that he will, in fact, move in a particular direction unless he's going to tread water, which is another alternative.

So I would like to ask him whether he could give us the benefit of his thinking in terms of financial controls and the autonomy of school boards. And given that, I would also like to ask him some specifics for example, whether he has any plans to work towards the further advancement and upgrading of people in the system throughout the province, such as the secretary-treasurers; whether he has any plans to upgrade or improve the calibre of secretary-treasurers; whether for instance he intends to press for better salaries; whether he intends to establish training courses or seminars, and similarly with superintendents; whether he is going to leave the superintendents as they are, or whether he is going to attempt a general upgrading of people in that very key role in the province. So I would like to hear his comments there.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, I also wish to ask the honourable member a question with respect to a matter which arose prior to his being appointed Minister of Education but I would suspect that the final disposition of it extended into the period of time during which he has been Minister responsible for the department. I would want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether a satisfactory settlement has been arrived at between the Manitoba Government and the former Deputy Minister of

Wednesday, April 26, 1978

Education, Dr. Lionel Orlikow, and if there was a settlement, what were the terms of it?

Now I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I'm asking about a matter which had come into being before he was appointed Minister because you will recall that it occurred a matter of a couple of days prior to the swearing in of the present government.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in response first of all to the Member for Elmwood, I think I made my position eminently clear regarding school boards in my previous remarks in stating that I felt that generally they were doing a very conscientious and capable job and that if in the years ahead if there is any way in which our department can assist them to improve on that we certainly will be prepared to assist. We, of course, will look forward to working very closely with the Trustees Association and responding to any needs or concerns that they have that we feel that we can meet that would improve the operation of school boards. But as far as direction beyond that, Mr. Chairman, at this point in time I don't see any.

If the Member for Elmwood regards that as treading water I would suggest that it is more than that. We are prepared to help and assist wherever possible.

As far as the school board employees are concerned, the Manitoba Association of School Business Officials now has a very viable operation and one of their main concerns is to improve their qualifications and to improve their ability to carry out their duties. I think it's a very worthwhile aim, a very worthwhile goal, and as a department, if we can assist them in achieving that goal in any way possible, we certainly will work in that direction.

I am a little surprised at the Member for Elmwood's reference to school superintendents. He seems to be inferring by his statement that they require upgrading. Perhaps I misunderstood him, but I would like to clarify from my position right at the outset that I believe the superintendents in this province are a very professional group of people, generally well-qualified, and I think they are the type of professional who is concerned about upgrading themselves and who do this in a professional manner and an ongoing manner.

The Member for Burrows refers to a settlement regarding a former Deputy Minister. I understand, although that does not come under my jurisdiction, that that is being carried forth satisfactorily.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** With reference to that matter, Mr. Chairman, again being aware that that incident occurred at a time when I don't think that even the one whose name was made known publicly to have fired the Deputy Minister had the authority to do so, because this occurred about two days before he was formally sworn into office, which in fact occurred during the last two days of my administration, that the First Minister took it upon himself to fire some staff. Could I ask the Honourable Minister whether this was done — (Interjection) — Well, he was my Deputy Minister in the sense that in one area in Planning and Research there was some overlap at one time because of responsibility for some of the programs until . . . In the last year it was sorted out, I think, and the separation was made. But I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether this dismissal of Dr. Orlikow, whether that was strictly on the initiative of the First Minister or upon the recommendation of — I assume that the present Minister probably was notified at that point in time that he would hold this portfolio — whether it was done upon his advice or recommendation?.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in this regard I can only inform the Member for Burrows that this matter had taken place before I had assumed any responsibility.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Well, at that time neither did the one who took the action that he did, didn't have the responsibility to do it either.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to then say, having heard the Minister comment in regard to the matter I raised about school boards, etc., that I think I am correct in stating that he does in fact accept the status quo, that he does not appear to have any plans to revise or make significant changes in relation to the boards and the trustees in the Province of Manitoba. Therefore I would suggest, unless he has a blinding flash of inspiration while he reads the Task Force Report, that by the nature of his original conviction — now I see I'm going to cause a conflict between him and the Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force — that he will in fact, or he has in fact, rejected the recommendations of that report.

I would also like to ask him, in line with that, since he appears to be going into the department and accepting things as they are, that we can expect very few changes from the Minister, that he is going to basically hold the fort and not rock the boat because, Mr. Chairman, he is very concerned about that sort of thing. He, in his earlier speech there, as I said, he doesn't want any pet schemes and he doesn't want any wandering minstrels. He wants . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The time being 4:30, in accordance with Rule 19 Section 2, and it being time for Private Members' . . . Hour. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** On a point of order. I was speaking to the Government House Leader a



few minutes ago and indicated to him that neither of our two members holding Orders for Return for debate were prepared at this time to continue with them and unless there was some member of the government side, that there was no inclination to go into Private Members' Hour. Now, if that has changed then we should proceed, but otherwise perhaps we would save a bit of time by staying in Committee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, if there is an agreement that agreement should be announced. If the honourable

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering if the other Committee has ceased its deliberations so that it would be present in order to hear the honourable member speak on this resolution. I don't know what's happening in the other room.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was about to speak on the resolution and I interrupted on a point of order because I thought it was only proper that the whole House would have the opportunity to listen to him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed then, will someone please send word to the other Committee. — (Interjection)— That has been done. How long do you want to wait before we proceed? Well, I'll hold for two minutes.

The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just as preliminary information for the House, Mr. Speaker, this bill was necessitated by the reorganization of Royal Trusts, and the establishment of a head office in western Canada. Similar bills, I might add, are being presented this year in nine of the ten provinces in Canada with the exception of the Province of Quebec.

This bill does not deal with policy matters but is a highly technical adjunct to effect transfer of one area of Royal Trust business, the trusteeship area, to a new subsidiary corporation. Other aspects of the business have been and will be transferred privately. As a matter of precedent, this bill bears closely to previous private bills passed upon reorganization or acquisitions of trust companies.

Just as general comments, in 1975, primarily as a result of increasing pressure from western based clients and directors, it was decided to give The Royal Trust Company a western decision-making base by incorporating as a subsidiary, a federally chartered trust company, and I might point this out, that The Royal Trust Corporation of Canada is a federally chartered trust company whereas The Royal Trust is a provincially chartered company in Quebec.

The Royal Trust Company, as I indicated, was chartered in the Province of Quebec by a private Act passed in the late 19th century. Royal Trust Corporation of Canada was incorporated under The Trust Companies Act on March 19, 1976 with head office in Calgary, Alberta and registered in Manitoba as well in 1976. I might underline this, that the deposit taking business and much of the real estate and mortgage business of The Royal Trust Company has been transferred to and is being carried on by Royal Trust Corporation of Canada in Manitoba and other provinces. A federal charter provides broader powers and fewer restrictions than a provincial charter, and has somewhat higher status in the international marketplace.

The bill which the petitioners seek to pass is for the purpose of transferring the trusteeship business from the Royal Trust Company to the Royal Trust Corporation of Canada. The trusteeship business relates primarily to wills or persons dead and alive. Appointments by the court as administrators of estates of deceased persons and other private and court appointments wherein property is held by the Royal Trust Company in trust for the benefit of other persons.

The main reasons for this private bill is that because of the large number of trusteeship appointments of the Royal Trust Company particularly in wills, many of which may be unknown to the Royal Trust Company, and because of the great variety of terms and provisions of trust instruments, it is difficult, if not impossible, to effect transfer of the entire trusteeship business by private document. As noted previously this bill bears some close similarity to previous private Acts, each of which affects the transfer of the trusteeship business in the case of the acquisition of one trust company by another.

The bill is intended to be a uniform bill which is being presented to the Legislative Assemblies in nine provinces of Canada, although there are minor variations as requested by authorities in each province. This bill has been informally discussed with the Legislative Counsel for Manitoba and the Registrar General of Land Titles for Manitoba. Suggestions arising out of these discussions have been fully considered and, in some cases, incorporated in the draft bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some explanatory notes for Bill 10 printed up which will be distributed to the members of the House and will in actual fact deal and explain relating to each individual Section of the Act. Because we are in Second Reading of the bill I won't go into discussions of those particular areas but just deal in general reasons for presenting the bill and hope that we have provided adequate information for our colleagues to appreciate and understand the bill and hope they will support the passing of the bill.

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

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 5, An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act.

**MR. GREEN:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 6, The Freedom of Information Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. FERGUSON:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are there any further items on the Private Members' Hour that have not been brought to my attention?

Before the House is adjourned I want to make a small statement. I don't know whether there was some collusion or not in arranging for Private Members' Hour today to end this early but I will extend an early invitation to all members, if they so desire, to attend at my quarters before 5:30.

The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.  
(Thursday)