

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 5, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed I should like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 80 students of Grade 9 standing, attending Windsor Park Collegiate. These students are on a music Exchange Program from North Vancouver. They are under the direction of Mr. Christianson, and Windsor Park Collegiate is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

At the same time I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the loge on my right where we have Mr. John A. Bagnariol, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington.

Speaker Bagnariol has been in Manitoba addressing an Executive Information System Seminar dealing with Effective Government Management of Information Systems.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

IR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

IR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, my first question is really in the nature of a point of order. It has to do with the distribution by you, Sir, of photocopy of Citation 171, which has to do with the form and manner in which questions should be put.

My point of order, Sir, is that the Chair, and you as the present incumbent, have a reputation, historical, and in your case recent but already well established, for impartiality.

By distributing Citation 171, which has to do with questions only, implies that it is only this side of the House that is erring in the way in which they put the questions.

Citation 181, Sir, had you attached it, then you would have maintained your reputation for fairness and impartiality because Citation 181 indicates how questions are to be answered.

R. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

ON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I find it amusing that the Leader of the Opposition would choose to rise on this point of order. He may or may not recall that almost every year in the last eight years that same citation has been distributed to members of the House and I never noted that he took exception at that time.

R. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

R. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it's a beautiful morning upon which to start this note. I believe that the Honourable the Government House Leader is quite correct, which merely demonstrates that he was not on his toes in those days.

While pursuing this further, Mr. Speaker, may I then now direct a question to the First Minister and ask the First Minister if either he or his colleague, the Minister of Finance, have had opportunity to take direct representations to the Federal Ministry of Finance to raise objection with respect to the her special deal — sales tax deal — with the Province of Quebec and, if so, can he indicate if any reply has been evoked?

I. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

IN. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am not in a position to answer my honourable friend's query today, but I will take it as notice for my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and see what facts he has been able to ascertain through his departmental officials.

. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the absence of the Minister of Finance my next question would be directed to the Minister of Mines and Resources and it arises from one of the annual reports of the Canadian Development Corporation to the effect that some \$45 million has been invested by the Canadian Development Corporation in gas leases in Louisiana. I should like to ask the Minister of Resources if he would take under advisement the possibility of making representations to the Government or Canada and/or the Canadian Development Corporation with

the view in mind of persuading them to put their money into the potentials in Canada, for natural gas exploration and development, including low pressure fields — some of which may well exist in the Virden-Scallion area of this province, and other places.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any communication with the province at this time in that regard but I would trust the organization in question would have some knowledge and have some competence in the field as to where their money might best be expended.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Honourable Minister has said that he will take this under notice, but in light of the other part of his reply, I would like to ask him if he accepts with equanimity the prospect of continuation of investment by the CD C in energy resources in such places as Louisiana, or wherever else?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have not taken it upon myself to make a judgment as to the operations of the Canadian Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health if in light of the concern that has been expressed, one copy or example of which I have conveyed to him, with respect to problems arising as a result of the withdrawal of certain support service to district hospitals by Community Services Division of the Department of Health, if the Minister will undertake to explore the possibility of the restoration as much as possible of these support services to district hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition. I would ask him if he would repeat the question.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was simply to ask the Minister of Health if, in light of the fact that there has been some expression of concern by those responsible for patient care services in district hospitals, concern that because of the withdrawal of certain support services by the Community Services Division of the Department of Health to the district hospitals, will the Minister undertake to explore the possibility of restoring at least some of the support services that had been extended to district hospitals by the Community Services Division of that department?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to explore the Leader of the Opposition's question and the foundation for the question. If, in fact, there is that concern, which has not been expressed to me, which has not been directed to my office or to me personally, then I will undertake an examination of it. First of all, I will examine the validity of the Leader of the Opposition's question.

MR. SCHREYER: Well a supplementary, it is not as though the question is theoretical, Mr. Speaker. I have conveyed to the Minister, if I haven't yet I'm prepared to do so now, letters from some of the administrators of district hospitals indicating concern, or expressing concern at the discontinuation of social services support at one or another hospital. My question is to the Minister, in light of the fact that X-number of family counsellors, X-number of social service support workers have been discontinued in employment at certain of the Community Services Division offices, can the Minister indicate in the light of this expression of concern, whether he will explore the possibility of restoration of at least some of these positions and services.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, could I perhaps suggest this to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I will certainly explore and examine the situation to which he alludes and if I discover that that is an area of concern, that it is an area that is producing hardship or cutback in quality of patient services, then I would be prepared to discuss with him his basic suggestion, that is a re-examination with a view to restoration. But I think, Sir, that it would be irresponsible to assure him that I will explore restoration until it becomes apparent in reasonable terms that quality and standards of patient care and services have really deteriorated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: In light of the Ministers undertaking that he would be prepared to consider such restoration, or partial restoration of positions and service, if he can be satisfied that those positions of direct involvement are concerned, I would like to ask him if he does not consider the opinion of the Executive Director of Patient Care at Concordia, the Director of Financial Services at Concordia, where they do specifically express such concern at the withdrawal of social service support as being sufficient grounds for commencing this investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Sir, I suppose I would. But, I happen to know the Administrator of the Concordia Hospital quite well — I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition does too — I happen to talk to the Administrator of the Concordia Hospital quite frequently, and that message, that concern, has not been expressed to me. I don't know what else I can say than what I've said in this House in the past few days and weeks, Mr. Speaker. I'm monitoring the situation, I'm staying in touch with these personnel. They are not conveying that kind of concern to me. They may be conveying it to others, and I will check that point. If they're conveying it to others, then there obviously must be some concern there, but it has not been conveyed to me, and I'm in discussion with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it may well be. I take the Honourable Minister's word for it, that he has not had any expression of concern directed to him personally, but he has been asked several weeks ago whether this could be checked via the route of the Department. Now I have here Sir, and I'm quite prepared to forward it to the Minister, letters by both the Executive Director of Patient Care and the Director of Financial Services, in which in one sentence they express concern about the curtailment of care for patients as the result of the withdrawal of service of social workers attached to the hospital. Will the Minister take these letters as being at least a partial indication of concern?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will take those letters from the Honourable Member who is the MLA for the constituency in which that hospital is located, and with whom that hospital would no doubt be in some contact, as a serious matter and I will look into the situation.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: My question is to the Honourable, the Minister of Health. Have all the hospitals in Manitoba been placed on a global budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I believe so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: If this is the case, then do they have the freedom to actually work on a global budget, or is there any interference from the Minister?

MR. SHERMAN: They have the freedom, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the Attorney-General. I'm sure the Attorney-General has received many inquiries pertaining to the recent decision by Judge Baryluk dismissing charges arising out of the breathalyzer on the basis that the breathalyzer machines were not of the proper type. Would the Attorney-General advise us this morning as to whether or not his department intends to appeal the decision by Judge Baryluk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that decision is currently under review and decision has not yet been arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. I have a letter here from the Progressive Conservative Victory Club, it's addressed to Wilson Parasiuk, Planning Secretary of Cabinet, Manitoba Government, Legislative Building, Winnipeg. Now given that this letter was sent to me as a civil servant to an office here in the Legislative Building, I would like to ask the Minister if she authorized the Conservative Party to solicit funds from Manitoba civil servants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: If she is not answering then I assume the silence is consent. Then, Mr. Speaker, I could ask the Minister if she would contact the Conservative party immediately to instruct it to cease soliciting funds . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There's a point of order. The Honourable Government House Leader has a point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: Notwithstanding my honourable friend's experience in government, he still is incapable of understanding a simple rule even when it's placed in front of him. That question, Sir, is out of order because it does not relate to any Ministerial responsibility.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the civil servants of the Manitoba government are having funds solicited from them by the Conservative party and their integrity as independent civil servants is being threatened by this type of letter, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do have the right to ask this question of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

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

MR. PARASIUK: I would repeat the question that I was making when I was interrupted by the House Leader. Will the Minister contact the Conservative party immediately to instruct it to cease soliciting funds from civil servants employed by the Government of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary. Will the Minister immediately write to the heads of Civil Service departments instructing them to disregard these letters from the Conservative party, and will she ask her Ministers, her colleague Ministers who are responsible for Crown corporations and agencies to do the same to the heads of Crown corporations and agencies, and will she issue a formal statement through Information Services so that all civil servants who are receiving letters like this will be informed that they should disregard them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSON: Again, Sir, on the point of order, I draw to your attention the Citation that you just distributed to the House and I invite you to look at subsection D(d).

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Health about a situation which I assume he is monitoring. Does he have any information on Manitoba nurses being recruited or raided by U.S. teams?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister confirm that new and inexperienced nursing staff is being given precedence over experienced professional nurses in Manitoba hospitals due to the government enforced restraint program?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Is the Minister concerned about the negative effects of the low or no salary increases for nurses, the poor working conditions and the lower standards of patient care in the hospitals of Manitoba?

MR. SHERMAN: I am concerned about negative effects, Mr. Speaker, but those aren't the negative effects that concern me. It's the negative effects of the imputations in the kinds of questions that are sowing misimpressions and misleading information among the public, such as the questions just directed towards me by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister inform the House as to who will replace Mr. Victor Rabinovitch as director of the Workplace Safety and Health Division as Mr. Rabinovitch's resignation as director becomes effective today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the position hasn't been filled as yet.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary then. Can the Minister confirm the instructions have been transmitted to safety and health officers to cease the issuance of improvement orders and stop-work orders until such a time as a new director is appointed?

MRS. PRICE: No, it hasn't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then. Can the Minister then indicate who has been designated to hear appeals against such improvement orders as called for in the Workplace Safety and Health Act under Section 38, clause 1, making it a responsibility of the director?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, any decisions that have to be made in the absence of a director will be taken care of very adequately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour, can the Minister of Labour indicate if the government has moved as yet to appoint a successor to succeed Professor Woods who headed up for a period of 14 years our Manitoba Joint Labour-Management Industrial Relations Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter a couple of weeks ago to the vice-chairman of that committee and asked him to call a meeting of it and that is where it stands right now.

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

MR. JAMES D. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health confirm that it has been the practice the Rehab. Centre of the Health Sciences Centre since the beginning of this year that bed sheets are changed once a week on a Wednesday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to investigate to confirm this suggestion? Would he also be prepared to check his sources of information to be certain that they are in a position to have the full knowledge of the situation?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to check it again. I think the answer that I gave at the opening of Question Period before Orders of the Day yesterday supplies the answers to this type of question but I'm prepared to give that answer again and I'm prepared to check the situation again.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister reconsider calling the Committee on Privileges and Elections to listen to a constituent of mine who is prepared to testify under oath that when he was in that section this year that his sheets were changed once a week on a Wednesday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Labour inform the House when the freeze or moratorium on minimum wages shall be lifted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear the question.

MR. FOX: Can the Minister of Labour inform the House when the freeze on minimum wages will be lifted, how soon?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, it's under constant review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister and welcome him back to the House after his recent illness. I address my question to him as the Minister in charge of Federal-Provincial relations and ask him if he would take as notice to find out if it is the policy now for visitors from the United Kingdom, coming to visit relatives in Canada, to have a letter of invitation from the person in Canada? If I might just elaborate a bit, Mr. Speaker, my wife received a letter today from my sister-in-law in the United Kingdom who is coming here in September for a visit. In the form she received, and I will quote from the letter and I'll actually give the Minister a copy of the letter after, on the forms received it says, "Visitors to Canada should have a letter of invitation of staying with relatives." I wish the Honourable the First Minister would look into that with his federal counterpart and see if that's part of Federal policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that it is not, as the honourable member appreciates, a matter which falls within the jurisdiction of this Legislature, I would be happy to make inquiries if he'd be good enough to supply me with the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance responsible for the Manitoba Energy Council. Can the Minister advise the House whether the Manitoba Energy Council and its secretariat are continuing to monitor sources of supply of natural gas, particularly future sources of supply for the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question would be yes and in particular the work of the Polar Gas group is getting underway and I expect that fairly shortly there will be more information available with regard to the work of this committee.

MR. EVANS: Last week I directed a question to the First Minister which he took as notice on the Minister of Finance's behalf regarding the question of possible increased exports of natural gas to the United States. I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to answer this question. The Independent Petroleum Association of Canada is now in the process of urging the Federal Government and the Alberta government to permit increased exportation of natural gas to the United States. In view of the need to assure adequate future supplies — and I'm not talking about 20 or 30 years from now, I'm talking about five, six years from now — adequate future supplies of natural gas for the Province of Manitoba, would the Minister undertake to contact his counterpart in Ottawa and also the National Energy Board indicating opposition to this particular move which I believe is now getting the support of the Premier of Alberta. This is a very serious matter.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the matter of future supplies of natural gas is exceedingly important and that is one of the reasons we have attempted to establish a closer watch on the policies that are being adopted in the west with regard to natural gas supplies. I think the member will realize as well that the ingredients that go into these decisions are somewhat more complicated than a straight sale in many cases and if, in fact, there are guarantees of resupply through the Alcan Pipeline back into the Canadian supply network as a result of early shipment of supplies from Canada and then a return at a later date with the construction of the Alcan line, this course will change the judgment that might be made with regard to the sale of natural gas supplies from Canada at the earlier date. But the nub of it all is that Energy Board hearings is the place where these sorts of contributions are made by the other provinces. We are, at the current time, just completing a very strong statement to the National Energy Board with regard to the oil pipelining in Canada.

It would appear now that the decision being made, or likely to be made by the National Energy Board with result to supplying oil to the further Eastern provinces in Canada is, in fact, going to cause an increase in the pipeline price of the oil in Manitoba which, of course, we are extremely strongly opposed to and we consider to be extremely unfair but that appears to be what is happening at the present time on oil pricing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed any further, may I suggest that if a member has a question that requires a long answer it might be better if that answer be given in writing, rather than take up a long protracted period of the Question Period in the answer. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On that point or order, I appreciate your comment. I just might add that I have put at least two written questions on the Order Paper; I think one is at least seven or eight weeks ago and I still haven't had a reply. I know we have been admonished many times by the Government House Leader to put in written questions, and I believe I have been the only member to do so and I thus far have not received a reply.

But as a supplement to my question, very specifically my understanding is that the Independent Petroleum Association is talking about supplies of additional exports to the United States not tied to any strings, with no consideration of refurbishing those supplies with gas from the United States back to Canada, or what have you. So it's a straight case of pressuring the Federal Government at this time. So therefore, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Can the member indicate what type of question it is he wants to ask?

MR. EVANS: Would the Minister undertake now to advise the Federal Minister of Energy and the National Energy Board of Manitoba's opposition to any increase in Canada's exports to the United States?

States at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think that question is a repetition of the previous question the member had asked. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: On the point or order, I listened to the Minister's answer very carefully, and he did not answer that specific part of my question, and he went on to another matter, including oil pipelines, which I did not ask.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I indicate to the honourable member that he has a perfect right to ask a question; he has not got the right to expect an answer. The Minister may answer, if he so desires.

Before we proceed, may I draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have 84 students of Grade 9 standing from Crescent View School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Furdievick. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance, I believe, lends itself to a short answer. And that is to ask the Minister of Finance if the Province of Manitoba has made representations to the National Energy Board, or is prepared to do so, to draw a distinction between any incremental sales of natural gas from Canada as between those that have conditions in it for return or swap — some few years down the road — and those that do not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of one question in isolation from the other. It's not possible to take an isolated position without looking at the other parts of the equation that may enter into the picture, such as the National Energy Board's position, and with regard to the likely timing of the Alcan line, or the fact the National Energy Board's hearings with regard to the Polar Gas line. They all enter into the picture.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we may find ourself in the position, with regard to the Polar Gas pipeline, that the Polar Gas pipeline can in no way be justified without very substantial exports to the United States. Now, if you are going to take a position with regard to a singular isolated decision on one area of export from Canada, but attempt to divorce it from a decision with regard to the likes of the Polar Gas pipeline, you are going to find yourself in a box that you can't get out of. So it's not going to be that easy to isolate these various decisions, Mr. Speaker. All I can advise the members is that we are in close contact with the matters that are going forward. The one that is of greatest concern to us at the moment is the decision regarding the oil pipelining and the direct implications or Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Would he Minister confirm to the House that I have now given him particulars of a woman who was in the hospital from the 12th day of April until the 19th, had her sheets changed once on the 14th and had he same sheets for the dates from the 14th to the 19th — six days inclusive — had her sheets changed from head to foot on the 17th when she complained. I have given him the name, the hospital and also, Mr. Speaker, the fact that she made a complaint on her evaluation to the hospital. Would the Minister confirm that I have given him this information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the Member for Inkster has conveyed that situation to me, in the manner in which he has just presented it to the House. That's the only thing I can confirm. I certainly do not confirm or agree to some of the contentions in his remarks, but he certainly as conveyed those remarks to me outside the Chamber yesterday.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reply to a question that was asked me by the honourable the Member for Churchill earlier this month, when the honourable member asked me whether I could confirm that the Lynn Lake Community Counselling and Resource Centre has been forced to close its doors due to a lack of funding.

Sir, the answer to the question is that funding has been terminated for the Lynn Lake Community Counselling and Resource Centre by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, effective March 31st, 1978. But it is not correct to conclude that the centre has been forced to close its doors due to a lack of funding. The agreement, according to my information and I am prepared to go into this in detail outside the Chamber with the honourable member because it's rather a lengthy explanation, the agreement was reached in concurrence and with the co-operation of personnel who had been at that centre themselves. But I would like to go into fuller detail with the member, outside the Chamber, Sir.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to follow up with a question to the Minister of Labour dealing with the minimum wage. I wonder if she could indicate to this House what factors she is reviewing constantly, that she indicated, in view of the fact that the intervening period before increases and between increases in the minimum wage and the cost-of-living increase. How far is the Minister prepared to let that area go before she is prepared to announce an increase in the minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of Cabinet policy and I will not be discussing it any further with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Since I asked the Attorney-General on March 29th, in connection with the Koteles break-in and he has indicated since that an inquiry is underway as to whether or not a full-scale probe should be undertaken, and since I have not received any further information as to the results of same, could the Attorney-General inform the House as to how much longer it will take for his department and the RCMP to provide him with information pertaining to same?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Next Monday morning, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to that same area, in view of the fact that the Attorney-General of Alberta has indicated that RCMP involvement in various alleged break-ins, the McDonald Commission, the Laycraft Inquiry, will be a subject of discussion at the forthcoming Attorneys-General Conference in Edmonton, the end of June, could the Attorney-General advise the House as to whether he is in the process of preparing a brief to that conference on behalf of the Province of Manitoba? The Conference of Attorneys-General in Edmonton, the end of June?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the agenda for the Attorneys-General Conference has not yet been finally settled but the McDonald Commission is on the preliminary agenda, and we are in the process of monitoring the involvement of the RCMP force in Manitoba with the McDonald Commission and we will be in a position to make known the position of the Province of Manitoba at the Conference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister of Health for the answer to my question and will look forward to discussing it further with him. My question now is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate who was Acting Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Division in the absence of a permanent Director?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Cam Younger is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Was the appointment of Mr. Obie Baizley to the Chairmanship of the Manitoba Labour Relations Board discussed with the Manitoba Federation of Labour?

MRS. PRICE: It's Doctor Baizley, Mr. Speaker. No, it wasn't discussed with the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

MR. DOERN: Will the Minister of Labour consult with organized labour on any appointments of vital concern and interest to them?

MRS. PRICE: If any of them have any concerns, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they know where to find me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. EVANS: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, in his capacity as Chairman of the Manitoba Energy Council. Would he have his staff look into the matter of exportation of Alberta, not Northern but Alberta gas, an increase that may be taking place in the near future? Would he have his staff look into this and apprise himself of this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the staff of the Energy Council are aware and keep abreast of the different moves. I want to repeat to him that the export of Alberta natural gas cannot be taken out of context with negotiations that are also going on with regard to the potential for a Polar Gas pipeline and the implication that it has with regard to export of natural gas. They will be considered jointly and when there's a government policy to be announced that serves best, No. 1, the interests of Manitoba, then that policy will be announced.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, my question relates to a problem that does not relate to Polar Gas. This is an immediate problem of increased exportation of southern Alberta gas to the United States. Would the Minister be prepared to propose an increase in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Member for Brandon that repetitive questions are not in the best interests of the Question Period.

While I'm on my feet, may I introduce to all members of the Legislature, 40 pupils from Teulon Collegiate. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: I want to be sure that I have permission from the opposition today. Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 4 and then No. 9?

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 4 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 4, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill dealing with the amendments to the Highway Traffic Act, there are two aspects that I would like to deal with at this point. First, of course, Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm the views expressed by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, in connection with the necessity for this bill. It would seem to me that the bill is principally based upon developing greater administrative efficiency insofar as the police forces are in the Province of Manitoba. That objective may be very well admirable, it may be quite admirable, as long as it does not impinge upon certain basic rights that are reasonable to be safeguarded. Mr. Speaker, in the bill that we have before you, there is the very fundamental and important objective of removing from the highways all those motorists that in fact may be a danger to other motorists on the highways because of the degree of alcohol which they have consumed. That is the principle of the bill, a principle that certainly we support, and it was the principle by which the former government introduced the legislation in the House last June.

On the other hand, I do not feel that the bill should be impinged upon for administrative efficiency when in fact I feel that important right may be compromised, and that is, the changing of the wording or remove the opportunity for a motorist to request a test some time during that 12-hour period, a breathalyzer test, so that person is in a position to establish that they, that he or she, is in fact in a position that they can operate a vehicle safely on the highway and receive the return of the license within that 12-hour period. There will, I do believe, be many instances of inconvenience if that right is not safeguarded. The travelling salesman, for instance, that may in fact find that he will be without his driver's permit for the full 12-hour period that could establish his ability to operate without question shorter than the 12-hour period. Or the truck driver, who also finds himself in that same position.

So that I do not see why, for purposes of efficiency only, we would want to remove that opportunity for a driver, driving for purposes of commerce, for the purposes of one's own livelihood, to have the opportunity to obtain the return of their driver's permit earlier than the 12-hour period if they can successfully pass the breathalyzer test. I believe that is a right that the Attorney-General should consider safeguarding in the legislation; he should not strip away that basic right, that basic safeguard, for bureaucratic efficiency, and that in fact is, Mr. Speaker, what is occurring at the

present time.

Now if the Attorney-General is not prepared to make that change in the legislation, then I feel the Attorney-General should take a careful look at whether or not the 12-hour period is necessary; whether or not a 6-hour period for removal of the driver's permit would not be sufficient.

I recall and I would urge the Attorney-General to ensure that we have before us, medical testimony, when this bill is dealt with at committee level.

My recollection is that medical information was to the effect that six hours would be as good as 12 hours in achieving the objectives of the legislation. If, in fact, that is so, then, Mr. Speaker, that would be an alternative to the earlier, possibly an alternative to the earlier suggestion that I made in respect to one's inconvenience caused by not being able to demand a test within that 12-hour period. If the delay period was only for a 6-hour period then the practical problem would not be so great.

So I would request the Attorney-General to ensure that before the committee there is medical testimony, so that we can question medical authority as to whether or not a 6-hour period would be as valid as a 12-hour period.

I recall when the bill was first introduced, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure you recall it so well last year when you were performing the role of justice critic of the then government, that the bill was introduced with a 24-hour period in it. I point out to the Attorney-General the flexibility that occurred at the committee level and the result that we amended the bill in committee, to reduce the number of hours from 24 to 12 as a result of discussion in the committee — and I believe you, Sir, participated in that discussion. So that I would say to the Attorney-General, if he is not prepared to reconsider the first point made, that serious consideration be given in committee to whether or not we need remove the driver's permit for the entire 12-hour period, whether six hours would not satisfactorily achieve the same objective.

That is I believe, Mr. Speaker, the only area of a basic concern that the opposition has in connection with this bill. I do believe that that concern can be dealt with in committee, while we retain the worthy objective of the legislation.

So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would not be prepared — unless there are others who wish to speak on this bill — to hold up further passage of this bill in second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, it appears that there is certainly agreement in principle with the bill and it is the detail of the bill that I, and members opposite, are concerned with. I would expect that in committee all of these matters can be dealt with much better and that the suggestions made by the Member for Selkirk can be dealt with in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader. —(Interjection)— Oh, you're quite right.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Call Bill No. 9, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 9 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MORTGAGE BROKERS AND MORTGAGE DEALERS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have considered this bill and in view of the amendments that are contained in it, we believe it would be best dealt with in the committee when it's passed in second reading, therefore, we are prepared to let it go.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes.

BILL NO. 14 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE INCOME TAX ACT (MANITOBA)

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day I just had about five minutes to make a few brief comments and I don't intend on debating a too lengthy period of time. However there were a few items that I wanted to make and contribute to the debate on the passing of this bill

Really, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated the other day, the basic differences between the two

governments are in this bill. The former government believed, as I indicated before, that the government should be the big business, the government should be the big employer and the government should be the big brother.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we obviously don't believe in that and in last year's election, went to the people of Manitoba and said, "That if you vote for us and we become the government, we will reduce the personal income tax. We'll reduce the small business tax," and really this is what's in this bill; and the people answered and said, "Fine, we want that," answered to the tune of 49 percent voting for us.

And Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that the Honourable Member for St. Johns — I don't think in his particular part of the debate — indicated how he was going to vote on this bill. I think it's quite clear how the Honourable Member for Inkster will vote on this bill because he let it be known in one of the committees the other night what he was interested in seeing a government that he would be part of do in regard to inheritance tax and in other taxes. So that I expect that the Honourable Member for Inkster will be voting against this particular bill.

But I ask, Mr. Speaker, how can they, as representatives of the people of Manitoba in the ridings that they represent, vote against a sales tax reduction? I would also ask, Mr. Speaker, how they, as representatives of their people in their ridings, can vote against a personal income tax reduction? And great to-do was made about the fact that people in the — as they called them — the middle-class area would be better off than people in lower income areas. Well, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the major contributors to our tax that we do collect in income tax are the blue collar workers, or the middle-class workers, the plumbers, the carpenters, the electricians, the civil servants, these people that they have in their particular constituencies that they represent, that are going to benefit from this particular income tax reduction. So I cannot understand why, as representatives of their constituency, that they would want to vote against this bill and it may well be that they won't vote against it and will pass it.

A MEMBER: No, they'll vote against it.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest the other day when the Honourable Member — oh, my apologies to the gentleman, I guess it's City Centre — made comments about the fact that an agreement with the doctors was settled at some 7 percent. My apologies, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, but when he made comments about the doctors fees being settled in the area of 7 percent, well I'm sure the Honourable Member is quite aware of the fact that he wasn't truly relating the amount of moneys that the doctors were going to be receiving. Because, out of those particular fees the doctors are paid, they also pay their secretaries, they also pay their nurses, they also pay their stenographers out of those particular fees, light bills, and he knows very well that the 7 percent is really to cover the increased costs of running the doctors' offices and so on. The only source of funds the doctors have to pay for the operations of these facilities are from the fees that they collect for their services. So it really is an unfair comparison.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of the income tax reduction, as we indicated earlier, was to encourage the people to stay in our province, encourage the people to stay rather than leave our province for where the income tax levels are more attractive, or had been more attractive prior to reductions, rather than see the brain drain of the carpenters and the technicians and the engineers and so forth, who have liberty to travel between boundaries of provinces under the present federal and provincial legislation. Mr. Speaker, I would think that this former government, the opposition, cannot understand that type of philosophy, because they have always believed that they are the big employers, they are the big employers, they are the big business people. I think it was answered very clearly at the last election, that the people of Manitoba wanted the government to get out of business, to spend less money.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support a bill that will see small business tax be reduced, which will hopefully attract small business and maintain small business in our province, because the greatest creators of jobs in the province is the small business community. And, it's hoped that through this effort they will continue to be major employers in the province as well as expand and be able to compete with the competitiveness of outside the province companies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment and relating it to the bill before us that the Honourable Member for St. Johns indicated with these tax reductions that we were going to create a bigger deficit than what actually has been predicted in our Estimates. Well, I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that he was the Finance Minister and part of the government, he is fully aware that when a government sets its Estimates and passes them at the start of the fiscal year, it's very difficult to move and spend all that money. If think if he checks back into the past history of his government, the past our years history of his government, that when they had an approval of "X" number of dollars to spend, say \$1.6 billion or \$1.5 billion that at the actual cut-off date at the end of the year, the money had not all been spend. In fact, history shows that it could go as high as 4 ½ percent to 2 ½ percent when you compare this, and really if you apply a 2 percent figure to what we're looking at, \$1.6 billion combined budget that we have this year, you're looking at \$33 million that will not be spent because of the lapse factor. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that \$33 million will cancel out the \$30 million that he's trying to add to create this deficit. And he knows his administrators and the people that have told him this, he knows that it was the same administrators that had this experience with his government, he predicted this. Yet, he will not accept that fact. And, he knows very well that there will not be the kind of over-expenditures that he's talking about because of that lapse factor, if he fully understands that the cash flow type of approach that is being taken in this budget is. Because if one applies 2

percent . . . Then, Mr. Speaker, if he doesn't believe that, and I ask him sincerely, does he really believe that this government will be able to, or will know how to spend money more than they did? Does he really believe that we are much better at spending money than their government was? And, their government had 4 ½ percent lapse one year, and they had 2 ½ percent in other years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can't really accept the Honourable Member for St. Johns suggestion that the \$30 million carry-over will end up as an additional \$30 million deficit, because it will not. And, I will remind him that we will find out when we deal with the actual financial position of the province in our quarterly statements. That's when the fact will come out on who is correct. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I would love to answer a question after I'm finished. Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in supporting the bill that's before us. I feel that we are completing or at least starting to complete some of our objectives that we put forward to the people in the last election. We have confidence in the people of Manitoba. We have confidence in the business community of Manitoba that these initiatives will turn the economy around and get things starting to go again in Manitoba, and that there will be investment continue in Manitoba and grow in the private sector where the major employers are presently situated, rather than the other approach that the former government had which was to get more and more of this involvement into the hands of the government. More and more involvement in the control of the cash flow of the province which in opposition we never agreed with, and this government do not agree with. So, I hope the opposition will consider again what the objective of this particular bill is, and will have the guts to support it. Thank you very much.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member indicated he would be prepared to consider a question. I would ask him whether he wishes to leave the impression that the Conservative government of the day went through a budget process, reviewing all expenditures and ended up with a figure which they do not expect to spend and, therefore, that they expect to have a lower expenditure in this fiscal year than is shown in the Estimates that are now before Committee of Supply?

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

MR. MINAKER: Well no, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the honourable member raised that question, because that is why the proposed way of estimating is put forward to the Legislature at this time, because in past what was happening, was that the capital carry-over was carried over from year to year and at times when we dealt with the Estimates in this House, we weren't dealing with the capital that was going to be spent in that year because it had been carried over from two years prior. And, because of that combination of capital and operating that you could have when you totalled the carry-over of capital and the capital approved for the year, and you carried it through from year to year, you weren't able to spend all that money, and that's why, exactly why this particular type of accounting is being put forward and why the auditor recommended it, so that we will know exactly what is being dealt with on a year by year basis. And, if you look at the past history of adding carry-over capital, capital approved for the year, and the expenditure that was approved by the Legislature, when you applied all that to be spent for that year, it wasn't spent and would vary anywhere from close to 5 percent in lapse down to 2 ½ and that's what I was meaning by that statement.

MR. CHERNIACK: Only if the member will permit a supplementary. Setting aside capital and current discussions, is the honourable member leaving us, does he intend to leave us with the impression that the Estimate sheets that we are now dealing with in Committee of Supply for the current fiscal years shows an expenditure item which the government does not expect to spend and that indeed the government expects to spend less because of whatever reason they feel that there will not be a complete expenditure of the expected amount?

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, not at all because it depends on the definition of spending. If the definition of spending is sending a contract out, yes, we will spend everything that's in there that's supposed to be spent and in the carry-over but if you look at the cash flow, then if the Accounts Payable is not in at that time or they haven't completed the work, you can issue a contract two months before the end of the year for a million job, then in fact the order has been placed but will not be accountable for until the following year because the bill hasn't come in or the progress billing hasn't come in because the definition is at the year end, what isn't either in Accounts Payable or work not completed on that particular contract, it's cut off. So this is why I'm saying that in the old method, there was this 4 percent lapse or this 2.5 percent lapse. So what you are comparing when you say there's going to be a deficit of additional \$30 million is to the old system and the old system, when you added all those items together, showed that you were never able to push all that money through in one year, it wasn't practical.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my comments with respect to this bill and in doing so, Mr.

Friday, May 5, 1978

Speaker, I particularly want to deal with some of the matters that have been raised by my friend, the Member for St. James. The Member for St. James is of the opinion that there is fear in the hearts of any legislator to vote for a reduction in taxes and that anybody who does that is destined to political failure. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I've been in politics for 16 years with relative success; I have never gone to my constituents on the basis that I would reduce their taxes. I have said that I would try to make taxes apply more on those who have the ability to pay and less on those who do not have the ability to pay. I've never called for a reduction in taxation by virtue of reduced public services.

With regard to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I would have no difficulty voting against it on the basis that it doesn't represent a reduction in taxation; it represents a part of a comprehensive budgetary program on the part of the Conservative government which will do economic harm to this province. If one takes the income tax in isolation and says that I'm going to charge my clients or my constituents \$13.00 a year more in income tax by voting against this bill, I tell my honourable friend that I am going to cost them a lot more by voting for this bill. Although it is possible, and has been done, for a group of legislators to get up and say, "Yes, we're going to vote for the income tax reduction as an isolated item but we object to it in the context of what it is doing," — which is a legitimate position and I'm not going to argue against it — I would have no difficulty voting against this bill on the basis of the fact that I know it is a comprehensive program. I'll deal with the reasons, Mr. Speaker, as to why it is possible to vote against a taxation measure which ostensibly reduces taxes.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I made a speech in this House in 1967 dealing with the very same question that the honourable member is raising and I showed him that we could reduce taxes far more than what the Conservative administration is suggesting. We could, Mr. Speaker, eliminate the educational services to the people of this province and eliminate \$352 million in taxes. That's \$350 for every man, woman and child in this province. \$350 million means that we could wipe out the sales tax entirely. Add to that all of the revenues — I hope that the Member for St. Johns will correct me if I'm wrong — but I believe that we could wipe out the sales tax if we saved \$350 million on education because the sales tax is about \$200 million — 5 x 40 is \$200 million — and we could also wipe out either the corporate or the personal income tax. We could say to the people of the Province of Manitoba, "User pay," and user pay means — and I'm going to be conservative — that for my family it would mean \$1,000 a child per year, that I would pay only for the primary and secondary education, elementary and secondary education. I have five children; 12 years is \$12,000 per child and I'm being conservative, times five children is \$60,000.00. You know, I'm being very very low on what it would cost to educate those children. I'm sure it would be \$1,500 a year. But that's what I would say to the people of the province, that if we are going to eliminate this tax, which in sales tax and income tax costs you a certain amount, and we're going to let you educate your children and that will cost you for a family of five a minimum of \$60,000.00. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I don't know about my honourable friend, but if I voted that way, I'd be chucked out of office so fast you wouldn't be able to take a fast speed picture of it, because the people in my constituency understand very well the benefits of society getting together, pooling their collective resources and doing things ourselves collectively as a matter of social responsibility which we could never accomplish individually.

Mr. Speaker, we could eliminate another \$300 million if we eliminated the health services, if we eliminated the hospital and the medical. I can tell my honourable friend that if he came in here with a bill saying that we will wipe out sales tax, wipe out income tax and eliminate these services, that I would proudly stand up and vote against that bill and I would go to the people in my constituency and would go to the people in his constituency and we would get him defeated on the basis of voting for such a tax measure. So let's not look at the percentage increase — but I will do that in a few moments — as being what this bill is legislated. This bill is legislating a taxation and budgetary policy which I am opposed to and which I believe a majority of the people of this province are opposed to and when the members talk about that 49 percent, I believe that it isn't 49 percent anymore. You know, if it would make them feel any better and if they would guarantee me the opportunity of doing so — and this is probably a vacant boast and they will say, "Well, in my constituency anybody could get elected." — I'm willing to test that 49 percent right now. I will resign on the understanding that the First Minister will call an election and I will go to Inkster constituency on the basis of how I have just voted and let us see whether the 49 percent that you are talking about for the Conservative Party exists. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it would happen in my constituency and it would happen in St. Matthews and it would happen in Osborne and it would happen in many of the fringe constituencies. At the First Minister call an election to test that 49 percent, Mr. Chairman. Right now, let's test that 49 percent. Because you talk about it, the members talk about it as if it was written in stone.

Mr. Speaker, when we were in office, Mr. Speaker, elected by the people of this province with 43 percent, I heard for eight years how we'd had no mandate, that we were a minority government, coming out of the mouths of the Conservatives. That's all I heard. At that time the electoral mandate didn't mean anything. Now, suddenly, it means much more than it meant over the past eight years. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that one thing that Conservatives really know but don't care to admit is that the electorate, once having spoken, is not thereafter mute and that we are continually . . . And one thing that the Member for St. Matthews apparently doesn't know is that in this House and on the streets, we are continually fighting the election. Not the last election, the next election. If there is any problem in that connection, Mr. Speaker, that people think that when I ask a question I remember someone said on the other side that that is a political question, I know of no question that is not a political question and every single question that I ask, I ask on the hope that it will make our side politically stronger and the other side politically weaker and every speech that I make in this House is

Friday, May 5, 1978

based on the fact that I hope that it will commend itself to the people of the Province of Manitoba and that it will bring discredit upon the opposition, the opposition meaning those opposed to me, the government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the basis —(Interjection)— I don't know, I have never considered "politician" to be a dirty word, never. I consider it to be one of the highest callings that anybody could be involved in. So those people who speak about "cheap political tricks" really do not understand politics because politics is not a trick, it is not a con game as was said by the Leader of the Liberal Party that politics is a con game, but too many people do fall into the trap of thinking that being elected is somehow putting something over and then doing the opposite. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in the continual test of whether that has been done.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to get to the specifics of the tax legislation in a moment. I do want to deal with the Member for St. James' — and I'm going to try to be as kind as I can while being as accurate as I can — the Member for St. James' Archie Bunkerism with respect to matters intellectual. Well, Mr. Chairman, I told a story in the House last year which is probably regarded by people of all philosophical persuasions, of all philosophical persuasions, to be one of the greatest short stories ever written. It was written by Count Tolstoi. It is a story not about Socialism; it is a story about human greed which is recognized as one of the problems of mankind —(Interjection)— No.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask the member . . .

MR. GREEN: It relates to what I am talking about. It relates to this human greed of the income tax, yes. And Mr. Speaker, I didn't interrupt when the honourable member was talking about it. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that on a bill a member has 40 minutes, and can relate almost anything to the subject matter of the bill with the smallest degree of ingenuity. If you're going to make me do that, I'll do it but we've only got 40 minutes and at the end of 40 minutes I'm going to have to stop anyway so why don't we just let it continue?

The honourable member attributed my philosophy as saying that a human being doesn't need anything more than six feet of land. The reason that the story was told, Mr. Speaker, was we were discussing the amount of land that a man needs and at that time I thought that it was an appropriate story — not a Socialist story — to talk about human greed as being one of the devastating problems that people have and that no matter what class you are, no matter what stage you are in, that human greed is something that will kill you. That is what Tolstoi said. He said that the man who walked around the six feet, who walked around and tried to get as much as he can, found out that by trying to do that he had killed himself. As an intellectual, Mr. Speaker, can the honourable member not regard that story as to its inherent value rather than trying to attribute to me the suggestion that six feet of land is the amount of land that a man needs. What I was talking about is human greed.

I want to tell the honourable member that I really didn't intend to deal with this matter. I show you a magazine. This magazine I can't read. It's a trade magazine that my friend, the Member for St. Johns, may be able to read. It's in Japanese. It's a magazine that was published in Japan and there is a story in it written by a great capitalist, one of the leading capitalists of Japan. His name is Misawa. He builds in Japan — at that time 50,000 homes a year. He wrote a story in this trade magazine, Mr. Speaker, which essentially deals with his relationship with one Sidney Green, Minister in charge of Natural Resources and Environment. This was written a year ago and they sent me a translation; I don't even know if it's correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he relate his story to income tax.

MR. GREEN: Yes, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: Very good.

MR. GREEN: I certainly will, Mr. Speaker. I am relating this story to the question of the philosophy of the capitalism and individual achievement, and the story that Tolstoi wrote of much land does a man need, as it relates to this income tax, which is essentially intended to show people in the business community that they are going to be a great substantial consideration on the part of this government, to the exclusion of others. That's what it's doing. That's the basis of this bill. This bill is not going to save businessmen money. And I will deal with the amount of money that we're talking about, in a few moments.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is what Mr. Misawa said about this particular story. "In 1973 when Mr. Green visited Japan I recall that Mr. Green told me a story, "How Much Land Does A Man Need" which I understand he took from one of the stories of " — Torstley is what they have here, and it was Tolstoi — "while we were on route to Misawa Homes Training Centre in Shizuoka." By the way, I want the honourable member to know that this magazine was written after we got out of Misawa — after we got out. After we were merely there as a . . .

He expanded the story further by concluding "that anything belonging to nature should not be dominated by a certain people, thus land should, in principle, be available to all human beings and should not be dominated by one or a few.

"Mr. Green is not tall, not in comparison with my height" — Mr. Misawa is a very short man — "and his philosophy is so sophisticated that I have learned a lot from him." Now, Mr. Speaker, that's a little bit of immodesty which I am driven to by the reading of the story.

But I am trying to indicate to my honourable friend that recognizing the intellectual validity of a great piece of literature is not the exclusive domain of socialists; that somebody could recognize that and be of an entirely different philosophy; and that the story has meaning and that if he would read it, that I am sure that he would find that there is some meaning in it for him and for Conservatives of all walks of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member talks about how this reduction in income tax is going to do a great deal for the small business community. Now, let's look at what it actually does. The amount of money that a business that is netting \$87,000 — and this is net, that a business after taxes got \$87,000 — after wages and everything got \$87,000, will now get \$89,000.00. Has anybody in Manitoba ever heard of a business leaving Manitoba or in any way being discouraged with Manitoba because its profit moved from \$89,000 to \$87,000, that at the end of the year it showed net — this is after taxes — \$87,000 instead of \$89,000.00?

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's go to the other comparison. Let's take a smaller business, one that had a net of \$4,350.00. It will now have a net of \$4,450 — \$1,000 more. Has anybody heard — (Interjection) — Oh, \$40,000 — \$43,500; it will have \$44,500.00. Has anybody heard of a small businessman complaining that his profit went down from \$44,500 to \$43,500, and therefore he was considering altering his program.

Mr. Speaker, that is so remote as to be ridiculous. In the law business, a law firm that made one year \$87,000 and the next year \$89,000 figures it made approximately the same each year. That its profit was roughly the same each year.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members say that we have to do this in order to be competitive with other provinces. Well, I hope we don't compete with other provinces, because the business in Ontario that saves \$1,000 on \$44,500 is paying two cents extra in sales tax from five to seven and if they have got 14 employees, Mr. Speaker, if they have got 14 employees under Ontario law, they have to pay 14 times 500, approximately, which is \$7,000 in health insurance premiums. \$5,000 in health insurance premiums, plus the wages. And I say that that is a package of wages, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there is a law in Ontario that you have to add to a worker's wages if there are over 14 people \$7,000 — you have to add to their wages. And I believe it is wages. But how does that make one competitive, if one looks at the two situations and says in Manitoba we're going from 13 to 11 to save them \$1,000.00. When we go down the line, Mr. Speaker, to real small business, which after wages

. . . And when you are talking about real small business you are talking about businesses which after wages to the entrepreneur if they make \$20,000 that's a good business. — (Interjection) — Well, if they make \$20,000, how much are you saving that firm? \$500 at most; has anybody heard of such a firm leaving Manitoba because it made \$19,500 instead of \$20,000.00? — (Interjection) — Pardon?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you I have been involved with businesses. I have never heard it; I have never heard it from any businessman that he was thinking of . . . — (Interjection) — or heard it from them — none of them know anything about business.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin always talked about nobody on this side ever having had to have a payroll. Mr. Speaker, if you talked about small businessmen as between the two sides of the House, we double the number of small businessmen that they have. The Member for St. Boniface had a small business — a mortuary. The Member for Seven Oaks had a small business. He had a sheet metal business. The Member for St. Johns had a small business. I had a small business. Howard Pawley had a small business. The former Member for Dauphin had a small business.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of operating small business and knowing the problems of small business, that the credibility of members on this side of the House surpasses members on that side of the House — surpasses, Mr. Speaker. But let's not take credibility as the issue. Let's look at it in its objective facts. Which small businessman gave up his business because his profit dropped from \$20,000, after taxes and after wages — wages to himself included — because his profits went down from \$20,000 to \$19,500.00.

I say, Mr. Speaker, without any difficulty at all, no such case can be found in the annals of business history. No such case. So what does this do, Mr. Speaker? This is not a relief measure. This is a symbolic measure. This is a measure which says to the business community that we really can't give you anything, because there is no real elbow room. And you know that's kind of a contradictory thing. The Minister of Finance comes in here and tells us that he is starving; that his hands are tied; that he can't operate; that he is facing a disastrous financial situation and then gives up \$20 million in income tax, \$8 million in estate tax — roughly \$28 million. And it's symbolic, Mr. Speaker, because it doesn't do anything for the small businessman but it says to the small businessman that you are now in overment, and we are going to look after you, as a business government. It is a declaration of dependency, which I have so often referred to in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the worst part of this declaration of dependency is, what does it mean? What is a small business? As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, a person who has invested \$20,000 and makes 50,000 in the first year, is engaged in big business. He is engaged in big business. The person who invests \$1 million and makes \$100,000 has made far less money than that first businessman — far less money. And that's something that the mining companies in this province understand when they said that our incremental tax makes much more sense than the Ontario incremental tax. Because we relate the profits of a business to the investment of that business. Not this — a person who makes \$20,000 and invests \$1,000 is engaged in small business. It seems to me he is engaged in very big

business. He has made 2,000 percent on his money the first year.

The Minister doesn't take that into account because he is engaged in something that we all get involved in from time to time, regrettably, and I will not even be able to exclude our own group from that position, in essential populism which really doesn't have any rationale behind it. Essential populism which doesn't have any rationale behind it because it's not based on any business principle that one can find.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Honourable Minister is engaged in trying to create this myth, this image, that this government is going to be better for business; that a reduction in taxes does more for economic activity than worthwhile desirable necessary public investment and expenditures; that it is better — and I have used this example before but I will use it again — that it is better and more profitable for society to have someone working in a massage parlour than it is to have them working in a hospital. Because one is in the private sector and one is in the public sector.

Mr. Speaker, that's coming home. The Honourable Minister said that he is going to reduce . . . The Honourable Minister and his party said that the way in which they are going to accomplish reductions in taxes while maintaining services is to eliminate the fat. Eliminate the fat Mr. Speaker, and they referred to Flyer Coach Industries, Saunders Aircraft. Where, in the budgetary figures of 1977, do you find moneys on operations for those companies? And if you say, well, it's lost and it's in capital, well if you compare the capital with what we are paying for for your administration's failures, it's far more than what we are paying for Flyer and Saunders.

But in any event, those things are there. You can't reduce fat on the basis of repayment of debt. You have to reduce it in operations. And when they came into power, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't find the fat. Not finding the fat, Mr. Speaker, they created a new definition of fat. If you will look at the definition of fat — here I have here the Conservative Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary and if you will look under fat . . . Here, where is fat? Fat under this new dictionary. Fat means, Mr. Speaker, meals — reduce to two meals a day. Sheets — reduce to replacing sheets one time per week. — (Interjection)— Yes, and head to toe instead of toe to head. And the elimination of health inspectors.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know this is the Conservative definition of fat, because they haven't found any fat in that budget. Mr. Speaker, so we are now seeing a Conservative administration that says it's hamstrung reducing taxes. Reducing taxes on the basis that it's going to stimulate the economy. . . I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of money that will be saved by cutting hospitals to 2.9 percent and changing sheets once a week, and give it to a businessman so that he will have \$45,000 instead of \$44,000, will not improve the economy of this province. Because it is much more likely that that nurse who is not working now, or the public health inspector who is not working now, or the amount of money that was being spent in the public sector for useful things, would be spent by the people making it in this province. Whereas there is every opportunity — as a matter of fact, the probability that the businessman who earns an additional thousand dollars will spend that in additional holiday — test that by yourself, test that by yourself. When I earned \$35,000 a year, is that when I started going overseas and making trips and spending money, which I could never spend before?

Mr. Speaker, that is the case almost universally, that the person who is working in the hospital is spending their money in the province of Manitoba, and the businessman whom you give an extra thousand dollars in profits is almost certain to use — (Interjection)— Well, where do I find the people with the suntans in February, other than myself, Mr. Speaker? Other than myself? I find them amongst my business friends, and I don't fault them, I don't fault them at all. I have never had anything remotely negative to say about a person who has earned enough money to take a good holiday and to go overseas, or to go to Europe, or to go south. I regret, I regret that that circumstance and the luck of the draw as to who has it available to them is created by an unjust structure of society, but I certainly would not blame the people — I do not blame them at all. — (Interjection)— Well, certain people do, you know, I hear certain people over on your side referring to the "working stiff" who works at Canada Packers for 50 years, has been there because he doesn't have the intelligence to do anything else. I hear people on that side of the House saying that, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that man is making a sound contribution to society and is a very hard-working person. That's right. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not fault either of these people; what I do is fault society for passing this type of legislation which is designed to create and maintain class differences.

You know, the First Minister and the Minister of Highways both said something which I find incomprehensible, and that's why it's so difficult to put yourself into somebody else's subjectivity — the First Minister said that the main difference between your people and our people, the Conservatives and the New Democrats, is you believe in peace and tranquillity and non-confrontation in society, and we believe in confrontation and creating difficulties. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, there is some truth in that, but what does it reflect? The man who is sitting in a position on top of the world over a group of people who are sitting underneath him, he wants tranquillity; he wants no problems; he wants no agitation. And really, what you are saying is that the economic status quo as it presently exists is a reflection of the Divine Providence, it should always be — and anybody who challenges it is envious and is seeking to stir up difficulties in society.

Well, Mr. Speaker, is there no understanding on the part of the other side of the House that a person who is born in poverty, who feels that he has had all kinds of avenues closed to him, who is living on the lowest rung on the economic ladder, who, in his mind — and I will support his thinking — feels that that is not because of some defect on the part of himself, but rather results from some type of organization in society which has created, which has put him in that position? Is there any understanding on the part of members on the other side of the House, that that person would be ir

favour of change and would not want things to stay as they are, whilst my friend and friends who have been born with silver spoons in their mouths, who will continue to profit immeasurably — if the situation doesn't change — should say, "We like things as they are. We're satisfied; why can't everybody be?" And that's the attitude, that's the attitude of the First Minister of this province, and that's the attitude of the Minister of Highways, that somehow we are evil people because we are willing to engage in an attempt to upset the economic status quo so that the benefits of the wealth that is produced in the society are shared more equitably amongst the people. And that not only becomes a wrong concept, Mr. Speaker, that becomes an evil and pernicious concept in the eyes of the First Minister because it leads to trouble. And Mr. Speaker, it has led to trouble as long as history has been written. The feudal lords said the same thing, "Why can't the serfs be happy like we are? Why are they trying to create trouble? Don't they know that peace and tranquillity is better for them than creating trouble?"

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: The same thing, Mr. Speaker, was true of the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain, between the 1850s and the 1900s when working people decided that they would take the same steps that industrialists had been taking, and that is, trying to combine together for the purpose of improving their economic bargaining position, and what did the industrialists say? "Why can't these people be happy and contented and peaceful, as we are? Why can't they be? Don't they know that peace is better than difficulty?" And Mr. Speaker, the same thing is being said by the First Minister: If the people in the Manitoba Club are not running around with signs, if they are not agitating to try to upset things, why shouldn't you, the working people, and the people at the lowest end of the economic ladder, why shouldn't you be happy and contented, as we are?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it just doesn't work that way. There has been and will be, I'm afraid, for time immemorial, a continual struggle, if you want to call it, the First Minister will say I'm talking about class war — you know, you can use whatever euphemism you like, or non-euphemism — what you are going to see, not only in 1978 but in 2078 is a continual conflict between those who have much of the material goods and power in society, and those who have less of the material goods and power in society, and generally speaking the people who have much will call for peace and tranquillity and the people who have little will call for change. And if the honourable members think that that is a phenomenon which indicates that the people who have little are engaged in an evil design, it merely reflects the shallow Archie Bunker-ism lack of knowledge which is reflected by the Member for St. James when he takes a Tolstoy story and talks about it as if it represents a pernicious philosophy, that nobody should have anything, which is the way in which he dealt with the story.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to say what this bill is. This bill is not relief to taxpayers. The amount of relief that it grants to the \$10,000 earner — I think my friend, the Member for Seven Oaks — \$13.00 a year, a dollar a year, will be taken away from him in the park fees that he'll have to pay if he goes several times — (Interjection) — It'll take away the transit fees four times, four times! A person who rides the transit bus twice a day will be paying about \$52 a year by this bill, Mr. Speaker. So when we're talking about who is increasing taxes, this bill is the increase in taxes to the people of the Province of Manitoba. The poor family that has to send a child to university and has to get that money will find this increase wiped out ten times by the mere imposition of the tuition fee. And there are numerous other examples and we will be collecting them as to what's going to happen to the \$11.00 a year that you people think that you can bribe the majority of the people of the province as being a tax reduction; it is not a tax reduction; it is a tax increase because it goes along, Mr. Speaker, part and parcel, with an economic program which is designed to put the people that it ostensibly says are going to save, in a position where they will be paying more money out of their own pockets in one form of user tax or another. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I at least want to let it be known that this bill is not tax relief; for the poor it is a pittance — with regard to income tax it applies to nobody who is below the income tax paying level, and that could well be 33 percent of the population of this province. With regard to the people who pay a very small portion of taxes, and then we may be getting - I would make a guess, Mr. Speaker, which is a hazardous thing to do . . .

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

R. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll finish with one sentence. I'll make a guess, which is a hazardous thing to do, that over 50 percent of the people of this province will not save \$50 a year by this bill and they will pay much more if their family uses the transit bus.

R. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General . . .

R. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister . . .

R. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. Only with leave of the House in a member ask a question. The Honourable Member for St. James.

R. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, it relates to the Tolstoy story. I wonder if the Honourable Member for St. James would advise if he believes that individuals should have a Torrens title to land and should be able to pass it on to their children?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in the context of things as they are, I would say, certainly, certainly. If you are asking me whether the most desirable procedure on earth is that people should have a Torrens title, then I have to tell my honourable friend that if I said I believed in that, I would be dispossessing the majority of the people of this province from ever having private ownership of land. Because, does not the honourable member know that the fewer number of people who have Torrens titles, which is the way in which things move, particularly in the rural areas, the greater the number who will never have anything? And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am accepting the Torrens title; I say that it amounts to a long-term lease, that it does not amount to private property in land; that what it says what it says is that the public will let you occupy this piece of land until we say that you no longer should have it. That is not my thesis; that is the thesis of the Conservative government or free enterprise governments, that pass the concept of Torrens title, and if they ever tried to change it — if they ever tried to legislate genuine private property in land that could not be taken away by the state — they would be defeated on that position. Because on that basis, Mr. Speaker, we would be dispossessing a large majority of the people of this province from ever owning land.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — PUBLIC WORKS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Committee come to order. We have a quorum. We are on Page 70, Resolution 105, section (d) of that particular resolution, Leased Accommodations (1) Salaries: \$65,500—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister explain the increase in salaries. Is that just normal increase, and what about the SMY?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS(Lakeside): We are on (d)(1). Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the SMY situation remains the same at 5.31. There's a slight increase of \$3,900, which is merely a provision for the general salary increase and annual merit increments. I believe we've discussed the other increase. No change in SMY positions here, specifically the answer to the Member on staff.

MR. DOERN: And no vacancies?

MR. ENNS: No vacancies in this appropriation.

MR. DOERN: I would then like to ask the Minister some questions based upon the discussion that he had with the Member for St. Johns when he was here, because the moneys spent in this division of Public Works for leases, of course, are also policywise, related to certain considerations of building as to whether a government when it requires space, should lease that space or build that space.

But, I would like to go back to what the Member for St. Johns asked you, I believe it was yesterday and that is the Minister seemed to indicate that he would give consideration to proposals of selling existing government assets. For instance, when I was responsible for the department there were many proposals put to me and you mentioned these the other day, people asking for space commitments so that they could construct new buildings. In other words, give them a sizable block commitment and they will put up a building, or they will build an entire building to meet your requirements, or they will go into partnership with you. I had one firm suggest that we would split

building 50-50, they would build it and sell one half for their purposes, etc. etc., so I'm asking the Minister if he could give us some further comment. The Member for St. Johns indicated that some businessman he knew is prepared to buy any government building or office building and lease it back to the government, and the Minister seemed to indicate that he was somewhat interested in this concept, so, I wonder if he could indicate whether he is serious when he says this or whether he was just sort of thinking out loud.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, without the benefit of Hansard I'm trying to recall or recollect precisely what I did say on the subject matter last night, it's not altogether clear in my own mind, but I left any impression that there was to be any change of substance with respect to the government's approach in policy in this regard, then let me take this opportunity to correct that impression. There simply is none. I think I was indicating that perhaps even some additional pressure or additional representations have been made to me in the short period of months that I have had the responsibility of Public Works by the private sector with the kind of representation that's already been referred to. But, for two very understandable and very common sense reasons, no real action or change is contemplated.

Firstly, the requirements for government space, understandably, is at this particular time contracting, not expanding. I think what we will find ourselves being able to do is to hopefully consolidate or bring together some of these spaces that we have in the city, but again, these would be done principally on the basis of providing for a better administration that perhaps now is fragmented in different locations throughout the city. But even there I don't see any substantive change occurring. I have for the members of the Committee, information on the overall lease accommodation space which I perhaps should give to the Committee at this time, which covers the unoccupied space as of March 31, 1978, which is as the recent most updating of the actual situation having in mind that some space has just recently in some instances become vacant.

Of the government space. . . I can break this down, or have some of this information available to the honourable member on districts which he is familiar with, but if he will accept for the moment, the grand or the total figures, allow me to give them in that way. Of a total of 39 "owned" units, that is, buildings that the government owns, there is a total of some 197,000 square feet of unoccupied space at the moment. An additional total of 19 leased units, buildings, there is an additional area of 36,000 square feet. Mr. Chairman, I have the metric figures here in metres, but I suppose that for this term round, we'd probably be more comfortable in square footage analysis.

MR. USKIW: Give us the other.

MR. ENNS: Well, it sounds. . . I should quite frankly as a smooth politician, give you the unoccupied space in metric metres because it's considerably less. The 36,000 square feet becomes 3,000 square metres or 197,000 square feet becomes 18,000. . .

MR. DOERN: For the benefit of the rural members, how many hectares is that?

MR. ENNS: Well, perhaps we can convert that further to hectares and we could then indicate that we possibly haven't got much more than one hectare standing empty at the moment.

But in total then, Mr. Chairman, for those members, if we can get down to business again, of the 58 units covered in this area of responsibility there is a total of some 233,000 square feet of unoccupied space at the moment.

MR. DOERN: The Minister, although he gave some inclination of this the other day, he is now making it clear that he does not intend to sell government assets, in terms of government buildings.

R. ENNS: That is very true, there is no suggestion of that.

R. DOERN: Is he giving any thought to leasing any government buildings, whole buildings?

R. ENNS: No, no current building is being considered for leasing. I suppose perhaps we can talk about the Provincial Garage later on on the Estimates.

R. DOERN: Yes, we certainly will, and can.

So there is no danger then of the Law Courts being, say, sold and rented back by the government from some U-Rent-It firm. I mean you are not desperately looking for capital by selling capital assets, you can throw it into general revenue on a short-term basis.

R. ENNS: There is no such thought being given to the operation of the Department of Public Works. While I have the microphone or the floor for a moment, I should just add that the square footage of unoccupied space that I just related includes that of the new and vacant Provincial Garage, which is, of course, of some substance, some 70,000 square feet in itself. It also includes space that is unoccupied and not suitable for occupancy, such as some of the Law Courts, the old buildings. . .

MR. DOERN: Land Titles.

MR. ENNS: The Land Titles building, I believe. 442 William being another example which I am told that if we just took the supports out from the one wall, we wouldn't have a building any longer.

MR. DOERN: I would just like to say to the Minister for the moment, when the time comes for an expansion rather than a contraction I would hope that the Minister would give serious thought to building that space rather than leasing that space, because I believe that the government can build space as cheaply or cheaper than a private developer.

I would cite to the Minister the following advantages. There is no Federal sales tax, no need to build in profit, and if the same architects and engineers can be hired, that the same contractors can be hired, and I believe that it is, in fact, either cheaper or as economical for government to build an operate and maintain as the private sector. Many space requirements cannot be met by the private sector unless the Minister is prepared to go out and say to some developer, "Build me a Law Court Building or build me a laboratory," because there are just not such buildings available. You cannot lease special purpose buildings, you know, from standard office space. A garage would be another example.

I would like to ask the Minister — going back to this available space, this vacant space, 233,000 square feet — can he indicate what percentage of that, what is the percentage vacancy rate given government space? When we were in office it tended to hover at around 3 percent. I assume this is greater than 3 percent, but I wonder whether staff has a percentage figure of the vacancy rate?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that that figure can be arrived at if staff is given a bit of time. I would offer the opinion that with the inclusion of the 70,000 square feet of the new Provincial Garage in this column, I am advised that it is 50,000. It's nonetheless, and with the contraction of staff and the many thousands and thousands of recorded, you know, civil servants that are no longer in the employ of the government, it still hovers at 3 percent or just in that area.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we will wait for the figure, because I find it difficult to believe that it is 3 percent, I believe it must be higher. I sent in a . . .

MR. ENNS: By way of example, Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to interject. The staffing components covered by some of the new legislation that is being felt staffwise only this year, for instance, and I cite the particular one — The Personal Property Act that was passed several years ago, have moved into the 15th Floor of the Woodsworth Building and occupied that space, that for admittedly a brief period of time was vacant, but those kind of normal spacing requirements have been met in that manner.

MR. DOERN: I gave you an Order for Return, and I wonder if the Minister has the information now. The answer may be nil, but I submitted an Order for Return a month or so ago requesting information on any new leases that were entered into since our administration left office. Can the Minister indicate whether there have been any new leases or blocks of space taken on since October?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that Order for Return is in the process of being prepared for the Honourable Member. I can indicate to the Honourable Member that there have been the normal flow of lease renewals, notably some lease renewals for MPIC in their current space accommodations. Of any new leases of substance I am not particularly aware, I am waiting for some advice from the staff. I am advised that there have been no changes of substance. There have been some renewals of current leases, there has been some giving up of leases. The Department advises me that on the question of amount of offices or other spaces purchased, rented, or leased by the Province of Manitoba or its agencies since October 24th, 1977, the answer is nil by the Department of Public Works. I wish to pursue and do the usual search with other agencies departments that (a) might have entered into some lease arrangements that the department at this moment is not aware of. We are trying to pursue the similar policy of the previous administration in being the leaser of space, but as the former Minister will know that that isn't always the case.

MR. DOERN: But you know, here is a vital point. I don't know what your figures are; I know roughly what mine are. But since your administration took office about 1,500 jobs have disappeared. I gather about 1,000 by attrition and several hundred layoffs. Now, can the Minister confirm whether those are the figures he accepts.

MR. ENNS: No, I certainly don't accept those figures and I am not in a position as being responsible for the overall government employment situation, nor is my staff in a position to, at this hearing, answer that to committee.

I can, and I have indicated to the members of the committee, what the staff situation is within the Department of Public Works and members will recall it is basically unchanged, that we have operated in the department with roughly the same vacancy rate that has prevailed in the department for the past number of years and we have maintained some of the SMY positions. So, essentially, I think the honourable member will acknowledge that I can and will give him information that the department has with respect to space, occupied or otherwise, but that I certainly cannot accept the figures by the

honourable Member for Elmwood as being fact.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, then these are my figures but they seem to be ones that are generally accepted, that there has been approximately 1,000 positions vacated by attrition and some 100 or 500 layoffs. Now, whatever the figures are, they are sizeable. There are hundreds of people fewer working for the province than there were when we were in power, and there are also hundreds and thousands more unemployed than when we were in power.

Now, the Minister, under Leased Accommodations has a slightly improved budget. The amount of money that our government spent on Leased Accommodations, compared to what you are spending, you are spending more money than we spent on Salaries and Other Expenditures, and I would like to know why. If there are fewer civil servants working for the Provincial Government of the order of 10 percent, or whatever the amount is, it would seem that logic would dictate that there be a comparable reduction in the amount of space and in the budget for space.

Now, can the Minister explain why that is not reflected in the Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think before the Minister answers the question, the Member for Elmwood might want to make a correction. He said that there were hundreds of thousands unemployed.

MR. DOERN: Hundreds and thousands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hundreds and thousands, not hundreds of thousands.

MR. DOERN: No, I never said that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps to answer more accurately or correctly — not more accurately but just more specifically — a question that the honourable member asked for a few moments ago, of the 7 million square feet of space that the government either owns or leases, the vacancy, as stated, is some 233,533 square feet. Put that figure over the 7 million and you come pretty well on the three percent figure of vacancy rate. So, I just want to put that on the record to answer the member.

Again, Mr. Chairman, without accepting . . . And I want to be careful about this because I am simply not in a position to accept the kind of figures that the honourable member is quite free to use, whether they are right or accurate is another matter. But I can indicate from just the general experience that in many instances some of the persons — and this by a large measure was the bulk of the people that regrettably employment terminated — were not big space users, in the sense that they often were of a term nature. They were of a seasonal type of a program, where specific office space, such as, was not set aside from. There has been very little, and I think the Minister of Labour indicated that on several occasions in the House, in terms of actual permanent Civil Service staff reductions that would require or have with it a contingent vacant space or reduced expenditures involved in the maintenance of that space. There have been some, and I will certainly not leave the impression with the members of the committee that there has not been some vacancies created by the staff reductions. But in some notable instances they have also been picked up by new programs coming onto stream. The one that I particularly noted was the new staffing requirements and the new spacing requirements of the division up on the 15th floor of the Woodsworth Building taking over the Personal Property, that will respond and administer the Personal Property Act.

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, that space is only a couple of hundred square feet and certainly doesn't amount to a hill of beans in 233,000. But this is my point. The Minister is telling me that the vacancy rate is the same as it was when I was the Minister. He is saying that, to the best of his knowledge, there is no change in the vacancy rate, but there is a change in the staff. There has been a reduction in the staff. And I say that if the Minister is telling me that we have fewer civil servants by hundreds . . . I say the figure is 1,500; he may have other figures and maybe members of the government would like to give their version of how many fewer civil servants there are. But there are hundreds less than there were and he still has the same amount of space. And I want to know what he is doing — what he has done in the past six months — about consolidating space, about sub-leasing space and about letting leases lapse.

Because surely I cannot believe that what has happened is when people move out, people there of that sort of, you know, occupy two desks instead of one, or 200 square feet instead of 100. Because, you know, some people do have that tendency. They will take as much space as they can. You know, it is not necessarily a peculiarity. All I'm saying is what are you doing about the space that is no longer required because of government layoffs? What are you doing with it? You shouldn't be leasing the same amount. You should have a higher vacancy rate, although you say you don't. But you should be spending less money on leases than we were, say, a year ago.

I want to know what the Minister is doing to get rid of some of the space that has been rented from the private sector?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Elmwood ought to be able to realize that, firstly, by far the greater portion of that number if I were to acknowledge or use for a moment his figure of staff reductions, is simply what he himself said, through attrition or through not hiring, you

know, filling vacant positions.

Secondly, the information that I and the staff can give him at this time reflects the situation as of March 31st, 1978, wherein, for instance, another rather substantial group of former government employees that were perhaps users of space, who were under contract and whose contracts have not been renewed — again in most instances those contracts are still in the process of running out at this particular time. But in total, in terms of the year that I am reporting for, in this year, no appreciable change has been reflected. We are certainly doing what he is suggesting, that where indeed space has become vacant as a result of this, leases will be lapsed. The former Minister is well aware that there are, of course, contractual obligations that the government sometimes finds themselves into and we are attempting to rationalize this as best possible. But quite frankly, that question perhaps will have more meaning and the comparison will have more meaning this time next year when the staff reductions have impacted on the department's space requirements for the period of a year. I think the member would accept the fact that in most instances we are dealing — again, I would draw the member's attention to the date, March 31 — in many instances, staff reductions that we received notice of, those staff reductions were and did in fact continue their obligations and their duties to this date, or close to this date and some beyond that date, and therefore the change that the honourable member is looking for really cannot be expected to show up in the data for the year just concluded but rather will, I suspect, show up in a clearer form this time next year.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could do some rapid calculations — I don't know what the average figure was, was it 150 square feet per person is the approximate amount of space we take as a rule of thumb? But if that is the figure, if it's about 150 square feet per person, and you have 1,500 laid off, my calculation is that this would be the equivalent of 225,000 square feet if that's correct multiplication. And that is approximately the size of the Woodsworth Building, and that is approximately the size of the amount of space that should be available in terms of what leasing could be let go, or what could be non-renewed. Now, can the Minister answer these questions? Can he give me any instances of any sub-leases — I assume there have been none — that they're not sub-leasing any space that was leased, and No. 2, can he give me instances again of any leases not renewed, and if so, how many square feet?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'll undertake to find you an answer for the latter part of the question, but let me just in a very short way indicate to the Honourable Member for Elmwood that while he may apply a rough rule of thumb of X number of square feet per employee, that of course varies considerably with the nature of the program that is being conducted. The requirements for square foot space for the operation of the Provincial Garage, for instance, is considerably different to that of an office containing clerical and filing duties. I'm sure the Minister understands that in an office which employed 10 people before and now there are 9, we don't sublet out one corner of the office, or 180 feet. I accept the fact that if there has been a major reduction within a division then consolidation takes place, as in fact it is taking place in a few cases, but the point that I really don't want to leave on the record is that that flat figure that the honourable member uses, 1,500, is not indicative of the number of permanent civil servants who are essentially the people that have space allocations made to them.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister give me his figure?

MR. ENNS: No, I can't; I indicated before I cannot give you that figure because I'm not the Minister — I can give you the figures as they relate to the Department of Public Works and these Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 28, Department of Education. We're on Clause 6. Universities Grants Commission.

Clause 6.—pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could give us a breakdown of the expenditures for the 1977-78 year in comparison to the previous year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes. I would also hope, Mr. Chairman, that in proceeding to deal with this item in the Estimates, that the Honourable Minister would take some time to give us a brief rundown on this particular branch of his department; on the state of affairs in the university community and set forth; a progress report to date and plans for the future; as I believe has been the custom for many years. —(Interjection)— And we'll get to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this particular section of our Estimates, I would first of all of course remark on the rather unique arrangement that exists between the government and the universities. As honourable members I am sure appreciate, there has been over the years established an arm's-length type of arrangement through the Universities Grants Commission. This has been maintained through statutory legislation that provides for the responsibilities of the particular universities of this province and of that Grants Commission.

The main function of the government of this province is to provide funding to the universities in a block grant, Mr. Chairman. The allocation of those funds to the universities, the way in which those funds are spent is left to the discretion of the Universities Grants Commission and ultimately to the universities involved.

We have found, Mr. Chairman, that certain rather interesting developments have taken place in the university community over the last number of years. In the area of full-time enrollment in 1960 there were some 6,232 students, enrolled full time. In 1970 it had risen to some 16,765, and in 1977 some 17,134. A levelling off seems to have been reached in this area, and I suppose a reflection, Mr. Chairman, on the number of young people in our society and declining enrollments in our public school system, which of course, in turn, supplies the graduates who go on to a university education.

The full-time enrollment estimated for 1978 is 16,750, the full-time enrollment. Part-time enrollment in 1960 was some 4,369; in 1970, some 17,395; and in 1977, Mr. Chairman, some 21,880; and this increase in part-time enrollment — especially in the last few years — shows a new direction, certainly a new thrust, in continuing education in the universities. And of those enrolled part-time in 1977, 11,741 were in the regular winter session and 10,139 in the summer session.

It's interesting that several years ago it had been estimated that part-time enrollment would overtake full-time enrollment in the mid-Seventies and clearly the number enrolled on part-time basis is now greater than the full-time enrollment by a considerable amount, Mr. Chairman.

I might also mention at this time that the projected enrollments for the next decade would indicate a decline in full-time enrollments, Mr. Chairman. Again a direct reflection on the number of young people who are presently in our school systems. This decline in full-time enrollment will certainly create certain challenges for the universities. It is going to necessitate a careful examination of their programming and, in fact, their whole operation. I'm sure it's a challenge that they will be able to meet and one that will easily be overcome with the expertise that they have available to them.

At the same time, the universities are concerned about maintaining quality as well as the question of quantity and this is again a challenge that they have been meeting and will continue to meet, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure in the years ahead.

There are new directions, of course, in community commitment that the universities are taking, much more so than, let us say, some 10 or 15 years ago.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I think the universities of this province are of a high standard, are well respected across this country — and in fact in other countries of the world — and I'm sure will continue to maintain that particular position.

The Member for Churchill had asked for a breakdown of operating expenses for 1977-78, I believe. I'll give him that information at this time.

In 1977-78 the universities operating on first claim, some \$82,466,300; in addition the UGC office grants in lieu of taxes, rentals, support programs, some \$11,967,300 for a total of \$94,433,600.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You will no doubt recall that in dealing with the Estimates of this department in relation to the previous appropriations, that the general position taken by the Minister was that even with the modest reductions but coupled with the more efficient style of operation, that no education program will really suffer. I would like the Minister to dwell for whatever time it takes him to indicate to the people of Manitoba, in what manner and on the basis of what rationale, given the inflation rate that still exists, given all the other factors that must be coped with today, how the universities can possibly be expected to deliver the programs, for which they are charged with the responsibility of delivering, with only the modest increase that the Estimates Book before us appears to show, which is only one and a small fraction of 1 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Burrows. In fact the increase in operating funds to the universities amounted to some \$2,400,000, which on a percentage basis represents some 3 percent. This, of course, is a little different figure to the one the Member for Burrows has been stating.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The fact of the matter still is, Mr. Chairman, if one looks at the figure on the left-hand side of the line, Resolution 46 — and I believe that this is the one which the Minister wants the committee to approve, this particular line — the figure for last year is \$87,925,000.00. The figure for this year, which this Minister wants us to approve, is \$89,108,000; and if one subtracts last year's figure from this year's figure, one arrives at a figure of just a shade better than \$1 million, which amounts I'm sure — applying the same method of arithmetic division as he would — it works out to

just a shade better than 1 percent.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for Burrows is quite correct, if he takes the two figures before him and works his arithmetic on that basis. But what he must understand is that the Grants Commission receives a sum of money and passes it on to the universities; and the amount of money that the Grants Commission has handed on to the universities this year amounts to a 3 percent increase. They, of course, have received this amount. In fact, if you take out the grants in lieu of taxes and other economies that the Grants Commission has seen fit to practise, the universities in fact have received 3 percent — a 3 percent increase, which I am the first to admit, Mr. Chairman, is no certainly a huge increase at all and at a time of inflation is going to cause the universities to certainly do a great deal of belt-tightening. But I can assure the Member for Burrows that I have had the opportunity, along with the Minister of Finance and the Premier, of sitting down and talking to the presidents of the three universities; and have received their assurance, although this is going to present a considerable challenge to them, that they feel that they can continue to provide the quality and the quantity of educational programming that they have been providing in the past; and that they will manage to live within the bounds of the amount of money that is being given to them through the Universities Grants Commission.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would like to ask him one question at this point in time. Did he or his First Minister or anyone from government suggest, advise or recommend to the universities that they increase their tuition fees commencing the forthcoming academic year?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the review that had been completed, the recommendation was made to the Grants Commission.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well then I would like the Minister to answer one further question and I now find it rather difficult to see how that recommendation squares with the existing legislation under which universities operate. It's my distinct recollection that the matter of setting tuition fees is on responsibility of the Boards of Governors of the two universities and the Board of Regents of the University of Winnipeg and not one of government to recommend or indicate or whatever to the universities what it should be but that is the prerogative, that is the responsibility of the boards and not of government.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the line of reasoning that the Member for Burrows is following, however, I would suggest to him that the Universities Grants Commission although receiving a recommendation from government is certainly under no compunction to follow that recommendation if, in their judgment, it would be harmful to the university community as a whole.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Does not the Minister feel that making a suggestion of that kind is really an encroachment upon the autonomy and independence of the universities?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows may interpret that particular recommendation in that light. I would suggest that even among the university community, an increase of fees has been seen as inevitable because, for some reason that is unknown to me, there had been no increase in fees for a considerable number of years and the fees in Manitoba had fallen certainly to the point where they were not only the lowest in Canada but away out of line with other provinces of the country. I'm sure not only the university community but all people in this province certainly saw that as an area where the percentage of university costs being borne by the students without any problem at all should be increased and even with the increase, Mr. Chairman, the university fees in Manitoba are still among the lowest in this country.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That brings me then to this question. What percentage of university costs is borne by the students?

MR. COSENS: In 1975-76, Mr. Chairman, the percentage was some 11.5 percent; in 1976-77, some 11.1 percent; in 1977-78, some 9.56 percent and in 1978-79, in line with the increase in fees, it is expected to be in the neighbourhood of 10.95, roughly 11 percent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would once again like to ask the Minister and at this time he has the opportunity to elaborate at greater length in his answer to a question which I had posed to him some time ago during questions before Orders of the Day, and that is this: Does he share the view of his First Minister who appears to make a distinction between taxpayers and students. He refers to taxpayers and students as being two separate and distinct categories or groups within our society because, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that there is a distinction. I am not aware of any tax levied by the Province of Manitoba which a student is exempt from paying by virtue of his being a student. I'm not aware of any. All taxes that the people of Manitoba — there's nothing, no goods, no service that a student buys where he could declare himself as being a student and thus be exempt from paying whatever provincial tax may be imposed upon that good or that service. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, to my mind and I believe in the minds of the people of Manitoba, students are taxpayers.

in the same manner as everyone else is.

Now, I think I know what the Honourable Minister might say. He might, as I've heard others, make mention, ah, but income tax. But, Mr. Chairman, whether an individual pays tax on his income earned has nothing to do with his being a student except for the fact that he's eligible for a deduction for tuition fees so that may reduce his taxable income but other than that it has nothing to do with it, absolutely nothing to do with it. There are many people who are not students who are not taxpayers or whatever reason. There might be members, as I mentioned once before, there might be members in this House who do not pay income tax, I don't know, because they may have been able to arrange their financial affairs in such a way as to take maximum benefit of all the provisions within the tax legislation and thus reduce their income below the taxable level or reduce it to an absolute minimum. So whether one pays an income tax or not has nothing to do with whether one is a student or not. If there's any student who has a level of income above the taxable level, he pays tax in the same manner as everyone else.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would say that those families in which there are members attending university, they are being doubly taxed. They are being doubly taxed in the sense that they pay the same sales tax, they pay the same income tax, they pay the same level of all other taxes that are imposed upon them and then on top of that they pay the tuition fee plus the increase that this government has recommended to the universities that they build into their budget for the forthcoming year. So really, I fail to see the distinction between taxpayers and students. To me, students are just as much taxpayers as any other citizen of this province. Now perhaps the Minister makes some distinction between taxpayers and students; his First Minister seems to make the distinction. I would like to hear the Minister's comments whether he shares his First Minister's view or not.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Burrows is begging the question a bit. I'm sure the First Minister in his comments in this particular area was intimating that most of us, and I'm sure the Member for Burrows' university experience was no different than mine, or perhaps it was, but in most cases those who are involved in scholarly pursuits do not at the same time have the opportunity to be working and earning a great deal of money. When the time does come around to fill out their come tax papers, very few find themselves in the position where they have to pay any considerable amount and in most cases I would suggest to the Member for Burrows most find themselves in the position where they do not have to pay anything and in fact receive money back. So when he is suggesting somehow that students are being taxed unduly, I would suggest that if he can produce figures that would prove this to me, I would be very interested in seeing them. It has been my experience with the university students in my own particular family and those that I know that in spite of the fact that they attempt to work during the non-university months, that the amount of income that they can earn in that time certainly does not put them in a tax bracket where they are paying any considerable amount of taxes at all and, in most cases, pay none.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to stress the point that there is no individual exempt from paying any tax by virtue of being a student. The student who needs to buy a pair of shoes this afternoon and goes down to Eaton's or the Bay is going to pay sales tax on that pair of shoes at exactly the same rate as the Minister would if he needs a pair of shoes. The only difference may be that it will create a somewhat larger dent in his pocketbook in relation to the amount of money that he has in it than it would in the Minister's because his income is not at the same level. But this notion that students seem to enjoy some tax benefit is a myth, Mr. Chairman, because no student is exempt from paying any tax by virtue of being a student. As I have indicated a moment ago, I don't know how many members in this House pay income tax or at what level they pay income tax but I do know that they are governed by the same laws and in accordance with those laws they pay the tax that the law dictates that they must pay. The same applies to all other taxes, on whatever other goods and services that they may purchase. They pay the tax that is prescribed by law. I know of no tax which exempts students from paying.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, of course no one can dispute the fact that students do pay sales tax items that they purchase with their own particular money. I don't think that's a matter of dispute at all but I believe the Honourable Member for Burrows will — and I would find it very odd if he would not agree that there are certain exemptions on the income tax that the students pay that favour them in that particular circumstance.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I mentioned this at the outset, that tuition fees are deductible from one's earnings and if a student is living away from home — I'm not a tax expert, I can't recall that exact provision — but I seem to recall there is a further deduction that a student can make for living expenses away from home up to a certain maximum allowable amount. But I think that it should be pointed out at this time, Mr. Chairman, that in this year, in the first year of government of the Conservative Party, that the students are being hit with a number of taxes, with a number of taxes that I make it doubly, or triply, or quadruply more difficult to pay the increase in tuition fees.

The tuition fee tax has been increased. Because of the cutback in transit grants, the increase in transit fares — and the Honourable Minister can do that arithmetic just as well as I can — that just to take that student to and from university during the academic year is going to cost him an additional \$1.00, \$35.00 for the seven or eight months that he spends in university, not to mention the fact that it

Friday, May 5, 1978

will also cost him an additional \$4.00 or \$5.00 a month to take him to and from work if he should be fortunate enough to find work.

There's another burden imposed upon the student — the cutback in summer employment. Now hopefully we'll be able to have a more thorough discussion of that when we get to Item 7.(c) under Youth Services.

Those are just to mention a few, Mr. Chairman, of the additional burdens imposed upon the student of today. I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that the increase in tuition fees is going to be most severely felt by the sons and daughters of the families at the lower end of the socio-economic scale. NT71 Those are the ones that are going to be most hard hit. The son or daughter of the more affluent family, he is not going to be hard hit. It is not going to hit him as hard, and certainly isn't going to hit as hard the student who may be fortunate enough to be on the payroll of his dad's company for the summer, or the daughter can be put on the payroll of her parent's company for the summer, and be paid an income that will put that student within the taxable range, so he deducts an additional \$100 from his earnings, and thus reduces his taxable income. So he is not the one that is going to be hit. But the one at the bottom end of the socio-economic level is going to be hard hit, and his parents are going to be hard hit, because his parents are also contributing toward the costs of his education.

So this notion that it is about time that the students paid more, but in many families it is not just the student that is paying more, it is the entire family that is contributing towards that student's education, not just the student whose name appears on the register of one of our three universities but the parents also contribute toward that student's education costs, and that additional \$100 or \$140 a year or \$150 or whatever it may be, to the family which is at the minimum wage level or just a shade above, that is equal to a week's wages, a week's earnings of somebody — of the student, if he was fortunate enough in finding a job for the summer, and if not, a week's wages of his dad. So, you know, this notion that this is only an attempt to get the 16,000 or 17,000 students enrolled at university digging down a bit deeper into their own pockets and paying more for their education is really a myth because the entire society, the entire community will have to dig down that much deeper, and unfortunately that is where the inequity arises, Mr. Chairman, is that it is going to hurt those at the lower end of the socio-economic scale much more so than those at the upper.

So, here again, Mr. Chairman, we have a perfect example, an indication of the general direction but, you know, when we have been asking the Honourable Minister to define and explain to us the new direction in which the Education program is heading, I think that when we have got to that appropriation, the direction in which this government is heading in its Education program has become very very clear. It is aimed in the direction of making post-secondary education, at any rate available only to those who can afford to pay for it, who can afford to pay for it with ease and comfort make it available to those upon whom education costs will not be any form of a hardship.

Then, of course, in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, you were in the House earlier this morning when we were debating the Tax Bill, and you know for the family that is earning \$25, \$30, \$40, \$50 thousand a year, the tax cut that this government has given to them will more than offset the increase in tuition fees. But it will clobber over the head that guy living in my riding. So that is the direction in which this government is moving in its Education program, to bring education back to where it was for many many years, that it was a privilege reserved exclusively for the sons and daughters of the members of the Manitoba Club, and for the sons and daughters of the board members of the Great West Life Assurance Company.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Well, we don't have too much time left at this time, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to start to address the remarks made by the Member for Burrows, who is making a substantial case, I am sure he feels, against the increase in fees, and I would ask him then how he explains the fact that in our sister province to the west, Saskatchewan, that last bastion of socialism in Canada, perhaps a crumbling bastion but nonetheless a province under a government with the same political persuasion as himself, charges their university students who are taking Arts \$625 a year, in Arts tuition. That is \$85, Mr. Chairman, a year more than our students will be paying even with the increase, and I have not heard these great screams of protest similar to those that are emanating from the Member for Burrows from the people or the students of that province in that regard. They seem to feel that that is not out of the ordinary. But here we are with some \$85 a year less, Mr. Chairman, that that particular province, the one who I would suggest is economically in no better position than that particular province. There are some very basic similarities in the agricultural base.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time being 12:30, I am now leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 o'clock.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 5, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

SUPPLY — PUBLIC WORKS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: We are on Page 70, Item 105.(d) Leased Accommodations. d)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate this point — I don't know if the Minister fully responded or not — but just to reiterate this point, there has been a significant reduction in the staff through a process of attrition and firings, and I calculate that figure to be 1500. I also calculate that, on the basis of a rough rule-of-thumb, that's about 150 square feet per person. I realize there is variations — in some cases some people may only have 100 square feet of space and others 200, but I think 150 is about average.

Therefore, I am saying again to the Minister that there appears to be the equivalent reduction in square feet required by the government, a reduction of 225,000 square feet, and that is approximately the size of the Woodsworth Building and therefore, I assume that the Minister is going to give up leased accommodations to a figure approximating that order of over 200,000 square feet.

Now he tells me right now, in effect, that there has been no sub-leasing and I don't recall whether he said there is any leases that have not been renewed or whether there might be a couple of small ones. Again I say that essentially the Minister has too high a vacancy rate vis-a-vis the number of employees compared to last year. He still is spending or going to spend about the same amount of money as was spent last year — 5.8 million compared to 5.6 million. He is spending the same amount on leased accommodation for fewer people.

So I am saying to him, what assurance can he give to us that he is going about consolidating, going to reduce the number of leases and in some instances perhaps sub-leasing vacant space. Could he summarize again?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what else I can add to what I have already said. (a) I certainly don't accept, I don't object but I don't accept the Honourable Member for Elmwood's figures. Secondly, the nature in many instances of persons no longer in the employ of the government of Manitoba were not space-holders, if you would like to put it in that term — not in all, but in a good number of instances. Space consolidation, space reductions will be felt more accurately this time next year with respect to this department's space requirements, because in many instances the actual reductions or something like that didn't occur until contracts ran out in March, June, April, February and these figures that I've given him for what the current situation with respect to space is as of March 31, 1978 essentially reflecting last year's full government operation.

I have a list I undertook to give the honourable members of the committee of some of the changes that have taken place since October. It's been prepared for me on a month by month basis today which are a series of relatively small space requirements. A reduction of 1,360 square feet in Portage la Prairie which, I assume, without even asking staff that it probably has to do more with consolidation of space there into the new Portage la Prairie provincial building. Additional 1,000 feet that was not re-leased at Roblin. Different small bits and pieces of space, 350—200 feet on St. Marys Avenue, 340 feet at Ethelbert totalling some 20,000 square feet. I was asked a specific question had I sold any asset, a government asset, I would like the record to show correctly that, yes we have sold a former provincial building in Portage la Prairie. And, I believe the Lands Titles building was in fact given to the community. It's not the Lands Titles building, it's the provincial building and the purchaser was the City of Portage la Prairie. Again the change affecting by the result of the consolidation of office requirements by the government into the new provincial building. I have the question of how much the building was sold for? —(Interjection)— I'm told \$99,000.00. In fact we did not change the Order-in-Council that was drawn up by the previous administration, but, Mr. Chairman, that is about all I can say in addition. The member can make the conclusions that he wishes with respect to the fact that the report on space doesn't reflect what he thinks it ought to reflect, and I can only reiterate once more that we're speaking in this instance, not of the space as it may indeed be used throughout the coming year, but reflected from these staff reductions. The only figures and statistics that I have are those reflecting last year's operation to March 31, 1978.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have additional questions and I want to explore the area of leasing versus building, but my colleague from Transcona wanted to make a few remarks so I'll pass to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have to wait for your other colleague. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the committee just what the ratio is of owned office space versus leased office space. Is that available or handy to the Minister, percentage-wise or something like that.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, The gross figures, and we have been talking in square footage — that would perhaps be the best way of giving you an overview of that situation — is that the Province of Manitoba owns 6 million square feet and we lease 1,060,000 square feet. So that is the ratio; earlier in the discussion we indicated a total number of 7 million square feet that are used, either owned or leased by the government, and that is the breakdown. That has changed little over... so it's ratio of six to one — (Interjection) — That is 1978-79.

MR. USKIW: That's about 15 percent, roughly. Then my follow-up question to that, Mr. Chairman in recognition of the fact that one has to lease some space for the luxury of — well, necessity, flexibility, and not to be locked into space where space isn't required, is there any particular policy adopted by the government with respect to the proportionate leasing versus owned space, or are there any changes contemplated or already taken in that regard?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can't indicate, and I'm not aware of, other than what perhaps my own personal political thoughts might be with respect to what kind of a policy there was in this regard since during the past seven or eight years. The department and staff fails to inform me otherwise that there is indeed a policy and we haven't imposed a policy in this regard.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I raise the question from two points of view: one is the need to get the most value for every public dollar utilized in space; and the other is to use the public capacity of financial capacity, to plug in additional buildings whenever (a) there is a need, and when we fall below a certain level of owned space, proportionately speaking. But to tune in or sort of act as a counter-cyclical instrument vis-a-vis the unemployment thing, that it seems to me it would be sound management from an all-around point of view, to be always in a position, to be ready, in other words to add additional building space and to plug those projects in at periods in the economy when unemployment is above a certain level. In other words, Public Works can play a very catalytic role in terms of the economic well-being of the people of Manitoba, generally speaking, at least from an employment and income point of view, and it's in that context that I raise those questions, whether there is any policy in that regard or whether we simply just move along without any preconceived plan or approach to that question of space and how it may be utilized as a catalyst?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the public sector will be involved as it has been in the past building, and as has been noted by the Member for Elmwood, there will always be specific building requirements, buildings that require, because of the nature of work expected to be done, or the kind of programs they expect to house. I suppose the most prominent example of that is the construction that's currently under way of the \$5 million to \$6 million Environmental Lab; there's no question that that kind of a specialized building requirement will be undertaken and continue to be undertaken if the need arises by the public sector and this is through the aegis of the Department of Public Works. What the new government recognizes, and to that extent will state as policy — although it's not graven in stone, to use an expression that is sometimes used in the House — that (a) there is somewhat depressing surplus of straight commercial office space in the city. I am pleased to report that that is diminishing and that the private sector in several important incidences is being encouraged to ensure that a continued and stable supply of prime office space within the downtown area of Winnipeg will in effect take place. I am making special specific references to the commencement of the Eaton Square complex, the finally long-awaited developments at the corner of Portage and Main, along with other private initiatives that are being taken in that area by means of buildings of prime commercial office requirements. I do not foresee, nor do I see it as the role of the department during the period of time that it's my responsibility to necessarily provide for provincial needs, government needs. I believe the ratio that's just been announced and made available to the Committee, that of the 7 million square feet that government needs, we own 6 million. That ratio, just looking at that chart, has changed little, even despite the coming onstream of several major buildings like the Woodsworth Building, over the last five or six years — I can be corrected if I'm wrong, but it's in that area, I believe, and it has remained fairly constant — and I think that that is an acceptable ratio and ought to be continued in that way.

MR. USKIW: I simply raised the point because of the need to recognize that if you want to use the Department of Public Works as a catalyst in the economy, then obviously there has to be some thought given long in advance as to the projected needs that the Public Works Department will have in the next decade or the next period of time, and to be able to have preliminary work, design work done in order to make it possible to engage in fairly large construction projects, if indeed the government wants to play a role in terms of providing employment in periods of high unemployment.

It's in that context that I raise the need for some advance planning; in other words, we should have planning in either five year cycles or three year programs or something like that, so that you can pull a project off the shelf and plug it in at a time that it is most beneficial to the economy of the province. It would be counter-productive, for example, to plug in a new project at a time when construction activity was very buoyant and in fact you had very high tenders coming in, so it's in that context that I raise those questions. There are times to move which are most beneficial to a number of inter-related areas, (a) the public, in terms of the tax dollars spent; (b) the unemployment question and how public investment could deal with that question through the Department of Public Works. All those, however, require quite a bit of preplanning and some projecting as to the needs of government.

into the future in order that preliminary work could be done, in order to make it possible to have as much flexibility as indeed is possible in the system. It's in that context that I raise the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to thank the Member for Elmwood who gave me the opportunity to raise my question now, because I didn't want to get back to the Education Estimates, but frankly the Minister has answered a number of the questions I was going to raise. He was less operatic this afternoon and much more intelligible from my perspective.

A MEMBER: He was in more of a hurry today.

MR. PARASIUK: In more of a hurry possibly. I think that the whole question of this ratio of public to ease space is one that does require judgment, and generally I would think that the permanent requirements will probably be housed in public space than those things which are transitional, or reflecting introductory programs or what have you, would probably be housed in a leased space and I can see the rationale for doing that. I think that there probably are technical studies within the department that indicate the long term needs for space can probably most cheaply be met by the public building and owning the building. I think that the Department of Public Works probably has such technical studies although I've never seen any and really I'm not calling for them now, but I do think that such technical studies exist.

I noticed in the Globe and Mail the other day that there is a bit of controversy in Ontario on this item, where the Department of Public Works there has done a study which indicates that longer term office needs of the government of Ontario could best be met by the government building and owning their own space and only leasing on a transitional basis. And, since the Minister has already indicated that that generally is his position, I'd just like to ask him if he could possibly undertake to try and get that study and I wouldn't mind taking a look at the technical analysis that has been raised in that analysis. I could probably get it myself, but I think the Department of Public Works probably has better contacts with the Department of Public Works in Ontario. That's the only question I really have to place now.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make it clear and leave on the record that the Department of Planning and Design staff is indeed at all times trying to anticipate future government requirements, and in that sense is doing preliminary design work. We get indicators from client departments as to their needs. The client anticipates when they see legislation being forwarded and talked about and being passed in the House, that it will have space implications for the department, and in that manner the department is constantly in its planning division, design division, doing preliminary estimates as to future space requirements by whatever department or program that it may require.

I suppose, and I don't mind saying so, that in a sense there will be I suppose, a different, an expressed different attitude and direction of the Department of Public Works as distinct from that which has been suggested by the Member for Lac du Bonnet just a few moments ago that, (a) we do not see ourselves in terms of being that catalyst in terms of providing the leadership in this respect, if you want to use that term, although I know it will get bounced back on me. We think that we can provide similar stimulus in those areas that are of equal concern in terms of job creation, in terms of keeping the construction industry as fully employed as we can, in a general way creating the kind of economic climate and policies, employment in this province that will induce and hopefully encourage the private sector to carry on with that building. I think what's happening currently, in this first summer of construction year that we're facing, is indicative of some success in that measure. I must say, that the government will also, as I might say I'm informed from time to time, use its space needs and requirements to spur on a development. It's been indicated to me that while there was not any finality to it, but the previous administration had talked about securing some 60,000, 70,000 square feet of space, for instance, in the Trizec Development with the idea that that would move that multi-million dollar project ahead.

Now, you know, in the final analysis we can argue as to the benefits of ownership or leasing. But in the context that it was raised in the committee it was a matter of job creation, it was a matter of keeping the construction industry open and I can't recall precisely when I said that, but in that sense, don't think we have done as good a job in spurring on the kind of planned and desirable downtown development through the use of the mechanism of securing some long term space requirements in some of these major developments.

Other cities across Canada have done that in a more meaningful way and have secured for themselves the kind of favorable downtown development — well that'll always be questioned, I suppose, in the eyes of the beholder. But, I know that in the major downtown complex in Edmonton, for instance, the municipal governments in the City of Edmonton, leases some upwards to 30 percent of the space in their, I don't know what it's called, McDonald Square Complex in the centre of Edmonton, along with I believe, some utilities companies of the province of Alberta, have leased additional, you know, are major customers of space in that area. And, you know, the securing of these kind of desirable long term tenants made the development of that square possible.

I throw these out just as musings of the Minister at this point, but the point that I think I want to leave on record is that essentially the Department main responsibility will to anticipate future needs of government. To anticipate future needs of the various departments, and to be in a position,

planning and design-wise to be able to respond to them at any given time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before the Member for Transcona carries on, I wanted you to take note of the fact that the lights were off. We were trying to accommodate the Member for Point Douglas as quickly as we could. He wasn't, unfortunately, here this afternoon. Yesterday he raised the fact that we had the lights on too often. Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd just like to raise something in connection with what the Minister said just now and I really don't even raise it in an argumentative manner, because I think many of the points he raised have validity. I just ask him to be careful regarding government commitments to very large scale developments in Winnipeg, which doesn't experience that type of rapid growth, and the one that does concern me to a degree, is the proposed East Yard development which is a very intensive use of the east yard property, and conceivably could result in the detracting of the Portage-Main Street area as the downtown part of Winnipeg, and frankly, I see the East Yard development as being a bit too far away from the Portage area to really reinforce that part, and that type of developer would actually act in direct competition to the Portage development. I think we are probably at a watershed period with respect to Portage Avenue; it could quite easily continue to deteriorate because it is deteriorating slightly now, and I would hate it to become a type of North Main, because I think the problem with North Main was that it was allowed to deteriorate too much and it's very difficult developing that type of climate whereby people would want to get into the North Main area.

I'm just a bit wary of a very large development in the East Yard development, which in one way or another would be somewhat stimulated or reinforced by public sector investment with respect to public transportation right to that particular area with respect to public housing or other types of housing in that area, or also with respect to taking out lease commitments for office space which I know is being proposed for that development. That development looks very grandiose and in a sense may in some respects compare with some of the major downtown developments taking place in other cities in Canada, and we might feel a bit proud of that. But at the same time, I would be afraid of the negative impact that that type of development might have on the Portage Avenue area.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just on that matter, let me assure the Member for Transcona and other members of the Committee that (a), no commitment of substantial space has been made by the government and/or agencies of the government with respect to the securing of long-term leasehold space in any of the projects, major development projects now either at commencement stage or on the horizon. What the Honourable Member for Transcona says, and I have a tendency to agree with him, underlines a concern that I expressed, the kind of spreading out of the development area to the detriment of the main central part of the city where the public already has considerable public investment, and I refer specifically to the Convention Centre. I think to totally maximize a facility such as the Convention Centre, it requires a high-density, fully utilized — particularly in our country with either underground courses, skywalks, integrated with shopping centres, convention hotel facilities — this kind of concentrated — you know, it may not from a country boy be a desirable kind of matter but certainly in terms of the utilization of such a facility as the Convention Centre, and its success hinges on the fact that we don't disperse our efforts and in fact allow the centre area to denigrate in any substantial way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there's a couple of interesting questions here. The Minister expresses a concern for over-building in the private sector but nevertheless he also talked about a balance. He has really two questions for him, one is, is he indicating to the Committee, is the Minister indicating to the Committee that he's not going to develop a dogmatic approach to the question of leasing buildings, but he is in fact going to come up with a mix, he's going to continue the mix; he's not going to do what I have been afraid he is going to do, namely to, from now on, lease all government requirements. Do I understand him to say that he will lease government requirements, but he will also build government requirements?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the facts speak for themselves. We will lease where we think it's appropriate to lease; we will build where we think it's appropriate to build.

MR. DOERN: Then I would ask him, in his concern for the developers who obviously misjudged the market and were unable to anticipate or correctly make projections, they overbuilt and find themselves stuck with quantities of government space. I don't know if the Minister has had any meetings with these people; I'm sure he has; I know that as Minister of Public Works one of the requirements I think you need is a number of buckets which should be placed in front of your developers and when the developers come and the architects come and the engineers come they will cry buckets before the Minister because of the fact that unless they do, they may wind up with no money and no jobs and no salaries.

So I understand his concern; he expressed a concern that there has been overbuilding of private office space, and although he gives us figures of 6 million and 1 million I think he would also agree that some of these requirements couldn't be leased; we've never thought in this province — Conservative Minister that I know of has ever said to a private developer, "Build me a hospital and

lease it from you," or "Build me a Red River Community College," I mean, we've always built our own requirements in those departments.

I simply say to him, on the other side of his concern does he have any concern for the unemployed construction workers and the architects and the engineers. I would develop that to this extent: there's a 30-odd percent unemployment rate in construction and the architects and engineers are facing some pretty hard times.

Now, I have some information that I obtained earlier in the week which is also in today's Tribune in the form of Frances Russell. I have some additional information that she doesn't have in her column. But it is mentioned there that Ministers — (Interjection) — My source is a number of members of the — (Interjection) — 10, people in the architectural profession and engineering profession. I understand that delegations have gone to the government and have been turned away. They have asked, in effect, of the Ministers — I cannot name all of them; I can name one of them but I will not name him at the moment. But I will ask this Minister whether or not he has had approaches on behalf of various architectural and engineering firms who have been turned away and asked what indications there were of the government resuming its construction program and also lifting the freeze. Many of these people hold in their hands contracts for buildings that were planned by our government that were frozen or perhaps discussions — they may be interested in other opportunities that may arise from the new administration, so I'm saying, did the Minister callously, as the Mayor of Winnipeg was recently reported, that when he went to the Minister of Urban Affairs he was told, about arena aid, to go to hell.

First of all, I ask the Minister whether he has been approached recently by architects and engineers for work, for new work or to unfreeze work that they had been assigned. Has he been approached, and what has he been told them?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the central question there was, am I concerned? Of course I'm concerned, and I met not only with the architects but also with members of the construction and building trade unions early on and expressed a similar concern. I don't know how much actual work would, in fact, have been in progress for this coming year, because in many instances they were matters on the planning boards only and in the early design stages.

I can't help but note that while I didn't read the particular article that the member refers to, I can recall a few days earlier a similar press report indicating the slowness or some of the difficulties that the architectural firms, in particular, are experiencing. But the article that I read notes that this is general throughout the country and while he knows certainly the situation in Manitoba, that that is a general situation which I think is perhaps indicative of government overbuilding and overexpending itself in this particular, not just here in Manitoba but across the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not I keep a crying towel in my office for bruised architects or architectural firms, I can make a comment that there is, in my judgment, as great a danger to encourage firms of this nature to become so overly dependent on government contracts and government work that for reasons, and the kind of very serious reasons that we face, not just here in Manitoba but reasons that were confirmed at the First Ministers' Conference by the Prime Minister, by our Premier, read into the record, the comments made from that conference by all Premiers, First Ministers in this country, indicating that because of the general economic situation in Canada that there would have to be a slowdown and a reduction of the public sector's initiatives in many areas, including the area of Public Works projects, in the hope and in the reliance that there could be a better balance achieved in encouragement of the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the . . . And of course we will agree to disagree on this matter, but I believe that with some of the encouraging announcements that are happening in the private sector with respect to major multi-million dollar plans and projects actually now under way that the architectural firms in this province, along with the construction industry as a whole — labour and management — can hopefully look to more stable and fuller employment opportunities in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I am generalizing; I know that. I read into the record earlier on in my presentation of Public Works the specific works and project areas that have, in fact, been lifted from the freeze, if you like, that was imposed last November, and are proceeding with. Hansard will show those particular individual projects as being proceeded with.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister inform us whether he was the one, or one of a number of Ministers, who told the architectural representatives that there were too many architects and engineers in Manitoba, and that he would be happy, or he would not be unhappy if some of those firms wound-down or wound-up, or left the province? Did he tell that to the architects?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wouldn't say something of that nature, and I would have to place extreme incredibility as to the possibility that any other Minister might have said that.

Now, having said that, I recognize and I don't see this as being any different than any other field of activity in a relatively free and open society, in a reasonably free and open market situation, whether it's architects or highway contractors that find themselves, because of lack of work in any given jurisdiction, move out to sister jurisdictions. When we were busy building in the Sixties major earthwork projects like the Red River Floodway, the Assiniboine Diversion, the Shellmouth Dam, major construction efforts in the area of dirt-moving and earth-moving, we had a preponderance of one kind of contractors available to us here in the province, many of them coming to this province from far away places such as Quebec, who had just finished some major work in their line in that

province. That kind of shifting and moving about of contractual construction firms and architectural firms is, I think, a natural component of our way of life in this country and I express no particular desire to see it pegged at any particular level. Because I don't believe, and I simply don't believe that the government, and certainly not during the tenure of our term of office, will really be attempting to say that, you know, this is a desirable level of activity and we will, whether space is required or not build to that level in order to maintain the full employment of several architectural firms.

We will build when we think it's necessary to build, and when we can find the necessary dollars to build, and we will lease when we think it is appropriate to lease and when the space is required

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to sort of read the message to architects and engineers in Manitoba, and draftsmen, and contractors, and construction employees, and I read that the Minister is saying as follows: That there may be some construction. There may be some unfreezing, but that at least in the next year or two the picture is bleak; that the government does not intend to undertake very much in the way of construction. Sixty-five percent, apparently, of architectural and engineering work relates to government, depends on government. MHRC is going to wind down. I don't know about hospital construction. It doesn't seem as if there is going to be much doing there, at schools. Certainly not much in public works. Hydro — we know some of the hydro projects have been frozen, and so on.

It strikes me that the message — (Interjection) — I will not talk about hydro; it's not my speciality. I simply say to the Minister that he appears to be giving a message, telegraphing to the people in the construction industry including architects and engineers, that the future in Manitoba is bleak and that they should should take their business elsewhere or wind down. Now, is that the message that the Minister is giving us?

Well, I mean, you know the Member for Rock Lake, my honourable colleague of 12 years, he says he can't believe this. But then I have to ask him whether the opposite is true. I have to say that my impression is not that the government is going to maintain a high level of activity: build public housing, build new hospitals, build new schools, build new facilities required for public works and hydro. If that's his impression, it sure isn't the impression that his government is giving. I wish that they were continuing a high level of activity, but the opposite impression is what is coming through. And I am asking the Minister whether his message to these professions isn't really a very bleak one. Maybe a realistic one, a message of restraint, but for them they will take it right on the chin; they are the ones who will feel the impact the most.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could maybe comment at this time if the Honourable Minister does not mind me making comments on up-to-date on-the-street situations that are occurring, because the Minister, I know, is very busy in his department as a government member and a Treasury Bench member, that he might not be in contact with as many engineers or architects that I am. And I want to make it very clear to the committee before I make my comments, that I am an engineer. I'm also a contractor. I also want to make it very clear that I've never done any business with the government and don't intend to while we're in government, or as a member of the Legislature. But, I want to tell you something, Mr. Chairman, that I have talked to architects, I've dealt with architects; I've talked with engineers, not with all of them in Manitoba, but I would say a good number of the major ones in the last six months. As a member of the Legislature, they have indicated to me their concern; they have said one very basic common thing, Mr. Chairman: yes, we became dependent on government business; yes, we are concerned that what's happening is going to affect us.

But, I would say in a court or anywhere because I'm that type of individual, and I hope that the members of the Legislature are, that the majority of the people that I've talked to, architects and engineers have said, what you're doing is right. We got lulled, I wouldn't say lulled, they said that we got involved in doing consulting work for the government of the day and in some cases some of them have had 90 percent of their business with the government. And all of a sudden they recognized what was happening, but being free enterprisers, which maybe the honourable member doesn't recognize, never having worked as a free enterpriser — (Interjection) — well, my apologies if he has

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please direct your comments to the Chairman

MR. MINAKER: My apologies, Mr. Chairman. They have indicated to me that what we are doing is correct. And not only that, they have gone out and started as good free-enterprisers to go and look for business elsewhere. But I must advise the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that as free enterprisers, they go where they're most efficient, and if they have a government that wants to wind out the business and think that government has to do all the business, then as good free-enterprisers they will go where they're most efficient. That's the name of the game in the free enterprise system. But they have also indicated when — the Honourable former Minister has indicated when times are tough — and the government of the day has decided that we have spent too much and we have to put the books back into shape. They recognize this, and they're versatile enough to go out and start to get after other business, which they have done.

I would say, I'm sure the pressures have been on the present Minister to try and correct this situation, but I also have to advise the Honourable Minister which he's I'm sure very aware of, that I

people who have not gone into business because the government of the day was throwing away free ideas or easy business. The ones that have been there from the old days and from recent years that want to stay in Manitoba and keep working, have looked at the situation and gone out and tried to correct it, and are out working on it right now.

So I don't believe that the architectural profession, or the engineering profession or, in fact, the construction area, the ones that are here and want to stay, will die because the government has decided to cut back. And that's what the former Minister doesn't really understand about the free enterprise system. That people will dig in, in the same way that our farmers will dig in; in the same way as my colleagues that are farmers, when they have good times, they go out and spend their money, but when the times get tough, they dig in. They don't give up the soil because times are tough. The same way that the architects and the engineers who are working in our province that want to stay here, don't give up, they dig in. They dig in very tough and they try and maintain their staff level to the level they can. And I'll be honest with the Honourable Member for Elmwood, they can't maintain everybody. But the whole idea of saying that everything has to be dependent on government is not the correct approach in my opinion; maybe in his opinion, it obviously is.

I'm just saying to the honourable member that the profession has dug in, has recognized the situation that we're in, and I have to commend them. I believe that Manitoba is one of the forerunners of what the rest of Canada has to do if we want to survive as a country, not wholly dependent on other areas. That's what I believe is happening in Manitoba, and the professional and the contracting field has recognized this.

So, Mr. Minister, I would just like to advise you, which maybe you are already aware of, I'm sure you are, that the word on the street, putting it in layman language, is that the architects and the engineers and the contractors have recognized the situation that we're in in Manitoba. They recognize the situation that we are in as Canadians — tighten their belts, buckling down, and they're going out and trying to produce and create jobs and create business so they can survive. But they're prepared to do this, and they're not saying that we have been castrated to the point that we're wholly dependent on the government either Provincial or Federal to do the work, but we are still free enterprisers, we are still Manitobans, we're prepared to do it. I just wanted to make this comment at this time, Mr. Minister, because that is the word on the street as I read it, and I would think in the majority of the areas that the former Minister has spoken about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Well, I had a basic observation I wanted to preface my question by. In Public Accounts on Page 121, I noted with interest that adding up the salaries of the Architectural Engineering, there was approximately very close to \$1 million in salaries paid out last year, and yet surprisingly, in fact, I say alarmingly, the Member for Elmwood seems to be holding a tag day for the professional people in this province who were. . . —(Interjection— Well, he seems to be encouraging more government building whether we need it or not.

The question I'm saying, can we foresee the in-house use of this staff, and is their type of evaluation that possibly federally is taking place, where when a particular government has a large staff and there's some evaluation as to in-house work vis-a-vis contracting out, because if there is a particular need in the community there, that possibly, if it was evaluated properly, it might be cheaper to contract out some of the particular work. The jobs couldn't be handled by the particular staff, because the same Member for Elmwood, you know, he's also seems to be encouraging more building and seems to be encouraging more spending. I noted with interest, when he was the Minister, that he had \$170,000 worth of purchases of art, and these are the kind of thing that one has to be alarmed at, that this stand that he's taking for injecting this enthusiasm to get more government work for the private sector. And I wonder if the Minister was aware that his salaries almost totalled a million dollars and can he foresee if there is a freeze, if there is a cutback in unnecessary government building, that possibly there might be some savings in this area?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there will be undoubtedly, and that's of course what the architects are bringing to the attention of the government, possibly some notable reduction in that particular area of expenditure that the Member for Wolseley draws our specific attention to. But the Department of Public Works again in its responsibilities shares with the private sector and does not build into its in-house staff any more professional help that we require in this area than we think is absolutely necessary. I suppose a person could comment on the anomaly that's being expressed here; on the one hand the former Minister of Public Works, and supported by his colleagues, is suggesting that the public sector in the area of building and owning buildings should be all-embracing and with little or no room left for the private sector to be in the business of leasing space or providing space for a government. They have expressed concern that nothing should happen to change that ratio of roughly six to one, or seven to one, to help out the private sector, but just a moment ago we have the plaintive plea here for private architects, private engineering and construction firms, who are experiencing some difficulty because of the general slowdown in their fields of activity. And on that particular area, that has been the story of the building construction throughout the history of Canada. When you have major construction works taking place in specific areas of the province, all things tend to flow there. We have major developments currently underway in the provinces such as Alberta; we can look forward to a massive and major involvement in the business of pipeline building. But let me use this one particular example on the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and ask him

whether or not he wants me to unfreeze a major billion dollar construction enterprise in the Province of Manitoba that would undoubtedly provide jobs this summer for 5,000 skilled craftsmen and tradesmen, and I'm referring to a freeze that their government imposed, and quite sensibly so, and perhaps, let me correct it; not so much their government but the directors and the management of Hydro, that simply indicated that with the growth rate that we are experiencing, we cannot proceed with the billion dollar development of the Limestone Dam and hydro project on the Nelson.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the answer is so simple; are we prepared, for the sake of providing a billion dollars worth of construction industry in the Province of Manitoba, and employing 4,000 or 5,000 people on that project, to face a general 30 percent increase in hydro rates at the same time, which are imposed on every householder, on every farmer, on every user of that valuable resource, which further makes it difficult for the private sector to enter into the debate, enter into the business . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk. What is your point of order?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, my concern would be that the Minister is going to carry on the debate in Hydro, that he's going to bring about a response, and I would think that you should call the Minister to order before we do enter into the entire field of Hydro and bring about responses I'm sure you're concerned about avoiding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he's generally talking about construction in Manitoba and I think the members of the Committee have all talked about it, and they've really strayed away from leaving it the general . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, you're going to find yourself in a debate on hydro rates because the Minister has introduced, opened the door to that type of debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate the comments on the point of order from the Member for Selkirk, that I overheard the Member for Elmwood mention Hydro and hydro rates, and think that the Minister is quite in order if this is going to be allowed. And I would just like to say on the point of order that we can go on and debate here for hours and hours, I just want to say, on the total context of what we're debating here today, that my colleagues, or my friends on the other side, don't seem to realize that governments don't create wealth, whether you talk about Hydro, whether you talk about the Public Works or what-have-you, when we're talking about jobs. But Mr. Chairman, I just wanted that for the record, that governments don't create wealth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Back to the Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would of course abide by your ruling except the issue was raised not in the debate hydro rates; the issue was raised, and the Honourable Member for Selkirk wasn't around the Committee table just a few moments ago when the Member for Lac du Bonnet as well as the Member for Transcona to some extent, and the Member for Elmwood, has been pressing on the Minister and on the government that the public sector should take the slack out of the construction industry currently being experienced, and that we should act as the catalyst in terms of spurring on the employment in an area where there is, admittedly, an unacceptable level of unemployment. I am merely demonstrating with the Hydro example what the cost is at the other end of the scale. I do not introduce the subject matter to debate the matter of Hydro here, but I can't think of a more significant example currently facing us right here in Manitoba, very germane to Manitoba, than the consequences of tomorrow, directing Hydro to commence full-blown the stalled, you know development of the Limestone plant which is a billion dollar construction site . . .

A MEMBER: No one said that . . .

MR. ENNS: Well, no, but the consequences are so very ready and so apparent in that example, Mr. Chairman, if I can persist, that nobody is saying it and nobody is arguing it. But, Mr. Chairman, the other example of uncontrolled government expenditures, merely for the sake of providing, you know employment whether the space is required or not has more subtle but similar implications to the general tax base in this province and to the general ability of those who have to compete within the private sector to be able to carry on business with the competitive neighbours and to be able to provide those job opportunities in the private sector that by far the majority, the majority of Manitobans working require. And I use this occasion only and I will desist from repeating it, demonstrate that particular point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . respond to the Minister. . . point of order, if hydro buildings or hydro development came within his portfolio and we were discussing expansion of Hydro projects a

what the effects might be under his Ministry, I could see the invalidity of my point of order. But we are dealing with government buildings and if the Honourable Minister wants to debate as to overall economic or social detriment in building more government buildings within his portfolio, that's one issue, but he is entering into a field that properly belongs to the Minister of Finance, responsible for Hydro, and that is the hydro developments in the north.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on just a couple of more points in this section. No one has ever said, I have never said, that buildings should be built for the sake of building them. What we have said is when there is a requirement or there is a need that the government then has an option. The option is either to lease or build. Those are the basic options when you require space. Nobody has ever said, "Let's build building, and then see whether or not we have any use for them." There might be an incentive in a time of high unemployment to bring something on track earlier, but no one in their right mind would build a building that wasn't required. The decision that any government faces is whether they should go out and have someone build a building for them and lease it, or lease an empty building, or lease a building that's under construction, or build that requirement. Those are the kind of decisions that we're all confronted with.

Now the advantage of leasing that everyone knows, especially members of the Conservative Party, is that it's less visible; you see that's the hooker there. If you lease space around the city people don't know about it as much as if you put up a building. So there's I suppose a political advantage there, if you want a low profile. You can get the same amount of space, but no one can point and say that that is a government building. And that is what the Roblin administration did essentially. The Campbell government built the Norquay Building or started the plans, started the ball rolling, the Roblin government built it, and from the time the Roblin government finished the Norquay Building, to the time that we built the Woodsworth Building, in effect, there was really no office construction of note, but there was a hell of a lot of leasing going on. I think that is the point.

Now another point that I would like to make is that the Minister talked about whether or not we would build all our requirements. We have never done that. We have never tried to do that. In fact we had a policy established in Cabinet whereby I think, it was something to the effect that when you have a requirement in a town as an example, that you do not take all the government office space, consolidate it in one building, and build it, thereby winding down all the leases from businessmen in the towns. We came up with a policy I think, and I'm not exactly sure of whether we said that if you had 100 percent requirement for space, about one third would be continued to be leased, or whether it was one-half. It is one of those two.

So, and then what happens is when you build a building you find, usually like in Selkirk we built a building, there was still space being leased and after a while there was additional space being leased in the town. I'm sure the same thing will happen in Portage or in other areas where — like in Brandon, we put up a building, all of a sudden the building was fully occupied and there was more space rentals going on. And that makes sense rather than putting an addition on right away, you continue to lease and then at another point in time you might say well, now we'll take up half of what we are leasing.

I want to just a talk to the Member for St. James, but he is not here so I'll hold my remarks for him.

I just have two more points here to the Minister. I would ask him this. In view of the difficulties of architects and engineers in the province today, one of the things that we did, I ask him whether he is doing this or is going to consider doing this, in view of a very very tough market for them, is he having in terms of projects, like the environmental lab etc., projects like that, is he, and can he cite any instances where he is asking architects and engineers to complete the design drawings even if the construction will not go forward at this time? Because by so doing, the architects and engineers will have employment, the plans will be ready and when the government decides to take those projects off the shelf, they will then be able to proceed with construction. Can he indicate whether or not there is any policy in that regard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe generally that we try to keep the horse well in front of the cart, once a decision is made by government policy-wise, to proceed with a major addition whether it's a school or hospital or other public building, then the staff within the department proceeds in a normal course of seeing that works proceed along the lines suggested by the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I then ask just one another general question now and that is this, that given the fact that rents are escalating every year, there is an increase in rents, and that there is also a considerable amount of slack in the construction industry and the architectural engineering area, would this also not be a good time to build, namely that the Minister should be considering the fact that rents are rising and that contractors are hungry, that there is a considerable amount of competition around, that people are willing to cut prices, are willing to come up with good prices and so on, is this not a good time to build, and is the Minister also reassessing his policy of unfreezing or freezing construction at this time?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that in the course of the last year, indeed the last several years, rents in the commercial sector have in fact decreased as a result of the pressure on the owners

Friday, May 5, 1978

of buildings where essential vacant space has been experienced. And certainly in the last year, and certainly during the period of time that I had responsibility for the department, we are receiving very favourable offers of rental space. In many instances, you know, rents that would have to be described as really the bottom line where it is questionable whether the owner is receiving anywhere near a normal return' if I can use that phrase. I recognize that rents aren't fixed and that those rents will in fact probably increase the next time a lease is re-negotiated, but in many instances we have signed comparable to a few years ago. We have leased space at very attractive rates.

MR. DOERN: I would like to see if the Minister could provide us with any examples, or could perhaps on Monday provide us with some examples where he has had offers of reductions in rental space. Because I find that most unusual. Mr. Chairman, I think that concludes my comments there, at least for the moment, unless the Member for St. James . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley has indicated he'd like to speak and the Member for Selkirk, and I might just remind all members of committee that we are still on the same item that we opened on first thing this morning.

MR. WILSON: I realize this is on the expense side of the ledger and we're talking about leased accommodation but I wanted to ask the question for the record of an Industrial Park that we own and it would possibly be — (Interjection) — I know it would be — but it would be — the comment is if we are leasing space is there any way where we could lease tarpaulins or covers or something to cover all those planes that we've picked up, or is there an intention to sell them, because I can see where we're storing a lot of equipment in a government building that would be better, if I can use the expression better to have them stored under canvas somewhere or sold. So my comment then is where are the — just so that I can put this question on the record — where are all those planes now? Are they stored in our government leased accommodation?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we are in fact currently trying to find alternate means of storing those planes that the member brings to our attention. Whether or not we can take up his suggestion of mothballing them in the way that he suggests is one that perhaps could be considered. We've approached, I think, the Department of Highways for some of the, you know equipment that might be utilized by them. I would think that the member may also wish to ask the question of the Minister responding for the MDC, I suppose, who is the receiver or owner of these craft as to what the future disposition of them is. We at the Department of Public Works don't know whether it's a long-term holding operation. Do we mothball them for the next generation of Manitobans to come in view at a suitable occasion or is it a temporary requirement of space from us?

MR. WILSON: It was just that if we're storing them in a government building it just seemed to me that in order to minimize our losses that we should be trying to lease out that space because it's another item under another time — I just wanted to put that on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I know that you, Mr. Chairman, are familiar with this leased area, and it was a question I raised last night and I wonder if the Minister has information. The leasing of the office space for the Department of Industry and Commerce in Selkirk that was vacated, brought back into Winnipeg — the services — and I'm just wondering if that lease was permitted to expire or whether there is still a term left in connection with that lease.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that particular lease expires on May 31st. It will the lapse — in Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: We're having to pay rent now on a vacant office?

MR. ENNS: For the remainder of the month.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I want to make one brief comment. I'm really surprised at all the undue haste to vacate premises that are providing a decentralized service in a regional centre even at the expense for a period of time — two months I believe would be here — two to three months of rental, which I'm sure is not insignificant.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm betwixt and between now. I was chastised a moment ago by my colleague, the Member for Elmwood, telling me that what with some of these staff reductions what isn't the department indicating and showing less space than is being occupied, or what are we doing to ensure that taxpayers' dollars aren't being unwisely spent in this regard. I'm simply indicating this specific example given by the Member for Selkirk that I think what would have to be determined within all reasonable description, you know, the department is acting as you would expect it to act. Space that is no longer being required by the department is lapsing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: I would ask the Minister if he is going to reply to the charge made by his colleague, the Member for Wolseley, who I note is not in the room. The Member for Wolseley raised the point that a million dollars had been paid for in-house architectural salaries and by implication made the charge that there were architects now sitting around in the department doing nothing. Will the Minister reply to this charge?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to reply to the charge because that wasn't the manner in which the subject matter was raised. The Honourable Member for Wolseley was referring to the roughly a million dollars that was being paid to outside architects — as he gleaned them from the Public Accounts Records — and, indeed, if anything, I can only indicate that in conjunction with the statements made earlier who was pleading on behalf of the architects, these same architects, that it's my hope that we can bring on to line and to move on to production and design stage those particular projects that are under way and those that we can see that will be required and have gained necessary Cabinet approval to ensure that whether it is at the same level but that it will be at an improved level in the coming years for these architects. But I make known to the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the concern was being expressed for not in-house architects — for the outside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass — the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister, further to the information which he provided on the Selkirk example, I wonder if the Minister could advise the committee as to what other locations have office space been vacated in rural Manitoba as a result of centralizing services which were formerly provided in regional centres and rural points in the City of Winnipeg. Is Selkirk the only such instance or is it only the only instance that I can refer to because, of course, I'm quite familiar with this. Has it happened in other points in rural Manitoba as well?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I earlier indicated and read some of the areas where some space has been vacated but I'm not prepared, nor am I in a position to suggest that those spaces that are being vacated are being vacated for the reason given by the Member for Selkirk. For instance, included in that space on the list I read a little while ago when he was not at the committee — and I recognize that he has responsibilities on other committees — but, for instance, on this list is some 20,000 square feet vacated in the City of Portage la Prairie. The old provincial building that was turned over to the City of Portage la Prairie as a result of consolidation of space within the new provincial building in Portage la Prairie . . .

MR. PAWLEY: I'm not questioning that.

MR. ENNS: Well, I know, but my difficulty is I have a list of 53,829 square feet of space that has been vacated since October, the date of interest, I'm sure, to honourable members opposite, but I cannot give you that information. I'd be prepared to undertake to see whether I can't define that more clearly with regard to the specific question asked. I'm merely pointing out that I earlier indicated I have, you know, a list indicating numerous areas where small space has been vacated on St. Mary Avenue, in the Lakeview complex, but I suspect that that happens to be the case of vacating a ministerial office that no longer is being required there.

I have, you know, other areas in Dauphin and Ste. Therese but I would have to check with the departments involved whether or not that space is simply a normal matter of relocation of space into more desirable areas within the community or whether or not it can be attributable to the reduction of either program or staff. The most noticeable example of that total that I gave you is the 20,000 square feet that is on this list which I'm sure is not being questioned by any members of the space vacated in the old provincial building at Portage — space which has just simply moved over to the new provincial building. I hope the member appreciates my difficulty at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)—pass;

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I did want to reply to the Member for St. James, then maybe we could go on. I understand he was being held in the hallway. Just a couple of points in regard to what he said. He talked about belt tightening and so on and how architects are — they'd rather be unemployed and proud than to rely on the government. There's some sort of shame attached — proud to be a free enterpriser and rather be unemployed than employed with the government. You know, I don't want to get into a philosophical debate . . .

A MEMBER: Go ahead. Ah, come on, go ahead.

MR. DOERN: No, I simply say, I simply make one point philosophically, and that is that it's easy to tighten your belt when you have a 42 inch waist — you can tighten it to 40, and then you're doing okay.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. David Blake: Just because I've taken over the Chair for a few moments I don't have to have personal aspersions cast on my . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, you're interpreting my objective comment as a snide remark. It is not in reference to your considerable girth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I just wanted to say in general that I think the honourable member will have to take—you know, I believe him because I think that he is one of the more straightforward and candid members. I believe him when he tells me that some of the architects and engineers are telling him that—well, it's killing them but they agree with what the government's doing. But I think he should take that with a grain of salt because he is now a member of the government. He is a member of the Administration, and an engineer or architect could walk up to him and say: You know, George, your government is wrecking this province and doing this and doing that—it's not a very, shall we say, a small "p" political statement to make. It would be much smarter to say, "You know, George, I'm really happy about what you and Harry and all the other people are doing at the Legislature."

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, . . . references by surname to members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, all I'm saying is I don't want my colleague for St. James, who made some remarks before you were in the Chair . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Try and stick to Item (d)(1) Salaries.

MR. DOERN: I'm sticking to the reply made by the Member for St. James prior to your . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's up to you. The item under consideration, I would remind the Member for Elmwood, is Item (d)(1) Leased Accommodations, Salaries.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me three more sentences, I will conclude my comments made to the Member for St. James prior to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are they prepared?

MR. DOERN: Yes, I wrote them out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, three more sentences.

MR. DOERN: Sentence No. 1 is that he should take with a grain of salt what is said to him by people in the profession because if they would have said that to him when we were in office, about, "I am taking all this work and making all this money and doing all these things, but I hate the government you know that I am with you." If they had said that to him, and now they are saying that they love the government even though it is killing them, then that would be all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The second sentence?

MR. DOERN: But I think—second sentence—I think that the member should be very careful about having people come to him, patting him on the back and saying, "You are doing a great job. My firm is going broke; I had to sell my car; my wife is selling apples on the street but, George, I want you to know that deep down, we are with you."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Third sentence?

MR. DOERN: That's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (d)(1) Salaries—pass—the Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, just to advise the Honourable Member for Elmwood that I assure him that the people who may have commented that what we were doing was correct when we weren't in government and were getting the government business, a good number of them are now supporting the Liberal candidates in the Federal election. But the people who have indicated to me that what we are doing is correct and we are tightening our belts and going out and looking for business, I do have to comment on the philosophy that they support. All I can say is they surely outnumbered many the ones who were saying, we're for you; when you people were in power; and were doing considerable business with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (d)(1) Salaries—pass; Item (d)(2) Other Expenditures \$5,880,900—pass.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, could we just have one brief explanation there, and that is, Recoverable from Canada — what does that line refer to?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that that is the cost-sharing of Federal programs, principally health programs which sometimes have a space component within the sharing formula.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (d)(2)—pass; (d)—pass; Item (e) Employee Housing, (1) Salaries \$88,100—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain the number of SMYs there, last year and this?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there is no change in the SMY requirements in this vote, 5.16 was voted in 1977-78, 5.16 in 1978-79. I assume from the figures the modest increase of \$6,300, that there is in fact no vacancy here but provides only for the general salary increases, annual merit increments. Sixteen weeks of term have been added to allow for vacation and/or sick leave relief.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister understand just the bald statement in the Task Force Report that employee housing should be eliminated as far as possible and adequate charges made for the remainder? Does he know the logic behind that, and if he does, what is the alternative in some cases in remote communities — tents, igloos, dugouts — what does he propose that staff do in remote areas?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it certainly wouldn't be my intention to in any way second-guess my colleague or other members of the Task Force but I am prone to remark that the situation, particularly in remote communities, and that is principally where the department or the government is involved in employee housing, is one that hasn't received the kind of attention perhaps that the members of the Task Force ought to have applied to if indeed they chose to comment on it. We have an ongoing kind of, you know, difficulty. We recognize that we are often called upon to provide employee housing, certainly as part of the overall means of attracting suitable staff into these areas, and I really don't see the department getting out from the continuation of that kind of program. There may be refinements to it from time to time as the nature and the style of the service that is being provided may change, as you would expect any program to change from time to time, but it is certainly an area of considerable responsibility for the department to find the means to properly maintain these units at reasonable cost and to generally accept the responsibility for these units.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass; (e)(2)—pass; (f)(1) Security Services, Salaries—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just a brief point here. I assume, as the Minister has said previously, that the policy of the department is unchanged, namely tendering out and announcing the bids, a public rather than a kind of a private commission situation, and that there will not be an undue preference given to a firm that has already been raised in the Chamber, namely Metropolitan, that he is not holding any brief for them and they will pay their money and take their chances like everybody else.

MR. ENNS: That is the situation, and that is the situation that will continue, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister intend to maintain the present level of in-house security services that we have now? We have a certain number of employees in this and other buildings who are on our payroll and Public Works payroll. Does he intend to maintain that but, let's say, perhaps lease new requirements or contract out new requirements?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this is one particular item that I have made my thoughts known to the honourable members of this committee and to the department, that where we have a reasonably high level of service available to us from the private sector, and where there can be and is indeed an active number of firms competing for the business, I wouldn't want to indicate that the department is taking any fixed position that a specific level or balance will be maintained. We will look at it pragmatically. Where it makes common sense to invite the private sector to gain gainful employment for their employees in this area, that will be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)—pass; (f)(2)—pass; Resolution 105: Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$23,242,400 for Public Works—pass.

Item 3. Supply and Services, 3.(a)(1) Salaries under Senior Administration. The Member for Elmwood.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. DOERN: One small item that I would like to raise here and perhaps the Minister could give us a partial answer and maybe a commitment, has to do — and of course it is carried further down in detail but I would like to raise it here in the early part — just a short item — that is that the Minister, I think, treated the Official Opposition generously when it came to the provision of space. I was given the task of negotiating with the Minister and much to my surprise and delight, the Minister gave us even a more generous allotment than I had hoped for, so I thank him for that. That, I think, enables us to function in proper circumstances as opposed to people crammed into one room.

Now, I realize that some of the members opposite may say, well, in the old days we were all crammed into our room, but there have been improvements made in the working conditions of MLAs over the years. We made, I think, significant improvements; you have made an improvement there. There are just a couple of items which don't amount to much but which I feel are essential for us to perform our duties, that I would like to ask you about. I think we are on the same wavelength here because it is too easy to say and too easy to think that we are not going to do anything for them, namely the opposition, etc. etc., but I don't believe that is the approach of the Minister. I just wanted to ask him a couple of quick points here.

We were promised a modern telephones communications hookup because we have our offices in the basement and upstairs we have two secretaries. We were promised — and I can't think of the name — a Centrex System. People came in, they studied our situation. The problem now is that each member has a telephone. If the member isn't there, it rings, the secretaries are sitting upstairs and no one is in the office and people are trying to get us, etc. etc. Just on that point, and I have a couple of other ones, could the Minister indicate when we are going to get that Centrex hookup?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am just about tempted to use the traditional expression, "soon." I must express some concern that that is not already in place. It was agreed to some time ago. The necessary instructions are in the hands of the appropriate officials. I will ask that senior staff take note of the member's comments and in fact try to expedite the installation of that system which I appreciate makes it somewhat awkward for the members opposite.

MR. DOERN: The other points are these: Again, and I think I am asking for minimum requirements to enable us to perform our duties, what I am asking for — I would also ask the Minister whether he could provide us perhaps with an additional typewriter or two downstairs, maybe manual or electric, that could be accessed by MLAs. That is one item.

But one of greater importance the Minister, I believe, could get approval from his colleagues for us — but I can tell you that we are labouring under some difficulty in regard to secretarial assistance. We have two secretaries year-round, but during the session we have no additional help. Now, our Leader has a secretary, which I believe is appropriate, and we have two for 22 MLAs. Now, during the year that is more than adequate, we don't need any more, but during the session, in my judgment we need a minimum of one extra person and probably two for a three to four-month period. I would ask the Minister whether he could make a comment as to whether this could be provided immediately or if he cannot ensure that now, whether he would undertake to make that provision for us next year because it is causing a considerable difficulty in terms of all the little things that secretaries do and particularly the typing load and photocopying and message-taking and so on. We are just not able to function properly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, now the Honourable Member for Elmwood is stretching my generosity too far. Does he not realize that there is a restraint program on?

MR. DOERN: Did you let one of your secretaries go?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the comments earlier expressed by the honourable member are appreciated. I think that we arrived at a reasonable division of space available. The matter of telephones will be looked into. I am not prepared to comment at this time as to those additional particularly with respect to secretarial staff, that the member requests. I would ask the department to certainly undertake to look at what kind of additional requirements can be made. You've mentioned the question of perhaps an additional typewriter or so, those requests will be noted, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Well, I would thank the Minister for that and I would simply say that I couldn't too strongly emphasize the need for additional secretarial assistance during the session, that that is problem. I think the members opposite would appreciate that, but maybe they still have some problem, but the point is that when you have 22 people sharing two secretaries and the session is really hot and heavy, it's just too much, they cannot handle that work load.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass; (a)(2)—pass.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just get clarification on those two increases of salaries and other expenditures, why the increase, any change in SMYs.

MR. ENNS: There are no changes, Mr. Chairman, only provisions for general salary increase and

Friday, May 5, 1978

annual merit increment. There's an Item 2, Other Expenditures, provisions for rise, the cost of stationery, private mileage payments and copying charges.

MR. DOERN: How many SMYs?

MR. ENNS: Four SMYs in this appropriation, no change,

MR. DOERN: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1) and (2)—pass; (b) Central Provincial Garage (a) Salaries.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this opens up another major topic and there's a couple of items that I would like to discuss here, but I would like to make one point in reference to electric cars, and I make this largely for the benefit of my friend from St. James, and that is that there is, you know, considerable glee and chuckling and laughter on the part of members of the government about problems with electric cars. I would just cite to you . . .

A MEMBER: . . . me laugh about it? Did you evei see me laugh about it?

MR. DOERN: Well, the Member for Wolseley is laughing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order. Let the Member for Elmwood carry on.

MR. DOERN: I would just cite as an example, one article, Winnipeg Tribune, January 1978. "U.S. recalled 12.6 million vehicles in 1977." Now you know, here is the automotive industry, highly developed, highly skilled, thousands of engineers and designers and God know how many years of experience and how many million vehicles of production in Detroit, and they have a never ending problem with defects. They have not ironed out the bugs of the contemporary automobile.

A MEMBER: They have a warranty system.

MR. DOERN: I mean I myself, you know, drive an 11-year old Buick, it is a 1967, and it's in pretty good shape, but there were several items in that car from the beginning, I bought it a year-and-a-half old, there were several items on that car, right from the beginning that were clearly defects, engineering defects . . .

A MEMBER: But it got you from A to B though?

MR. DOERN: Yes. So, all I'm saying in general is electric car problems, you'd better believe it. We had plenty of problems. They still haven't ironed them out. They still have a long way to go. But even the contemporary gas engine automobile that we all drive has all kinds of defects, and if you buy a brand new car you have problems and if you run it for a while and then you get little notes from the manufacturer maybe that this little part has resulted in three collisions and deaths and as a result it will have to be recalled etc. etc. etc. That's the point I'm making. — (Interjection) — If the member didn't get it I'll repeat it, but . . .

MR. WILSON: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, my privilege is the Member for Elmwood has stated that I laughed at his purchase of the electric cars. I certainly did not laugh. I was more than concerned of the fact that that particular type of research information could have been gathered without a \$100,000 plus expenditure by the government, and I think it is a very serious blunder on his part and we'll just have to live with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, another couple of short topics before the long one, which I think we won't get into in too much detail today. The member, like a number of his colleagues I think is superb, that's the only word I can use, at flying trial balloons or kites. He has an ability here, like the seat-belt alloon and in fact there it is, I think it's right out the window, it's in bright red flying down on Osborne Street there. So, I'm saying he is pretty adept at this, I have to hand it to him because when someone says something politically the opposition usually pounces on it and sometimes they find out that it was a mistake to do so.

But I believe that he has made some comments about charging civil servants for parking. This is an old historic honourable subject and I would just like to know, if the Minister could indicate what his intentions are. Is he going to introduce legislation or change — it wouldn't be legislation, a change in administrative policy? Has he spoken to his colleagues around the Cabinet table? What are his personal views on this matter? Does he intend to make civil servants pay for their parking, which up until now has been free?

R. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have not considered that question in any way. I would assume that that would be a question that would quite appropriately be dealt with by those Ministers responsible,

Friday, May 5, 1978

negotiating with the Manitoba Government Employees Association as part and parcel of a wage and salary agreement. I would rather suspect that it always entered into those discussions. I can only indicate to the honourable member that I'm not a member of that sub-committee of Cabinet and that I have expressed no personal views or departmental views that is as Minister of Public Works. I can indicate to the honourable member nor have I heard around the Cabinet table, not that I feel bound to report to the Honourable Member Elmwood what I hear around the Cabinet table, but I have not, you know, I don't say that facetiously, I have not heard of any changes in this respect.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought, and I don't have all my clippings here, but I thought that a number of months ago that the Minister was quoted as saying that there was about to be a policy of charging employees, but perhaps I'm mistaken.

MR. ENNS: I am searching my own mind while the honourable member is asking that question. It is of course entirely conceivable that the printed word in the media does not always coincide with the actual noble and precise and accurate words that were mentioned by this Honourable Minister from time to time but I hold that to be one of the occupational hazards that he and I both are engaged in. In any event, there has been no consideration by the department, aside I suppose from the kind of consideration that has come up from time to time in trying to resolve some of our parking problems in some of our areas. We get proposals for instance, I think I mentioned it the other day at the committee, when I was being asked by some other member, you know, what kind of proposals am I getting in terms of the people, the private sector coming to me offering to build buildings for lease or for other reasons, I think I indicated that there was a proposal much in this general way from somebody suggesting that he would like to build a parkade or parking facility within this facility and offering X-number of car spaces to provincial employees, whom then I assume, if it were to be entered into as a commercial venture, would either be paying for their parking spots or indeed if it was a negotiated part of the agreement, the government would continue paying for it. But I can only recall it in that context that it may have been raised.

But in any event I think what's the important thing to consider here, it would not be up to the Department of Public Works or this Minister to unilaterally move in this direction without it being part and parcel of the negotiations which I understand are currently under way with the MGEA.

MR. DOERN: So, the Minister is telling me at the moment there is no policy on the back burner to charge civil servants for parking?. On the negative side, does the Minister have any plans to discourage the use of private automobiles, or does the government have any plans to discourage the use of automobiles and perhaps related to that, discourage the use of private automobile, on the other hand encourage the use of public transit, and/or.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any particular changes in policy direction, at this particular time. There is a great deal of discussion taking place within the department, as is noted by the Task Force, as to the possible changes that may occur within the government fleet. The size of the government fleet has come under some review and some question. The necessity of it being that size or the availability or the possibility of re-examining some leasing arrangements for some aspects of parts of the fleet. I am just throwing out the number of areas that are currently under review. It may be timely at this point to indicate to you that at the month end of March 31st, 1978, the provincial government fleet stands at some 2,415 vehicles. Percentage of sub-compacts and compact sedans versus all sedans is 34 percent. Well, I don't know whether these other matters are germane to the argument, but we have some in rough figures . . .

MR. DOERN: Well, that was my next question, so perhaps you could give us the break down.

MR. ENNS: Well, we have in total some 1,327 sedans . . .

MR. DOERN: What is the percentage of that? Is there a percentage there?

MR. ENNS: We have in the area of total wagons, that's compact wagons, intermediate wagons and standard design wagons, along with four 9-passenger wagons, an additional 124 in the wagon fleet

MR. MINAKER: Could if the Minister could tell us how many of those have been returned under warranty because they didn't work like the electric cars.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, do I have to put up with these snide comments from members of the committee while I'm trying to give serious information to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister of Public Works carry on please.

MR. ENNS: Total vans list 518. Then we have in the area of half-ton and three-quarter ton pick-up an additional 401. We have a total of 57 special vehicles which includes such things as a bus jeep, one-ton truck, a two-ton truck, three-ton truck, four-wheel drive units, for a further total of 5 comprising of the grand total of 2,415 units.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. DOERN: The last point that I would like to ask here, but I have many other comments to make on the fleet and we won't be able to complete anything there today, but what is the Minister's attention in regard to the number of compacts and sub-compacts. He indicated about one-third of the, I guess the sedans were compacts and sub-compacts, we tried to increase this, does he have any goals in that regard?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that while there has been, you know, some difficulty in these units there is no change of substance considered. The recognition that manufacturers, generally, of the North American automobile are moving towards the smaller compact units. What we would have referred to as a compact unit a few years ago now has become the standard unit in many instances just about.

We anticipate that if we carry on in much the same way with the fleet and the fleet replacement, that we would have much the same situation and the composition of the fleet would be much the same.

MR. DOERN: So you have no intention to increase the percentage of compacts?

MR. ENNS: We are finding that in the purchasing of our standard units, we are getting perhaps closer to the compacts in that instance, intermediate and sub-compacts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct the honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 34 pupils of Grade 9 standing from the Grant Park High School under the direction of Mr. Dooly. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights and also, — there's a little confusion — but also the Member for Crescentwood who happens to be in the other committee room chairing the other committee this afternoon.

I would ask the honourable members to please welcome these students.

I direct the honourable members to Page 28, Department of Education, Clause 6. University Grants Commission. Clause 6.—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the Honourable Minister had concluded his remarks during the 30 seconds or so that he spoke at the time that the committee broke for lunch, or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe when we did recess for lunch, I had been speaking to the point brought forward by the Member for Burrows in regard to the fee increase and I had pointed out that in our neighbouring province of Saskatchewan, they pay some \$625 in tuition fees and in Arts Course as opposed to \$540 in the Province of Manitoba with the increase. I believe that type of comparison, Mr. Chairman, points out the tremendous discrepancy that had existed in this province and had been allowed to exist over a considerable number of years. Of course, even with the increase which at 20 percent is considerable in a year, we still are some \$85.00 below that level that exists in Saskatchewan. If the Honourable Member for Burrows can then claim that our fee structure, as it now exists, is exorbitant, out of the way, not comparable to other provinces, I'd be very interested in how we would justify that particular point.

He brings up several other costs that occur in our society and I certainly agree with him that these increases do happen. I don't think that they are going to necessarily mean that anyone will have to miss going to university because of that particular fact. It may produce some hardship for some individuals; I certainly would be the first to admit that, however, there are many of us who I am sure have enrolled at university and endured some financial hardship — at least we felt it was hardship at that time — in order to get the type of training and the type of education that we felt would be of value to ourselves and to society in the future.

He mentions, of course, that it is people at the bottom of the economic scale who will be most affected by this. I would suggest to him that it is perhaps the people at the bottom of the scale, students in that particular category or who have parents in that category, who find it most easy to avail themselves of government bursaries and of government loans to help them along. Whereas those who are in the so-called "middle" of the economic scale are the ones who, in fact, if anyone offers under this type of circumstance, feel the pinch, because they are just over the borderline of eligibility for these types of help. They have to scrimp and save and budget, and perhaps prioritize their life-styles in order that their children may attend university.

But I take exception, and I would question very seriously the point that the Member for Burrows maintains, that it is people at the bottom of the economic scale necessarily that are hurt by this type of increase. I maintain it's the people at the middle of the scale who, if anyone feels any great amount of hardship, will certainly suffer in this way.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd be most happy to take the Honourable Minister into my riding and spend all the time with him that would be necessary, take him into other ridings, take him into the riding of the Honourable Member for Churchill, and have him attempt to persuade and convince my constituents that the fee increase is going to hit harder the family of the middle income level, rather than the one at the bottom level.

I must confess and admit to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that persuasive power to convince my constituents of that; they wouldn't believe me. If the Honourable Minister feels that he has that skill and ability, I would welcome him to come into Burrows constituency at any time, or to go into any constituency wherein there may be people living at the lower end of the social economic scale, and persuade them and get them to believe that the fee increase isn't going to hurt them at all but that it's going to hurt those more who estates may be liable to succession duties, who are in a category that they make gifts that may be subject to tax, and that sort of thing. That it's the people in that bracket who are being harder hit. My constituents, Mr. Chairman, I would tell the Honourable Minister now, would not believe him. And I'm also certain, Mr. Chairman, that he would have difficulty in getting his constituents to believe the statement that he had just made in the House. He would have extreme difficulty; in fact, he would find it impossible.

He just shook his head in the negative, that he wouldn't have any difficulty. I would like to meet that individual in his constituency who does believe him that the fee increase is not going to hurt the guy at the bottom end of the wage scale, but rather the one in the middle and in the upper brackets.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can arrange such a meeting for the Member for Burrows, if he would like to meet that type of an individual. And I maintain, again, that the opportunity for student aid and student assistance is there for those at the lower end of the scale and provision has been made in the student aid appropriation to deal with these increases, if there is increased need, and of course when we get to that particular part of the Estimate appropriation, I think he will notice that we have made that provision and I still maintain — and he is entitled to his opinion, of course — that in fact it is not the lower but perhaps the middle where the people are just above the level that qualifies for that type of particular aid that do suffer under this type of circumstance.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I agree that there is another Section in the Estimates where the impact of tuition fees on students and in turn as it relates to Student Aid could be debated more appropriately but I just simply would want to remind the Honourable Minister at this point in time that he would find it extremely difficult to square the comment that he has just made with the fact that quite recently, as it will affect Student Aid for the forthcoming academic year, he has increased the entry level into Student Aid. In other words, the loan first, the bursary second point has been raised from what it previously was by a few hundred dollars. How one squares that with the comments that he has made, I certainly do find it difficult to understand. However, Mr. Chairman, let me not violate the rules and, as I've indicated, there will be a more appropriate time to debate that point.

What I would wish to ask the Honourable Minister to comment on, and this is a matter which had been of concern to the Conservative Party and to the Legislature in general in previous years and I'm sure that it still is and it is to us on this side of the House and that is the Faculty of Education, the enrolment in the Faculty of Education as it relates to the supply and demand of teachers. The Honourable Minister may recall that over the years there was a feeling that there was an over-supply of graduates and, as I recall it in previous years, that there may have been a temporary over-supply of graduates at a snapshot point in time as of September 1st of a school year or whatever but over a period of months, three or four months, most — in fact practically all who were seeking teaching employment did manage to find their way into the classroom. Could the Honourable Minister comment on the present state of affairs?

There is a class of graduates who have completed their studies this year and who will be graduating, receiving their diplomas officially in two or three weeks' time and what the job prospects appear to be for them for the forthcoming school year. Perhaps he may also want to comment and express any views that he may have on any direction or advice or guidelines that he may wish to offer for dealing with the level of enrolment in the Faculty of Education for the forthcoming year, what he may consider to be a reasonable level or whatever.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, as the Member for Burrows well knows, and I'm sure he has lived with this particular problem in the last two or three years as school enrolment has been dropping, and it has dropped some 2,000 students in the public school system this year from last year and I understand there was a drop the year before. In fact, there has been, certainly, a downward trend and there is every indication that this will continue on for some seven or eight more years. And of course as this trend continues, then we are well aware that the number of teachers required will diminish as well. I understand that last year there were some 200 teachers who did not find employment. That's 200-and-some, Mr. Chairman, I don't have the exact figure with me at this time.

The disturbing aspect here, Mr. Chairman, is that I also understand that we had some 200-odd number teachers come into the province from other provinces and other countries to fill positions that apparently could not be filled with provincial people. That, of course, is explained in part by the fact that we have had some difficulty and will have some difficulty as the previous government has had, in persuading people that teaching in rural areas and teaching in the northern part of this province can be a most satisfying experience. For some reason, we have not been able to break down

a certain psychology that suggests that the only teaching opportunities that are worthwhile are within the area bounded by the perimeter, or perhaps in a city the size of Brandon.

Of course, the Member for Burrows knows full well, as I do, that the chance and the opportunity for a teacher to meet a new challenge and to live a very satisfying professional and private life in the rural or northern areas is equally as good as in the urban areas. And I know that he has, I'm sure, as I will do, and as I do on every opportunity that I get the chance, urge the young people entering the teaching profession to consider teaching in the rural areas and the northern areas of this province.

In fact, in the northern areas, Mr. Chairman, there is an opportunity not only for the same challenge as one finds in what we talk of as the typical rural area, but the challenge of becoming acquainted with another culture and of increasing one's understanding of that culture and at the same time of doing something, I think, from a humanity point of view, that is very worthwhile.

There was a trend at one time, Mr. Chairman, where university graduates felt that they had to go to some foreign country to teach in order to be helping out cultures, and so on, perhaps not as fortunate as we were. I would suggest that you don't have to go quite that far, that there are parts of the northern sector of our province where good teachers are always in demand, and where they will be welcome and where they can certainly realize a very satisfying career. And so I would say to the Member for Burrows that in some way, and I know the previous government was not completely successful in overcoming the problem, perhaps we won't be, but I believe that it's a common assessment that we share that if we are short of teachers in any spot, it is in some of the more remote rural areas and in the north and that certainly we do have to promote in some way the movement of graduates in the teaching profession into these particular areas for some of the reasons that I have just mentioned, of course.

I understand that the Faculty of Education has been monitoring the situation as far as teacher supply is concerned and I understand that they have, in the past and will continue to do so, will continue to impose some type of quota as to the number of teachers that are entering the faculty. I would hope that that monitoring process will not result in us having too great an over-supply of people in the teaching profession. Not, Mr. Chairman, that I would suggest that training as a teacher is not worthwhile in itself, it's certainly a training that more or less supplies a person with certain skills and abilities that probably can be used in other areas as well as the classroom but really for the full realization or fulfilment of the professional, I think they would like to get into the classroom area after receiving that training. So I would say to the Member for Burrows that pretty well the same type of policy will be followed in the next year at least as has been followed in that particular area.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So here's another example, Mr. Chairman, that this government is not venturing in any new direction in education as the Minister and his colleagues had stated on many previous occasions.

The Honourable Minister did make reference to the Faculty of Education considering imposing a quota. —(Interjection)— I would like to ask the Honourable Minister what role does he play in the determination of the quota that he says has been imposed?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Member for Burrows, it's my understanding that the university, in its discretion, has made some judgments as to the proper enrolments in the faculty in past years and has followed rather closely those guidelines that they have set out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we're on the discussion of the Universities Grants Commission, I thought members opposite might enjoy some comparisons, Mr. Chairman, of tuition fees and costs of education that I personally paid and experienced in the course of attending the University of Manitoba. In 1964 when I enrolled in the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba, the tuition fee was some \$375.00. In that first year of education, my total expenditures that year were \$1,200 for the year of education, for the seven some-odd months I was in the University of Manitoba. The tuition fee represented that year some 31.2 percent of the total dollars that I expended to attend university for that one year.

In 1968, tuition fee in Agriculture had risen to \$400 per year; and in my final year of attendance at the university my yearly costs were \$1,800 per year. It had increased by 50 percent because in the last year I got the urge and I bought a set of wheels. So my costs were quite a bit higher because I was driving a car. But still, even at that, the \$400 in tuition fee represented some 22.2 percent of my yearly costs of education.

Now I've just checked with the Faculty of Agriculture and their tuition fees for 1978-1979 — a degree program at the Faculty of Agriculture, University of Manitoba — range from \$575 per year to \$630 per year, the variation depending on what particular course enrolment you have.

So if we strike out an average on that range of costs, it might cost you \$600 per year, on an average, to attend the University of Manitoba Faculty of Agriculture, to take the degree course.

Now, in brief discussions on the costs that a student incurs in a total year of education at the University of Manitoba, it seems like \$3,000 might be a reasonable cost for a year's education at the University of Manitoba. So in the Faculty of Agriculture we've got a situation in 1978-79 with a recent increase of roughly \$100 per year, we've got a situation where tuition fees will equal approximately 20 percent — and no more than 20 percent — of the student's out-of-pocket cost of education. That has decreased since 1964 and since 1968, so that the student today is in a better

position than I was in 1964 through 1968, to finance his portion of tuition fees as a portion of his education costs.

My costs of my education in 1968, when I graduated, totalled some \$5,900, in total, for the four years. Now, I considered that to be an investment in the future. It was something that I could carry around with me and use as a job recommendation. And when I graduated I received a job with a pay of \$575 per month, for a total of \$6,900 per year, upon graduation in 1968.

Now I just checked with the Department of Agriculture — seeing as how I was an agricultural graduate — and I find that a graduate from the Faculty of Agriculture, in 1978 as compared to 1968, if he lands a job as an Agrologist 2A, with the Provincial Government — and this is the wage rate that approximately 90 percent of the graduate students in Agriculture receive in 1978 — his pay will start out at some \$15,500.00. If he has a little bit of experience in summer-related jobs, his wage will be \$16,100.00.

Now, we're talking, a student in 1978 spending approximately \$12,000 in total, to obtain his degree in Agriculture and being able to step into a job which will pay him \$15,500 per year — I spoke in 1968 of graduating after spending some \$5,900 for four years of education and stepping into a job that would pay me \$6,900 — if anything it's more encouraging today to go to university in terms of upgrading your income compared to the costs of going to university than it was in 1968. So that I think the fee justification of \$100 is not a serious implication and not a serious barrier to anybody going to university.

When I went to university the tuition fees were, as I mentioned, approximately \$400 per year; and I openly admit that my family was not a wealthy family at that point in time. They had to scratch and scrounge to come up with the money to put me through the university. My father took on custom work on an unpleasant job of breaking scrub to pay my tuition fees for the first year that I was in there in 1964. But the whole purpose of doing it, of going to university — and I had options open to me; I could have gone out of Grade 12 and taken a job; I could have taken the diploma course in Agriculture, two years; or I could have taken the degree course — and I chose the degree course at considerable expense because I considered it to be an investment in my future. It was an investment that I was willing to make and that I was willing to make sacrifices for, because when I graduated Student Aid was not as liberal in terms of bursaries then for people who couldn't afford to fully fund their university. I graduated in 1968 after spending \$5,900 going to university, with a \$2,000 Canada Student Loan that I had to repay. I considered that no hardship at the time because I was pleased to have the opportunity to go to the University of Manitoba, get a degree in Agriculture and use that degree in Agriculture to better my future.

I think the same situation exists today. The opportunity to everyone is available, to go to university. The increment of \$80.00 or \$100.00 in tuition fees, if it hampers anyone from going to university from the dollar and cents standpoint, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they're not very serious about the benefits of going to university and they're not very serious about going there because it represents a smaller portion of the total year's cost of the education today even at the increased rates of tuition fees; and I don't think it hampers anyone from going to university particularly vis-a-vis changes in the Student Aid Program.

I have to think that anyone who is claiming foul and saying that we're now turning the universities into the "Haven of the Rich" at the expense and at the effect of closing the door on the poor people in Manitoba, I have to say that they're using the cheapest form of political sensationalism to get themselves a little bit of coverage in the newspapers, or whatever.

If anyone is serious about a university education and serious about upgrading his future by a university education, \$80.00 to \$100.00 per year increase in tuition fee should provide little, if any hampering to him obtaining that education.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to this last contribution and the reminiscence of times past. So I am reminded of my times past which are a little more past than that of the honourable member.

And you, Mr. Chairman, I remember hearing your maiden speech when you were harking back to times past and really, I suppose, we can only reflect on how far we've gotten by looking back to where we were. So I'll tell the honourable member. I'll give him a little bit of my autobiography.

I went to university. I was the son of a lawyer, one expects the lawyers are doing very well, have always done very well, rich kids. —(Interjection)— Did somebody say rich kids? Somebody said rich kids, I didn't hear who. —(Interjection)— Oh, yes, well that's true, Mr. Chairman. I lived two blocks away from where I live now. I suppose we were amongst the better-off on our street.

My father was a lawyer. I went to school, to university. I worked that summer for two bits an hour. And you know, Mr. Chairman, I was a rich kid because I worked for a friend of the family and he was paying me the minimum wage. I discovered later that others who were working beside me, doing better work, were somehow not being paid the minimum wage, in spite of the laws at the time.

So being a rich kid, as the Minister of Education says, and having pull with my employer, I got two bits an hour; \$12.38 a week. After two months I had saved some money which really made me feel like a rich kid, when I discovered that my father was on the verge of losing our house and he asked me if I would pay the tuition for that year out of my earnings — which I did — \$125.00. I think that came about as a result of the McRae Scandal, because it was just about that time that it was discovered the university funds had been stolen by other rich parents, if not rich kids, and the university was in a bad

state, so they raised tuition fees.

The point I am making is that even for me, the rich kid, it was rather difficult for that payment to be made, but I don't talk about me. I am talking about people whom the member describes who are having difficulty putting themselves through. I remember how, well we all used to go by streetcar to university, there was no thought of anybody having a car, or any other means of getting there, so we went by streetcar. Streetcars were much cheaper then than they are now, Mr. Chairman, especially in the last month and I make the point about that, because — (Interjection)— Well, they were a nickel each, a nickel a ride. We got 8 tickets for a quarter and then they were two for 15 cents as I recall it, and if the honourable member wants to ask a question he should do it by standing up and asking a question.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that I observed so many of my fellow students who used to bring their sandwiches to the university for lunch and didn't have a common room because the university didn't have a place for them to eat, and I would see them eating their sandwiches in the coker room, this was in the winter, and admiring them because they had the strength and the fortitude and the desire, and they did, and they worked, they delivered groceries at night — they put themselves through — as compared with the majority of university students at that time who did not have to sacrifice, who came from homes where the payment was automatic, who were able to manage very nicely. The result was that the small minority, and a very small minority, of students who had to fight their way through the educational ladder, had to be the brightest and most aggressive, the toughest.

But, Mr. Chairman, it would be all right if all of them started the same way and they all had to be as aggressive and they all had to work as hard and they all had to be as bright, that's fair game, then I would say by all means let them work, let them work like my father did. My father was earning, I think, \$5.00 a month when he came to Canada and he was still sweeping the streets when he was going to Law School, but that is all right as long as everybody is in that position.

My complaint against this government and to some extent against our government, is that we were not able to equalize the opportunity of these students. That is the point that I want to make and that is the point I would make right through Education. The honourable member's speech was so good, I would have to ask him why it is that he does not endorse a tuition fee, a user fee, at the high school level. The argument is valid. He said he could have quit school at grade twelve, he could have quit at grade nine. — (Interjection)— Well, I say he could have quit at nine, he said he could have quit it twelve. I say he could have quit at nine, and I know other students have quit at nine, and not only because they couldn't cut it, but in many cases because they had to go to work. So look at it in the context.

Now, the honourable member peculiarly enough compares his graduation year of 1968 with what is being offered today to people graduating with the same qualifications. After eight years of NDP government he suddenly discovers that life is a lot better for students who graduate from the university. The fact is that in times of rising costs and rising expectations, we deliberately — the Chairman of the Universities Grants Commission is here to tell his Minister — we deliberately wanted tuition fees kept at the lowest level possible, because we believed that there should not be a deterrent to higher education. We said that we believed that the equality of opportunity is important. I am not talking about equality of income at that level. I am talking about opportunity. You can't convince me that people coming from wealthy homes don't have a stride well ahead of those coming out of poorer homes, to take the benefit, the full advantage of higher education. We strove for that. I tell you frankly, Mr. Chairman, I have said it in this House in years gone by. . . . I don't know how many students we have at the university undergraduate level today, I am guessing — may I throw out a figure of 30,000. — (Interjection)— Well, let's cut back to 20,000. Let's assume that we have 20,000 students today. Mr. Chairman, I would reduce 20,000 to 18,000, to 15,000, if concurrently I could remove the disadvantages that they would have amongst the 15,000, so that they would all have the equal opportunity to show their ability to learn. If by doing that, if we could cut out — and we can't do it and our government wasn't able to do it, but I think the ideal would be to be able to cut out tuition fees and costs and even to pay students to go to school providing that they are able to show their ability and their desire to learn and to improve their ability to fulfill their lives in society. We are doing that to a large extent at the high school level, and I don't take credit that the New Democratic Party introduced fee-free public school costs. I haven't heard the Minister of Education proposing to charge for public school. I don't know why not, it would be more consistent with the policy of his government if they did, and the policy of the Honourable Member for Pembina. It would be much more consistent with his philosophy. There, Mr. Chairman, is the important difference in philosophy. Clearly that is a clear distinction. It is no longer what can be done, but really what we believe ought to be done.

And again I have to say I deplore the fact that there are members of the Conservative Party, many of them, who say, "We have to raise tuition fees because we have an economic mess." That is not true. They want to raise tuition fees because they believe that somebody should be called upon to contribute to his education, and the Member for Pembina made it clear, and I accept his point of view, only he wouldn't hide behind this fiction of a mess and this fiction of financial incapacity. The Member for Pembina hasn't been here that long, but I can guarantee to him that he spoke about a mess. As a matter of fact it seems to me that in either the Budget Speech or the Throne Speech, he was the one who mentioned the figure of 225 million more often than even the Minister of Finance. I may be wrong — (Interjection)— Would the Honourable Member for Pembina agree that he did

mention at least once the figure of a \$225 million deficit?

MR. DOMINO: Different speech, different topic.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, different speech, different topic, and the Member for St. Matthews seems to be able to sit on many fences and to ride many go-carts in order to arrive at some argument. I would tell the honourable member that he will find more consistency here where we don't have to apologize for making a different speech on a different topic and showing a different philosophy.

I am saying, and I don't think it's wrong, that the concept of user fees is one which the Conservative Party endorses, the concept of higher tuition fees is consistent with Conservative philosophy, and I don't fault them for it. I disagree with them, I don't fault them. As I said I fault them for finding other reasons to blame.

The unfortunate thing, Mr. Chairman, is that we often help finance graduation of students who leave the province and the country and that's an unfortunate thing. I would not yet be prepared to make education exclusively available to those who guarantee to stay here because that becomes a form of coercion to force a person not to move but we have to deplore the fact that we train people highly skilled people, professional people, and then they leave the province.

I must tell the Member for Pembina, I was at a dinner the other night where it was a farewell dinner for a person who had lived in Manitoba for some eight years who said, "You want to know why I'm leaving Manitoba? It's because of the Lyon government," he said, "I'm leaving Manitoba." He was a New Democrat but clearly that's what he said.

So now, Mr. Chairman, I do mention the fact that we are losing students and I deplore the fact that an unnamed Cabinet Minister is quoted as having said to architects, "You'd better get out of here you've had it too good." The phrase "you've had it too good," is a phrase that the Minister of Labour has already accepted as being a correct one as it applies to society generally. She said that she agreed that Manitobans are spoiled. She made the cute distinction — at first she agreed with spoiled rotten and then she said, "But he didn't really say rotten." So I'll only go as far as she was prepared to go. She agreed that Manitobans are spoiled. Now we learn from today's Free Press that a Cabinet Minister is quoted as telling the architects, "Well, you've had it too good and maybe you should get out of the province." I deplore it. There was just a recent announcement that a cousin of mine is leaving the province to teach and do research elsewhere and he has complained to me in the past that there's not enough money available for research in his speciality.

A MEMBER: You'd better name him because he's a . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Dr. Rueben Cherniack who is a highly regarded respiratory physician whose research is renowned all over and he's leaving Manitoba and I think it's unfortunate. I will not blame the Lyon government for that because I believe that it's unfortunate that the education which we have provided to him, largely paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba, is being lost, the direct service is being lost to Manitoba but that's not the case in that people of that calibre, 1/80, working wherever they work for the betterment of humanity and we in Manitoba will benefit from it.

But just to brush aside as the Member for Pembina does and describe what he paid in tuition fees is to be out of concert with the fact that there has been tremendous strides in this province towards reduction of cost of education and the thing is, he says, "Where will you find it cheaper?" Well, as his colleague from St. Matthews said, "Where will he find it cheaper?" The thing is, they don't really look alike that much but they're the only ones in the backbench so if I confuse one for the other it should be understandable that they're both chirping side by side.

Mr. Chairman, I just point out to the member — I don't even disagree with his statement of facts — point out that we have a difference in policy and philosophic approach as to the availability of education and the extent to which it is beneficial for the people of Manitoba to assist others to obtain the highest possible educational standard to which they are capable of accepting and that, to me, the only real criteria. Do you want to learn; do you have the ability to learn; then we should make possible for you to learn and remove financial obstacles. That's really all that it's about, and I say that's the difference. The Member for Pembina seems to feel that if you put in a financial obstacle, it will make them work harder. Well, it will make those who don't have it work harder but it will not affect those who maybe shouldn't be at the university at all. Maybe we have people who should not be at the university but are there because they are coasting along because they can do that with ease and equanimity and for them it's good. I wouldn't like to see a continuation of that sharp difference between those to whom educational costs come easy and those to whom it comes more difficult especially as is recently imposed on them by the increase in tuition fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have 40 students from the Glenboro High School of Grade 9, 10 and 11 standing under the directorship of Mrs. R. Christie. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. I would ask the honourable members to welcome this group.

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Chairman, I don't interject into the Estimates procedure very often. I've been listening and I think the Minister of Education has been doing an excellent job of explaining the Estimates, explaining the government's position. I think he's done a good job. But the Member for

Johns has made certain points and he mentioned myself by name, or at least my constituency, and I think that I should say something.

He mentioned other speeches at other times made in this House and I recall several of the speeches made by other members across, vicious attacks on the government's attitude towards the poor and those in our society of low income and those who don't have as much as maybe the average citizen. There have been many attacks made, suggestions, that this government, all of its initiatives have been toward removing privileges and funding and services from the poor and giving them to the middle and upper classes. The Member for St. Johns mentioned the upper and middle-income people were \$25,000 a year and over. I think that was his definition a couple of days ago. Well, I would suggest that this is . . . And the reason he came to his feet and other members, and the reason we're having this debate right here, right now, is because they want desperately to cover up an inconsistency in their argument. The tuition fee raise does not hurt the poor in this province, does not hurt the low-income people. I don't think it does. The Member for Inkster says, "It certainly does." I don't think it does. I would suggest to you that the tuition fee increase of about \$90 a year will not discourage any students from going to university and, more important yet, it will not in any way affect the level of family income of the average student. The family income of the average student already is high. It's certainly not a poverty level type of person that goes to university. There are very few people.

I taught High School at Gordon Bell for almost four years. Most of the students who go to Gordon Bell, except for those maybe who come from the Gates, their family incomes would be less than the average for the Province of Manitoba. It's a core area high school and the students are poor. Very few of our students went on to university but yet you talk about the kids from Grant Park or any other suburban type high school, a large majority of those children go on to university. So when you're asking students and families of students to pay a little more, you're not in general asking the poor to pay more because the poor don't get to university. —(Interjection)— Okay, bear with me. You're asking, in this case the government is asking those who can afford to pay a little more, we're asking them to pay.

Now, I would suggest if you were to do away with university fees, tuition fees altogether, you would still not alter that mix. You would still find basically upper and middle income children went there. —(Interjection)— So if we're going to discuss ways of getting — and I think it's an admirable pursuit — that we should find ways of getting the low income children, the disadvantaged children — first we have to get them through Junior High and through High School because most of them don't finish, and then get them on to university, let's take it completely out of this context of tuition fees, because tuition fees have nothing to do with it. If tuition fees were \$500.00 a year for a course, or nothing, it still wouldn't make any difference to most of my constituents, who don't send their children to university.

The reason they don't send their children to university is because the children don't have a desire to go; and the reason they don't have a desire is because of a very deep rooted economic and social condition.

Now, I've been looking at a report prepared by a Jack Lamb. It's called, "The Path Analysis of Barriers to Post-Secondary Education." It's a summary actually of a much larger report. I read it over in lunch hours. It was prepared in March of 1978. It's a project for the Post-Secondary Research Reference Committee of the Province of Manitoba and it goes on and on. However, it's a provincial government report. They talk about which sort of students go. They talk about the fact that it's middle and upper income students, students whose parents have already gone in the past, not students of the working poor, not the parents of the working poor. The working poor, their children don't go. And they talk in their conclusion, this gentleman suggested ways in which we can encourage more of the poor children to go to school. He doesn't mention tuition fees. He doesn't talk about tuition fees. He talks about things like better or more effective guidance counselling, changing the sub-culture among students which encourages them to take advantage of the immediate benefits of getting a job rather than postponing the benefits and going on to university.

He talks about making sure the schools offer better knowledge and skills to the students when they're in school. He talks about changing the values so that they can place more emphasis on education and less emphasis on going out and working for the minimum wage, or just above it, as soon as they get out of school.

I think generally the point made across by two speakers now was that the tuition fee hike somehow hurt the poor. It doesn't. The tuition fee hike asks the wealthy to pay a little more. It's specially true when you consider that the Minister of Education and the government increased the amount of money available to students, on the basis of need, in terms of loans and bursaries.

If you've got a child coming from a poor home, there is more money available in terms of loans and bursaries this year than ever before. So let's take them out of the argument. Let's talk about who we're asking to pay more.

We're asking the middle and upper income children to pay more. That's who we're asking, and I don't think there's anything wrong with asking them to pay that. —(Interjection)—

IR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

IR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wish I had the power to take the Member for St. Matthews and the Member for Pembina, and lock them into a room and force them to talk about those two divergent philosophies that I think I heard from them. I think that they ought to get together.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Matthews made a better speech than I made, along the same

lines that I was trying to make. Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Matthews pointed out all the obstacles there are in the way of people from the lower income groups to be able to go to university. He pointed them out and he may recall that I said that I would like not only to remove the financial barrier of tuition fees, I would be prepared to pay students who showed ability and desire to go to school. I said to pay them, and that is part of the economic problem.

He spoke about the socioeconomic problems, and I wish he would realize that's what we're talking about all the time we're in this Legislature. That is the real reason why there are two parties in this Legislature, because we disagree on how you approach the problem of dealing with the socioeconomic problems of people who are in need, mostly.

But the honourable member is the one who is going to vote — I don't think he's yet spoken on it — but he's going to vote in favour of reducing income taxation which affects the highest level of the greatest; those whom he wants to contribute a little more to the universities because they're wealthy he said. Let them pay a little more, \$90.00 more, meanwhile he is going to vote to remove — I think it's about \$500.00 from a \$25,000 a year person — in income tax. He is going to do that. I know he's going to do it. He doesn't dare not do it.

He is going to see to it that the wealthy have a reduction in taxation and then he says, "Well, it's mostly the wealthy who are going to university anyway, so let them pay a little more, \$90.00 more," so that means that per student going to university who will pay \$90.00 extra, per individual earning substantial income, they are being reduced — we debated that this morning — they're being reduced \$400.00 or \$500.00 and meanwhile we know that the \$10,000 a year person is going to be reduced \$13.00 a year. His kids will have to pay \$90.00 or \$100.00 more if they're in university, per child, but he is going to save \$13.00.

The point is that the Member for St. Matthews is right. It's most unlikely that a person earning \$10,000 a year will have a student in university. It's a little more unlikely if the tuition fee is just a little bit more because there are people to whom the tuition fee has been meaningful — and I think the Member for Pembina described that his father had to go out and do an unpleasant moonlighting job in order to find the additional fees necessary to pay his tuition fees — and that means that he made a substantial increase and a substantial sacrifice to help his son do it. And the Member for St. Matthews reading a book pompously tells us, tuition fees mean nothing. Well, if they mean nothing they ought to go to the university.

Mr. Chairman, I invite them both to go to the university, sit around the common room and talk to the students. —(Interjection)— He just left he was there this afternoon and talking to them? —(Interjection)— Oh, you mean as a student? That's correct, Mr. Chairman. The member was a student at the university much more recently than I was. I told him that when I went to the university, the tuition fees were raised to \$125 a year, not by \$125, but to \$125, actually by \$125, and that hurt, it hurt a lot of people. So let him not say that because he is so much younger than I and gone to university more recently that he knows the problems that are going on among students. I suggest he go today and find out what they think about this Minister's increase in their tuition fees and if this Minister wants to absolve himself from any blame, then let him say so because the blame lies on his shoulder and not on his government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I listened to what the Member for St. Matthews said and I recall participating in this debate previously with respect to the cost of higher education and how it should be paid for, and I will readily concede, Mr. Chairman, that there have been arguments within the parties on this question and that nobody has had a clear cut position with respect to it. And the Minister of Education points out that the Saskatchewan government increased tuition fees for attendance at university, and this is done by a government of the New Democratic Party. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I sometimes agree with what the Government of Saskatchewan does, I sometimes disagree, but I certainly wholeheartedly disagree with what has been done in Saskatchewan — I don't think it's right in Saskatchewan and I don't think it's right to the Province of Manitoba. And the Conservative Party in this Chamber has indicated that they don't agree with everything that is done in Ontario even though it's a Tory Government, or what's done in Alberta.

The point that is most often raised, Mr. Chairman, is that the tuition fee does not deter university attendance. I want the Conservatives to digest that thought. They say that a five or six hundred dollar tuition fee would not deter even the lowest income group people to be able to pay for higher education, and it would not prevent those people from acquiring the money and going to university. This is the same party that says that a \$500 reduction in revenue on a business from \$20,000 to \$19,500 is of such consequence as would mean that that business would discontinue operation and leave the Province of Manitoba, because \$500 — not a fee — but a \$500 difference in revenue. That instead of making \$20,000 they are going to make \$19,500. Mark you, Mr. Chairman, that is what they have been saying ever since we came into this Legislative Assembly during the first session, and they say, Mr. Chairman, out of the same mouth, although it is two-faced is coming out of the same mouth, that a lower income group family would not be deterred from having their child attend university because of a tuition fee of \$500.00.

Well, Mr. Chairman, honourable members will all relate personal experiences. The Member for Pembina says that his father made all kinds of sacrifices and did all kinds of difficult things in order

make it feasible for his son to attend university. Is the honourable member suggesting that all the people in the Province of Manitoba have equal capacity to make sacrifices, because I suggest to him that it is not so, and that what he is depending upon for a lower income group family to go to university, is that the father will be an extraordinary person who will sacrifice his time and his hours to make it possible for that son. And, Mr. Chairman, I don't see anything wrong with that — don't misunderstand me. I don't think that that's a bad thing, but why should it be so, why should opportunities be so unequal, because none of the parents in the upper income groups, who come from the "Gates" and send their children to Gordon Bell — not all of the parents have to do that, they don't have to make that uncommon sacrifice. And if we are saying that education of lower income groups will be based on uncommon sacrifice, does that not indicate to the honourable member that we are discriminating against low income groups with regard to our post-secondary education, and, Mr. Chairman, I'm not referring to the increase, I'm referring to the notion that individual responsibility for post-secondary education on a 15 percent basis is a sensible program.

What is the result of the existing program? The Member for St. Matthews indicated the results. That by and large, the people who acquire post-secondary education at the academic level, and now we have a great discrimination at the industrial level, it's horrendous, it's more of a crime against society to raise the industrial schools from \$7 a month to \$21 a month, that is a greater crime than the increase in tuition fees. It is a horrendous thing to do, and this, Mr. Chairman, is the fat that is being cut by the Conservative Party — another definition of fat — permitting people to make themselves sociably useful in our society by going to an industrial post-secondary school, and charging them a user fee, that's to eliminate fat. So now we have now the list of fat that's being cut by this Conservative administration: sheets in hospitals, meals at nursing homes, toilet paper in toilets, lifeguards. . . this is the fat that's being eliminated by the Conservative Party.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that no matter what we have done, what we have demonstrated is that our present system subsidizes the very well-to-do, that by and large the people who get a post-secondary education are the well-to-do, that we are paying 85 percent of it — they are paying 15 percent of it. And what we have done, Mr. Chairman, is said that we will cause the general society, including the poor, to pay for the education of the rich. That is the present system. We have made the tuition fee high enough that it doesn't deter the rich, so they will get the subsidy, but it doesn't include the poor who will then have to go to work and pay taxes to pay for the rich kids to go to school. That's what we've been doing in the area of higher education.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable members, the Conservatives, really believe that we should not be subsidizing these rich people, I give them one of two propositions for the principles of Conservatism which they spout over there: let them pay the tuition fee, the cost of education — pay their user fee, they're rich kids, — the fee for attending university, if \$500 is 10 percent or 15 percent, then the fee is obviously in the nature of \$4,000.00. Right? Is my calculation correct? Let them pay the \$4,000.00. Do it your way and then have a needs test for those who need, who are poor, and who can go. That's not my way, that's your way, but that's in principle your way, and then we will not be asking the poorest taxpayer to subsidize rich kids. You will do it on the basis of your Medicare program, that the individual who can afford it will pay \$4,000 and the poor kids going out and working for a living when they leave high school, will not subsidize their former friends whom they went to school with to go to university.

Those who want to go to university, and who want to make the extra supreme effort, will go and apply for a needs test, and the government will ask them to close their eyes and cross their heart and spit and show that they have nothing in their pockets and that their parents have nothing and that they have received no gifts, and then they will get a needs test. That is the Conservative way.

Or, Mr. Chairman, do it in a different way, and I'm not even able to say, the New Democratic Party way, but in a different way which I have proposed in this House between 1966 and 1969, which I say without any difficulty because it was done publicly, it was part of regular discussions and public discussions with the New Democratic Party, do it this way. Say that the provision of a higher education, a post-secondary education, is to the benefit of society, that society will accept social responsibility for it in the same way as we accept social responsibility for secondary education. And, by the way, the honourable members want to look at the statistics, universal, elementary and secondary education have resulted in all income groups being better educated to the benefit of all of us, as distinct from the system when private people and education was a matter of private individual responsibility and they paid for it themselves.

The honourable member says, "Get them to go to Grade 10 and 11, and not drop out." Yes, Mr. Chairman, if there was a future in it for them, and if, in a lower income family they did not, as of cultural and economic inertia say that higher education is really not going to be part of us, therefore what's the use of going to the secondary school, if they really saw that there was a future for it and that higher education was not the province of the upper income groups, then I suggest to you that they would go to high school, that they would know that the higher education is going to be tested on the basis of capability. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is an ineptitude. That is a very difficult process. It involves some arbitrary decisions, it involves some error, it involves some disappointment, but it's done at the medical school, it is done at the law school, and however arbitrary, however it is prone to error, it is not prone to the savage error that is committed by the existing system which causes a whole group in our population to consider the fact that post-secondary education is not for them, it is in activity which belongs to the upper middle class groups in society because that's what it is. Those are the great majority of people who go to university.

Now, you will always find the exception and the exception will always be thrown at you. Well, this

poor family — his child went to university and became a doctor, that's true. You know, your best examples are from personal experience because you know them best. I was from a family of six, two of them went to university — my eldest sister, and she only went because she won scholarships every time, and myself — and the rest of us did not go and it had to do with the tuition fee, with the money that it was necessary to have to go to university and, Mr. Chairman, I tell you that that is not only my own personal family experience, that is the experience of most of the children that I grew up with, most of the children. They just did not have, and at that time it was \$180 to lay out. One of the things was fees and the other thing which was just as important is that they were expected at the age of 18 years to start bringing some money into the family or to share the burden. But the fee was part of it and the other feature of it came from what the Member for St. Matthews is talking about.

A MEMBER: What about student aid?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the concept of student aid and the concept of that I am so poor that I have to come to a government to help me, to get those nice Conservatives to put me through school, is the most degrading system of all. And you know, I've given you that system, if you're going to go to the student aid system, then ask those people who can afford it to pay for it, charge them \$4,000 and use the student aid to help those people who you think you want to get to declare to come in and say that they are not self-sustaining, that they are poor, that they need charity, and send them to school. That's the Conservative system.

My system, Mr. Chairman, the one that I propose, is that we make society generally responsible for post-secondary education. That we say that that is something that we gain from, and the Member for St. Johns has gone somewhat further, but I think that in many cases it is valuable, that if I could somehow be assured that the people that are given a post-secondary education will contribute what they have learned to society, then there should be a way of sustaining them while they are going to school.

But let's not move ten jumps at a time, let us say that first of all you're going to make it available to those who show the aptitude and the need, and, Mr. Chairman, I want to do this and I want to do it with restraint. I want to save the Minister money, save him money by eliminating tuition fees. Is that so difficult? It's not difficult at all, Mr. Chairman. How much are you spending for post-secondary education? What is the figure? Ninety million dollars? Spend eighty-five. There's your saving. But for those eight-five, say how many students that you can take, which faculties you can take them in and take the top students that you can get for those faculties and send them to university, but don't have a tuition fee — don't have a tuition fee. Say that the top people who have made themselves acceptable to the faculty, and, Mr. Chairman, the interesting thing is that the screams that you will get are the screams from the rich. Isn't that interesting? They will say, there were one hundred places; I am a hundred and one on the list — I want you to open the educational system so I can get in — stop spending eight-five, start spending ninety. Those are the people who will scream, because those are the people who are presently getting huge subsidies, 85 percent of the costs that are being spent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I heard somebody else say, "Don't you believe in the work ethic? Don't you believe that people should work for their education like you did?" I get that from the Member for Sturgeon Creek. Well, you know, I find the Conservative Party becoming more radical every day. Do you really believe in that? Do you want a work ethic as a standard of university education? The Member for Peina is saying yes. Fine, let us have a standard on the people who will be selected, or the people who are paying their tuition, that they have to show that they went out and worked, not for their father or mother, an independent source, and that the money they are giving to the school was made as a result of the exercise of the work ethic, that they got a job and that's where the money is coming to go to school. If that's what you believe, Mr. Chairman, let us require a sweat certificate when you are applying for a university education. In accordance with your principles, that the certificate that I am presenting is going to show that I independently earned \$650, which is going to pay for my education, that I am not coming here through the grace of having been born with a silver spoon in my mouth, that I've gone out and worked, because you believe in that.

But, Mr. Chairman, they don't believe in it. They don't believe in either saving money, which I have offered them a way of doing very simply; they don't believe that people with the best aptitude should go to university, because I have offered them the same proposal; they don't believe that people should work to acquire their post-secondary education; they don't believe that those who can afford it should pay for it, because all of those propositions are quite contrary to what the Minister is doing.

What they believe in is as follows: Let's keep our class society; let's keep university education the province of the upper middle class of our population. Let's have a tuition fee that's high enough to keep the educational system pure, and which will make it very difficult for the others to get in because if it's a deterrent to a business to get \$19,500 instead of \$20,000, and we believe that, we Conservatives believe that, we have said it a hundred times, ad infinitum, then we Conservatives must believe that \$500 will be a deterrent for the family of a young person in the lower income group who is not getting \$20,000 or \$19,500 instead of \$20,000, but who is earning a total of \$10,000 to look after a family, which many people are on, that that will be a deterrent, and we will have the best of both worlds. Our children will be subsidized by the State, and everybody will pay for it but not have it available to them.

That's the system that you are employing and it's not the system that you have to employ. And that is the system that is employed by every jurisdiction and if you want to include Saskatchewan, go ahead and include it, that deals with this situation. But it's not the situation all over. There are many jurisdictions in the world that recognize that post-secondary education is a social rather than an

individual responsibility, that the society generally gains from it, that society generally should pay for it, and that when the people go out of the post-secondary system and enter the productive fields, then generally they will be paying for their education as a result of the higher incomes that they will be making as a result of the preferred position that they will have by virtue of that post-secondary education.

So there you have it, Mr. Chairman. I've offered you a bold Conservative scheme, it has everything, it has restraint, it has user pay, it has the work ethic, and it has what you love best of all — the needs tests — because you just love to be charitable to those people who will come on their hands and knees and grovel and say to you, "We haven't made it and we need your help." And, Mr. Chairman, I know from experience and direct association, there is nothing more degrading than putting a person through those kinds of needs tests with the possible exception of the degradation that it causes amongst those who are being appealed to and love to think of the luxury of giving charity. There's nothing more degrading than receiving charity than the sanctimonious superiority that it creates amongst the people who are giving charity. And we say that it should be neither. We're not talking about charity, we're talking about creating a useful society, we're talking about making it possible for people to make a contribution to that society by post-secondary education. Now if you want to do it your way, do it with a user fee and a needs test. If you want to do it in the way that I am suggesting, do it by educating to the extent of your financial capacity and I'll let you set the figure, because don't call me a spender — I would spend less than you are spending, less, not more — you set the figure, and have education socially provided for on the basis that it will be made available to those whom it will do the most good and who will thereby do the most good with it for the future benefit of our social and economic well-being.

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I seek your guidance on a point of privilege. I asked the Minister a question yesterday. He undertook to bring the answer today. I thank the Minister for sending me a typewritten answer, however, the answer does not apply whatsoever to my question and I wonder if I would be able to perhaps — we don't have Hansard before us — but I wonder if I could give the Minister the question that I gave him yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose if his question could be placed again under Item 1. (a)?

MR. ADAM: My question was 1.(e), on the Keewatin. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I realize, but the honourable member has another chance to ask the question under 1.(a) Minister's Salary, if he would bide his time for that point.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether the Minister would be able to provide me with the answer in that short period of time, that's why. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We won't be till 1.(a) for a while, I don't imagine. Would the Honourable Minister carry on? The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: We can come back to that particular item if the Member for Ste. Rose feels that the information he requested has not been adequately provided. I think that the explanation that accompanies the information should clarify that particular situation. There is some matter of confidentiality involved in the material that he requests and I believe the explanation accompanying the material I supplied explains that, and does provide an opportunity for him to receive the information from another Minister. If that is not satisfactory then perhaps he will come back to this topic under 1.(a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the course of discussion, the Member for St. Johns brought up quite an interesting concept in that he would like to have post-secondary education free of charge and even pay the students to go to university. I think that's an interesting concept because I think there's quite a few children of wealthy families who would meet his criteria of standards to go to university who would very much enjoy having their university paid for and, as a matter of fact, receiving an income whilst going to university. I think that concept would be probably quite acceptable by a lot of people, especially people who can afford right now to go to university, the prospect of getting paid to go would be attractive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with some interest to the different comments that have been made by the members on both sides on this topic. I think it is rather interesting the divergent philosophies and schemes that have been proposed by members on particularly the other side. I would like to make a few comments in connection with what has been said because I don't

Friday, May 5, 1978

think too much of what we have heard today is new. These particular concepts have been with us for some time and have been considered in many different countries of the world and some have adopted one, and some have adopted others. In our particular democracy, in our particular country the idea of an elitist system such as the Member for St. Johns suggests, where the state selects those who will go to university, some omnipotent board of government officials decides that this boy will become a doctor because of his marks and so on, and then the state will pay the full amount for the individual and this system will be what will provide the best educational system with the state deciding who will go and that will take care of all of the problems we have and the different economic levels. That of course is one option and certainly we do have a bloc of countries in the world that follow that system. But it is hardly consistent, Mr. Chairman, with the idea of freedom of opportunity that we hold with in our country.

I can't accept, and regardless of the impassioned arguments that I have heard from the Member for Inkster, I have known many people whom he would certainly classify as being economically destitute and so on, who have struggled and who have made that trip to university. I would suggest and perhaps it is a wrong rule of thumb to use, that quite often those who sacrifice the most to get an education, appreciate it the most and as a result have become more productive in our society. There are perhaps many examples of that very rule of thumb sitting in this House on both sides of the House, I would suggest. Those who sacrifice very little, quite often, as a result, do not quite appreciate the opportunity and I think I would agree with some of the members opposite when they put forward that idea.

Let me also say, Mr. Chairman, the idea that university should be free has all sorts of implications with it, not only financial to the average individual but to universities themselves. Because as soon as the state begins to finance the total costs at university, then in fact the state says what will happen there and what courses will be taught, and they dictate exactly what happens in that particular institution. If we want to talk about academic freedom and autonomy, then, Mr. Chairman, we can forget about those concepts because they disappear under that particular system. They happen to be concepts, Mr. Chairman, that in our society we still feel are valued and it is something that we certainly will not attempt in any way to remove.

However, I would suggest that that is the path that you would go if you wish to subscribe to a state education. Of course, a majority of people, I am sure, in this province subscribe to the idea that although the citizens of the province are paying some 90 percent of educational costs at the university, the idea certainly endures and I'm sure among a majority of people, is approved, that students have to pay some portion of that cost, that they will feel that then they are making some contribution to their education directly and as a result, feeling that they are a part of that and having made a contribution, will derive more from it.

The Member for Inkster has said that nothing is free. I think that is a concept that the fees schedule implies and carries with it because if you went to university without paying that fee, then you might have the idea, well, this is free and really I have no investment in it, what do I have to be concerned about? I have paid nothing to be here, so it's a free ride and as a result, I have no commitment. Well, I happen to disagree with that, Mr. Chairman.

I also found it was rather interesting that the Member for St. Johns, speaking of some isolated case, about someone leaving Manitoba and I don't know whether it was a student or a professor, that of course happens every once in a while, and by the same token, we have people from other provinces coming here, but I wondered if it was a student, which way he was going. If he goes to the west in Saskatchewan he'll pay \$625.00 in fees, and if he goes to the east to Ontario, he'll pay somewhere up to \$700.00 at most of their universities. So I was a little puzzled as to which way this particular person might be heading, Mr. Chairman, but nevertheless I think it's interesting that he was heading one of these directions and there can be good reason for that as well. We've always had people who have had reason to study at universities outside of the province, perhaps because of the particular faculty or the particular academic interest that they had and that's not something that I criticize, I think there is certainly some logic in some cases to that.

I was interested in the comment on research. I'm not sure just how much money is enough for research, perhaps there is never enough. I know that there was some \$14 million that went into the total research of the university last year. I have no reason to believe that that would be less this year of course, that is not all government money by any stretch of the imagination. A great deal of that comes from private sources. But I know that in some areas and particularly in the health area, I think we could be doing more in research. I think governments perhaps have been lax in that area and should have been putting a great deal more money into research in health to try to overcome some of the diseases that certainly are taking their toll on our citizenry. And of course we can look at countries that are spending millions in rocketry and space travel and at the same time have not solved the problem of cancer or some of the other diseases that as I mentioned take such a toll on our humanity. At the same time I would suggest that we should be doing more in this area. All governments should be doing more and I don't think that I would get any argument from members opposite in that way.

I have also some concern when I hear members opposite saying that perhaps we should take on the top people and send them to university. Only those who show that they have the highest intelligence. This elitist approach again bothers me a bit because quite often I think we have four that some of the people who with the highest promise have gone on to university and perhaps after graduating have not made the greatest contribution to society. Whereas others, who might not me

the criteria of this elitist approach would never have that opportunity to go, and I would suggest to members opposite and members of this House that there have been rather outstanding contributions made by people who, at the time that they graduated from high school, perhaps not having reached a certain level of maturity or perhaps for a number of other factors, did not show that outstanding promise at that particular time, but in fact in later years that developed and they made outstanding contributions to their society.

And that is one of the real dangers I would suggest to members opposite of that particular elitist approach. Let's skim off what we consider the academic cream of the crop, forget about the rest, and then we will solve all of the problems, and I suggest that is not a solution. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster is asking how they do it at the medical school today? They have entrance examinations I understand, and I understand and they possibly are picking the top. And I suppose if that is the way the member wishes to define that type of elitism he may, but I am suggesting that in the broad entrance requirements to university, that that particular approach not be used, because everyone has that opportunity to apply to medical school, and everyone has that opportunity to apply to get into law school, whereas the system that the Honourable Member for Inkster has been espousing would not even give them the opportunity to apply because they'd never be at university in the first place.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, lest there be any misunderstanding, on a matter of privilege, I am willing to give everybody the opportunity to apply.

MR. COSENS: I certainly apologize to the Member for Inkster because I had the impression, perhaps it was the Member for St. Johns then, that he would pick those who were judged most able and they would be the ones who would have the opportunity of attending university.

Let me also suggest, Mr. Chairman, if we can just return to the fees for a minute, that the amount of money that is derived from the fees this year will amount to some 2.1 percent of the total budget and that, along with the 3 percent, the universities, will total some 5.1 percent. Now, I would wonder, Mr. Chairman, if members opposite consider that that is an inadequate amount of funding for the universities to operate on in this coming year.?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I am afraid the Minister for Education has just lost some marks in my marking. Mr. Chairman, firstly, I don't know where he interpreted anything I said which had to do with some student leaving Manitoba to go to school elsewhere. I haven't the slightest idea of what I could have said that would have given him that idea. I did suggest that many people are leaving the province because of the lack of opportunity. I meant opportunity to earn a living. I really referred specifically to the architects who are being referred to in today's Free Press as having learned from Cabinet Ministers that they've had it too good and would be better off to leave, that's what I referred to. I also referred to a cousin of mine whom I did not want to use as a debating point out of respect for him, and whom I don't because I feel that his capacity is so great that it belongs in a field where there is greater opportunity for him to do his research work.

I don't know whether the Minister was defensive about research or not. I don't see how one could expect that the province of Manitoba, with one million people, should be able to provide research work to the extent — he talked about finding the cure for cancer, you know, it's a national and international problem that has to be dealt with. I wouldn't think that the people of Manitoba should finance the highest level of research. The important matter for research is to attract the best teachers and to keep the best students, that's the important use that research has at university but maybe he doesn't know it, so I guess I have to teach him something too. —(Interjection)— Oh, he says he knows it. Well, if he knows it he wouldn't have to be apologetic about the amount of research that is being done. He should know that it's an educational tool.

The reason that I spoke a little harshly now is that I think he deliberately attempted to distort what was being said from this side of the House, and I say deliberately, and I say he lost marks because this is the first time during the Estimates debate that I've heard him attempt to twist something in that way.

What we were saying, Mr. Chairman, is that there should be equal opportunity to acquire an education in the province of Manitoba at all levels and then we talked about capacity of a province to finance it, and I asked him how many students we had and he didn't know, and I didn't know, so —(Interjection)— Well, he didn't tell me. I said 30, and I was told not quite that much, so I said, "Well, all right, then maybe 20." If he does know, that's not important. The important thing is that I suggested that I would rather see a lesser number of people have equal opportunity to learn than the number that are today attending, if that is our financial capacity. Now, I would like every person in Manitoba to go to school. I would like every person in Manitoba to go to university, but I would expect him not to do so if he's not able to measure up to the academic requirements to do so.

Now, the Honourable Minister talks about a leader society, and the only thing he didn't say was describe Russia as being what he might think we were saying as the ideal, because he kept talking about state selection of students. No word did I hear from this side anything to do with state making the decisions. And he talked about academic freedom, and he talked —(Interjection)— Oh you see, Mr. Chairman, that's the way he operates. He talked about academic freedom, but he says that they pay the money, therefore they make decisions. Who pays the money today? Well, to a large extent, it's those people who he insists should think that they are paying the cost. He says people should

have to pay something in order to appreciate that it is not for free, so who pays the cost? Let him as the Member for St. Matthews. The Member for St. Matthews told him as well as me, if the Minister was listening, that it is the rich, the well off, who attend universities. And the Minister of Education says "Let them know it costs money, so we charge them a fee." They know it costs money, that's why many of them supported the Minister of Education in this party. They knew they could expect a reduction in taxation from them, cause they knew they were paying for this, they didn't want to pay so much, so they are the ones who are very conscious of what they pay and they are the ones who crack the whip and play the tune for the Minister of Education, who now accuses us of wanting an elitist society.

Let the Honourable Minister know, I'll give him a little bit more of autobiography. My sister wanted to get into medical school in the early 30s, and she discovered that she had to fit into two quotas, she had two big problems: firstly, she was a woman; secondly, she was a Jew. She had to qualify in two ways in what they called numerous clauses in those days. You couldn't go to medical school unless you had very high marks for accreditation if you were Jewish; you had to have extremely high marks to get in if you were a woman. Otherwise, it wasn't that difficult. That was pretty elitist, I think.

What is it today? Today it is based more on academic — well, I think it is based entirely on academic achievement. It is still selective, not everybody can go, it is pretty tough to get into medicine today. Maybe even tougher than it was, because now the competition is greater because it is a 3.9 average, I gather.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the 30s you had to be non-Jewish and a male, and then it was a lot easier if you had the money; if you had the money, there wasn't that much of a scramble to get in then, there wasn't such a big fight. I used to see the list of the applicants. There was a Professor Wardle, whom I think so highly of because he was one of the admission members who gave me all the confidential information to show me how they had three lists: women, Jews, everybody else; and told me how many they were told they could bring in on each of those three categories. So don't tell me about elitist selection. But in those days it was easier, because only the people who were well-off could really get in. That doesn't apply today.

Today, people of more moderate means are able to do it, and I will not hesitate to give credit to all of the governments in all of this country for what it was that it achieved in the last 8 years. The Attorney-General came in at the end of my remarks, and he heard me talking about a payment of \$12 in tuition. He asked across what I thought it was worth in today's dollars, and I said, "An awful lot more." I think he was going to say, "Well, then, why shouldn't the tuition be an awful lot more?" The point I was making then was the \$125 was a larger percentage of my ability to pay at that time than the tuition would be today, but I say that with pride and so should he. Society has progressed well beyond the middle 30s to the extent of providing a greater opportunity of access to universities.

The main reason I stood was to point out to the Honourable Minister, that if he doesn't believe the kind of "elitist society" that he mentioned, let him get busy in that medical school, let him go to that law school and find out that they have their own quota system. Does he know that? Yes, he knows that. I think it's 10 or 15 out of 100, approximately, let's say 10 to 15 percent of the students going to law school are people who do not have the academic qualifications in the same capacity as the general run. They are selected, they're given special opportunities, and the Member for Minnedota likes that. He should be pleased to know that this introduction came about during the NDP regime.

Mr. Chairman, there is a reverse discrimination taking place in the law school, because it is recognized — the point he makes is recognized — I don't think that applies in medicine, I don't know. But the important point, and the reason I rose to my feet, is that he then suggested that if there were no tuition fee, by inference — I drew the inference that if there were no tuition fees then the government would be involved and there wouldn't be academic freedom; therefore, the state would be involved, and that is just so much errant nonsense, Mr. Chairman, so much errant nonsense. The decision was never a suggestion made from this side, that selection should be made by government. The decision as to who enters universities, I believe, should be left to universities.

He said something else, though. He suggested that it would be a terrible thing for government to intervene as to what courses should be taken. There I'm willing to debate a little. I think that all people, the taxpayers' representatives, do have a stake in knowing that we are producing too many of one kind of expert and too few of another, and I don't mind saying that when — I don't know whether it was our government or the previous government that introduced a special payment for students in dentistry who were prepared to go outside of Winnipeg. We introduced it — all right, there, you could call us elitist, if you like, but I'm told that our government introduced a system of special bursaries to dental students who agreed to spend a certain number of years practising in rural Manitoba. That's selectivity — that's elitist, if that's what you want to call it, but I think that that's justified. I think that it is right for a government to recognize what is missing within its province in terms of capacity to deliver important services such as dental health services, and to have an incentive to do it. They used money, and we used money, only they give it to private enterprise by way of tax reductions ostensibly to stimulate their interest in working in Manitoba, and we gave it to dental students. Call that elitist, if you like, but don't for a moment suggest that we recommended: first that numbers of students should be limited; secondly, that they should be selected by the government. That we did not do.

We said that if you have limited money, then you have to limit students. And if you limit students it is better to limit them on the basis of their ability and desire to learn than on their ability or that of their parents to finance their going to school, and I think that's important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to continue debating this particular issue, because I see the Member for Inkster is no longer in his seat, and some of the concepts that have been put forward he had advanced. But I would like to come back to the point regarding the total funding to the universities, both by the government and the amount of funding that they have realized through the increase in tuition fees. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that with the 3 percent provided through the University Grants Commission and in turn to the Grants Commission by the government, and the 2.1 from the increase in tuition fees, that we're looking at a 5.1 amount of increase to the universities. I've been hearing from the opposition for some time, that that's not enough — 5.1 isn't enough, it's not receiving enough, — but at a meeting I attended at the University of Manitoba, along with the Member for Fort Rouge, who I'm sorry is not here at this time, and the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition said to the students and others assembled there, in criticism of the 3 percent that we had provided, "If we had been looking at this, we would have provided something in the area of 5 perhaps 6 percent." I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that through the tuition increase and the 3 percent that we have provided, that the universities have their 5 percent, and if the Leader of the Opposition was saying that 5 percent was adequate funding — and I'm sure of course he was not advocating a fee increase — that would not be consistent with the policy of those on the other side — then I can't see where they're criticizing the 5 percent of moneys that the universities will have to operate on next year. And I have some trouble, Mr. Chairman, understanding the criticism in that area, particularly in relation to what the Leader of the Opposition has said, "Five percent or perhaps 6, we would have considered," and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the universities, along with the tuition increase, have received 5 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

c84-07 MR. HANUSCHAK: I have two questions. Would the Honourable Minister be good enough to give us some breakdown of the \$89,108,000 to indicate how he arrives at the 3 percent increase, because as I had indicated to the Honourable Minister previously, that on the total amount shown here, the increase is only one and a fraction percent, and that's question No. 1.

Question No. 2. I would like to know from the Honourable Minister what portion of the university costs does he feel ought to be borne by the students directly, and what portion ought to be funded out of the public purse?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in order to answer the first question of the Member for Burrows, and of course these determinations are made by the University Grants Commission, they arrived at this increase of 3 percent in the following manner: they made reductions in a number of areas to bring down that amount of money that we see in front of us in the Estimates, to a point where they were able to provide some \$2,400,000 additional to the universities. Now, I think if the Member for Burrows does some simple subtraction in the figures that he has in front of him he will find some \$1 million something, so we are short another million something. So if we start adding up the figures of seven hundred thousand and some dollars in grants in lieu of taxes, and if we add in other economies that the University Grants Commission themselves practised, and if we take into consideration the fact that the Grants Commission itself pays things like computer and xerox rentals, and first claims, and then apportions the money out to the universities — that in fact the amount of money that they have given the universities this year amounts to some \$2,400,000 more than last year, and in fact is 3 percent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister be good enough, rather than talking in generalities, give us the figures that would apply on both sides of the Estimates sheet to indicate where the 3 percent increase is? In other words, Mr. Chairman, here we have two figures: one \$87.9 million; the other \$89.1 million, which shows one and a quarter percent increase, or whatever it works out to precisely.

Could he give us similar figures for the fiscal year ending 1978 and for the fiscal year ending 1979 that would show a three percent increase, rather than if the university were to exercise the following economies as recommended by the Grants Commission, etc., etc., that would add up to three percent? Give us the precise figures.

MR. COSENS: I'll have the breakdown for the Member for Burrows in a minute, Mr. Chairman. It involves as I've mentioned those factors previously and I can give him those particular factors with the dollar equivalents. It will take a minute to produce those for him and if we don't have them ready today, I can certainly have them ready for him on Monday. But as I say, the figure that it represents is some \$2,400,000 which is three percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, we will remind the Honourable Minister on Monday in the event that if the figures should not be forthcoming at that time and we'll deal with him then. In the meantime here was a second question that I asked the Honourable Minister, and to refresh his memory I had asked what does he consider to be an appropriate breakdown as between the fees charged — breakdown of funding university operations — as between fees charged directly to the students and

that paid out of public purse? In other words, what percentage of a cost of university operations does he feel a student should bear directly?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that's a rather difficult question to answer specifically to the Member for Burrows, but I would suggest if he looks at tuition fee costs across the country, that the figure seems to fall into the bracket between 10 percent and 15 percent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, you know, listening to the user pay philosophy as expounded by this government over the past few weeks, I am at a loss to understand why this Minister would want to limit the user fee to 15 percent. Why not 16, why not 20, 50, 75, or 100 percent? What is the magic about 15 percent? Why not the 100 percent?

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that perhaps we are trying to fill in a bit of time at this point. However, perhaps the Member for Burrows is serious in his question and I'll treat it in that way. I think he well realizes as certainly I do, that society in general believes that the contribution of university education to our society is of value and it is prepared to pay part of that particular cost. And as a result, that is the reason that we find across this country that in all provinces, society is in fact prepared to pay a certain percentage and I have given the Honourable Member for Burrows some idea of the range within which society is prepared to go in that regard, and I would suggest to him that those that does fall into the category from 85 to 90 percent they have been prepared to pay to this point.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I can now give him the breakdown that he requested and we will go through 1977-78 and 1978-79. The operating grant — would you like me to proceed, Mr. Chairman? Very well, I will go ahead. The operating grant in 1977-78 was some \$80,126,800, Mr. Chairman. First claims amounted to \$2,339,500, the University Grants Commission Expense \$395,200, the support programs \$1,024,400.00. I'll just pause for a bit of clarification. Computer rentals \$3,352,000, grants in lieu of taxes \$7,215,000 and that totalled some \$94,455,900.00. Now in 1978-79, Mr. Chairman, the operating grant some \$82,490,000, the first claims \$2,339,300, the University Grants Commission \$344,200, support programs \$822,500, and computer rentals — believe Xerox and so on is in that category — \$3,111,000, and the grants in lieu of taxes of course are in the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the total there is some \$89,108,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 4:30, is it the intent of the House to go into Private Members' Hour?

MR. JORGENSEN: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that there is no disposition on the part of honourable members to go into Private Members' Hour, and I suggest that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.