

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 26 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 52 students of Grade 5 standing from the Parc la Salle School under the direction of Mrs. Cyr. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

There are 36 students of Grade 9 standing from the Yellow Quill School under the direction of Mrs. Kowall. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Legislation re validation of Free Press property

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs. Could the Minister indicate whether it is his intention to introduce at this Session of the Legislature legislation that would validate the expropriation of the Free Press property or adjacent property?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend knows very well, this has been discussed with

the Leader of the Opposition at this time by the members of the North of Portage Corporation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thought governments were elected to govern. Could the Minister of Urban Affairs indicate whether he is satisfied that legal challenges cannot be made against the expropriation process that would invalidate that expropriation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is asking for an opinion. Would he kindly ask for information.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Urban Affairs whether it is his intention, as a member of this government, to introduce legislation at this Session of the Legislature to validate the expropriations of the Free Press property?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: To answer that question, the answer is exactly the same as I gave a second ago.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister what is his position? Does he feel that legislation is necessary to validate the expropriation of the Free Press property?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is the same question that the honourable member asked previously, seeking an opinion.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister to inform the House as to what the government's position is? Is it the government's intention to introduce legislation at this Session of the Legislature?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat to make sure that my honourable friend understands this time. There has been a request by the North of Portage Corporation. They are discussing that at this time with the Leader of the Opposition as a courtesy. — (Interjection) — Just a minute. This was originally — (Interjection) — all right, do you want me to tell you that they're not discussing it? They are discussing it. I don't know how else to tell you. You want the information, so take it.

Now the situation, this was originally brought in by the former government and as a courtesy, it is being discussed with the Leader of the Opposition. There is no decision by the government yet. If and when there is one, you will be informed.

Highway 75 - condition of trees

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Grade 5 class from Parc La Salle that you kindly introduced, they brought

to my attention a project that comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister and involves a property on Highway 75 near the St. Adolphe Bridge where the Minister, I believe, attended with 156 students from the Mennonite College in Gretna who planted some 13,000 trees in early May of this year.

I thank the members for the applause, Mr. Speaker. But to the Minister, I am advised that the trees are dying, the weeds are two feet high around the trees and no attention has been given to the trees. Could the Minister advise as to the state of the growth of these trees, and the weeds, and what he and his department will be doing about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the site that the member refers to is indeed a very substantial tree project in the Province of Manitoba, and I recall at the time of my being there initiating the tree planting, I had mentioned to staff that there ought to be arrangements made to make sure that a situation as the member describes does not occur. I have to admit that my staff were somewhat surprised at that kind of instruction because they thought all they had to do was plant the trees and that somebody else would worry about it from thereon in, including the Department of Highways.

I would hope that if it isn't resolved, and I don't know where the jurisdiction is, whether it's Highways maintenance staff that have to deal with that, or whether it's Natural Resources, which I doubt, that the Department of Agriculture will indeed enforce the weed law of Manitoba to make sure that we do operate in a fashion that does not pollute the countryside.

But, Mr. Speaker, aside from that comment, I want to assure the member that I'll follow up on his information and hope to resolve that particular problem, not only there, but I suspect in other parts of Manitoba.

Cream quotas - status of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question to the Acting Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, there are numerous calls coming to our caucus room and to our members from cream producers in the province who are out of quota. Can the Acting Minister of Agriculture tell us if the province is out of cream quota totally now, if the province does not have any more cream quota to allocate to those members who have filled their quotas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture who is away to South Dakota to try to resolve some of our hog problems, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Acting Minister. I would ask if the Minister request of the Minister of Agriculture that each individual is treated fairly, and I would hope that he could instruct

or would instruct, I'd ask him if he would instruct the people who are responsible for administration of quota not to have discrimination take place? I have been alerted that an individual was asked to give up some 200 kilograms of cream quota and is now seeing his neighbour as being allowed to overship and overproduce and no penalty, Mr. Speaker.

I am concerned that there are inequities being allowed to take place and the question is, will the Minister have the Department of Agriculture check into the anomalies that are now taking place because of cream quota shortages?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice, but it would be helpful if the Member for Arthur would provide me with the specifics to relay to the department for further investigation.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the specifics are, there are many cream producers who want to maintain and earn a living and I would ask him to make sure that the allocation of quota is done appropriately and fairly.

Further question to the Acting Minister of Agriculture, will he as well ask his Minister of Agriculture to contact Ottawa and the Canadian Dairy Commission for more cream quota for the Province of Manitoba so people can, in fact, make a living in their agricultural community?

Martens Report re seat belt legislation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I address my question to the Minister of Highways. I sense he's been waiting for me to ask this question for some period of time, as we're moving to the end of June and the Minister led us to believe on many other of his answers to previous questions that he would offer his department's analysis of a report prepared by one, Mr. Martens, with respect to a number of injuries and a number of deaths that have occurred in the Province of Manitoba since the advent of the seat-belt legislation.

I'd ask the Minister at this time, whether he now can provide for members of this legislature a copy of his department's analysis?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had indicated in a conversation to the member last week that I just received the report from the Deputy Minister and had a number of questions on that report. The Deputy Minister was away for a number of days last week, so we didn't have a chance to get together on it.

But I can tell him now that we're preparing the answer to Mr. Martens directly and the Member for Morris will get a copy of that response and then he can peruse that information and do with it what he wishes at that time. Perhaps he'll have some follow-up questions that he will want to ask at that time, but he should be getting that this week.

I've asked him to prepare the letter to Mr. Martens - or early next week; I'll be away tomorrow - so the letter should be coming in and then he'll be getting a copy of it.

Motorcycle registrations - decrease in numbers

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I would, at this time, respond to another question that the Member for Morris raised last week and that was with regard to the number of motorcycle registrations in the province. He said that he understood that there was a dramatic decrease in the number of motorcycle registrations in the year 1985. I have received the information on this question and found that this is not the case. There has been a small decrease though.

In 1984, there was a decrease of 3 percent from 16,785 down to 16,303. Then in 1985, there was a 1 percent decrease down to 16,138 registrations in this 1985 year. This compares with only 8,000 registrations in 1979. So it's about double what there was only five or six years ago, and a 1 percent decrease. So there has not been a substantial decrease in the number of motorcycle registrations.

I should also point out that there has been a decrease in the number of motorcycle deaths in the 1984 year. My understanding is there's a 13 percent decrease in 1984 over 1983, the latest statistics that we've had as regarding deaths involving motorcycles in the province.

Motorcycles injuries

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has provided statistics that relate to death. I'm wondering if he also has injury statistics that would correspond to those that he has just given to us.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have not received the up-to-date statistics on injuries related to motorcycles for the complete year, but I do have figures for April 1, 1984 to August 31, 1984, received from the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation that show 415 injuries in that five-month period as compared to 433 the previous year. So there is a small decrease, about a 4 percent to 5 percent reduction in injuries during that five-month period, but I do not have the latest statistics for the full 1984 year.

MHRC - number of houses in arrears

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Housing, with regard to the reports coming out of Norway House and Cross Lake with respect to housing and the arrears that some of the houses are in under jurisdiction of CMHC, I'm wondering, how many houses are in the same position that are under our jurisdiction, Manitoba Housing and Renewal?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have about between 400 to 500 tenants who are in various stages of arrears in our rural and northern housing. But insofar as evictions are concerned, at the present time I'm not aware of any

eviction notices that have been issued for those homes that are being administered by Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Housing Minister, in other words we have not, under MHRC, any eviction notices gone out. Is that what you're saying?

Are we in the same position as CMHC or are we anywhere near the predicament that they are in?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I don't have the exact figures for the situation with CMHC as that's not within our jurisdiction, but with respect to the units that we administer through Manitoba Housing we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of between 400 and 500 out of a total of around 1,200 that are in various stages of arrears — (Interjection) — 1,200.

We have advised all tenants about our evictions and arrears policy. Staff are presently completing personal contact with those tenants who are in arrears, and the information provided to me is that our arrear situation is somewhat better than it was last year. As a matter of fact, the last report is for the month of April at which time there has been an improvement of some 30 percent over the previous year.

However, once the contact with the tenants has been completed, we may well find ourselves, hopefully not, but there may be situations where tenants are refusing to pay their rent and are able to do so where we will, in accordance with the existing legislation, under The Landlord and Tenant Act, be in a position where we may have to issue eviction notices.

Autopac appraisers - workload status

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and ask him a question on behalf of a constituent of mine who is the owner of a 1965 Austin Healey 3000 Mark III, who is trying to purchase special risk coverage and has been informed by the officials at Autopac that he cannot have his car appraised until August 26th of this year. Can the Minister tell me whether Autopac appraisers are that busy?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: That is certainly a matter that hasn't been brought to my attention. If the member could provide me with specifics, I'll follow it up and provide a report back. But I was not aware of any undue delay in having appraisals carried out.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, I will forward the details of the specific case to the Minister, and I would ask him if he would look into the matter for me.

Workers Compensation Board - merit system

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct my question to the Minister in charge of the Workers Compensation Board and would ask: in light of the fact that many employers who have very good safety records within their plants and who have spent extra time, as well as extra money, to improve the safety conditions in their plants, in light of the fact that these employers are asking for a merit system to be installed at the Workers Compensation Board, I wonder if the Minister could inform us whether or not this type of initiative is being reviewed or going to be undertaken by the Workers Compensation Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The member may not be aware, but this was raised during my Estimates. I did indicate that there was a study undertaken during the course of this last fiscal year by the Compensation Board with a view of determining what the benefits and costs would be in terms of the employers in proceeding along that kind of route.

The recommendations of that report were that there would not be any significant advantages to doing that, especially under the act as it currently exists; that there would be, indeed, probably increased administrative costs to doing that. They have provided a copy of that report to employer representatives and any employers who have asked for such a copy or have written to the board inquiring about the implementation of such a system.

Now it may be, with a review of the act, that becomes increasingly attractive. It may be that we want to call it by a different name rather than a merit rating system, but to achieve the same goals.

There is in place now what some would call a merit rating system but, in essence, it is not really one, it is basically a surcharge which is refunded at the end of the year if the experience is better than was anticipated, but that is not what I or you would call a merit rating system per se.

MR. R. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether the Compensation Board is reviewing the report that was presented with the down-the-road possibility of introducing this type of a system so that an employer who is spending more time and money and does have a better safety record is not asked to pay the same amount of money that a bad employer is. In other words, there should be some incentive for people to make the workplace a safer place and some reward to those people that do achieve a good safety record.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I do agree with some of the principles raised by the member and, indeed, the report that I referred to was prepared by the board. It was an internal report prepared upon my request with a view of trying to do just what the member expressed, but I have also indicated that, based on their findings, it would seem that there is, as the act is presently structured, no great benefits to be gained and, indeed, perhaps additional administrative charges

to doing just that. That does not remove the possibility of doing that under, and as part of, a review of the act which we have undertaken to do. So it is certainly still a possibility in the cards for the future, but it cannot for this current year be implemented.

Extra billing - ban to take effect

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Health. Yesterday this House gave third reading and passed the bill to ban extra billing in Manitoba. I was wondering if the Minister could inform the House when he expects the ban on extra billing will take effect in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the Royal Assent will be given later on this afternoon and then, in all fairness to all concerned, there would be notification going to the medical profession, those affected by the bill, and it is expected that it would be in force by August 1st. Of course, an Order-in-Council would have to be brought in.

Cormorant - assistance re flooding

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Earlier this week, officials of the Emergency Measures Organization visited the community of Cormorant with respect to flooding problems. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether or not the government is prepared to assist the community in overcoming their flooding problems.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat my question now that I have the attention of the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Earlier this week officials of the Emergency Measures Organization attended at the community of Cormorant with respect to some flooding problems they were experiencing. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether or not his government is now prepared to assist in flood relief measures for the community of Cormorant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, firstly, the Emergency Measures Organization doesn't come under my area of responsibility, and I have asked for a copy of the report as soon as it's completed and I'll give the . . . the report's not complete at this time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the reason I addressed the remarks and the question to the Minister is that he's the one who is quoted in the article as having said that the problem had worsened and that indeed the Emergency Measures Organization were evaluating it. I wonder if he can indicate whether or not the government is prepared to assist the community of Cormorant with respect to their flooding measures, whether or not they have looked into the possibility of constructing dikes or any other flood relief measures.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources and myself were in the community of Cormorant last Monday, and we saw some of the flooding that was taking place. It is recognized that because of the high precipitation in the last two years, the water has been higher than it has been for the last 20 years. We are having members of my department, along with members of the Department of Natural Resources, evaluate it, and we will act on it as soon as the report is completed.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if the flooding has anything to do with the operation of the Grand Rapids Generating Station.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Natural Resources have been keeping records of water levels ever since the Grand Rapids forebay was created. The records show that there has been some effect on the water levels in that area since the Grand Rapids forebay has been put into place.

Bill 115 - analysis of effects

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Acting Premier, there was a report prepared by the Manitoba Government Employees Association, an analysis of the effects of Bill 115 as proposed in the last Session of the Legislature on bilingual staffing requirements by this administration. I wonder if the Deputy Premier could indicate whether or not the government prepared a response to that analysis, or has done its own analysis on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I believe that question has already been answered by the Premier.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to disabuse the Deputy Premier of that thought. The question was not asked of the Premier, nor answered by the Premier. So I am asking her whether or not the government — (Interjection) — is the Minister of Finance finished, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. FILMON: My question for the Deputy Premier is: has the government done an analysis of that report from the Manitoba Government Employees Association? Have they agreed with the conclusions, or have they anything that they could share with the House with respect to that analysis?

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

NATO - position re participation by Canada

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my next question for the Deputy Premier is, there is a news article with respect to discussions taking place within the federal wing of the New Democratic Party on the issue of the position of Canada with respect to NATO. I wonder if it is the position of the Province of Manitoba that Canada should participate in NATO.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I believe the honourable member knows that he should ask questions on topics which are within the administrative competence of this government.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, that severely limits the field and scope. But recently, Mr. Speaker, we passed a Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone resolution that involved debate with respect to various items including NATO, and that certainly appeared to be within the jurisdiction and in order. So my question is: is it the position of the Province of Manitoba that Canada should continue to participate as a member of NATO?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is the same question and it provokes the same response.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order with regard to the admissibility of questions. For the record I think it should be clear that our rules do not presuppose that a matter is within the administrative competence of the government because the opposition chose to raise the matter in Private Members' Hour by means of an amendment.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day, and before we proceed may I direct the attention of members to the gallery. We have a visitor from Chile, one Miss Ana Maria Llao, who is the guest of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

There are 30 visitors from Minneapolis under the direction of Miss Kinberg.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, Bills No. 79 and 80 have been distributed to members. Mr. Speaker, The Highway Traffic Act and The Summary Convictions Act that are in now two-language format have incorporated

all of the amendments since 1970, so they amount to a modest revision to date. The further amendments which are proposed this Session will then be amendments to these statutes upon their re-enactment in the two-language format.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave in view of the distribution only a few minutes ago to move these two bills to the position for Royal Assent today in accordance with the process that we have discussed here in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

SECOND READING

BILL 79 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT; LE CODE DE LA ROUTE

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 79, The Highway Traffic Act; Le Code de la route, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 80 - THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT; LOI SUR LES POURSUITES SOMMAIRES

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, The Summary Convictions Act; Loi sur les poursuites sommaires, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bill No. 79, The Highway Traffic Act, and Bill No. 80, The Summary Convictions Act.

MOTION presented and carried.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bills No. 79 and No. 80.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

BILL NO. 79 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT; LE CODE DE LA ROUTE

BILL NO. 80 - THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT; LOI SUR LES POURSUITES SOMMAIRES

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering Bills No. 79 and No. 80. What is the will of the committee, bill-by-bill? Bill-by-bill.

Bill No. 79—pass; Bill No. 80—pass.
Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 79 and Bill No. 80 and reports same without amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READING

BILL 79 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT; LE CODE DE LA ROUTE

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 79, The Highways Traffic Act; Le Code de la route, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think this should pass without a few remarks and it is obvious that the Provincial Government needs a Highway Traffic Act in which to administer the affairs of Manitobans and tourists and visitors on the highways of the province, so nobody is going to question the need for that.

But I want to say in passing, as we begin this preposterous procedure of going through 4,500 statutes, that part of this, Mr. Speaker, is tantamount to simply mumbo-jumbo incantations, mere verbiage being passed over a whole host of legislation with very little interest.

Mr. Speaker, we are now all going to be provided with vast quantities of paper at considerable public expense and I think that that should be noted. — (Interjection) — Now, I hear the Deputy Premier mumbling away as I am speaking and I want to tell her for starters - she says this is what I wanted - I have to tell her that what I did not want was the phony, expensive, divisive deal that was put together by the Government of this Day.

Mr. Speaker, as a consequence there were four or five possible outcomes in terms of taking the matter to court, and I believe that there is now at this time several procedures available to the government to perhaps circumvent, perhaps minimize, perhaps to ameliorate the harsher consequences of the law.

But I go back, Mr. Speaker, to a central point that was made by Mr. Twaddle a couple of years ago, in fact, in April of 1982, that was quoted recently in the House by the Leader of the Official Opposition, when

Mr. Twaddle said as advice to the Attorney General: "It will be appreciated that such a constitutional extension cannot be imposed on Manitoba. As there remains an excellent chance of success in Bilodeau before the court, careful consideration should be given as to whether it should be agreed to as a price for relief from the obligation to translate all existing statutes."

Mr. Speaker, the government didn't have the intelligence or the guts to proceed in regard to the Bilodeau case. If they had, and I'm now going back a couple of years, prior to the developments and the furor of 1983 and 1984, if the Attorney General had proceeded in court on the Bilodeau case, I think he could have won that case; or if he had gone to court on the Bilodeau case and had the two translations in hand, had translated the two acts that were pertinent and relevant to that case, The Highway Traffic Act and The Summary Convictions Act, the whole affair may have stopped right then and there. But that wasn't the case. The government panicked; the government decided it was going to do something wonderful and it was going to negotiate an out-of-court settlement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go into that, but I am simply going to say that we are in a situation today where we are now going to reprint all kinds of bills and acts. We are going to do them in both languages; we are going to foot the bill which should properly be paid for entirely by the Federal Government. I think it's going to be interesting to watch whether the government presses the Prime Minister on that or fights the Prime Minister on that particular point.

I'm delighted, Mr. Speaker, that we're going to be saved the pain of fractured French in this Legislature, that we won't have to listen to the Ministers opposite attempting in their elementary French to read even the titles of the bills because that would be really more than most of us could bear. But I think that attention has to be turned (a), to the procedure we are now going through; and (b), whether or not there is some legislative or parliamentary or constitutional method by which this Assembly will not have to proceed in terms of the 4,000 useless or antiquated statutes that are going to slowly come into this House over a period of the next decade.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

**BILL 80 - THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT;
LOI SUR LES POURSUITES SOMMAIRES**

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, on behalf of the Attorney-General, Bill No. 80, The Summary Convictions Act; loi sur les poursuites sommaires, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would like to try to advance Bills 67, 68 and 71, first of all, the Second Reading.

SECOND READING

**BILL 67 - THE REGISTRY ACT;
LOI SUR L'ENREGISTREMENT FONCIER**

HON. L. DESJARDINS presented, by leave, on behalf of the Attorney-General, Bill No. 67, An Act to amend

The Registry Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'enregistrement foncier, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL 67 - THE MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES ACT
LOI SUR LES LIMITES MUNICIPALES**

HON. L. DESJARDINS presented, by leave, on behalf of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les limites municipales, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 71 - THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT; LOI SUR LA PENSION DE RETRAITE DES ENSEIGNANTS

HON. L. DESJARDINS presented, by leave, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'administration financière, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 67 would now be referred to Law Amendments and Bill No. 68 to Municipal Affairs. Bill No. 71 was in committee without amendments so, by leave, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: One moment, please.

HON. R. PENNER: That's not right; it was standing on the Order Paper for Third Reading.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, by leave. It's reported but without amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: One moment, please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, excuse me, it didn't go to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, I forgot a step here, it should go back to Committee of the Whole.

May I suggest then, Mr. Speaker, that we leave it the way it is now then, just in committee and we can do that next time.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister of Health wish to leave the matter stand on the Order Paper or to move into committee to deal with the bills now?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Leave it in committee the way it was in the Order Paper, and we'll finish that next time, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Could I make this announcement, that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will meet Thursday, June 27th, tomorrow, at 10:00 a.m. to consider the Annual Report of Flyer Industries; and the Standing Committee on Statutory, Regulations and Orders on Tuesday, July 2nd, at 10:00 a.m. to consider Bill No. 5 clause-by-clause.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have some committee changes. For the Committee on Economic Development, the Member for The Pas will replace the Member for Churchill; and the Member for Radisson will replace the Member for Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, could you call the Second Reading of Bills No. 12 and No. 16, please.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 12 - THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT; LOI SUR LES SERVICES A L'ENFANT ET A LA FAMILLE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, the Honourable Member for Rhineland, Bill 12.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to make a few comments on Bill No. 12.

The Member for Fort Garry has already expressed many of the concerns that we have regarding that piece of legislation, and I do not intend to repeat what the member said.

The Child and Family Services Act is the only body of law that empowers people to act on behalf of children. The government has a responsibility to protect children who are unwanted, have suffered abuse, or are mistreated for whatsoever reason. When cases of abuse or mistreatment are brought to the attention of the government, this law empowers the government to act on behalf of that child.

Many of the recommendations in this act are good recommendations that should be followed. However, this government has introduced all sorts of statements which will make protection hearings extremely ambiguous and could result in leaving children without a decision for long periods of time while court battles are fought on very vague issues. This is frightening when one considers the level of child abuse happening in the community. The act certainly needs tightening up and clarity in many areas.

Mr. Speaker, the move made in this act to appease the Native community has led this government to forego its responsibility of protection to children. We applaud the involvement of the Native community, but we must

make certain that the protection of children is clearly identified and remains as the No. 1 focus of government responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are other members who want to speak to this bill, so I will conclude my remarks and have further remarks when the bill is before committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Community Services will be closing debate.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'll just comment briefly on some of the matters raised by members opposite. There was concern that the definition of abuse was not wide enough. However, it is the interpretation of the lawyers we've been consulting that, in fact, the definition is quite broad and covers children, not only who are abused, but who are in danger of abuse and in need of protection. So there is a broad definition already in the bill.

With regard to the powers of the director, they're the same as exist in the current act. They are similar to what is found in the Ontario legislation and that of many other provinces. The powers at the local level have to do with discretion as to the delivery of service, but the government through the Minister who delegates power to the director is responsible for setting standards and maintaining standards. That's how the different levels of authority relate to one another.

The question of whether children are too exposed to being involved in court procedures, I think there has been a misunderstanding. The legislation says that children over 12 must be advised of proceedings and the implications of proceedings. A child under 12 may be so advised if the judge considers it not harmful. A child must be served so that they know of the action, but that does not make the child a legal party to the action. With the judge's right to exclude a child where they so choose, we feel there is adequate protection.

The person with whom a child was living prior to apprehension is also notified, but would again not have status as a party. The judge could grant such person status if the judge considered it to be in the best interest of the child.

Children over 12 are required to be in the court unless excused by a judge. Again they are not automatically a party to the action, but they are required to be there because experience has taught us that it's very important that children understand what is happening to them. Again in unusual cases, the judge does have discretion to exclude children.

So really the drafting basically agrees with the Member for Fort Garry's concerns. To get the full picture, he must consider Section 2(2), Section 30(1), Section 33(2) together to get the full picture.

With regard to possible conflict of voluntary counselling in an abuse or a neglect case, all counselling services, all medical doctors, teachers and indeed neighbours face that dilemma. By having a clear obligation to report, we believe this is a dilemma that cannot be avoided. In fact, we cannot provide protection for children without having that. What happens is that a professional in this situation when meeting a family would inform them of that obligation.

In the long run, the preventive services that counselling can provide have been shown by the experience of agencies where the preventative family support approach has been tried, they are able to gain the support and trust of families and the preventive approach is found to be more cost-effective than the crisis response approach which has too often been the pattern.

With regard to the Child Abuse Registry, the intent would be to have regulations which would enable a child's name to be removed from a registry after time, but initially it's important that the child's name stay on because it is often only through the establishment of a pattern of unsatisfactorily explained injuries to children that there is built up a basis for apprehension of such children. Many families are mobile and, if there is not a central registry, there may not be a capacity to keep track of what's happening to that child.

With regard to an alleged abuser or an actual abuser getting their name removed, we have asked the Provincial Child Abuse Committee to recommend guidelines as well as we've asked the Ombudsman, and by regulations we will be tabling the proposals in that area. Again, the focus will be on keeping the children listed. The current recommendation is that adults only have their name on the list if there has been legal proof of the abuse. So simple allegation, people who have just been alleged as abusers would not have their name on that registry.

The final point, it was suggested that we were discontinuing support to long-established services in the community. The Young Parents' Community Centre was identified as one such. In fact, that is a relatively new organization. It's been funded by Core Area. It only approached us for funding when we were well through our Estimates planning. Funds are not available this year, but we do recommend funding this type of program for next year.

Again, the Member for Rhineland referred to some areas where he thought the bill should be tightened and clarified. We'll be interested in hearing specifics when we get into committee. We categorically deny that there has been any attempt to appease the Native community. We have worked very closely with them. We've not been able to agree with all of their recommendations to the full extent they would like, but we feel the act is a real landmark advance in protecting and respecting the Native culture, and provides the basis for helping them to build a healthy family life.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 16 - THE HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT; LOI SUR LE PATRIMOINE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 16, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just to be of some assistance, the honourable member indicated to me

that he would ask to have this matter stand but has no objection to anybody else wishing to speak to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand, or does the Honourable Member for La Verendrye wish to speak to it?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The bill before us is a fairly voluminous one and deals with many aspects of trying to preserve our history and, I guess, to a certain extent, culture within this province, and of course deals extensively with the way in which artifacts as well as historical buildings and that kind of thing will be protected.

One of the concerns that I have, and I guess many people have, is the abuses that could take place either at the municipal level - and I guess primarily at the municipal level - if there is not some measure within the bill that puts an onus on the municipality that is declaring a specific area, an archaeological site, with regard to being able to use that power in such a manner that the owner or the individuals involved in the property really don't have any recourse if the Legislature is improperly used.

I think the Minister, when we are coming to second reading with regard to this bill, should be looking at having some changes made with regard to putting some onus on the municipalities or the body that is bringing forward the order which can, in many instances, stop work and stop development and really put an owner of a property in a position which could cause a pretty severe financial loss as well as maybe some other problems.

One of the things that we have found out as time has gone on in dealing with the historical sites problem is that in many instances we do have historical buildings in particular which, while many of us would like to see them preserved and kept, we find that it is virtually impractical to do so because what you have happen is that the very costs that are associated with trying to maintain those buildings or trying to restore them become so onerous on the people who are the landlords or do own the property, that in many instances we have to try and save maybe just the facade or some portion of it.

But one of the things that we found out with regard to the historical resources program - and this would happen not only in Manitoba but it would happen in Alberta and all over - is that unless there was some commitment or some onus on the municipality to deal with it in a meaningful way - in other words, have a financial commitment involvement when they do declare a site as a historical site or a building as an historical building, unless there is some recognition that it could cost the taxpayers and the municipality some money, it really becomes something then of where council could pass a resolution without really having any negative effect or really any effect at all on them. The people then, of course, who suffer through that are the people who have acquired the property or who wish to renovate the property and I guess my concern in this particular bill would be along that same line.

There has to be some responsibility and some onus on the municipality if they are to hold up a project or

hold up a landlord from developing his or her property or disposing of it, there has to be some way of making the municipalities more responsible. I point that out to the Minister, because I believe in the long run that will prove to be one of the areas of concern and one of the areas of contention with regard to the bill. I don't think there is anybody out there that would want to see an archaeological site that is of some value to the province not protected in one form or another, but I would like to see a little more responsibility being placed in the bill with regard to municipal involvement.

I also have a few questions which I hope the Minister during second reading will answer. There is a mention in the bill that we will now be asking people to be licensed if they are out looking for sites, looking for diggings, and I guess simple things and questions arise. What if somebody does find some pottery, some arrowheads and that type of thing, is that person - if he or she is now not licensed to do so - is that person then in contravention of the act if they keep those artifacts and don't register them with the province?

So I guess what I am saying to the Minister is, how far-reaching is this particular bill? Are we going to be asking a lot of people who, by virtue of farming their land from time to time find different things, do those artifacts belong to the particular individual who finds them? Because, as the Minister knows, very often these things are brought to the attention of the archaeological people by the very farmers who discover the different sites. So if somebody does find on a quarter section or a small section of his property over the years some arrowheads and some old stone carved hammers and that type of thing, is that person then, when collecting this - and the Minister knows that we have some fairly large people especially when you go through the western part of this province all the way up to Portage la Prairie and that whole area, we have some people who have some fairly extensive collections with regard to different types of arrowheads and that type of thing.

So I guess what we need and what my concern would be in dealing with this bill is that we do not put too much bureaucratic red tape into a bill which will affect the average individual who is not the type of person who is out to make commercial gain from this. I understand that is one of the problems we all want to avoid. If there is a fairly significant, archeological site, we don't want people to come in and have that taken away during the wee hours of the morning, and that's, I would imagine, one of the reasons for the bill.

But I say to the Minister I think there should be some clarification on a lot of these things. One of my colleagues pointed it out today, while we want to see that implemented, there is cause for some concern in some areas that, allowed too much latitude, the bureaucracy has a way of getting away on us; and some things that we didn't envision to happen might just happen and we'd see people who, like I've said before, who have picked up a few artifacts from the past, then asked to go through a whole registration and licensing process which I think hopefully the Minister doesn't have in mind and I don't think the people of Manitoba particularly have in mind. I would envision that the bill is not aimed at those particular people who are doing that.

So I would ask the Minister for some clarification when he is closing debate on second reading to deal

with a few of these issues so that we at least, on this side of the House, know what the Minister's intent is with regard to that, and maybe elaborate a little more on the people who do have collections right now. I understand there is sort of a grandfather clause in the bill. — (Interjection) — It's not retroactive. What about if that person is acquiring and adding to that collection?

There are a number of questions here which I think should be answered. Hopefully, if I read the Minister's intent right, it's to try and protect any larger sites that we're talking about possibly finding or that are existing right now, but not really going after a lot of these smaller detailed things which I think should be left up to the individuals and left up to the people who find them.

So having raised those few concerns with regard to the bill, I know some of my other colleagues have certain points they want to raise, but I wanted to raise these two points with the Minister and hopefully, he will be able to address them either by way of his comments at second reading or after he closes debate on second reading or possibly, if required, through amendments at the committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other member wishes to speak to the bill at this time, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, 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 to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for Education; and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for Community Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are still considering Item No. 3.(c)(1) Manitoba Developmental Centre: Salaries; 3.(c)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(c)(3) Professional Training - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions and some may have been answered, and also some remarks about the psyche training at the Portage Centre. When I was reading through the impact report in March of 1985, and I know this has all been gone over before, but I don't think it hurts just to restate it.

The indecent haste that this whole area was looked at, was discussed, that is through the whole report. Everything is qualified because of time and it seems to me as I read the report and some of the things, of course, that had been gone over before, there are some questions and some real concerns that I would think the Minister in the department would have in the haste

that they are going about ending the program at Portage. Now maybe the Minister could tell me, is that program ending as of this year?

HON. M. SMITH: There will be a phase out of the program on that location. The people currently in first year will complete their second year by June of next year. The total program will not be reduced in size, and there will still be approximately 70 to 75 psych nurses being trained in Manitoba every year. It is just their program will be consolidated but they will receive their theory at Brandon and Selkirk and then they will do the rounds of practicum placement. All of the trainees, regardless of whether they are intending to work in the mental health field or the geriatric field or the M.R. field, will put in an extended practicum at the MDC.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: As I read this impact report and it talks about the area of practicums of field work, that neither Brandon nor Selkirk would have enough placements for the extra nurses. Now that was as of March. Has the department found sufficient places for the extra nurses to practice, to have practical placements at Brandon and Selkirk?

HON. M. SMITH: The people are normally mobile during their practicums, and there is no reason why any practicum placements will disappear. People have been placed out in the community, out in smaller hospitals, in hospitals in the larger community, there is no practicum placement which would disappear. It may be from the vantage point of the separate schools that they have tended to work in a certain area, but when they are consolidated their area from which, and the variety of placements which are available to them, expands so there is no disappearance of any potential practicum placements.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. I am going by this report, and on Page 14 it indicates that a more significant impact may be felt in the area of practicums of field work.

"An area of concern for both Brandon and Selkirk is the clinical experience requirement in medicine and surgery. In Brandon, due to space and time availability at Brandon General, rural hospitals, as well as night and July/August clinical placements at Brandon General Hospital, have been utilized." I imagine BGH is Brandon General Hospital. "Increases in students would compound this problem, and it possibly could be addressed by using the current MDC clinical placement arrangements at Portage General Hospital, or with some modification." But this is just a general, it's a statement that is made in here that it's tight now, that with more students it looks like it could continue to be tight, and it goes on to say on the same page that "the Selkirk Mental Hospital competes with Winnipeg nursing schools for medicine and surgery practicum placements and would, therefore, need to find new sources of such clinical experience for additional students." And goes on "perhaps by utilizing the Portage General Hospital resource and other rural hospital settings."

These are all suppositions, and I would hope before anything is done that these spaces, these field work areas would be in place and this just wouldn't be

something that . . . Well, none will disappear. I don't expect any to disappear. What I am expecting and hoping is that there will be new ones appear on the scene. Maybe it's because the haste with which this impact report had to be done that they weren't able to find this.

I think that, not only the people in Portage, but I would think anyone that is looking at this report would be a little bit concerned, and I consider it indecent haste that the department and the Minister has come about the closing of the Portage Nursing Home.

I'm sorry, I can't find it, but there is a letter in here stating that - oh, here it is - on March 4th. That, further to our discussions . . . From Mr. R.J., or from R.J. Ross - I was making an assumption there that I shouldn't - R.J. Ross, Executive Director, Community Social Service. "Further to our discussion on the attached memorandum from Mr. Mendelson to Mr. Edwards, I am asking you to reconvene the committee that developed the impact statement on the potential closure transfer of the Manitoba Developmental Centre Psychiatric Nursing School . . ." and it goes on. But it says, "This report is needed at my office no later than March 25th to permit a departmental decision by March 31st."

Now it's an amazing occurrence, I would think, to have something like this done in what I consider to be indecent haste. Whether the option in the long run turns out to be right or wrong is certainly something I think that might have used a little bit more study, especially when you come down to what they consider the saving is going to be. It was starting out to be - what was it? - 183,000 and then ended up to be 20-some thousand, 132.5 per annum it says. This figure has now been changed to 24 per annum. I am reading from this particular report; there could be an updated one.

The other thing, and I might as well go through this - the Minister can answer them all at once as she chooses - is the fact that generalization rather than specialization. There is a real concern that comes out of this report that there may be a lack of students, people who will go into the field of mental retardation. I think that this has got to be a real concern, and it's the last item on Page 21. "The concern is expressed that were the School of Nursing at MDC to close, the basic commitment would be lost which may have a negative effect on service to our residents."

I think that the government, the Minister is taking an extreme risk at the expense of the residents at the centre, possibly of all the residents of the new Welcome Home Program, because certainly nurses who are psych nurses, who are going to take specialized training in mental retardation, that's the field that they're going to work in. I find no quarrel in having someone go in and specialize in a certain field when this is a problem that's not going to go away just because it enters the community. The services are still going to be needed.

So I follow along with the Member for Portage la Prairie and the Member for Pembina who criticized the Minister for taking this action. When I see the haste with which it was done, which we all have been through certainly in the House before when we dealt with it there, I wonder if the Minister in acting in all this haste is not putting the members of the community who are mentally handicapped at further risk, because no one is quite sure how this is going to work. I haven't heard

anyone give a definite that this is how it's going to be; it is how we think it might be. I would suggest that it would be much better to have slowed down on this and given it a lot more thought than has been given to this particular program change.

HON. M. SMITH: The phase-out of this school is something that's been talked about for years. The question of speed, I must remind members that we had such a thing as a fourth quarter adjustment in federal projected revenues that didn't give us a lot of time to figure out how we could resolve it. The external situation is tight and often presents us with shocks.

We hear in opposition, talk to us about controlling deficits and so on. At the same time, every time we show evidence of being able to manage a little more efficiently, then we are criticized, and I just don't accept that. The impact study that occurred in early March is since through the consultative process - or the problems have been identified and we are solving them. I did review the problems that it turned up to see whether there was a way through them and so far we haven't met anyone that hasn't seemed to be solvable.

The skills that are going to be required in the future are going to be a slightly different mix than what psych nurses have, so the jobs in the future are going to be that some in the community will require psych nurse training, others will require a slightly different type of training. It would be quite irresponsible for us to go on training people for jobs that aren't going to exist in the same numbers in the future.

Everything that we can see looks to a high probability of success of the type of program we are going through. There is evaluation built in, so we should get early warning of any emerging problems.

I would just like to table for members at this point in time, the drawings that I said we had last night of the activities' building that will be going in to help enrich the program at the centre.

Again, I think it's indicative of our commitment to improving the quality of care there, and the lengthy comments I made last night about the Welcome Home Program and how it's advancing and how the funds are being allocated, I think, is indicative of a real commitment in both qualitative and quantitative terms to enhancing the care of the retarded, both in the community and in institutions.

I asked my deputy to show you the architectural drawings for the new building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(1) - the committee will take some recess time, until needed.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister about the schooling for the residents that are say from the age of five to 16. What kind of instruction are they getting and how much?

HON. M. SMITH: We could give you the exact detail tomorrow. Essentially there hasn't been any change. A fair number are going out and they are receiving a half to a full day of education. But, as I said last night, the intention is to phase out the under 18s at MDC so that the school type of educational program would

disappear with that, but the vocational activity program would pick up and in a sense, your vocational activities are education for the adults. The school program really hasn't altered in the past year.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wasn't asking if it had altered. I was trying to find out what it was and how much of it there was. How long will the phasing out take of the under - well, the Minister's using 18 or 16?

HON. M. SMITH: We'll give the details on the program tomorrow. We expect the phase-out to take two to three years.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Will we be able to come back to this and deal with it when the Minister brings the details tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We cannot hold the proceedings of the committee unless by leave. We can return to it all the time under the Minister's Salary.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I would like leave then, Mr. Chairman, to return to this when the Minister brings the details of the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will never finish this. We will do it under the Minister's Salary. Is that all right? Anything you want to ask.

HON. M. SMITH: Leave it for the Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: How long would it take to get this information? I understand that we might be able to get it now.

HON. M. SMITH: Fifteen minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fifteen minutes.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, that's fine then, because we have some questions on this item, some more questions. So you'd probably have it here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we can ask the other questions while we're waiting for them.

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you.

With these new drawings that we've seen for the new building, is that going to completely replace the existing accommodation that we have in Portage, or are some of the older buildings still going to remain?

HON. M. SMITH: This is not a residential building. It's an activities building. The residential building that will disappear as the Welcome Home Program moves along is North Grove, one of the big dormitory buildings. The other buildings will remain. Some of the work activity has been done in the basement of North Grove. This will replace that and expand and enrich it, but the other residential buildings will stay the same.

MR. A. BROWN: Has this item already been budgeted for, or it appears in the budget?

HON. M. SMITH: It's in the Government Services budget.

MR. A. BROWN: Oh, Government Services budget. That's all the questions I have at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just a question to the Minister with regard to the proposed expansion out there. I'm inclined to be just a little mixed up on the streets. I wonder if she could clarify the position of the new proposed recreational complex. Is it where the present North Grove site is today?

HON. M. SMITH: As clearly as I understand the geography of the place, it's in the northwest corner where currently there is a big open piece of grass. It will sit diagonally across that property.

MR. L. HYDE: I think, Mr. Chairman, I have oriented myself and placed the building in the grounds now. It will be immediately north of the present cottages.

HON. M. SMITH: North and west.

MR. L. HYDE: And west, right.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain to me and the committee just when she proposes this development to begin. When are your plans to have this construction started?

HON. M. SMITH: I think the sod turning will be within the year; I think they are aiming at January of 1986.

MR. L. HYDE: With the completion date as what?

HON. M. SMITH: Up to about 18 month construction time. It's more than a year, less than a . . .

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister, on glancing at the proposal plans here, could she explain to us in more detail as to what - I'll put it this way - it's easier now to visualize what she has planned after seeing the plans. When she referred to it last evening, it was quite difficult just to understand the entire program. I wonder if she could just review that once again for us so that we, in opposition, will have a better idea as to the future plans for the program.

HON. M. SMITH: The gradual downsizing of the total centre, the equivalent of the population of the North Grove Dormitory, so that it will not require the several million dollar fire upgrading, but more like a half million to provide security in the meantime. It will take up to three years and it's achieved partly by moving people out to community settings and partly by supporting at-risk people in the community in a better way so that the entry rate would be down. We are about 770 now and we are aiming at around 550 in a period of about three years.

MR. L. HYDE: Could the Minister indicate the total cost of this project to MDC?

HON. M. SMITH: Again, I am not quite sure of the question, whether you are meaning the direct cost at the centre or the direct cost of the overall program for the mentally retarded?

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess I was asking for what investment would be made to the MDC program itself.

HON. M. SMITH: 2.75 million.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, it all seems very nice to see it evolve and have it explained the way the Minister has done so, but I want to conclude my remarks by saying that I am not fully in agreement with what she is attempting to do. It is certainly going to eventually hurt the total operation of MDC in Portage la Prairie; it is going to affect the present staff in Portage la Prairie; it is going to certainly hurt the economy of Portage la Prairie over the years. I once again stress that I am not at all in favour of what the Minister is attempting to do to, as she claims, improve the lot for the mentally handicapped people in the old school for Retardates at Portage la Prairie.

I stress once again, that I believe the Minister would have done well to have approached the issue in a better manner than what she did. She claims that her government is a very very open government. She certainly did not prove it in this case. It will certainly not do her or her party any good as far as the citizens of Portage la Prairie are concerned in the manner in which she conducted her business at the Manitoba Development Centre and the closing out of the Psychiatric School of Nursing at Portage la Prairie — (Interjection) — so are we. I've had hundreds of letters, and I've got people in Portage that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage wants the floor.

MR. L. HYDE: It's been brought to my attention by the Member for Flin Flon, that the Minister of Tourism has letters. No doubt, he has received letters in favour of the move that the government is making. There is no doubt about it.

A MEMBER: They don't count.

MR. L. HYDE: Certainly they do, but I am telling you that we received many many letters protesting the action of this government. You may have got one. I've got many . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I advise the Minister of Tourism not to provoke.

MR. L. HYDE: . . . by people who have patients in that school for years, and they don't want it disturbed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder, are any new positions going to be created, or were there new positions of employment as a result of this? Are you going to attempt to employ those people who will be losing their employment as a result of North Grove being shut down? Has the Minister any plan which is going to give us some indication as to what is going to happen with the employees?

HON. M. SMITH: The staff-resident ratio will be improved. As we've done everywhere else, the redeployment will be the way we will approach it. The staff-client ratio will improve from .91 and we project it will be about 1.04 at the end of Phase 3.

MR. A. BROWN: Do we have the information that the Member for Kirkfield Park was asking for yet? Is this coming? — (Interjection) — it's not here yet.

A MEMBER: We'll come back to it under the Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I suggested. We are holding the proceedings of the committee.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. If the information is going to come before 4:30, possibly we could deal with it this afternoon if we could have leave to go back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why can we not ask the questions under the Minister's Salary unless, of course, the question involves some factual information that is not available to the Minister?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I would imagine that I would hopefully be asking for factual information.

HON. M. SMITH: We'd like to facilitate the discussion. It just seems that, rather than waste time now, if we could go onto the next program and just reserve the item on the education for the time allotted for any general items under Salaries, it could be accommodated there. But it would seem, if we finish the other questions on this item, just as wise to move along.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we agree, by leave, to pass this item? When the information comes, the Member for Kirkfield Park will reserve her right to ask some more questions.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
3.(c)(1)—pass; 3.(c)(2)—pass; 3.(c)(3)—pass.
3.(d)(1) Programs: Salaries; 3.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(d)(3) Financial Assistance; 3.(d)(4) External Agencies - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, since this item deals with programs and program evaluation standards, I wonder if the Minister could give us a rundown of what's been happening, whether there have been program changes, changes in standards or whether anything has happened as far as evaluation is concerned. I wonder if the Minister has a statement on this item.

HON. M. SMITH: Since this is the section where the bulk of the impact of the Welcome Home Program shows, you can see by the big increases under (3) and (4) that there is quite a large addition of monies. I think last night, I referred to the improvements in the per diems in the 47 residences for the 340 beds, 340 clients. On average, they've moved from 21 to 30 per diem for the residential care. We're not quite as far ahead in developing standards for the vocational day activity programs, but they too are being slowly upgraded on average, from a \$6 per diem to an \$8 per diem.

Again, the continuum of services that we talked about last night at some considerable length, respite care, crisis intervention, that type of service, I think we went into it in considerable detail. That's basically the thrust of the program.

Again, the process by which we have arrived at these determinations and priorities has been working with the implementation teams throughout eight provincial regions and six sub-regions within Winnipeg.

MR. A. BROWN: In rehabilitation, for instance, does the Minister have any figure as to how many of the mentally retarded, or the handicapped, that were previously in institutions are out of institutions now and are either working in the labour force or have found some sort of employment?

HON. M. SMITH: The data base, I can just give you approximate figures now. Part of the process we've been going through is to get accurate counts on people because there was not a total system in place before to identify people. I can't give you all the accurate figures from what went on before. We talked last night about 3,500 people, in total, that we are dealing with. We have around 1,100 in occupational day activity centres; we have about 200 in sheltered workshops which is a little bit more demanding skill, a higher skill level work; and about the same number who have found their way into regular employment. But we will each year be in a slightly better position to track these numbers. It is because there has been no co-ordinated system in the past that we don't have back figures.

We do know that the institutional care has been downsized - well we know at MDC it is has been downsized from the early '70s when it was 1,170 to about 770 this year. So about 400 have made their way out into the community through that route and then, of course, others have been maintained in the community or at home by virtue of the other services that we're starting to develop.

MR. A. BROWN: We've been talking mainly about the mentally disabled so far. I wonder if the Minister could tell me what programs and what progress we have been making as far as the physically disabled are concerned. Have we any new programs that we are working on in order to try to get job opportunities for these people, many of whom would be capable of taking employment?

HON. M. SMITH: There are a variety of vocational training services that we have purchased from universities, community colleges, trade schools, industry and other special programs. We supply books, special

equipment and so on. There are about 510 people here, I'll just run down quickly. About 70 in the universities; 155 in community colleges; 63 in schools and colleges; 113 receiving training on the job; 53 in work training; 36 in life skills; 14 in special programs and six receiving special equipment and working in a modified workplace. We also have an interpreter service for 11 hearing impaired clients at Red River.

Again, this program has increased a very slight degree over last year, but it probably will see gradual expansion in the future. The main focus this year has been on the welcome home thrust.

There has been new funding provided of 130,000 for the independent interpreter referral service to assist the deaf and hard of hearing to function in a more normalized setting.

Our main funding to the disabled is through the Society for Crippled Children and Adults. We're the prime funder there.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister tell me whether any changes have been made at the school for the deaf? There seemed to be considerable concern expressed by this group that conditions were deteriorating at this school. Has there been a change in programming, a change in policy, a change in direction at the School for the Deaf or why did we have this flurry of concern that was shown by these people?

HON. M. SMITH: That facility comes under the Department of Education. They have had a marvellous new multi-purpose gymnasium added to their building. I don't know about the whole range of programs. I know that, having gone out to an open house there, I was most impressed both with the facilities and with the variety of services that were being provided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Last evening, when the Minister was discussing the moving of clients out of the Manitoba Development Centre, she talked about different regions and the fact that there was focus being put on particular regions for group homes and for the Welcome Home Program. In the community of Austin, in my constituency, there is a hard-working dedicated group of people working for the mentally retarded, and they are anxious to establish a group home. I think they are considering five beds with one respite bed, and they have been, for some time, hoping to get this under way. Could the Minister give us some idea when that might be possible and what criteria they have to have? What programs do they have to have in place in order to be given the opportunity to have this group home?

HON. M. SMITH: Last night, I did read out the allocation - it was around \$3 million - to the different regions to develop programming. Central region is the area where Austin is, and Austin was identified as one of the four centres to have a new residence.

There must be day programs available, and we've also granted extra money for respite care and crisis intervention, and a new regional staff position for that Central region.

The priorities were set by the local committees and, again, the type of criteria we used were that there were to be some people from the development centre who were ready to come, and whose families and communities wanted them to come, and some people, at risk, from the local community. The prioritization was done in co-operation with the local committees.

MRS. C. OLESON: I believe, in that case, there are some people locally that they want to include in their home, and there is a workshop situation in Austin. So that could be possibly part of their program. Could the Minister give us some idea of how soon they could get a project like this under way if they have all the criteria in place?

HON. M. SMITH: I've signed the letters reporting the allocation to the local areas, so it is just a question of them getting their plans in place, or implemented.

MRS. C. OLESON: It was a few weeks ago that I attended their meeting and I haven't been in contact with them since, so possibly their problem has already been addressed.

Could the Minister tell me if there are ever any of these group homes established in a rural farm setting? That was one question that was asked by some people in Austin. I'm wondering if there was a possibility of a farm setting where they could, as possibly part of their program, use the raising of animals and, for instance, market gardening, that type of thing as part of their program.

HON. M. SMITH: The approach that we have used throughout is to be very flexible at the local level in terms of the types of setting, provided adequate support and protection could be given, and day programming provided as well as residential care. So that would be an issue that would be discussed and decided at the local level. The central group would just ensure that there were adequate standards being met. But if that was an appropriate plan, it could go ahead.

MRS. C. OLESON: Has there been any of that type of program set up in the province?

HON. M. SMITH: We don't know. Again, the focus has been on starting with the individual and their needs and capabilities and then trying to place them in a setting where they could best function. So it would depend on the skill-ability level of the individuals rather than starting with programs and trying to find people to fit into them.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This question may have been asked already, I am not quite certain, but I would like to know under the Welcome Home Program, how many homes have been set up, and if I could have the locations of them? I believe that Austin certainly was one; Gimli, I believe there was another. Do we have a list of homes and locations?

HON. M. SMITH: I did read out the two pages, 11 and 12, of the Welcome Home newsletter. We'll make sure you have a copy. It identifies the towns and the locations

of the different homes. Again, the focus for this past year has been very heavily in the planning. The development of the homes, and the actual moving out of people will accelerate during this year and the year to follow.

MR. A. BROWN: My major concern here would be that there were things to do for these handicapped persons when they go back into the community. Are there workshops in each one of these communities?

HON. M. SMITH: Day programming plans are required as part of the total plan for the individual. There is not just the moving them out when there is a residential plan and ad hocing the day activity. The total planning for the individual must be in place before the move is made.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(1)—pass.
3.(d)(2) - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: On Other Expenditures I see that there is no increase in that particular item. Could the Minister give me a rundown of the funding under Other Expenditures?

HON. M. SMITH: Office and travel expenditure, program staff, and that was found to be a reasonable amount this past year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(2)—pass.
3.(d)(3) - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Under this item I see that there is a considerable increase in this particular item. Can the Minister explain the funding of that item?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, this is where the per diems on average vary. There is quite a range based on the level of care and the numbers in the residences, but they have moved on average from \$21 per diem to \$30.00. Again, developing in the settings, the life skills, the social skill training and supervised living skills, again, the needs vary depending on the individual.

MR. A. BROWN: Is this the level of care that we are talking about in each individual group home, and is this the funding under the Financial Assistance, or which are the areas that are being funded under this? The Minister said the per diems - I understand that - but is this for all the areas or is this for certain areas?

HON. M. SMITH: There's the per diems for the residential care in 47 residences. In addition, there is training in residences, and there is an increase there of \$181.5 thousand, bringing it up to \$380.8 thousand.

There is maintenance of the mentally retarded in the community. That is some support to families who are caring for mentally handicapped children at home. We were helping 25 families last year and expect that to remain about the same.

There is an adult day program where there has been an increase of \$163,800, which we expect will meet

the demand, bringing it up to 388,800.00. There is a supervised apartment living line which has been moved from 201.6 to 246.4, again to meet the increasing demand.

Respite care has jumped up from 173.2 to 630.2, again, short-term care relief to families of mentally handicapped children and adults; 390 families were helped in 1984-85. A largely increased number will be helped this next year. It's an important way of enabling families to manage with their mentally handicapped family members.

There is 75,000 for child development, infant stimulation-type of program. Fee for services, again to provide administrative grants to the 25 day program activity centres, has been increased from \$1,723,700 million to \$1.861,400 million.

There is also a subsistence allowance and transportation, vocational training, a small summer day program.

MR. A. BROWN: As a result of the respite program - and previously there was no funding available to members of a family, if they had a child, there was no assistance to them to keep it in their own home - as a result of changes that have been made, have any of these children moved back with their families; or is there any indication that, as a result of assistance to these families, more of these handicapped are now remaining with the families?

HON. M. SMITH: There was some relief for families that were caring for their own children. Last year, there was 173,200.00. This year, we've added another 457,000 so that care can be extended and protect the at-risk person in the community.

I don't have any figures as to whether that has enabled any return to the home of individuals. By next year, we should have a better reading as to whether that provides for that type of movement. The Welcome Home Project, of course, will bring family members back into the neighbourhood where their families are. So whether they're able to return to their home, or just to a home in the neighbourhood, there should be much more interaction and enrichment for the disabled person.

MR. A. BROWN: What assistance is available now for a family member if he was to remain in his home? Prior to this, there was no assistance. What assistance is there now?

HON. M. SMITH: There was 173,200 that assisted 390 families this past year. There was that in place. It wasn't a high respite service, but there was some.

Again, traditionally public monies rarely went to families. A person had the choice of struggling on their own, or putting their youngster in an institution. What we are saying is it makes more sense to provide selective help to the families to enable them to stay together and cope with the added load, rather than force the either/or decision on them.

That's why we have moved up the respite care quite substantially. Now we'll be carefully monitoring that to see how effective it is. Respite care is one of the preventive family support services that we would like to see greatly expanded over the whole field of Child

and Family Services, but it's going to take awhile to build up that program to meet all the need out there. We think it's a cost-effective way of helping families.

MR. A. BROWN: Last year, I brought to the Minister's attention a particular case in the Town of Winkler where the parents of this child live 30 miles outside of the Town of Winkler, there is an aunt living in Winkler who has under her care, I believe, about four or five mentally handicapped children who are attending a workshop, and she is looking after these people.

Now this family wanted the aunt to look after this particular child and she had great difficulty getting any assistance whatsoever. It seems to me that in instances such as that, that we should not discriminate just because it's a relative looking after the child.

Has anything been done in that regard to fix up situations such as that?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, I think the same answer applies in terms of respite care. Social policy in the past has usually said if a person is in the family unit, whether it's extended family or the nuclear family, that it's that family's responsibility to pay. If they can't manage, then they give up the child either to institutional care or some other type of foster care.

We have been questioning that in the total child and family service, arguing that sometimes it makes sense to give a little support to a family to enable them to stay together rather than observing the sharp split between no money to a family but quite a large amount of public money if you take a child out of the family. That's a direction we would like to go, but partly because there is always fear that too much money will be swallowed up, we have to move cautiously and work carefully with their criteria.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Royal Assent being scheduled at 4:20 p.m., is it the pleasure of the committee to rise now? Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 6, Universities Grants Commission, (a) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, when we broke last night, the Minister was suggesting to the members of the House that the problems that universities are experiencing at this particular point in time, I shouldn't say aren't any different, but they are no more onerous on the university system than problems that have come and gone over many years. I was surprised to hear the Minister respond in that fashion.

I am well aware, having been an active participant in university affairs during six years on campus, that there always were difficulties of sorts on the campus setting with respect to support of faculties, and financing and support particularly of additional capital construction.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, what we see occurring now is that in spite of the government's major increase in support of funding to universities, and to education

in general in the first year of their term, and I believe the Minister said it was somewhere around 16 percent, I am told by many students particularly those who are involved in student government at the university and the student association, that virtually all of that increase went to tenured professors, that very little of the major increases, or the increases that were provided by the NDP Government to the university in the first two years, was directed towards expansion of courses or upgrading of support services.

The reason I bring this situation up at all is I am surprised that the Minister feels that the problems we have today aren't a lot different than have always been in place. What I was trying to draw out of the Minister was some response with respect to the lack of flexibility that I and many other people see that is available to university administration.

I am told that because of the tenured system that is in place that administrations in universities have very little opportunity to affect savings throughout faculties, they have very little opportunity to cut courses in some area or do anything that will bring about an infusion of new staff in a significant fashion.

Before us at this sitting, Mr. Chairman, we have the Minister and the government bringing a bill in support of enhancing public school teachers' pensions. Part of the arguments used in support of that, and the main part I might add, is it will allow younger people with more vitality to come into the public school system. Surely, if that argument is supportable, and on the surface it's an argument that we don't disagree with, Mr. Chairman, but if that's supportable in the public school setting, obviously then that same argument has to be given some credibility as in the university setting.

Now that I have expanded in my understanding, at least, of what is meant by flexibility or lack of it, again I ask the Minister for one last time where she sees administration at universities have any opportunity whatsoever to deal with the problems at hand; and again I ask her whether she concurs with me or not as to whether the quality of education at universities, if it's not already fallen, it certainly will begin to fall very quickly if increases in support of education are not increased by a fashion any greater than they have been, or, secondly, if all the benefits of those increases, 2 percent or 3 percent, are immediately directed towards the faculty at the universities.

I think that was the intent of my first question in this whole area. I am trying to ascertain again whether the Minister feels that universities are in any different situation today than they have been in years past.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have an opportunity to clear up a misunderstanding that the Member for Morris has about what I was saying last night, because I wasn't saying that they are not in any different position than they were years ago or that the problems are exactly the same. I was relating those comments specifically to the quotes that he gave from articles where a number of people were writing articles and indicating some concern about what universities were doing, what was happening to universities, and the role of universities.

What I said there is, while I wasn't disputing the points that they made, that you could go back decades, or

one decade or even two decades, and find some people who had written articles indicating the same concerns and the same problems.

So when I was saying that there is a lot, I wasn't relating to the problems or to the challenges or things that universities are facing. Those comments were only related to recognizing that universities are always under a lot of examination, a lot of debate, a lot of discussion and a lot of criticism, and that hasn't changed.

However, the problems and the things that they are facing have changed and are going to be very different in the next decade or so, some of them are going to be the same and some of them are going to be different, and I outlined what some of them were.

I was saying certainly the level of funding is one issue, and all I can say is that had the members opposite, and I feel I have to say this, that one of the reasons that we had so much trouble when we took office, and one of the reasons why we gave such high increases initially is because of the level of funding in the previous four years. I just say that because that's a fact. I mean 2.2 percent, 5.9 percent, 8.8 percent, no increase in miscellaneous capital, it stayed at \$3 million for all of those years, no capital buildings, no new facilities or renovations and buildings. We had a lot of catching up to do.

So part of our problem is that we are dealing with the needs not only of the university in the four years that we're in but because of the problems that were created over the lack of and deficiencies in funding in previous years. They're in terms of the question of tenure - and there was a suggestion that while tenure may be an issue and there's a suggestion that all of the problems, including the level of funding and flexibility, are related to tenure and the fact that they're dealing with tenured people. I'm not sure and I don't have and the member didn't present any information that suggests that's so, I think there is a general statement that universities believe they don't have a lot of flexibility and he mentioned new programs. Well, we gave them new program money.

You didn't give them any new program money; you didn't approve any new programs while you were in office, but we did. We have given major expansions in programs at each university, not as much as they want, and they still have a list of things they want to do, but we are moving on program expansion.

I think the universities are looking seriously at early retirement as an option for the question of a number of experienced high-cost staff at the top end of the salary scale, which is the point he was raising and it really buys into the justification and the reasons we've given for the early retirement package in the public school side, and all of the arguments that we use there and all of the reasons I would use here and suggest that it certainly is worthy of their examining their contract and their agreements in seeing if they can negotiate an early retirement clause. Because that's one of the solutions, certainly one of the solutions to tenure, and if tenure is seen by a lot of people in the education system to be a major issue that they want discussed, Board of Governors, students, faculty, administration, they can suggest it and we would be probably be willing to look at it.

But I haven't had those suggestions made to me in all the meetings that we've had, I haven't had tenure

identified as one of the major issues that they want studied on and want something done about. You know, they're caught in the same squeeze that we all are during a difficult economic period, so we can't suggest that the universities are exempt from what we're going through in every other field, in every other department, in every other service. The public education system is under the same limitations as are other groups; and universities, while they suggested that they should be exempt from the limitations and there were reasons why they thought they should get more, so did everybody else think that way. Everybody could make a defence for their being able to get more than the amount that was being allocated across the board and justify it very well.

So what I said to the universities is you're getting the same as everybody else and you're going to have the same struggle to deal with it as we have had. I think they, as the other institutions, have done a good job. So you can't take all of the problems of the universities and sort of say that the 16 percent increase we gave in the first year and the 10 percent increase we gave in the second year and the 66 percent increase in Miscellaneous Capital and the \$30 million in Capital Construction, that those things haven't been enough, when under the circumstances they've been an extraordinary level of funding in all levels.

There are things that they can do. I don't buy quite frankly, and I would say this directly to them, that there's simply nothing they can do in terms of courses or programs. They must examine their programs and their courses like all of the rest of us. We're always examining them in the public school system and in the college system and we've found through our experience in the reforms that we introduced in colleges that if you had a sensible criteria, and we have seven-point criteria that you apply when you're looking at courses, that there is a rationale for eliminating some courses and programs so you can bring in some new programs. Educational institutions, all of them, have to learn that when they need to move in new directions and bring in new programs, they cannot keep doing everything they've been doing for the last 20 or 30 or 40 years, and just have it add on. They've got to develop criteria that examine things in the same rational way that the rest of us have been doing.

I think if I were going to sum up, that they're facing some very serious challenges and questions and opportunities. I mentioned funding, role and jurisdiction, keeping pace with technology, both as a method of teaching and its use in teaching, is something that the university has to do. The question of training for jobs versus broad liberal education is going to become a more serious issue; and accessibility, those issues, all mentioned last night, are going to become I think more serious issues over the time. But I think in terms of the support they've been given by this government, we've moved in every level that we could move in; improving their equipment, improving their facilities, increasing and expanding programs, and a fair and reasonable level of funding in terms of the funds that were available for all fields at that time - I might say in the first two years, the most generous level of funding they had received and the most generous level across the country.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to always want to enter into a major debate comparing

her support of university education to the previous government. I purposefully made my remarks and my question, I purposefully framed them in a fashion that would not draw us into a debate comparing one versus the other. I have given the Minister her due credit that in my view the increases in the first two years of the NDP administration were most acceptable, even though, as was pointed out by the Member for Turtle Mountain last night, that all other segments of government spending increased in a much higher fashion.

The point I was trying to find though and the point I was trying to solicit from the Minister, I was trying to determine whether she honestly believes that under the current makeup and the current restrictions in place in the universities, that they are in a position to grapple with the financial problems that they have. Now, I'm not trying to say to the Minister that a 10 percent increase in funding in '85 or '86, had that been possible, would have corrected that. I'm not standing here saying that. I am saying though that when I read the Winnipeg Free Press, May 30, 1985, when the University of Manitoba Faculty Association puts out an ad and headed "University of Manitoba Faculty Frustrated by Negotiations Breakdown", and I'll just read the final paragraph. The summation says the facts speak for themselves: "The Naimark administration's upcoming attitude threatens the long-term academic and economic health of the University, and in the short term, it threatens to provoke a crisis in labour relations which may disrupt the educations of thousands of University of Manitoba students when they return to classes in September."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister can say, well, that's negotiations, yes, and that is what is used by unions and associations to attempt to put their plight in front of the public, and that's the vehicle in place and I accept that. But the point is, Mr. Chairman, where are these situations going to lead? Is the Minister going to be a leader or is she saying that, no, particularly in the area of universities, their autonomy should be totally safeguarded and that whatever views that she has towards universities in the future she should keep to herself and allow the larger community to arrive at conclusions and policies that are going to attempt to address these types of public comments? Because the point is, Mr. Chairman, I think many university people that had those of us in attendance at their day of concern realize that public policy makers aren't stupid either, that they know that there is a restriction on the total resources that are available to government to direct toward any segment of society. But I came back with a view that they were at the point now when quality is, in some areas of Education, going to be threatened.

Now, that may say that over the last 15 years we've funded universities, all governments funded universities at a level which was not in keeping with the productivity of the province and the nation to support and that may be a valid argument. So, therefore, maybe we spent too much in those bygone days, in those better days.

But the point is and the reality is, we are where we are today and I'm wondering if the Minister is going to lead, first of all, in attempting to find solutions to these problems, or does she believe there are no problems and thirdly, if she does believe there are problems, is she saying to universities, you find the solutions on the basis of whatever money we, as

government, provide to you, because she can't say on one hand that it's up to the university and yet on the other hand say this whole problem of access also has to be considered. And I know the Minister's view, she wants open access and free university to those who want to attend in whatever number. I know that's the ideal that is held by the Minister.

So I don't know where between these wonderful ideals, one hand the university allowed total autonomy and yet in the Minister's view, being able to grapple with its own problems and yet the Minister's ideal being university that allow access to everybody who wants to go for the broad based liberal education. Surely, it's incumbent upon her to find some reality between those two ideals and that's what I'm asking her to do. Is there some place between the two?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, I guess I might have been a little confused in the way the questions were being put because at first I thought the Member for Morris was suggesting to me that he was concerned there wasn't enough flexibility with universities and that their hands were tied and they didn't have enough flexibility to do what they wanted to do. Then as he got farther into the preamble or the points he was making, I began to feel that the question and the concern he had was one of autonomy and that he was raising the question not of giving them more flexibility or did they have enough to do the job, but should they be left to be as autonomous as they were, or should the government or the Department of Education or the Minister of Education be, and he called it showing leadership, but it would be intervening and in terms of their local autonomy and control.

I'm still not sure which it is he wants but I gather from his last remarks that he's actually leaning towards a bit more of some kind of an intervention or, takeover isn't the word, but some less autonomy and some taking over by the government or the Department of Education - is he shaking his head, or nodding his head, I can't quite tell - and I think that I did touch on this before, because in some other province they are moving to take over and take control of the universities and as often is the case with other things, in Manitoba we don't move quite to those extremes.

We do give them some idea of what we're feeling and what we're thinking, but we're working in a much more co-operative way. We don't just leave them; we give direction and we give our thoughts in a number of ways. They also get it from the Universities Grants Commission who sits and reviews and gives consideration to broad issues, not just specific funding issues and programs, but broad issues of education. So there are people who are taking those roles and I would prefer to continue on the co-operative model, I think, where you sit down with them and between the government and between the universities and the Grants Commission, you work out the direction and the issues and what is going to be done.

In terms of the points about the bargaining - and he read off some quotes about the collective bargaining - I mean that is the bargaining posture and we all know that the things that went in the papers there, not to say the issues aren't legitimate issues, but it's part of the bargaining process and it's supposed to bring

pressure on the other side to get their message out to the public to get some support and some sympathy.

So one can't take things like that that are a normal part of the process and suggest that the universities are going to hell in a bread basket as a result of it, you know; nor will I accept, nor do I accept, nor do I think he's put anything on the table that suggests that the quality of education has deteriorated - that doesn't mean I'm not saying we have some problems - because I continue to recognize and say that we have problems in every institution and at every level; improvements in program and things that we have to make at every level. I always try to identify them and talk about what they are.

At the same time, I always talk about the improvements we've made; the good things that there are in education; the quality of education that we have now while we're trying to improve the quality of education that we're going to have in the future. I have nothing that suggests, with everything I know about the problems that they're struggling with as we all are, the improvements that they need to make, I have nothing that suggests to me that the quality of education in our universities has deteriorated or is any less than it was in previous years. And in many cases, I am sure we could demonstrate that it's better.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I like to feel that I'm reassured by the Minister's last answer. I don't think I went on the record as saying the quality of education was falling. I hear people say that as the Minister does, these just aren't students, these are people of the university community and the Minister says she has some way of disproving that in some certain areas. Well, I'd be happy to hear her submission in support of her argument, that, in fact, quality is increasing in some areas, so she can lay that before me if she wishes.

With respect to the government influencing to a greater degree actions or decisions of the university, I wasn't suggesting that either. The Minister did say though, in her view she felt that, at least I think she said, there are solutions available to some of these problems and I'm wondering if she would share them with us. That was the intent of the first question. If she believes there are problems in the university setting and she has solutions, even though she wishes maybe not to enforce them through the Universities Grants Commission I ask her, can she at least share with us in the House and the people of Manitoba what she sees as potential solutions?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking in very broad terms about solutions, I believe, and when I said there are solutions, there are solutions and ways to improve any program that you've got in any department and in any service. I mean we all know that. We can always improve and there are always solutions to problems.

I was talking more about process, I think, in determining solutions and what I'm saying there is, there are things that can be done and that we're going to have to consider and those decisions should be made jointly, I think, through the Grants Commission, through the universities, through meetings and discussions with

students and faculty as we've been having and administration, and that that's how we should be deciding how to deal with them; as opposed to making a decision to deal with them in an arbitrary manner where the government decides what the problems are and decides what the solutions are. So it was in that context I think I was making the point.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister indicate whether any guidelines were put into place to universities this year as to what maximum level tuitions can increase for the next coming year, I take it?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the universities this year, I believe, stuck to an increase of 6 percent for tuition. I think that both the universities and the students and the government all agreed that was a reasonable increase.

MR. C. MANNES: Why did the government, a couple years ago, insist that universities not increase tuitions by any degree?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Because that's the one where we paid the tuition fee increase. There's a misunderstanding that there was a year when there was no tuition fee increase. There was no tuition fee increase paid by the students and no increases attached to tuition that was paid and came out of the pockets of the students but, at that time, we were in discussions with the universities, and we believed that there was going to be a 10 percent increase, as I recall. That was the suggestion and what they were looking at that year.

Because we wanted to maintain our tuition still at one of the lowest in the country - and that continues to be a goal - the government decided that year that we would pay the tuition. What we did, Mr. Chairman, was take an additional \$1 million and put it into the pot that went to universities. So universities got their tuition fee increase; they got it from the Government of Manitoba and not from the students.

MR. C. MANNES: I know the university and many members of the government support free university education to all. How is it then that the government is allowing tuition increases on one hand when, in principle, it is totally opposed to the levying of any tuition fees?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, because unfortunately we don't live in a perfect world. We're quite aware of that; we're very realistic and very practical. We have said repeatedly that we would like to have no tuition, that we would like to be able to remove tuition, but it isn't possible and it isn't practical with the tradition and with the history and with the building in of the tuition fees into . . .

MR. C. MANNES: The real world of economics.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well we're very practical of the real world of economics, as the Member for Morris knows.

So what we want to work towards as a goal is one thing, and since we know we can't achieve that, what

we have tried to do is to keep them as low as possible is to, when the economy is difficult and money is tight, say that there is a limit to which they should increase.

If you'll remember, there were some years where we were hearing talk and discussions of 25 percent, 26 percent increases in tuition. Maybe some of that was talk, too, but it's possible that the increases would have been significantly larger had there not been, I would say, a government in place whose attitude and philosophy was that they should be kept low, and that the increase that was attached to students and the burden that was put on the students should be kept as low as possible. So it's a goal.

I suppose, if we ever get to a period where we've got lots of money around like we had in previous years, and I don't see it coming for quite awhile, I suppose that is one of the things that you might move towards. In the meantime, our goal is to try and maintain the tuition fees to continue to be one of the lowest in the country so that it doesn't affect accessibility to students.

MR. C. MANNESS: What a difference two years makes, Mr. Chairman. Just two years ago, the Minister - and I have it documented - said we'd turned the corner, the recovery is here.

Mr. Chairman, did the government take seriously at all the funding proposal put before it by the University of Manitoba Students Union, dated January 29, 1985, in which the association indicated that tuition fees should increase by 4 percent, the government's contribution should be increased by 4 percent; and I believe there was some requirement of the Faculty Association, maybe they would take a 0 percent increase. Did the government look seriously at all at that proposal?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, when we were going through the process of determining the funding to the universities, and included in that question has always attached to it, has always been the question of the level of increase for tuition. There is always a lot of discussion back and forth and a lot of positions put on the table.

Yes, the 4 percent was put on the table and it was considered, but when all the negotiations and all of the discussions took place - and there were many - I don't think there was disagreement, because I talked to the students from each of the universities after the decision had been made. While they might have preferred that it was at 4 percent - they would always prefer it to be smaller - the 6 percent was an acceptable figure to them. There wasn't anybody who came back and said that they either couldn't live with it or it wasn't acceptable. So the 4 percent was sort of a bargaining point and a point that they put on the table, but that doesn't mean they were opposed to the 6 percent.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I just mentioned it because I thought it was a very credible proposal, and one where I saw the students, at least, were prepared to recognize the realities of the day and were prepared to make a direct contribution.

The Minister indicates some confusion. This was signed by Carol Manson, President, UMSU. The covering letter I have came to my leader on February

27th, but the proposal date on the cover page of the proposal is January 29, 1985. I don't know whether that was presented to the government. I take it, it was, I can't see much use for the association to develop it and send it only to the opposition.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me what additional faculties will be putting in place enrolment limits in the fall of 1985?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: To our knowledge, I don't believe there are any additional faculties putting enrolment limitations.

MR. C. MANNESS: The Science Faculty at the University of Manitoba and the Agricultural Faculty, will they be removing their enrolment restrictions, or will there be any change in those statuses?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think there's no change in the status, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, if you would just give me a moment, please.

Mr. Chairman, in question period, I had the opportunity to pose a question of the First Minister with respect to the Bovey Commission looking at the future development of universities in Ontario. I believe the Minister of Education was not in attendance during that period of time. The First Minister indicated to me that the Government of Manitoba would be significantly in opposition to many of the recommendations and conclusions reached within that particular review of Ontario's universities.

Can the Minister tell me what her personal position is with respect to many of the recommendations made? I am not referring only to those involving tuition. Obviously, the Minister must have read this and digested it in fair detail as it represents, in my view, the latest attempt to grapple with the problems of universities in the future.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all I don't have the Bovey Commission Report before me, and haven't looked at it for some time, but I can give some general comments.

First of all, the position that was taken by me I would like to say was a position that was taken by most of the other council of Ministers. I was at the council of Ministers' meeting when the Bovey Report was presented, and they had a fairly extensive overview and discussion of it. During the discussion, other Ministers made it very clear that while they were interested in hearing what was being done in Ontario and while they were interested in hearing the recommendations that were coming through the Bovey Commission, they in no way wanted to have any suggestion that listening to it, hearing it and discussing it, meant that it had been accepted or that the recommendations had been accepted by the council of Ministers and that's not to say that there weren't some good suggestions in it.

They had some good ideas such as centres of excellence and, as a matter of fact, I have referred to that a bit in terms of our universities. While we haven't described them as formally, it is something that I have been talking to them about for the last three years,

where they become centres of excellence and it is understood what they are, what centres of excellence they are.

And I am trying to think of what some of the main problems were. There were a number of main concerns. One of them was, that some of the statements that were made, there was a feeling by a fair number of Ministers that there was no justification for it. In fact, there was no information on which to base some of the statements and some of the recommendations that were made.

There was, I actually remember, Betty Stephenson, the Minister of Education, in her response, indicating that in some cases she agreed. In some cases, there were major recommendations for change, but it's not really a rationale or adequate information or statistics to suggest that what they were suggesting was true.

So some of the concerns related to the basis on which recommendations were made. Others were that it seemed to be a very elitist document; that, in other words, the structure and the system seemed to be one that was moving towards a very elitist system, identification of almost like a creaming at the top and moving towards that. Of course, that is the opposite of what we believe.

What we believe, for instance, has been demonstrated through our access programs is that when you have an elitist system, you are closing the door to many many people who can handle post-secondary education, but who can never get in if you set up a structure like that.

Higher tuition fees was another of the elements. Capping of student enrolments in general, I think, without any sort of rationale or reasons not related to a period where there was a major increase in students they couldn't handle because of facilities or reasons like that, but just a capping of student enrolment really to limit the numbers of people who could go was his basic reason.

So, you know, things like the Bovey Report are interesting, and there is something we should look at to see what direction they are going in and what they are moving in, but I don't think there should be any suggestion that an examination of a system that isn't even based exactly as ours is, is something that we should take seriously.

If we want to look at the role and the function of the university system, we should look at our own, and it should be based on our own system and our own philosophy. We should come up with our own ideas, although I don't mind taking good recommendations from another province.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I've read the report on a couple of occasions, and I think there are some very significant remarks in it that have application to every province. Of course, not every one of them is mirrored in a fashion like Manitoba. But remember the Minister - and I'm referring to Page 5 of the report - should be cognizant of the major objectives and the assessment goals of the report.

These were the basic underlying assumptions or premises:

The first, of course, was the element in the proposed strategy as a recognition of the vital importance of higher education.

Secondly, University research and scholarship is an investment and a development of knowledge.

Thirdly, in the proposed strategy is a greater emphasis in a period ahead upon excellence and adaptability.

The fourth element is an encouragement of further differentiation between Ontario universities.

The fifth element is the enhancement of accessibility is desirable.

The sixth being the encouragement of closer linkages with and increased support from the private sector through universities.

The seventh entails a revision of the arrangements for public funding of the university.

Mr. Chairman, those seven strategies are the basis in which the commissioner went out and attempted to gain insights into where the university community and the whole configuration of universities in that province should head over the number of years. Certainly the Minister can't argue with any of those strategies.

But coming out of the recommendations - and I won't move into the area of quality or the priority for excellence because the Minister and I have discussed that in some fashion within the public school system - but within the area of accessibility and demand, these statements are made, and I quote from Page 8, "At the same time, within the available financial resources this objective has to be placed against the priority for quality. Furthermore, in determining eligibility for access, the commission has concluded in the interests of both quality and equity that admissions direct from secondary schools should be based on a combination of teacher's marks and school reports and of province-wide admission examinations assessing achievement in at least language, English or francais and mathematics."

It goes on, "While many of the school and teacher organizations who appeared before us opposed reliance solely upon province-wide admission examinations, many from the private sector and from the university community favoured such examinations as ensuring greater reliability and equity standards."

Continuing, "Perceptions of inequities arising from admissions to university based on varied school standards lay at the heart of much of this latter pressure. It seems to us that basic admissions on a combination of 50 percent for such examinations and 50 percent for teachers' marks and school reports concerning motivation and relevant extra curricular activities, would provide the soundest and most equitable foundation upon which universities might make their admissions judgments."

I read that, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister has made reference to access on a number of occasions in her answers. We have discussed provincial testing, the concept of provincial examinations on previous occasions. Yet I'm wondering how she can consider access without some greater reliance on a system of provincial examination given, not only by this report's analysis, but by the Minister's own admission, we have some points of major restrictions to enrolment within the total university community. The good years and the times of the post-war baby booms when universities had to accommodate these larger numbers of students, myself being one of them, I might add, Mr. Chairman, we're to a point now that can the Minister, first of all,

see where we can increase, significantly, university numbers to accommodate, and I believe from memory, are we somewhere around 20 percent of our — (Interjection) — 15 percent or 16 percent, or is it 8 percent of our post-secondary graduates find their way into university? I know that number is somewhere back. But to what degree can we increase it?

Secondly, if we don't have the financial resources to increase it beyond the present point, then isn't it incumbent that we bring into place some system of measuring more fairly and more equitably the scholastic progress of students within high school such that those who should be at university are there?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm not sure what the question is in there, and I think there were a number of them. I guess we'll deal, first of all, with the university numbers. We have a slight increase, very small, somewhere between 0 percent and 1 percent in the university population this year. There were predictions a number of years ago and an expectation that enrolment at the universities was going to drop considerably. That has turned out not to be the case, and it's for a number of reasons.

One of them is that the faces of the students in the target populations that are going to school have changed considerably. There are many more part-time, many more adult, many more mature people going to school or going back to school. But the expectation is over the next decade or so that it will be reasonably flat. In other words, we didn't anticipate the decrease they were expecting previously, and we're not anticipating a large increase in enrolment, fairly stable, although I believe that the population inside of it may change. I think that there may be changes in terms of who is going to university and the faces of the students. But I think that the enrolment in general will stay fairly stable.

Then there were two things. He did a lot of talking again about the Bovey Report, and made a number of quotes from it. While I wouldn't quarrel with any of the recommendations either, some of the specifics - and those were general goals he sort of quoted from - some of the specific recommendations I don't think tie in with the general goals. So there's some contradictions there.

But the Bovey Report has no particular status. I'm not sure how relevant it is in the discussion today to be quoting from it as if it's both a major document and one that has been proven and accepted, because even the Ontario Government hasn't accepted it yet and hadn't previously, even prior to the election. They had asked for it, but they have some cautions about it too. We're not at all sure how they were going to handle it, or whether all of it or some parts of it would be introduced.

So at this point, it's considered a discussion piece. For us in Manitoba, when it's not even based on our system, to be treating it any more seriously than an interesting discussion piece that's going on in another province about their university system, I think would not be a very good idea.

In terms of the provincial exams - and then he wanted to get into the assessment question again because he says they recommended 50 percent teacher exams and

50 percent provincial exams - I think he seems to be suggesting, because it's in the Bovey Commission, it's a good idea. I don't buy that.

We had a lot of discussions previously about testing and what were good predictors to predict student success and student ability to handle post-secondary education. We did this on the public school side, but the information that I gave suggests that the greatest predictor of success in post-secondary education is teacher marks. One of the least able to predict ability to handle a post-secondary program is provincial examinations. Incredibly - and I don't know what this says about all of our exams and studies, I'm almost reluctant to say it - but the greatest predictor seemed to be the greatest measurement, the one that was the most predictable, able to predict, had nothing to do with tests at all, as I recall. I don't have the public school side and information here, but it had to do with their involvement in - what do we call it, activities outside of school - in extra-curricular activities. The students' involvement and the level of involvement in extra-curricular activities was a better predictor of their success in later life and post-secondary education than were any of the tests, including the teacher tests.

But when you're looking at tests, certainly the teacher tests are a far better predictor. Out of all the tests, the ones that are done by teachers are a far better predictor than those done by, say, a general test either by the province or the university.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I don't know when the Minister makes reference to the study indicating that students involved in extra-curricular activities tend to be the better students. I don't know if that came out of the St. James School Division Report where they assessed all their graduates — (Interjection) — oh, the Minister indicates it came out of the department. I have heard references made to other studies that would concur with her department's results.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make and I guess the question I'll ask, have the universities through the Universities Grants Commission or have university presidents, in discussion with the Minister, ever indicated to her their concern with the quality of education, the quality of student that is coming to university in general? Have they requested at all of the Minister that she give consideration to considering either Grade 12 provincial examinations or, failing that, her blessing if universities deem it wise to have entrance examinations?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The answer, Mr. Chairman, is no. I have had numerous discussions with university presidents. I guess they've had other discussions with the Grants Commission. While we have raised a number of issues and they've been concerned about equipment - I mean, I must say largely their concerns are related to funding, although we try more and more to get into other broad questions that are important like accessibility and enrolment limitations and visa students, the question of visa students and students outside of the province, where we have discussed issues like that.

I do not recall, in any of our discussions, a feeling of concern or an indication from the university

presidents that they believed the quality of education was deteriorating and they believed that something should be done about it. I have not, to my recollection, had any of them suggest that we move towards provincial exams or entrance exams, to me.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I have before me the University of Manitoba enrolment as of October 1, 1984-85, at least as published in the Manitoban newspaper, dated October 31, 1984. Can the Minister tell me which faculties were responsible for the 1 percent increase in numbers that she referred to a few minutes ago?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's a very small percentage overall, and we would have to do some figuring to find out exactly where the increase is coming, which faculty. If you want it, we can get it. It would be a very small increase regardless of where it is.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, a more general question, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate whether this 1 percent increase in numbers was experienced by all three of our universities or was there some difference between them?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's an overall average and I think it's under 1 percent. I said the range was about .5 percent.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, using this as a guide and I'm sorry the Minister doesn't have this, but last year, for example, in Administration Studies, 1,323 students were enrolled as full-time students. I don't have the breakout as to how many of that total represented first-year students. But my question to the Minister, within that faculty is there an enrolment limit or indeed, what criteria have to be reached if one wanted to gain entry to that faculty?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, as far as we know, there isn't an enunciative policy of enrolment limitations in that faculty. I just wanted to give a little bit of additional information on the percentage increase. It appears to us in looking at the figures that one of the places that has had the highest increases is the St. Boniface College, and of course we've had some expansion in programs there last year, so that would be one of the things that would account for it.

MR. C. MANNES: Changing the subject somewhat, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me whether it's her intention to bring forward legislation that will give to the University of Brandon an act governing university affairs during this Session?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the answer is no, not during this Session. The requests and the recommendation, the proposal that Brandon University have made are presently before the Universities Grants Commission and it's my understanding that because there are fairly significant changes that would result in changes of authority and responsibility and accountability that are changes to the entire university system that we have, not just Brandon University, that

the grants commission is taking a fairly long and hard look at it which I expect them to do. So I do not expect them to be making a recommendation to me and I do not expect to be moving in this Session of the Legislature.

MR. C. MANNES: Last year during Estimates, we spent a considerable time with respect to the affairs of the Brandon University. In light of the firing of Dr. Perkins and the fact that Brandon University now has a new full-time president - I don't know how to pronounce his name, John Mallea - can the Minister divulge at this time, the state of negotiations or the state of affairs between the Brandon University and Mr. Perkins as to his claim against the university?

Well, I suppose the Minister is claiming some type of amnesty from responding to that. — (Interjection) — Of course, the Minister of Labour jumps to her support very quickly and the Minister of Finance jumps too.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I cannot respond to that question. It would be very inappropriate for me to respond to that question. It's not that I don't want to.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are some sensitive people over there. I would ask the Minister how the Brandon Foundation is doing in being able to raise funds in support of the Music Building at the University of Brandon.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The fund raising has continued to go slowly and I understand that the Brandon University Board of Governors has recently hired a consultant - I'm just looking for the name - and they are putting their fund raising program in the consultant's hand, Gordon Goldie and Company.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, has not that consultant performed his task and reported to the university by this time and if he has, can the Minister share the conclusions of his report?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand he's reported to the board but we do not have a copy yet. When we get it, we'll be quite happy to share it.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm lead to believe that the particular company in question, Gordon L. Goldie Company Limited filed a report March 8th with the Board of Governors in which it was indicated that they felt that it would be very difficult to raise funds at that time. Is the Minister saying that she was not aware of this report?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the information I have is that the Board has not accepted all the recommendation and in any case, they have not passed either the information or the recommendations on to me.

I might also say that we have said all along in this Chamber that it was going to be difficult to raise funds and that the Brandon Board was going to have difficulty and we were very concerned right from the beginning

with the level and the size of the project that they wanted to bring into place, because we thought that it was too large and we did not approve it. If you remember, I think we gave our approval at a certain level and they were \$1 million or \$2 million above that. We said very clearly, we don't think you can justify the building of that size; we think you'll have trouble raising the money for a building of that size and we will approve a certain amount of it, that which we think is justifiable and if you choose to go beyond that and build a facility that is greater than that which is approved, you do it on your own hook, Mr. Chairman. You do it knowing that you will have to produce the rest of the money and cannot come to government for that.

So we've been very practical all along in saying we thought it would be difficult and we thought they should have cut their plans to suit the cloth that they had in their hand. What they've had approval for is \$5 million project and provincial government put in \$2.1 million, the Federal NEED grant was \$1.4 million and they were counting on \$1.4 million from their fund.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate when the Board of Governors will decide what to do with this report and have they given her any indication as to when they will proceed with a major fund raising program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, I have not been; I don't know when they're going to give me that indication. It could be that they see that that's something that they have undertaken. It's their job. It isn't really related to us since this government has been very clear. If they don't raise the money, they can't come back to us to ask for it. We've been very clear on the level of the approval that we have given to date. So it's something that they undertook. They've got the report; they're dealing with the recommendations; they're doing their job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'm informed that the Lieutenant-Governor is arriving shortly to give Royal Assent to some bills. Is it the will of the committee to rise?

Committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason): Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

Her Honour Pearl McGonigal, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

Mr. Speaker addressed Her Honour in the following words:

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour.

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent:

No. 64 - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'assurance-maladie.

No. 79 - The Highway Traffic Act; Le Code de la route.

No. 80 - The Summary Convictions Act; Loi sur les poursuites sommaires.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: In Her Majesty's Name, Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 4:30, and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the Order Paper for Wednesday is Proposed Resolutions, Resolution No. 8 moved by the Honourable Member for Thompson, the Honourable Minister of Labour has 20 minutes.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as Acting House Leader, if there is an inclination to call it 5:30, we will call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister wish to make that motion?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, I had not risen to speak on the resolution; I had risen as Acting House Leader to move that, in view of the consensus that we call it 5:30, I so move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).