

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 1, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY — LEGISLATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members to Page 3 of the Main Estimates, Department of Legislation. We are on Resolution No. 3, Clause 6. Ombudsman: (a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, before the luncheon break I made some comments to the Minister and I would ask him if he would care to respond. The Ombudsman has made some scathing denunciation of government policy in regard to the need for a new facility at The Pas Correctional — if not the construction of a new facility which is long overdue, well-known to the members of this House and in particular the First Minister who served as Attorney-General, and talked about and was approached to construct a new facility some 20 years ago; certainly known to the Minister of Health, to the Attorney-General, . . .

A MEMBER: And the previous ones.

MR. DOERN: And the previous ones, and known to our administration as well, Mr. Chairman. The difference being that our administration decided to act, develop plans, produced the working drawings, and let the contract. And if there had been no interference . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well, I will try once more. Maybe I am overly sensitive because I have just gone through my Estimates with the same member two days ago, three days ago, where we discussed this same item in terms of how it affects perhaps the Department of Government Services. It has been discussed fully with the Minister of Health and Social Development's Estimates. It's been brought up with the Attorney-General's Department Estimates.

I'm just pointing out to you, Sir, that once again, once again, the members opposite are using this particular opportunity to totally ignore and thwart the purposes of the particular Estimates that are now before us.

So, I humbly bring it to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that the members opposite are showing a very purposeful intent of disobeying the ruling that you made, Sir, last night on this subject matter and the vote that actually occurred on this subject matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the honourable members . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same point of order?
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I have no intention of unduly prolonging this department. I believe my remarks are in order. I'm dealing with the report of the Ombudsman and the government is interfering with the right of the opposition to discuss the business of the House. And by jumping on members of the opposition they are simply prolonging the Session, antagonizing everybody on both sides the House and bringing the business of to a stop.

I think if some of the members on the opposite side would restrain themselves and allow free speech, we will deal with the issues and we'll get the business done. —(Interjections)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, again I have allowed some latitude. The item under

discussion is Ombudsman; some of the other discussion and debate has been on other departments but as I say I have allowed some latitude and I would hope that the honourable members would stick to the subject of Ombudsman as a caution, rather than as a criticism.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I was just concluding a brief comment, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister of Health challenged me as I was speaking, and indicated that our government had not acted on the very point raised in the Ombudsman's Report. The Ombudsman made the point that there are violations of federal and provincial statutes. Our government took action in that regard, provided trailers and was about to construct a new facility which would have met all the complaints of the Ombudsman. That was in process; that took several years to develop, government works rather slowly at times. It took several years to get the approvals and then to get the working drawings approved, the contract tendered and the contract was then let, and now, the government, because of its stop is confronted by a lawsuit, Mr. Chairman.

I want to ask the Minister whether he has discussed this matter with the Ombudsman and whether he is satisfied, namely, the Ombudsman, if the Minister can report whether the Ombudsman is satisfied with the reaction of the government, which I take to be a non-reaction or a no-action on the recommendations of the report. They have had the report since February; I believe there has been no progress, and I believe that the government has, if not a legal obligation to follow the recommendations of the Ombudsman's Report, at least a moral obligation. So perhaps the Minister could comment.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, certainly the remarks of the Ombudsman relative to The Pas Correctional Institution have been noted. The matter has been frequently brought to the attention of Ministers on this side by members of the opposition through the debates of the Minister for Government Services, the Minister of Health and the Attorney-General. So, Mr. Chairman, there is no possibility that this has escaped our attention. He has been assured by the Ministers responsible that action is being taken to correct this difficult situation. This does not end the debate. Following the passage of the Estimates, there will be a General Appropriations Bill and a wide-ranging debate is permitted there. But again, Mr. Chairman, we are getting into a re-examination of the departmental Estimates during which this particular subject was rather extensively debated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I should like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 25 students of Grades 3 and 4 standing from Westgrove School under the direction of Mrs. Nancy Roskam. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood, the Honourable First Minister.

We have 25 students from St. John's High School under the direction of Mr. Bochinski. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

We have 21 students of Grades 6 and 7 standing from the Laurier School under the direction of Mrs. Normandeau. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

We have 50 students of Grade 6 standing from Riverview School under the direction of Mr. Roch. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborn,

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

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, the Ombudsman's report was about 100 pages long. It dealt with a dozen departments and in most cases the recommendations were either implemented or the Ombudsman solved the matter on his own, however you want to look at it. The one outstanding area where there has been no government action or little government action is in this section on The Pas Correctional. I have looked through the report. I have seen the various recommendations and the solutions. This is the outstanding area. So I say, Mr. Chairman, three things here.

Number 1, the government has really failed to move on a new facility. They're still studying after a year and a half the need for a new facility.

There are two other outstanding points on this matter, and that is that in the meantime they should have separated the juveniles from the adults. They have talked about taking over a new building; they've talked about renovating some new space. They have talked about separating juveniles from adults, but they have not taken any action. This after their term in office and after this report. That's a second area, Mr. Chairman. Talk about action but no action.

And finally, what I said earlier, the government is in violation of federal and provincial statutes and I think that when the Attorney-General of the province can sit there — after three months he was asked in this House by members of the opposition on the condemnation of the Ombudsman

to rectify a situation where they're in violation of provincial and federal statutes. It takes them three months, Mr. Chairman, to study the matter. Well, nobody on the government side can justify that kind of a delay. All it would take to get an opinion would be a few days or a couple of weeks. It doesn't take 90 days to get a legal opinion from a department. That's clearly a case of avoiding one's responsibilities or sitting on a matter.

I say that the question that the government must answer in that regard is: Are they above the law? Do they regard themselves as being above the law? Because they have now studied the matter which was drawn to their attention and they have admitted that they are in violation of provincial and federal statutes. Yet they continue to do nothing. They continue to study, to monitor, which in our language, Mr. Chairman, is synonymous with doing nothing. So I ask the Minister again, and I don't intend to prolong this much more. I ask him again, is he going to ride herd on this? Is he going to require or force or press or urge or implore his colleagues, the Minister of Health, the Attorney-General, to do something about what is a deplorable and long-standing issue, one that should have been solved by letting nature take its course, one which they deliberately blocked 18 months ago and now they find themselves in a very difficult position.

So I ask him whether he, as the one who represents the Ombudsman, who is an independent objective person in Cabinet and in government, whether he is going to attempt to solve the problems raised in this report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass; 6—pass; Resolution No. 3— pass.

Resolution No. 4: Administration, (a)—pass; (b)—pass; (c) — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry, Sir, did you move to Executive Council?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I went to the very next Resolution; I should have called out Executive Council.

MR. CHERNIACK: And if so, having moved to Executive Council, Mr. Chairman, did you call (a) ahead of all the other items?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: (a) being the Salary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I apologize to the honourable members. The heading on this department is Executive Council.

SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 4: 1.Administration, (a)—pass — Do you wish to speak?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the practice accepted is that the Minister's Salary is dealt with last as I recall it, and this is the Salary, (a), 1.(a) is the salary of the Minister responsible for the Executive Council. So I think, Mr. Chairman, one should move to (b) and by-pass (a) until you've dealt with all the other items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: On a point of order. I wonder if it would be agreeable to members of the House if we could deal with the two other items here before going to Executive Council, and that is the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote and General Salary Increases; we might perhaps deal with those two lines first?

SUPPLY — CANADA-MANITOBA ENABLING VOTE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the members' attention to page 79 of the Main Estimates, Resolution 109: Item 1. Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote; (a)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I might just by way of explanation remind the members of the remarks made by the Minister of Finance during his Budget presentation with respect to this

Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, and I can repeat those remarks for the benefit of the record. He indicated that members can appreciate there is considerable variation in the rate at which new and amended agreements between Canada and Manitoba can be implemented and to ensure flexibility in the implementation process.

Approximately \$9.7 million has been allocated to this appropriation, No. 26, in the following manner: For existing agreements 15 percent of approved project amounts have been transferred from the implementing departments to the Enabling Vote; that is this vote, and (b) For new agreements and programs estimated 1979-80 requirements have been included in the Enabling Vote in total. This enabling authority will be administered through the Department of Finance and allocated to implementing departments on the basis of their cash flow requirements."

Mr. Chairman, I make that explanation just to remind the members of the reason for this particular appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For clarification, how does that reconcile? Do we see an item similar to this where we can relate to this under the Department of Agriculture? It suggests \$660,000 is recoverable from Canada. Can the Minister advise where, in the Agricultural Estimates there is some reconciliation or counter-reference?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, the particular amount to which the member alludes is the Value Added Crops Production Agreement and this is a new program with the Department of Agriculture, and I understand was considered and explained during the Estimate of that department. The idea and purpose of this appropriation — this particular amount — is to provide for an unspecified amount of expenditure during the coming year.

And again, as I explained in the opening remarks, this is a new agreement and we're including here what we estimate to be the 1979-80 requirements in the Enabling Vote in total. This is a 5-year program, Mr. Chairman, and will amount in total during the five years to \$18.5 million and during the first year of it the expenditures will normally be somewhat lower and as the program develops become larger. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for that explanation. He did make reference to some possibility of a discussion of this in the Department of Agriculture Estimates. I was not present at those Estimates and I don't disagree with this expenditure item or the intent of that item, but I wondered if it is possible for some more detailed explanation as to what we do with this \$1.1 million. Is it a matter of paying subsidies directly to farmers; is it a matter of paying it into some type of agriculture research; is it a matter of putting agriculture infrastructure in place; is there some explanation as to what that \$1.1 million will be spent on?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe again that while the member was not present perhaps during the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, there was an explanation of this new program and this is an estimate of the amount of expenditure, and only an estimate at this time, that will be required during this first year of the program, and if the member requires a greater detail on that, it will be necessary to obtain that information for him.

MR. EVANS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of procedure, it seems to me in years gone by, when we dealt with a general item such as this — and I might add a very significant item, it's a fair amount of money.

It has been customary, such as in the review of capital spending, to have the Minister responsible present during that debate in case there were some detailed questions to be answered. I know, in capital supply, there was usually an effort made to have the appropriate Minister available, because when you go into capital supply, you may go into different items involving different Ministers.

Similarly here, you're involving Departments of Agriculture, Tourism, Economic Development, the Energy Council, and the Department of Northern Affairs, and I can't anticipate whether my colleagues have any detailed questions or not. I throw this out for the facilitation of discussion and consideration of these as a suggestion Estimates, that considering the amounts of money involved, that it would be a sound practice to have the Ministers involved at least present for those sub-items which might involve those departments. I can appreciate the difficulty my colleague from Brandon West, the

Minister of Telephones would have, because one cannot expect him to have all that detailed information at his fingertips.

So I just make that as a suggestion. The Minister has undertaken to provide some more detail for us, or if he can show where in Hansard we can find it, what would be adequate as well. But I don't recall receiving any information on this particular program of value added, the Value Added Crops Production Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, this vote is for the purposes of the Department of Finance, who will be the department through which these funds will be allocated to the implementing departments. And if we were to proceed and adopt the member's suggestion that we involve each of the Ministers of the various departments, we would, I think, be falling into the same difficulty and trap that with on previous estimates under legislation, that we had to contend we would be repeating the debates and the explanations relative to each of these Programs.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I personally have no interest in repeating any debate, and going over ground that has been debated before, but where in the Department of Agriculture Estimates would this item have come up? Can the Minister, or some one on the government side, indicate what item this would be covered under in the . . . Because I appreciate what the Minister is saying. These are enabling votes for the Department of Finance, that's fine, I understand that, but where do they relate to the Department of Agriculture Estimates?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to obtain the detail for the member on this particular item, if he requires it now, but I'm quite certain that during the presentations of the Minister of Agriculture, that he explained this Value Added Crop agreement which has been entered into with Canada, and that there was some considerable discussion.

We're quite prepared to undertake to get some information for the member, or to look it up in the appropriate page of Hansard if that will be helpful to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)—pass — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: On (b), what exactly is the \$1,400,000 to be spent? Again without going into infinite detail, again it's a joint agreement with Canada and I guess there was some discussion in that department, but since we're talking about \$1,400,000, I think it's worthy of some time to get a brief explanation by the Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Well, this is a program which will carry on for five years, Mr. Chairman. The total amount involved is \$20 million. The program is just beginning according to my advice and that the department is providing an estimated amount for this coming year of \$1,400,000 to be administered by the Department of Finance to implement this program during the coming year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: In the Industrial Development Agreement, there's \$1,061,000, of which \$636,600 is Recovered from Canada. Does that relate to the entire subagreement that the Minister of Economic Development has talked about in the past? I believe there was some reference to this in our discussion of the Economic Development Estimates, but that item is not found in there of course. If it were, it would be duplicating, so therefore it isn't. This is something in addition to that, and I see the Minister of Economic Development is here and perhaps we could spend a moment of getting some explanation. Is this the same Industrial Development Agreement that was announced? I presume it is. Does this cover the entire amount required for this year? I know there are various elements to the Agreement, the Small Enterprise Development Program, involving forgivable loans and so on, and does this item cover all of the federal-provincial subagreements — Industrial-Federal subagreement — that was announced previously by the Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on page 26 of the Estimates, while the Honourable Member for Brandon East was sitting there, the Member for Transcona said he understood what Enabling Vote

was but we discussed it. You will find that there is \$6,012,000 for the Canada-Manitoba Industrial Sub-Agreement and if my Expenditures total \$7,073,000, there has been \$1,061,000 withheld in the Enabling Vote if we require it, and I might say, Mr. Chairman, I provided these three pages to all members of committee explaining it thoroughly at the time.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister could give us his views on whether the amount involved will be expended this year. In other words, as I understand the program working, it's one whereby the department will respond to loan applications, will respond to municipalities, will respond to the business sector in putting infrastructure in place or making these forgivable loans. Is the minister of the opinion that this amount will be sufficient for the year, and I presume he has some idea along those lines because this is the amount that we're given. But on the other hand I've asked the question, does he feel that this amount will be expended, or will there be some considerable amount left over? Given the fact that it is a responsive program — in other words, given the fact that the amount that you expend depends upon the response upon the initiative taken by the business sector. The business sector will only come for these loans, will only come for assistance if there are some opportunities — if there are some opportunities for business expansion. They're not going to seek out loans, they're not going to seek out financial assistance if there are no opportunities, as much as they may be prepared to co-operate with the Manitoba Government in spending this money on industrial development.

I feel that given the rather pessimistic news that we've been given the last few weeks about companies moving out of Manitoba, we've discussed this morning Electro Fabric Knit, and the other day about Shaino's Limited going to Vancouver and other stories about head offices moving out, and so on. And at the same time, no significant announcements of any new enterprises of any size coming to Manitoba — no repeat of the McCain Foods Limited, for example, nothing of any size that seems to be on the horizon — and I'm just wondering whether these funds will be expended. I know the minister will get up and say, well, we're really concerned about small enterprise, fair enough, but at the same time this is an all-encompassing agreement and I am very skeptical that these funds will indeed be utilized, simply because, unfortunately for all of us, that the opportunities are not there.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the horizon looks tremendous. Some of the programs are moving along a little faster than others. As explained to the member during my Estimates, again I will say we spent . . . The agreement is \$44 million — only \$5 million out of the whole 44 is involved in the Forgivable Loan Program, and that's over five years. Now, we have had a good reception to it; we don't know whether we'll exceed our Budget this year, or be requested to exceed our funds this year. We are trying to monitor the program so it goes regularly over the five-year period, as I previously explained, Mr. Chairman. If the money is required we have to ask the Minister of Finance if we can have a part of our Enabling Vote.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the minister one specific with respect to the program that he has responsibility for, and that deals with a recent request by a group of farmers in the western part of our province, an organization by the name of the Beulah-Isabella Farmers' Association.

They were a local pool association, which had their railway removed from their community, and as a result were attempting to set up an elevator in a siding called Uno, some 6 or 7 miles away from the local community. They received concurrence or approval from the Railway Company

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

MR. JOHNSTON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I'm aware of what the member is talking about. There is nothing in the Manitoba-Federal Agreements, sub-DREE Agreement that that group qualifies under. They have had meetings with myself; we have referred them to other federal departments; we've had meetings with the Minister of Highways; we've had meetings with the Minister of Agriculture with this group; they do not come under this Section.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, then I take it from the Minister there is no assistance whatsoever

that his department or his government are able to provide this group.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the member takes it wrong again, as usual. My statement was, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this vote to assist those people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass; (d)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, while there may not be funds in this vote to assist, is the Minister prepared to indicate to them that there is financial assistance available in another vote to this group?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I again suggest that it doesn't come under this Section. We have had discussions with them. They are a service industry; they are not a manufacturing industry. It is very hard for us to have any program; the Member for Virden arranged several discussions with them, but it does not come under this particular Section; they don't qualify in the sub-Agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)—pass; (e)—pass; (f)—pass; Resolution 109—pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Section (f) in terms of the Northlands Agreement, the enabling vote of \$5 million, is there someone there who can give us the breakdown of that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a program that runs to the end of '80-81 and has been under way since '74-75; the total expenditures anticipated to be in the neighbourhood of \$194.2 million. We're getting into the latter years of the program, so that is why the estimated expenditure this year is higher than it has been in previous years. The member notes that last year it was \$2.9 million and now it's up to \$5 million, but we are reaching sort of the end of that program and the estimate accordingly is for a greater expenditure.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate in terms of the Northlands Agreement, is that dealing with the Highways Department, or is that the Northern Affairs portion of the program?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that this came up under the Estimates of the Minister of Northern Affairs, so that is the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I apologize for being a bit late but I just caught the last comment of the Minister regarding CanadaManitoba Northlands Agreement. Is that what we're on right now? Yes. The Minister was indicating that that Agreement is coming to an end? Is that what you just indicated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the program which began in 1974-75 and runs to the end of 1980-81.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister's aware that the time frame for that agreement really was a 15 year time frame, that it wasn't intended that this agreement run out in 1980-81. When this agreement was developed and signed, it was originally developed as a 15 year concept and some time was needed in order to get the first agreement in place so that an initial one year agreement was signed, or a five year agreement was signed, then it was extended. But the original intent between Canada and Manitoba was that both governments commit themselves to a long term undertaking of economic and social development for northern people, and I would hope that that still is the intention of the Manitoba Government. I think that would be something that would have to be checked out with the new Federal Government as to whether their understanding and objectives are the same as the Manitoba Government's, and since this may be brought into doubt,

and since I don't think it would be good for the longer term economic and social development of northern Manitobans for this to stay in doubt, I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate to us right now whether this government, which didn't sign the original Northlands Agreement, still is of the opinion, and still has as its objective, a long term development shared between Canada and Manitoba of economic and social development in the north, because the problems of the north cannot be solved by five year agreements. But it was thought that maybe if we took a 15 year approach to it, to some of the basic, structural and social problems that exist in the north, there might be some better way of ensuring that more native northern people are given better economic and social options in their lives.

So I'd like the Minister to indicate whether it is still the intention of the present Manitoba Government to carry forward a long term 15 year plan of development in northern Manitoba.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that this agreement was discussed during the Estimates of the Minister for Labour and Northern Affairs. I'm certainly able to communicate the remarks and the recommendations in this respect by the Member for Transcona, but I again point out that what we're dealing with here is just the enabling vote from the Department of Finance, and that the major matters as to policy under this vote would properly be dealt with under the Estimates of the Minister involved.

MR. PARASIUK: I appreciate the Minister's comments, and frankly, I can understand his particular predicament, although I'm a bit surprised that the Ministers who are responsible for the various components of the Canada-Manitoba enabling vote aren't here in the Legislature to answer any questions that still might arise or still might be outstanding. We can't change that, so I appreciate the Minister's own comments on this. I would hope that he would pass on my concerns to the Minister of Northern Affairs because I will probably try and raise this question with him. I'll check with Hansard to see whether in fact it was dealt with in the review of the Minister's departmental Estimates. But if it wasn't, I certainly will raise it in Question Period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . —pass; Resolution 109—pass. The Honourable Minister.

SUPPLY — GENERAL SALARY INCREASES

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could deal with the appropriation for General Salary Increases. That's on Page 80.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct the honourable members to Page 80 of the Main Estimates, General Salary Increases, Resolution No. 111, Item 1.— pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In dealing with this resolution, Sir, I wonder if the Minister who is bringing it forward can indicate specifically in terms of the enabling vote of the amount that is being asked for, whether the negotiations in terms of this year's negotiations with the MGEA has been concluded or at what stage are negotiations at, and can he give us a general report in terms of what positions are being taken by the government and by the union and what stage the negotiations are at and what is the government hoping to conclude their agreement if it has not to this date, with the Civil Service union?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, as the member indicates, the negotiations are indeed under way, and I'm sure he understands why it wouldn't be appropriate for me to attempt to give him any interim position or estimate of the present position in the negotiations. The resolution which we're dealing with here was made prior to the beginning of negotiations and is an estimate made to the best of the ability of the department at that time to cover such advances as may eventually be agreed upon.

Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I really can't respond to the member in any way inasmuch as the negotiations are now in process.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister indicate as to — he should have an estimate as to what the salary component of ' the Civil Service is and what percentage this amount is of the salary component that is presently in effect. Can he give me that figure?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any detailed breakdown of this amount. This is a total sum made up by the Department of Finance and is to cover what they consider to the best of their ability to be the requirements upcoming.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe I may have not been understood properly. The question that I was asking the Minister was that, what percentage is \$7.5 million of the total salary bill that the government pays? I'd like to have the figure that, if the Minister has it in his possession, what the figure for salaries in the government service is.

MR. MCGILL: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that figure, and I think it would be again somewhat improper to give to the member a percentage figure which might in some way pre-empt whatever negotiations are being undertaken.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not asking the Minister to reveal his bargaining position. What I'm asking for is, somehow the government had to arrive at \$7.5 million. They could have arrived at \$5 million, they could have arrived at \$10 million, they could have picked any figure. There had to be some basis for the figure that they arrived at in terms of the amount that they put into the book. Surely if one had to go through item by item and ask every Minister to add up all the salary figures within the Civil Service one could have by going through every department and being at every Estimates, ask the Minister what his total salary cost is for the year, one could have arrived at the figure, but I would hope that the government could indicate as to what relationship this 7-½ million has with the salary figure. Is this figure a high figure, or will we be getting supplementary supply in terms of a special warrant in terms of additional salary requirements, if the agreement is not settled at this amount? There must be some parameters that the government is working under and I'm not asking them to reveal their bargaining position but there must be a basis for the figure that they have provided.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a figure that's arrived at in the same way as has been used in the past. It's described as a guesstimate and will have to be adjusted as the actual figures are decided upon and determined and will either be dealt with by special warrant if additional funds are required, but we are placing this in the present Estimates as our best estimate of what will be required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has information which really is in this book, but it's a summary of each item which is referred to as salaries. If you go department by department, Agriculture for example, there is under every component, under the first one, Planning and Management, Item 1., (c)(1), there is a salary item; under Management Services, item (1) is salaries; in fact in just about every case the first item is salaries. In other words there is information in this Estimate Book on the salaries which are estimated to be paid in the year 1979-80, and I think one of the questions, at least, my colleague was asking, and this is something I'm interested in, simply, what do these salaries add up to? One can go through here and spend a lot of time picking it up and adding it up, but surely the government or the Minister would have an estimate of what the salaries —(Interjection)— well you know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Economic Development sits in his seat and says we'll let you figure it out. You know, that attitude is typical of what we've been getting in this House for the last couple of days. Closure — we're getting closure, we're getting bells ringing, you know I think, Mr. Chairman, this . . .

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I did not say I will let you figure it out. I said, I wasn't speaking to the member, I wouldn't really waste my time on what the Member for Brandon East is saying right now. I just really spoke across to the Member for St. George, and said, "how did you figure it out, Bill?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, nevertheless the attitude of the Minister leaves much to be desired. It's that kind of an attitude that will put you back on this side of the House. In fact we know there is evidence of that already. —(Interjection)— Well after 18 months you're coming here pretty

Mr. Chairman, my request is quite reasonable, I'm simply asking the Minister if he has, if he hasn't okay, he hasn't got it, but does he have a summation of the salaries items that are in this book? I can tabulate it after two or three hours worth of additions. —(Interjection)— Yes, you see there's the attitude of the Minister of Economic Development coming forth from his seat again. —(Interjection)— It's right here but it takes a lot of time to add it up, and I wondered if the Minister — the Minister of Finance isn't here — but if the Acting Minister could give us an indication of what that total salary figure is.

In days gone by, I think we've all talked about what the Salary bill of the Civil Service was, it's not a secret, and I'm just wondering, what is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that last year, the total amount required was about \$12 million, the increase was \$12 million, this year we are usually underestimating what may be the final result, and this is an estimated amount which will have to be increased by whatever the final negotiations bring up.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Honourable Minister heard my last request. My request simply is, do you simply have a summation of the Salaries that are included in this Estimates book?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't have it right here but I'm sure the Department of Finance can provide that, which would make it easier for the member than going through his book. We'd be glad to get that.

MR. EVANS: So, Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Minister make that an undertaking, provide that information, that is, what is the Salaries' total? What is the total of the Salaries shown in the Estimates book for this year, ending March 31, 1980?

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9Item 1.—pass; Resolution 111—pass.

SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct the honourable members to Page 5 of the Main Estimates, Executive Council (II), Resolution No. 4. Item I. Administration, Item (b)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, over a month or so ago, we had the annual report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation discussed in Committee of Public Utilities. The Minister responsible for that corporation, whose salary I believe we are presently discussing, indicated that there was a general review to be undertaken of the Public Insurance Corporation. He admitted, along with the General Manager, that there was a freeze of staff for that corporation specifically in the general insurance field, and that his government was preventing the corporation from competing in the general insurance field, and that every application for staff increases would have to be channelled through his offices, unlike any other Crown Agency that I'm aware of.

The Minister, at that time, indicated that, if I recall, there would be staff requests coming forward and he would be dealing with them. I wonder if the Minister can report as to whether there have been any staff increases allowed in the general insurance field, and any other divisions of MPIC and what has happened in the last month and a half.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, there were some staff changes in the Autopac division that were approved and that was quite some months ago. There have been no requests since. There is one request from the General Insurance Division that is in the process and being evaluated and that is the only other one that's outstanding.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, during those meetings the General Manager and Chairman of the Corporation indicated that in order for the Corporation to maintain what is known as a good book of business, that they would have to have maintained somewhat an aggressive or at least maintain

a constant stress or direction of advertising and of staff in order for them to build up and maintain a book of business that could keep them competitive and keep the general insurance field from floundering and from losing money.

He admitted that the advertising budget and the staff component were those which were being controlled by the government and that there were no openings or no move by the government to allow this portion of the corporation to effectively compete on the open market, thus putting the general insurance division in a very precarious position, in fact so precarious that it was obvious to members on this side, and I'm sure even to the Minister that if it continued for any length of time, that division would in fact lose enough money that it would either have to close its doors or then be sold for a loss. I asked the Minister if it's the government's intention of not continuing that division in the general insurance field.

Surely they should have now the good business sense to sell that division off and at least return a modest profit to the people of Manitoba because that portfolio is worth some money by any standards in the market of insurance. But if they are continuing to strangle that division, and it's obvious by the Minister's remarks that they have no intention of either allowing the corporation to have its own hand, to have the management run that corporation as it was originally intended to do to give that corporation the mandate that it requires to build up a good book of business, by his very words today that there is no staff requests, it is obvious that they have told the corporation that we are not going to be approving any staff positions, and that is it. So no requests are forthcoming.

Does the Minister expect the management of the board of that corporation, every week, to send in to his office staff requirements, when they have already been told last year by the then Minister responsible, the Premier and himself, that there will be no further staff additions allowed for them to be able to continue to service the accounts that they have and continue to build up a book of business so that they can ride out any period of time that may be less favourable in the general insurance field, like it is now? There is no doubt that there is some rate cutting going on in the general insurance field, and especially at a time like this the Corporation should be aggressive in the business field if they are at least to maintain the book of business they have. If they do not have the required staff and advertising, then certainly that division will flounder. And it's apparent, Mr. Chairman, by the statements of the Minister, that there have been no requests, that they intend to allow that division to flounder and really give it up by default, thus losing, I maintain, hundreds of thousands of dollars to the public of Manitoba, in terms of . . . if they really truly don't believe that that division should be going on, then they should put it up for sale and at least sell it and retain a profit from the sale of that division. I'd like to know if the Minister has any intentions in that respect.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister whether the Committee that he talked about in terms of the review, in the Throne Speech, has been decided upon, whether members of that Review Committee have been picked out and whether any meetings have been held or what has transpired with respect to the review that they have conducted. Is this just a red herring that the Premier of this province decided to throw into the Throne Speech so that it would divert some attention from the lack of program that they have had in terms of their Throne Speech and Budget? Is that the diversion that they threw into it, or is there any intent to review the program? And if there is, the Minister certainly didn't have any answer for us a month and a half ago; I'd like to see how many answers he has today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm under the impression, of course, that MPIC has been debated, so I don't intend to be in breach of the rules of the House by debating MPIC internal management, which is done at an outside committee. That being the case, I can say in response to the honourable member's question, which was in ' order, with respect to the review of MPIC, that that review team or committee will be announced in due course and my honourable friend will be among the first to hear when it is formed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd also ask the First Minister if he can report on the progress of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission Review, if he has any comments on whether members have been appointed to that study or whether that study is taking place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, that question could be asked under my Salary, or I presume it was asked when the Attorney-General's Estimates were before the House, under his Salary. I don't intend to repeat that debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Yes, I believe my colleague, the Member for St. George, was asking about the review of Autopac or of MPIC and I believe the answer was, from the First Minister, that a committee would be set up in due course. I wasn't sure whether I heard this or not, but do I understand, therefore, that there is a staff freeze in the entire Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation until this review is completed, by whatever committee; is that the situation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, those matters were discussed when the MPIC was before the committee to which it reports.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't think whether the Premier wants to get up and say they were discussed. Mr. Chairman, the Minister responsible for that corporation indicated that they will be reviewing staff positions with respect to the corporation when they would come forward. He has indicated to us today that there has been no request for staff positions and implicit in his words was that they were told, or that corporation was told, that there would be no approval for staff positions. Is the First Minister indicating or denying that now the freeze has been lifted. If the freeze has been lifted, I would like to hear that from the First Minister if he is indicating that he did not wish to discuss it. He wasn't in the Committee of Public Utilities at the time this matter was discussed. If he hasn't got the answers, then let his Minister get up and answer it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has answered it, but this is not the appropriate item under which to discuss internal matters of MPIC, which reports to a separate committee of this House.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order, we are discussing the salary of the Minister, whose only description I am aware of is Minister reporting for MPIC and Telephones. As I understand it, the Minister has given, in his role as reporting for MPIC, has given instructions to MPIC regarding a freeze in salaries. So it's not the internal decisions that are made by the Board of MPIC, it is the action, surely, of this Minister in giving instructions to MPIC and therefore it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is in order to discuss the Minister's involvement in decisions of management of MPIC. If I am wrong that it is not his decision that we're debating, then all right, but I believe that he agreed that it was a directive passed from him through the MPIC.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under this item, under the Estimates of 1.(b), which I understand covers the Salary of the Honourable Minister reporting for the Manitoba Telephone System and for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, the matter of memberships, in particularly the Manitoba Club, was raised at a previous occasion, both in the Committee when MPIC reported to the Public Utilities Committee and also very briefly at Question Period. I understand, also, that the Provincial Auditor has made some remarks on this particular matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as you are aware from this morning, the government in imposing closure on two occasions prevented us from raising this matter when the Provincial Auditor's Estimates, or the amount for the Auditor, was before the Committee.

So I would like to ask the Minister, then, whether he had received any communication from the Auditor in regard to the payment of annual membership fees in the Manitoba Club by the MPIC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, not to rethrash old straw, Public Accounts Committee will be called and my honourable friend, who just asked the question of the Chairman of that Committee, he will have full opportunity to ask the Auditor any and all question he wishes, with respect to this or any other matter.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the Honourable the First Minister for pre-empting his colleague and answering the question that I addressed to the Minister reporting for MPIC.

I would like to redirect my question to the Minister reporting for MPIC and ask him if he has received any communication from the Provincial Auditor having to do with the payment of fees in the Manitoba Club by the corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, the whole matter of fees, I believe it came up at the first meeting of Public Utilities dealing with the report of Manitoba Telephones. There were questions put to the Chairman and General Manager with respect to memberships in clubs and responses were given at that time.

The question of whether or not there was any contravention of the manual for civil servants and regulations, if such memberships were held by executives of Crown Corporations, I think has been dealt with. I have not received any directive or direct information from the Provincial Auditor with respect to this matter, but I have not been given anything to indicate that any such membership held by an executive of a Crown Corporation in any way contravenes the regulations as they now stand.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat surprised that the Provincial Auditor has not contacted the Minister directly, for it would seem, in reading the press reports, that the Provincial Auditor did have some comments to make on the subject, and in fact had called upon the government to establish a clear policy on Crown Corporation memberships in what the Auditor terms to be "elite social club" and failing that response to the Auditor in the setting of a clear policy, the Provincial Auditor said, again, according to this press clipping, that he would ask the Legislature directly to do it.

If I can just quote a little further from this particular clipping, Mr. Chairman, it said that "the Provincial Auditor said the government has a duty to rule on the propriety of memberships in the Manitoba Club and other social enclaves held by Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, before they become the precedent for a loosening financial discipline." Mr. Chairman, that sounds a rather serious matter as far as the loosening of financial discipline is concerned. It has been a particular stated concern of this government, starting with the setting up of its Task Force report, that there should be greater control on financial administration matters and the reporting of such things.

I go on to give the Honourable Minister a further quotation. "Although the auditor said he would not likely denounce the payment of club fees as a waste of public money, if it were openly condoned by the province," he said, "the lack of clear policy is much more serious than the relatively small sum of money involved." So Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a clear call by the Provincial Auditor to this Minister directly and through him to the government itself, to set a clear policy in this regard as to whether it considers that the payment of annual dues in — what was the expression? "an elite social club" — is a proper matter for government policy, or does the government in fact consider that its own manual of administration would prevent the spending of public funds on such matters?

Mr. Chairman, there is a clearly perceived need for the Minister and for the government perhaps, by the First Minister, to clarify this issue and make it quite clear to the Legislature just where the government stands on this matter, whether in fact it has a policy or whether it is trying to slough off this matter to its Crown corporations, saying that it has nothing to do with the internal management of those corporations at all, and whether, if the government feels it can get off the hook and say that it's really not responsible for anything but MPIC or the Manitoba Telephone System or Hydro itself, in fact does.

We have noticed that to be some sort of a trend on the part of this government since taking office, Mr. Chairman. It says that it is reviewing the matter, it is reconsidering it, it is monitoring the situation, it tends to set up review committees and commissions, it says that it is waiting for a certain report to be tabled, and then instead of declaring that a certain thing is the government's policy, it turns around and says, well, that was the committee that was set up and that is its

The Minister of Education is just one example, Mr. Chairman, where he has said that the two bills having to do with Education are really not from his department, they are from a committee that's been looking at the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have been following the debate quite closely. There has been reference to quite a few departments other than the one that is under discussion. There is debate on Education, there's been debate on Provincial Auditor's office, which has already been passed, and I would caution the honourable members that we are on Item (b) and I would hope that without going all around the mulberry bush, that we can stick to this item.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for that admonition and I will admit that I did stray a little from the particular specific that is in front of us, which has to do with the Salary of the Minister reporting for Telephones and MPIC and it was with specific regard to MPIC and its purchase of memberships in a particular club that I was addressing my remarks.

Just in conclusion, I want to ask the Minister if he is prepared to state a definite policy on behalf of the government as far as the paying of annual subscriptions are concerned in elite social clubs by the government's Crown corporations?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, as I believe the Minister of Finance some several weeks ago said in the House when this matter of a \$600 expenditure was raised, he said that the government would be taking a look at it with respect to Crown corporations, that will happen.

With respect to the inner government service itself, there is a standing order that was passed, I believe, 1973-74, thereabouts, where such memberships may not be purchased. There has been, as my honourable friend may or may not be aware, a practice that has gone on through at least three or four administrations that I'm aware of where the Chairman of Hydro, the Chairman of, I believe, the Telephone System, were members of what my honourable friend prefers to call "elite social clubs" whatever they are, and I really ask my honourable friend the question, should a board which is invested with the power of spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year, does he really think that this power should be lifted from the board with respect to a matter of a business membership in a club?

I readily admit, Mr. Chairman, that there are valid arguments on both sides of the case, but I really do not consider it a major matter of government policy. Had it been, had my honourable friends opposite considered it such, I'm sure they would have withdrawn the memberships of existing Chairmen of Crown corporations when they were in office, but they chose not to do so, so we can only draw our own conclusions from that.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to answer the question posed to me by the Honourable the First Minister, and would say that I was very pleased to hear that either the First Minister personally or the government itself intends to look into this matter. And in answer to the First Minister, I will tell him that I also intend to look into the matter.

However, I'm not the member who has the responsibility for stating government policy in this regard. I don't have to answer the Provincial Auditor when he says that the government must issue a clear policy on Crown corporation memberships in elite social clubs, or he would ask the Legislature to do it. The Honourable First Minister should know that the expression "elite social clubs" is not my expression, it's a quote in The Free Press as being said by the Provincial Auditor.

So again, I'm glad to hear from the First Minister that the government is looking into the matter. I would urge him to have his government enunciate a policy on this matter as soon as possible, and make it very clear to the public as to whether the memberships in these clubs are, in fact, rebounding to the benefit of the ratepayers of Hydro. Perhaps he would be able to explain to the ratepayers of Hydro just what benefit they are getting from this particular membership and from the purchases of insurance from MPIC — just what benefits they are receiving by the payment of these fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I wonder if the minister is going to answer my colleague, the Member for . . . O.K. Mr. Chairperson, I would like to ask the Minister without Portfolio if he is still carrying out any discussions with the CRTC, or whether that function has been taken over by another minister. We have discussed some of these items at a technical level in the Public Utilities Committee, but

I believe that there are some discussions and negotiations taking place at a ministerial level, and I'm wondering if it's appropriate for me to ask him questions on this matter, or whether indeed some other minister is carrying out that duty?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think the appropriate place for that would be in the consideration of the report of the Manitoba Telephone System which is now before the Public Utilities Committee.

The matter of the relationship between the CRTC and the Manitoba Telephone System and the whole area of cable television is one that has been, and will be, pursued during the next meeting of the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairperson, again I find that rather strange. I said that we discussed technical matters at the Public Utilities Committee and I specifically said that negotiations undoubtedly take place between governments, between a minister representing the Manitoba government and a minister representing the Federal government and I asked if he was the minister who carried out those negotiations.

Now, I know that it's not the Chairman of the Telephone System; I know it's not the General Manager; I know that the Minister has those responsibilities. I assumed that as the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System, he was carrying out those functions, and I thought it appropriate, since we are discussing his Salary, to ask him questions on it.

Now again, I ask the question — is he the person responsible for carrying out these negotiations with the Federal Government?

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PARASIUK: If he is the minister responsible, I would like a clarification of what the position of the Province of Manitoba is with respect to the whole issue of Cable television, transmission of signals by a satellite, and the role of the private sector. There have been differences between provinces in Canada on these matters, and I gather that there are differences between the position of the Province of Manitoba and, say that, of the Province of Alberta. I would like to get some clarification from the minister as to what the position of the Manitoba government is on these matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the position of the government with respect to the Cable television field is that we continue to support the view that the Crown corporation should fulfill the role of common carrier, provide capacity for the private sector to produce and to deliver programs or services by means of the electronic highway provided by the Manitoba Telephone System so that there will be an opportunity for the private sector to participate in the provision of these services.

As to what their position is on the role of satellite communications, we are of course following the development of satellite delivery systems very carefully and, with the advice and participation of the professionals in the Crown corporation, we are managing to maintain a role of watching the development of the technology and ensuring that our corporation and our province is able to participate along with others in the field to take advantage of the improving and changing technology in that field.

The member earlier suggested that it might be my role to deal directly with CRTC. That is not the role of the minister as it is now conceived to be. We have negotiations with the Federal Minister of Communications from time to time; matters are discussed there, and we have had in the past, some meetings with the Federal Minister of Communications. That, of course, now is in a state of interruption until a new Federal Minister is appointed by the new government in Ottawa; but the Canada-Manitoba Agreement is still in place and we continue to deal with matters that relate to Cable television under the terms of that Agreement, which provides generally that CRTC will be the Licensing Authority for programming services, and that the province, through its Boards will be the Licensing Authority for non-programming services.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to thank the minister for his clear answer. I would just like to follow up on one point, and that is that I understand that there has been some friction at the federal level which could have some impact, and I think has probably had some impact on Manitoba, namely

that although Manitoba and Canada signed an agreement which both governments agreed to, apparently the CRTC thought that that it had some sovereign power of its own and has decided to carve out some role for itself other than that which was agreed to by the two sovereignties in our Canadian federalism, namely the Provincial Government and the Federal Government. Can the minister indicate where that matter now stands?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I can't enlighten the member to any extent with respect to what differences may now exist between the policies of the Federal Minister of Communications or the former Minister of Communications, and the CRTC in its authority and operation. There may indeed be from time to time differences between the Department of Communications in Ottawa and what it sees the role and the decision-making process of the CRTC. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be inappropriate for me as a Minister responsible for Telecommunications in Manitoba to comment in any way on what the member sees as differences between a federal authority and the Department of Communications in Ottawa.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I'd like to move to another topic. I felt the minister gave us a clear impression of what he thought to be the scope and role of the Manitoba Telephone System with respect to Cable television, satellite transmission, and the role of the private sector.

As the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, I was wondering if he could provide us with the same clear answer as to what he considers to be the role and scope of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and whether he believes that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is presently adequately filling the role that he envisaged for that corporation of which he is responsible?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, as the member knows, it was announced in the Throne Speech that there would be a review of that role now being filled by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, both in its participation and its service in Autopac, and its competitive position with respect to general insurance. That position has not changed. It would be correct to say that the role as it was previously filled by the MPIC continues pending a review of the whole operation, and any recommendations that might come from such a review — our ultimate objective of course is to ensure that the service being provided by the Crown corporation is the best that can be provided. If there have been improvements, if there have been some new directions taken by other jurisdictions in this area, we want them to be examined and to be compared with what we are now doing in Manitoba, and if it develops that some changes are in order, then they certainly will be considered.

MR. PARASIUK: Is that review being carried out under the direction of the Minister?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, a commission or a committee, a review mechanism will be appointed. Some research has been done in this connection, and this matter is continuing. When we have the results of that review, they will be studied and any changes that are likely to improve our present system, will no doubt be seriously considered.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. It's quite important to find out who is doing the present work of review of the Corporation. Is it being done internally by the Corporation, or is that being done by staff that the minister has working for him in some other capacity, and who will be appointing the Review Commission, and who will it be reporting to? Will it be reporting to the minister directly? Will it be reporting to Cabinet directly? Will it be reporting to Cabinet Committee, or will it be reporting to staff of the Corporation, or will it be reporting to a Board of the Corporation? I think there are a number of questions that arise out of the minister's answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, that question — maybe the Honourable Member wasn't present — it was already answered. An external Review Commission will be appointed, and when it's appointed, as I said to the Member for St. Vital, and equally the Member for Transcona, you'll be the first to know who they are, what their terms of reference are, and so on. It'll be an Order-in-Council appointment; the appointments have not yet been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I thank the First Minister for that answer, but I did ask another question and

that was, who is presently undertaking the research or the review work that the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation indicated was being done? Perhaps the minister could answer that particular question. He indicated that research is being done and I'd like to know who is doing it, and under whose direction?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, it would naturally follow, as my honourable friend would know from his previous experience, that the only preparatory work for the commission will be terms of reference, etc., which are being done internally by staff and then when the commission is appointed, the terms of reference will be public.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. That's where I have some confusion. I don't know who's doing this internal work. Is it —(Interjection)— well, staff, but is it staff in the Premier's office? Is it staff in the Executive Council? Is it staff in the Minister's office? Is it staff of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation? I still haven't been able to get an answer on that.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we're taking advice on these matters from all sources within the competent staff of the Government of Manitoba. If my honourable friend has any input to make, we'd be even happy to have his suggestions.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, I'd like to make an input right now. Since the First Minister has indicated that one of the thrusts of his Administration would be to clarify Ministerial responsibility and Ministerial accountability, I find it somewhat difficult then to deal with answers that say government staff are dealing with this matter. You know, I think that it would be important to find out whether in fact this is being done under the direction of the Minister responsible, or whether this is a Cabinet function, because if it's a Cabinet function, I know that a number of Cabinet committees, for example, have been created, and I had asked the Minister a number of questions. He gave me a response indicating that work was being done on this, and if this is being done by some staff that he has relating to his office, fine, or if it's being done by the Legal Counsel, that's another thing, but I'm still not sure as to who is doing this preparatory work for this Commission of Review of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, because I'm pretty sure that the First Minister would agree that the terms of reference for any review are very important, and the type of background information that is done will indeed determine the extent to which the Commission undertakes a narrow review or a broad review. It'll determine the cost of the review, and we've had other examples of that where some Commissions have been established and they've gone off and they've cost a lot more money than people expected in the first place. That possibly was because insufficient preparatory work was done in establishing the Commission of Review in the first place. I certainly wouldn't like to see that experience repeated, and that's why I'm asking some specific questions of the Minister right now.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, to repeat myself, internal staff of the Government of Manitoba, reporting through the Minister, who is a member of the Executive Council of Manitoba, who will be giving advice to all of his Cabinet colleagues, and must then pass an Order-in-Council which will contain the terms of reference and the names of the Commissioners.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (c)—pass; (d) — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister reporting for the Manitoba Telephone System whether this particular line covers the staff in the Minister's office?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Salaries under (c)?

MR. WALDING: Yes.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, under Item 1.(c), the Minister without Portfolio's administrative staff is included in the total vote of \$436,000.00.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give me a breakdown of those staff positions in the Minister without Portfolio's office.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there's the Administrative Officer, a private secretary, one clerical staff person, and one other secretary.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I count that as a total of four positions. Can the Minister tell me what the dollar amount is involved in that?

MR. LYON: I'm sorry if my honourable friend misread what I said; it should be a total of three: Administrative Officer, private secretary, and a clerical secretary.

MR. WALDING: Does the Honourable Minister not have an executive assistant, Mr. Chairman?

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Honourable First Minister if he can give me the dollar amount that's involved in those three positions for the coming year, please?

MR. LYON: The senior officer is \$41,100.

MR. WALDING: I don't require a breakdown by each position, just for the total of the three.

MR. LYON: That would be the largest of the three salaries; the Administrative Officer, who is Mr. Eagleton, formerly a Deputy Minister. And I should say, Mr. Chairman, the amount being requested in that case is \$41,800, where it was \$41,100 last year.

MR. WALDING: Is the Honourable First Minister, working out the total in that department for me, Mr. Chairman?

MR. LYON: The other two salaries on a full year cost basis . . . There was a transfer here of \$5.3 thousand and \$4.2 thousand. That was for the fiscal year 1978-79. Now there's not a request for 1979-80, not on Page 13 (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: A few minutes ago the First Minister invited my comments, or whatever input I could make, and I really must say, Mr. Chairperson, that if one of the Minister's staff is being paid a total of \$41,800 to be an Administrative Officer in a staff of three in support of the Minister, that that is completely out of line with anything I've ever seen at a Federal Civil Service level or at the provincial Civil Service level, and that it would appear that somehow that staff aren't properly being utilized by the government when we have situations of Administrative Officers being paid that much.

Presently we have a number of Acting Deputies, we have a number of unfilled positions, we have a number of instances where it would strike me that a senior person at that level would be better utilized than to act as the Administrative Officer to a Minister who is responsible for two Crown Corporations that are fully staffed up and headed up by people who are paid a significant amount in their own right. It would strike me that an Administrative Officer to a Minister in this situation probably should be paid something in the order of \$15 to \$20 thousand dollars, so that it would strike me that, although it's a small amount, it does seem quite anomalous, and I'm wondering if the Minister can explain that situation.

MR. LYON: Quite easily, Mr. Chairman. The man in question was a Deputy Minister, and acts relatively in that capacity with the present Minister whom he is serving. He was seconded by the previous administration from his Deputy Minister's post or change into a floating position in Management Committee, at the same salary, or the equivalent, as that to which he is receiving now. He is directly responsible for liaison with not two corporations, as the member said, but three corporations, MPIC, the Manitoba Telephone System, and Manitoba Forestry. The man in question is a senior career civil servant, who is well and favourably known, I think, to all members in this House. He is worth every nickel he is being paid, and I daresay that he is more productively employed now than when we found him in Management Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Honourable First Minister twice if he could give me the total for the salaries of this coming year that are included within this amount of \$436,000.00. I wonder if he's now in a position to give me that figure.

MR. LYON: Just for the three persons?

MR. WALDING: Yes.

MR. LYON: Well, I gave, Mr. Chairman, the costs, because there was a transfer of these persons from Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and the cost to Executive Council this year for a part year salary only in the case of the two persons in question was \$5.3 and \$4.2 thousand. That was the cost in the current fiscal year because their salaries were previously borne by the department from which they were transferred. The regular salary for a secretary to a Minister is around \$12,000, and the other position equated on that basis would be somewhere around \$8 to \$10 thousand. I can get the precise figure if it's really of concern to my honourable friend.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister then is telling us that a little over \$50,000 of this amount is for the salaries of the staff in the Minister without Portfolio's office. Can the Minister inform the Committee what the balance of the \$436,000 is for?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I can give it to my honourable friend by title of position, if he wishes, all the way through. The Clerk of the Executive Council, the special assistant to the Premier, the Administrative Officer, a clerk, an administrative secretary, accountant, clerk, clerk typist three times, administrative secretary, three more clerk typists, secretary to the Premier, another clerk typist, an appointment secretary, an executive assistant to the Premier, a secretary to the Minister, which was transferred, I'm sorry, two more administrative secretaries, a clerk typist, a program — no, that's vacant — secretary to the Counsel; those are all the positions that are presently occupied, in addition to the three from the Minister without Portfolio's office. Have you got a total on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister was reading them too fast for me to put them down. Could he tell me how many positions there are and what is the total of the salaries for the 1979-80 year, please?

MR. LYON: As at March 31, 1979 there were 34 positions allotted, 22 filled. There are 12 vacancies six were transferred, including two Ministers and support staff positions closed, two; positions vacant, four; and the total would be approximately \$60,000, deducted from the \$436,000, which would give you roughly \$375,000 for the positions that I enumerated, in the total Executive Council and Premier's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass; (d)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. I had some questions with respect to Other Expenditures. What are the other expenditures for? Is this for contract staff, or is this for travel, or do we have a breakdown of Other Expenditures?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Well, the largest amount in that total figure, and there is a breakdown by item, Mr. Chairman, one of the larger amounts would be printing, stationery, xerox supplies, etc., for travel and miscellaneous expenditures of about \$13,000 — automobiles; those are the major items.

I can give my honourable friend a breakdown, if he wishes. Is that sufficient?

MR. PARASIUK: I wanted to know if there were any staff that were being paid through this sub-appropriation. I recall reading sometime last year that a lawyer was brought on as a legal advisor to the First Minister, and I was wondering if it was through this particular sub-appropriation that that person was brought on.

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Chairman. His position was mentioned in Item 1.(c) Administrative Salaries. He is on a one-year contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)—pass; (e)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I wanted to get up on (f).

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass; (f)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PASIUK: Yes. I am wondering if the Minister can indicate why we didn't have any money in the appropriation last year and now why we have \$250,000 in this appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This was an appropriation the commitment for which was made by the former First Minister of the province and the government of the day for a three-year period, of \$250,000, to the organization in question. I will get the proper title: Manitoba Council for International Co-operation. Last year, in an attempt of course to keep all expenditures to the bare minimum, we did not include the fourth year of the program, which would have been \$250,000.00. This year, however, it was decided to reinstate the program at the same figure as has been applicable for the previous three years.

The honourable member may well know or may not know that this is a private philanthropic group, which conducts good works — and I use that term in the highest sense — throughout the world, under the auspices of private agencies, many of which would be known to him, such as OXFAM, the Pentecostal Assemblies, the Primates, World Relief, UNICEF, United Church, World University, World Vision, YMCA, CanSave, CUSO, Food for the Hungry, MCC, etc. And they have an arrangement, Mr. Chairman, whereby the amount that is received from the Province of Manitoba is equalled or doubled. This contribution, along with the amount that is privately raised by this organization, which is in excess of the government contribution, is then matched by CEDA at Ottawa, which enables them to go and do projects on the spot.

We have been more than satisfied that the kind of work that the Manitoba Council for International Co-operation is carrying on is extremely unique and extremely good, and their overhead, their administrative costs, are kept to a very bare minimum. They have a lot of volunteer people who work throughout the various agencies of that organization, and the kinds of programs that they do, my honourable friend might be interested: Clustered village development programs; co-operative storage projects in Ghana; a national popular theatre workshop; MURPUR resettlement project; Botswana Integrated Agricultural Development Project; Laos refugee resettlement project, to name only a few of what I consider and I'm sure my honourable friends, as well, would consider to be extremely good works, carried out with a very bare minimum of administrative overhead, with a tremendous amount of dedication by the various organizations that are involved.

So we are recommending to the House this year, Mr. Chairman, that this grant be reinstated and that the work carried on by this excellent organization receive this additional amount from the taxpayers of Manitoba to carry out some of our extra-territorial responsibilities throughout the world.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I agree fully with the reinstatement of this particular program. I was a bit concerned last year when it was not provided for, and I have read some newspaper clippings which indicated that the Minister had a personal philosophy based on individual redemption rather than one based on some mixture of individual redemption and social action. I'm glad to see that that imbalance that appeared to appear in that article has been somewhat decreased by this type of action. I think it's a good thing. I think that occasionally provinces tend to be far too parochial, and that the MCIC is a body that is trying to tie in the resources of many other entities, to do small scale but necessary social action works around the world, and I will just say that I'm glad that this government is continuing the program that was started in this respect by the previous administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, yes, just for clarification of the government's policy in this regard. Has the Honourable, the First Minister, an estimate of how much this private agency expects to raise itself in Manitoba in the forthcoming fiscal year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: I don't have an exact figure, Mr. Chairman, in front of me, but it's well in excess of the amount that is asked for in this vote. They do an exceedingly good job in private fund raising. They then meld the two amounts that they receive from the province, and from their private fund raising and get a matching grant from CEDA, which gives them quite a good sized working

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So, just to confirm the policy. It will be the policy to match dollar for dollar, the private amounts raised in Manitoba. Is that correct?

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Chairman. We give this amount, whatever they raise privately is their own business, but they raise in excess of what the province gives. My advice is that the only matching grant they get is then from CEDA, which matches what they raise privately plus what the province gives them. The fixed figure that the province has given now for the 4th year is \$250,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)—pass. Resolution No. 5, ITTEM $\frac{3}{8}$.—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, is this an opportunity to make any comment on the Management Committee restructuring?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no moneys appropriated for it.

MR. DOERN: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: On the elections, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we're going to have too much time to discuss the matter, but I did want to put a few comments on the record, and particularly comments which are totally opposite to those of the First Minister, because the First Minister, the other day, made a very vigorous speech. I guess it was just before his trip on the Friday, on the last day of the Budget, against the new rules and regulations by which federal parties are provided with funds, through probably a tax system, and also by which there was equal time on radio and television.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m. and in accordance with Rule 19(2) I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if there may be a disposition to complete this item today or to go on to Private Members'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't understand. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.
The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We're under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business, Proposed Resolutions. Resolution No. 7 — the Honourable Member for Gladstone on a point of order.

MR. James R. FERGUSON: No, Mr. Speaker. I'll just . . . I would like to rise on a committee change, but I didn't want to do it before . . . I understand that there is a commitment that there will not be . . . have members of the House to of course look after thtt.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews. Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I've had no indication from anyone that we're not proceeding with Private Members' Hour. So if my honourable members want to — it's their hour, if they want to dispense

with it, then I wish they would come and tell me so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: On a matter of procedure, Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to the Government Whip, that we were disinclined to carry on with the Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladszone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The change would be the Honourable Member for St. Matthews for the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney on Public Utilities.

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

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House accordingly adjourns and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Monday.