



ISSN 0542-5492

Fourth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

29 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVIII No. 78A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 12 JUNE, 1980

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty - First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Bob	Springfield	PC
BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BARROW, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	PC
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Hon. Keith A.	Gimli	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.	Riel	PC
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	PC
DOWNEY, Hon. Jim	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	PC
ENNS, Hon. Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	PC
FILMON, Gary	River Heights	PC
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, Jim	Dauphin	PC
GOURLAY, Hon. Doug	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	PC
GREEN, Q.C., Sidney	Inkster	Ind
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	PC
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
JORGENSON, Hon. Warner H.	Morris	PC
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	PC
LYON, Hon. Sterling R.	Charleswood	PC
MacMASTER, Hon. Ken	Thompson	PC
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Hon. Edward	Brandon West	PC
McGREGOR, Morris	Virден	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.	Osborne	PC
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, Hon. George	St. James	PC
ORCHARD, Hon. Donald	Pembina	PC
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Hon. Norma	Assiniboia	PC
RANSOM, Hon. Brian	Souris-Killarney	PC
SCHROEDER, Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	PC
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WESTBURY, June	Fort Rouge	Lib
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	PC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 12 June, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND
TABLING OF REPORTS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee's Interim Report.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne) introduced Bill No. 90, The Builders Liens Act.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Radisson) introduced Bill No. 62, The Pharmaceutical Act.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON (Springfield) introduced Bill No. 64, The Registered Respiratory Technologists Act.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland) introduced Bill No. 66, The Registered Psychiatric Nurses Act.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Pembina) introduced Bill No. 87, The Licenced Practical Nurses Act.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet), on behalf of Mr. Leonard S. Evans, introduced Bill No. 89, An Act Respecting the City of Brandon and Certain Municipalities, and to amend The Brandon Charter.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I should like to introduce to all honourable members, some members from the Canadian Union of Public Employees who are visiting the Legislature this afternoon.

We also have 60 students of Grades 5 to 7 from the Hartney School under the direction of Mr. Frank Basiuk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable First Minister, who may have been present at a speech given by Premier Lougheed last night, and I would ask the Minister whether the Manitoba government supports the idea that the federal government should put constitutional reform on the back burner and concentrate instead on attaining energy self-sufficiency for Canada, which was apparently supported by the Premier of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I was at a speech given by the Premier of Alberta yesterday noon to the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and to some 700 people who were there. I don't recall the Premier making a comment about the constitution at all, although he may well have made such a comment later on to a press conference which was held some time that afternoon before he left Winnipeg. That's all I can usefully add to my honourable friend's enquiry.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the enquiry was really whether there is support by the Manitoba government to the idea that constitutional reform be placed on the back burner. I would ask the Minister whether he would not agree that in the light of the national situation there should not be any effort to downgrade the importance of the discussions on constitutional reform.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think that the policy of the government of Manitoba is well expressed by the statement that I made to the House on Tuesday last with respect to our participation in the ongoing series of intensive meetings that are going to be held by the continuing committee of Ministers over the summer leading up to a first, and I think it will only be a first meeting of First Ministers, in September of this year. If my honourable friend is alluding to a newspaper headline or a newspaper comment alleging that the Premier of Alberta made that statement, he would have to ask the question of the Premier of Alberta. What I can say to him is this; that the two subjects, namely, the pricing of energy in Canada, which relates in turn to control over natural resources and ongoing constitutional discussions are not mutually exclusive. It depends on the priorities which various of the national leaders in this country, of the provinces and the federal government, choose to place on these matters. I understand very clearly that the Premier of Alberta wants to conclude, in the national interest and in the interest of the people of Alberta, an energy pricing agreement with the government of Canada, that he should give that prominence is no surprise to me at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture just when it is that he

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

proposes to announce the eligibility criteria and parameters of the Drought Assistance Program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, we have already announced certain programs to alleviate some of the difficulties that farmers, particularly livestock producers, were having in moving feed in with the Feed Freight Assistance Program, that in fact we had indicated at that time we were looking at other programs that may alleviate some of the difficulties. We have in place water pumping programs to assist the farm community in filling dugouts. We are looking at the whole area of movement of feed in from Ontario by rail; at this particular time there is still negotiations taking place with the rail lines.

I would also indicate to him that I indicated yesterday in the House that we are looking at the wild life management areas and the Crown lands that are available. There is a Freight Assistance Program to move cows and calves to those particular properties or areas of the province that have pasture, 10 a head for adult animals. That was announced some time ago. If the member could refer to something more specific, I could respond, but as we continue on into the drought situation, Mr. Speaker, we are keeping in touch with the farm community and looking at alternate programs that may be introduced.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I was really wanting the Minister to elaborate on what the maximum amount of aid per applicant is, or will be. If the Minister has not yet made up his mind about that then perhaps he can take it as notice, but what are the parameters of the assistance, that is, the ceiling limits per applicant; a) for transportation of cattle, b) for transportation of feed? There must be some upper limits established by the department.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the limits that we have placed on it at this particular time are 20 per ton feed assistance for each ton of feed that a farmer moves in. We haven't limited any particular producer to any particular maximum amount of funds at this particular time. I would suggest though, that if any one producer was moving in amounts of feed that were abusing the program, it would have to be looked at. I think our first objective is to alleviate the immediate problem of all the producers who want to use the program, not as he would indicate, that there may be at this time limits put on these particular people. We are still in the process of trying to help the people, and that's the No. 1 objective.

As far as the movement of livestock, I have indicated in my last answer that we are prepared to pay up to 10.00 per adult animal, cow, to move them to pasture and 4.00 per calf that is with that particular cow. So as far as the numbers of animals that any particular producer has to move, we haven't limited that particular part of the program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question I believe would be appropriately directed to the Minister of Labour, although the Minister responsible for the Human Rights might wish to answer it. The question is that in light of allegations by the former Deputy Registrar of the Manitoba Court of Appeals, that the Manitoba government has rejected a conciliation report recommending that he be reinstated after being forced to retire under mandatory retirement provisions at age 65, would either one of those Ministers be prepared to elaborate as to what exactly was contained in that report, who that report was initiated by, and would they be willing further to table such a report before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'd respectfully ask the Member for Churchill if I could take that question as notice.

MR. COWAN: Certainly, and I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, while he is reviewing the situation, if he would undertake to review that conciliation report in light of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench decision yesterday that mandatory retirement was in fact in opposition to The Human Rights Act.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, my final supplementary is to the Minister of Health and I would ask the Minister of Health if he can advise us as to the current situation in regard to the health centre at Leaf Rapids and in fact, if there are services being performed out of that centre and if arrangements have been made for emergency transportation if such becomes necessary?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Honourable Member for Churchill asked me whether the Leaf Rapids hospital was open and operating in the present circumstances and I told him that I did not have that information at my hand yesterday. But I have subsequently had an opportunity to investigate and I can advise him that the hospital is open and operating and says that they can deal with all emergencies.

There are some shortages of nursing staff, as he knows. The hospital has two nursing vacancies at the present time, Mr. Speaker, which means that there are four nurses now covering the necessary shifts rather than six and certainly a search is under way for additional nurses, but the hospital says they can deal with emergencies. Lynn Lake is giving 24-hour telephone consultation. A doctor is coming in on the 15th of June for a couple of months, on contract, and negotiations are taking place with a doctor in England which are described to me as hopeful

negotiations in terms of producing a permanent placement.

The transportation problem doesn't appear to be a major problem at the moment. Voluntary drivers are available and vehicles are being made available for transfer to Lynn Lake or Thompson in those cases deemed necessary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. I posed this question a number of weeks ago in regard to the wage negotiations between the grain handlers and the management at the Port of Churchill. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Labour could indicate to us at this time whether or not an official settlement has been reached between the management and the labour negotiations in regard to the grain handlers at Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that a satisfactory conclusion has been reached in those particular sets of negotiations.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the question that I posed many weeks ago to the Minister of Labour, I wonder if the Minister could indicate and give us some information as to why it has taken so long to reach this decision.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I heard the members opposite saying that they couldn't agree; well that's not exactly what took place. There was an agreement by the negotiating committee some weeks ago in conjunction with the Harbour Board officials. But the system that's used in the Churchill area when negotiations take place, is they wait till those people who are employed in the summer return to the Port to give them the opportunity to vote. They have, in fact, waited till the majority of the people returned, the majority of the people have voted in favour of the negotiating committee's recommendation and the contract has reached a satisfactory conclusion.

I share the concern of the Member for Rock Lake who asked the question, the concern being that it would have been better, of course, if those negotiations could have been concluded quite some time ago so that there would have been peace in the minds of the people in Churchill. But there were some difficulties in reaching that conclusion and I respect the union's decision to hold their negotiations in their method and to vote in the particular manner that they find most democratic.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Community Services. When the Department of Community Services pays foster parents the rate required to pay for the maintenance of the foster child who's being kept by the foster parents, is there any profit

involved and does the department consider this to be a form of surplus income for the foster parents taking care of the foster child?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that series of questions as notice.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, then I'd also ask the Minister of Community Services and the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation — and I perhaps can just get the Minister's attention because I know he's in the House — my question is directed to both the Minister of Community Services and the Minister responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation. I'd like to ask why this government has decreed that the payments made to foster parents for looking after foster children will be deemed surplus income and therefore are used in calculations of the rents according to income that people in public housing have to pay; and as a result people looking after foster children, getting the bare rate for that, are now being required by this government to pay higher rents as a result of changes in policy by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, as far as the public housing is concerned, I believe states that income from all sources will be taken into consideration when calculating the rent for public housing. I'm not just sure of the circumstance that the honourable member speaks of but I'll have it looked into and report back to the House.

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

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary to the Minister of Housing. In view of the fact that the Critical Home Repair Program application form specifically states that if you have received a grant and/or loan under any previous critical home repair program, you are not again eligible, will the government please reconsider this policy, especially in view of the continuing high unemployment rate, so that older people trying to keep their homes may receive some form of assistance to enable them to do that and, furthermore, that this type of renovation of pensioners homes will indeed provide some employment to the unemployed in the construction area?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Finance made it very clear what is being done for pensioners living in their homes in the province of Manitoba and I think it's probably one of the best programs in Canada. To answer his other question, will we look into it? Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, last week I asked the House Leader how many more bills were to be introduced into the House, he indicated he would have to have a look and let me know. I ask the question again today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman will note that Bill No. 90 was introduced for first reading today. I expect, that while I can't give him a definitive answer at this time, it could be somewhere in the range of 30 to 40 more bills that would be introduced, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister responsible for, I guess it's either Resources or Parklands, I'm not sure which category applies in this instance, whether or not he is in a position to respond to, or whether he has already responded to, the Brokenhead River Planning District and the surrounding municipalities with respect to their request for the setting aside of Sherwood Forest Campground for the benefit of the local residents in that particular area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, we have been having some discussions with the municipal authorities as well as with the group Anishnabi Neebin, I believe it is, that have been leasing the facilities in order to run a day camp. We have that matter under consideration.

MR. USKIW: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Minister could indicate just when he expects to arrive at a decision on that question?

MR. RANSOM: I think, Mr. Speaker, that we either will make the decision very soon or perhaps the decision has already been taken. If my recollection is accurate, I believe that the Anishnabi Neebin group have been given the opportunity to operate the facilities again. I believe they provide the short-term camping for perhaps up to 1,000 youngsters there in the summer and if there is any way that we can see that sort of activity continue, we would like to see that happen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, to the House Leader, a clarification on the number of 30 that he mentioned, is that 30 over the 90 or 30 up to the 90?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, he will appreciate it's difficult to forecast a specific number because of continuing deliberations of caucus. The 30 to 40 I referred to, Mr. Speaker, was over the 90.

MR. FOX: In view of the fact that we only have 60 that have been introduced to date, which means we have 30 to go to catch 90, does the Honourable House Leader expect to adjourn this session sometime this year or next year?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I think members opposite are quite competent to deal with the bills that we will present to them in the next short while.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Member for Churchill posed a question about Medi-vac aircraft being available to the Leaf Rapids area. I want to inform the Member for Churchill that we have one of our Aztecs, which is equipped for medical evacuation, stationed at Thompson for quick service to the Leaf Rapids area should a need arise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I thank the Minister for that information and would ask him only if that is on a temporary or a permanent basis?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, that will be on a permanent basis.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for that information. I would ask the Minister of Health if he could elaborate just slightly on a question I'd asked him previously and that was in regard to the current status of operations at the Health Centre in Leaf Rapids. Can the Minister indicate if the 8 beds at the Health Centre there are shut down and that is the reason, in fact, why persons are having to be transported to Lynn Lake and to Thompson?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm told, no, Mr. Speaker. I'm told that the 8 beds are operating and that the nurses are meeting the shift requirements on a rotating basis and that where they can't cover because, as I've pointed out a few minutes ago there are only four nurses to cover all the shifts, where they can't cover the day shift is left open and two departmental Outreach nurses are utilized at that point. I'm told, Sir, that the beds are open and operating. But I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I'm also told that the occupancy rate in the hospital is only 30 to 40 percent on eight beds, so we're looking at some 3 beds being occupied at any one given time on the basis of normal volumes there.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the fact that the occupancy rate in Leaf Rapids is less than it is in other areas but I have to point out to the Minister that due to the employment in the area there is a potentiality for a major disaster

from time to time and that is a necessity that all those beds be available and open, and I'm certain that the Minister agrees with that. I'd ask the Minister, then, what extraordinary efforts he has undertaken, because I believe extraordinary efforts are necessary in this regard, to ensure that nursing staff is attracted to the area as well as doctors, which was the question we asked yesterday and in this specific instance, what matters that are undergoing that are of an urgent nature to deal with what seems to be a very urgent problem?

MR. SHERMAN: All I can assure the honourable member of, Mr. Speaker, is that the hospital is making every effort to attract new nurses through advertising and through communication with nursing organizations and associations within Manitoba and elsewhere. We had one nurse lined up and virtually confirmed to be available, sometime around the second of July, I think was the date, sometime very near at hand and then suddenly found that decision had been changed by the individual herself. One contract nurse is to start in the second week in July and the efforts, through communications with nursing associations and through advertising, are being pursued as vigorously as possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of some of the questionable comments from the Member for Brandon East, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could the Minister confirm that Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company will buy all the production that the government-run logging camps might be able to supply them; and can he also confirm or possibly advise the House as to whether or not the government-run lumber and cord camps are in full production? In other words, is the Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company satisfied with the production that they are receiving from the government at this point in time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the member's question, yes, the Abitibi Paper Company is prepared to buy all of the production from Channel Area Loggers. With respect to their satisfaction with production, I haven't heard of any official complaints from them but I know that the anticipated production fell considerably short of their objective this year. In spite of the many pleas that we've heard from a lack of jobs in the north, one of the main reasons that we were short of production of Channel Area Loggers was the absenteeism of native workers at Channel Area Loggers this past year.

MR. WILSON: Would the Minister have any approximate estimate of the production dollars that may have been lost because of absenteeism in the lumber camps, or is there any way that discussions could take place to ensure that a better production figure will be reached this year so that Abitibi Pulp

and Paper will receive a greater amount of production from the government-run corporation?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got exact figures of the loss of production figures as a result of absenteeism, but it's somewhere in the neighbourhood of about 130,000 to 140,000.00. Discussions are anticipated in the very near future with respect to the Abitibi Paper Company and also in conjunction with the Band at Berens River and with the Federal Minister of Immigration. As I understand it, there has been some competition from training programs initiated by the federal government which happens to coincide with the production period and I would like to be able to sit down with the people concerned, that any training programs would be held at such a time of the year that would not compete with the pulp production.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister of Health on behalf of the people of the Swan River area. In view of the fact that the present Member for Swan River made an election promise that the Birch River Hospital would be reopened if he is elected, and in view of the fact he is now a member of the Treasury Bench, could the Minister of Health inform us if it is the intention of this government to reopen the Birch River Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can't give the honourable member a commitment on that at this juncture. I will have to review the situation with respect to the Birch River Hospital and I'll attempt to give him more information on it within the next day or two.

MR. PARASIUK: In view of the fact that the Birch River residents and people from the surrounding area have been dealing with the Manitoba Health Services Commission now for two-and-a-half years, can the Minister indicate whether in fact the Manitoba Health Services Commission has ever approached him on this matter in putting forward moneys in the estimates process in order to free up moneys to allocate to the Birch River Hospital which has now been closed? Can the Minister indicate that?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but that has not been the essential problem with respect to the Birch River Hospital. The problem, as the honourable member well knows, with respect to many of the smaller hospitals in smaller rural areas is one of attraction and retention of the necessary professional staff. I'll have to respond further to the Honourable Member for Transcona after I've had a chance to review the current situation.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask the Minister if he could indicate to us whether there

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

is a nursing station at least operating in Birch River right now and whether there is a commitment on the part of the government to provide some level of health care facility in Birch River.

MR. SHERMAN: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and ask the Minister if he has written a letter of support in regard to an application for a route extension for Calm Air Limited operating out of Lynn Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Thank you. I would then ask the Minister if he has since that time written a letter of retraction in regard to that original letter of support concerning that route line application.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. COWAN: I would ask the Minister then if he would be prepared to table both letters and if he could now indicate why he felt it was necessary in the first place to write a letter of support and then why it was he felt it was necessary to write a letter of retraction, as the two seem to be a contradictory process.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister confirm that there has been a deficit at the Souris District Hospital of some 17,000 for some time now and that this arises out of the Souris Hospital having a surgeon and making surgeon referrals? Can the Minister also confirm that the Manitoba Health Services Commission has refused to pick up this deficit now for some time, putting the Souris Hospital in a very difficult situation?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but the situation is not as Draconian as the Honourable Member for Transcona might suggest. The Health Services Commission has indicated complete willingness to review the deficit position with the Souris Hospital pending the completion of an investigation with the Souris Hospital Board and administration of the volume and the demand from outlying areas that is placed on that particular regional hospital. One of two reports requested has been received. The other one was to be undertaken under the auspices of the College of Physicians and

Surgeons. Thus far the Souris Hospital Board has not acquiesced in that request and that's where the argument rests at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the Minister. In view of the fact that this issue has been brought before the government and the Manitoba Health Services Commission and in view of the fact that Mr. Gordon Pollack, chairman of the Health Services Commission, and Dr. Johnson, who is the Acting Deputy Minister of Health, have been looking into this matter since August of 1979, can the Minister indicate whether in fact it's the general practice of this government to be so tardy in dealing with deficits of hospitals, and whether in fact this hasn't contributed to some of the uneasiness on the part of hospitals in pursuing the collective bargaining process at present?

MR. SHERMAN: Not at all, Mr. Speaker, and we've had no difficulty whatsoever in the area of collective bargaining with respect to the hospital to which the honourable member is referring. This indeed has been a long and protracted situation where Souris is concerned. It's also been a unique situation. It does not reflect the norm in any way, shape or form, and if the hospital board agrees to the kind of necessary examination of ongoing operations that I think even the Member for Transcona would concede as part of the accountability process, then the matter can be expedited fairly quickly, but it has so far been stalled on that point. I will make a further effort, Mr. Speaker, to resolve it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Northern Affairs and follows upon a statement the Minister made earlier in the question period in regards to absenteeism of workers at Channel Area Loggers. I would ask the Minister if any study has been done to compare absenteeism rates there with other operations of a similar nature throughout the province and indeed throughout other jurisdictions where workers are operating under conditions that may be similar in fact to those that are being operated under in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any survey that's been done with this respect. However, the information that I have is that there hasn't been the same problem in other jurisdictions, or other camps, that to my knowledge no actual survey has been done to compare comparative working conditions, so I can't elaborate any further than that.

MR. COWAN: Then, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister has been informed that there are not similar rates of absenteeism in other camps, has the Minister been able to come to a conclusion as to why there should be rates of absenteeism in this camp that he feels that he should single out in this House?

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, it was indicated to me when I raised this question at committee of the delegation that were here about the absenteeism in Channel Area Loggers. It was brought to my attention that one reason was because of the poor living conditions that were available there. I've checked this out and find that the living conditions, although they certainly could be better, they're not all that bad. Another reason that was given to me as to absenteeism is the fact that there are many federal training programs available to the native people that compete for the labour force at the time of the year when they could use them to advantage in the pulp camp. As I indicated earlier, I have a request in to meet with the federal Minister responsible for these programs to see if they couldn't be offered at the time of the year when it wouldn't compete for optimum conditions at the lumber camp.

Now I'm not aware that this situation has been a problem in other areas. I do know, however, that we did lose 130,000 to 140,000 because the jobs went wanting and I bring this up that although it was indicated living conditions may be not as good as they should be, they're adequate. And furthermore, the other people in the area are coming out to work and the program was set up to provide work for the Channel Area residents. There is the Metis community in the area as well as the band, and as I understand it, the Metis community have been fulfilling employment opportunities and the absenteeism for the most part has been from the Indian population.

MR. COWAN: I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, to elaborate on what seems to be a contradictory statement. He says that living conditions are not as good as they should be but they are adequate. Are living conditions up to standards and have there been inspectors involved to test and to examine and to investigate those living quarters?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please. May I suggest the honourable member is debating rather than asking questions. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: I would ask the Minister of Northern Affairs in what way those living conditions are not up to standard?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had the opportunity yet to visit this camp and I plan on doing so as soon as I possibly can. I have checked with the manager on site who has been working with both the Channel Area Logger Operation as well as the Moose Lake Operations, and he advises me that the living conditions there are adequate. He says naturally they've not as good as perhaps one's home, but they are substantial and adequate but he said there is still room for improvement. I can't be more specific than that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Honourable the Minister of

Community Services. If a child of a family on social allowances was to attend a government-sponsored day camp, will the value of that be added to and considered as revenue for the family on social welfare?

MR. MINAKER: I don't think it will be counted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister explain then, or tell us the reason why, if the government is sponsoring it and it won't be considered revenue, but if a private individual wants to sponsor the same holiday, this would be counted. Would it be that this government is so interested in getting government in every phase of our lives that . . . ?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, the reason I gave the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that answer was that he didn't go into detail on the lengths of time or where the camp was and so forth. I think the honourable member will have full opportunity to debate the subject in dealing with Bill 39 that's before the House at the present time.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now saying that it depends where the camp is?

MR. MINAKER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a change on Public Utilities and substitute the name of Mr. Craik for Mr. Ransom.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreeable? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could first of all indicate that we'll be calling Private Bills Committee next Tuesday at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Education, and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for Energy and Mines.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — ENERGY AND MINES

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): Call the committee to order. We are on Resolution 59. 3.(a)(1)—pass.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Chairman, do we have a quorum?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it's in the rules so long as we've got a quorum between two or three or four committees.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): We were about finished anyway, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the windup. Page 45. 3.(a)(1) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can indicate to give the Member for Brandon East some breathing space there, that the Member for Rossmere had been desirous of obtaining a former agreement with Prairie Potash that had been entered into by the former government and didn't come under the mining recorder's office usual procedures, on the one hand; and neither was it ever approved by Order-in-Council, strangely and oddly enough, on the other. So it's an agreement that is expired now but was in force for some five years and having had a look at it, I think probably it's the type of thing where there is no necessity for giving the agreement of the other party, in this case, because it is an expired document. So we'll provide it to the member who had the particular interest in it and any other members of the Legislature that may similarly have an interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. I know the Member for Rossmere was very interested in that so I'll convey your message to him. Will it be sent to him by mail or is it tabled?

MR. CRAIK: I'll table it at a meeting and then it will be available to him.

MR. EVANS: We're beginning now the other division, I guess, of the department, referred to as Mineral Resources, and we're dealing with Administration 3.(a)(1). I wonder if the Minister could explain just what has happened in terms of the organization. I would gather you've got all the mining sections or divisions of the former Department of Mines and Natural Resources and Environment in the new department.

MR. CRAIK: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Since we're talking about administration, which includes organization, was there any parts left that were with the old Mines Bureau or Mines Department that are left back in the Department of Natural Resources? Or is every body, every function, every position now brought over into the new department?

MR. CRAIK: It's almost identical, Mr. Chairman. There may be some on the administrative end. There

was a division of personnel on the administrative end, but basically it's the same operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: There was, I believe, a map or a chart, organizational structure in the latest report of the government, Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment as of March 31, 1979, and it shows the Mineral Resources Division as one of several. I take it that all of that division, as shown in this annual report is now here but my question is, are there any of some of the other divisions that have been brought over, for instance Lands and Surveys, is that still in Natural Resources or has that been brought over with Mineral Resources?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Chairman, that's in Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Well what about regional services then? Are there regional services of the Department of Mines in your department?

MR. CRAIK: No.

MR. EVANS: Then what about mining inspectors? Are they not handled on a regional basis?

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but they are more or less restricted to one region.

MR. EVANS: Well I see in the organizational chart, the northwest sub-region and the northeast sub-region, I'm not familiar with the boundaries, but north conjures up two areas in northern Manitoba where there may be mining activities, so I was just wondering, what happens to people in the regional services, what happens to people in the administrative service division? I imagine a percentage of them would come over.

MR. CRAIK: Yes. Mr. Chairman, the Mines was separate from that regional services concept as a separate entity and has remained that way.

MR. EVANS: A couple of other questions, just on organization. I see three categories, one, policy advisory, again in the previous department, is that function brought over to this department? I'm not sure what it is but it says policy advisory?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: There's another area here which reports directly to the Deputy Minister in the old structure, it's shown as Mr. P. Jarvis, Resource Economic Section, Chief, W. Fisher. Do you have any resource economic staff in . . .

MR. CRAIK: No, that's Natural Resources there. Yes, on the other hand there is an economics group in the Mineral Resources itself though.

MR. EVANS: I'd just clarify. Where would the resource economists be, they would be under 3.(c) when we get to it? Under Mines? They could be under administration too.

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

MR. CRAIK: I guess, Mr. Chairman, probably the appropriate place is under administration. Yes, under administration.

MR. EVANS: I assume then that certain SMYs have been transferred from this Resource Economic section into the Administration section of . . .

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Chairman, not transferred. I don't believe there was ever an integration of the two before. It came across as the same entity as it was under the former structure.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the entire Resource Economic section has been brought over to Mines has it?

MR. CRAIK: No. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. There were no Mine Economics type of people in that division of the former Mines and Natural Resources, they were all Renewable Resource-oriented personnel that were in that box on the organization chart.

MR. EVANS: Let me ask this question. I would take it there are some economists in the department, in the Mines division, under the Mineral Resources division and if so, where would they be in the listing here? Are they under Administration?

MR. CRAIK: Yes. There are four people in Economic and Policy Analysis under Administration.

MR. EVANS: I see, and these are new SMYs in effect.

MR. CRAIK: No, they were transferred over, Mr. Chairman, but they weren't in that box the member's referring to under the former organization chart.

MR. EVANS: Oh, I see here. They would come under the Mineral Resource Economic Policy and Analysis box here that's shown under the Mineral Resource division..

MR. CRAIK: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Okay. The other question is with regard to the Associate Deputy Minister, Mr. J. Roper. It seems to me his background was in mining. Is he with the Mineral Resources division now?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Roper is retired and he's on the board of the Manitoba Mineral Resources and I think has been acting in a consulting capacity to the department on a number of different things and he's involved in the Mine Safety Review Operations that are presently under way.

MR. EVANS: Is there a position of Associate Deputy Minister responsible for Mineral Resources in this department?

MR. CRAIK: Well, that title is not probably the one that is used now but the person who has essentially moved to occupy that position is the new addition to the department by the name of Mr. Bardswich, who joined the department a few months ago.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, what is his position? Is he director of the Mineral Resources division or is he Assistant Deputy Minister?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I have to backtrack. The position that Mr. Roper held before is held by Ian Haugh, Dr. Haugh, who was with the department prior and is now the Executive Director of that but it's the equivalent of Associate or Assistant Deputy Minister, the titles are more or less synonymous. Mr. Bardswich is the Director of Mines and he has joined the department in the last few months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I see. The other department had a box entitled Program Review Team. Is that function to be found in the new department? Program Review Team, it may still be with Natural Resources.

MR. CRAIK: Not by that name, no, Mr. Chairman. That's essentially Natural Resource, renewable resource people that remained with Natural Resources. Mr. Chairman, I should point out that when Mines and Natural Resources were divided, in accurate global numbers, I think there were some employees that numbered, in total, somewhere around 700 or 800 in the Mines and Natural Resources. About 600 of those or more remained in Natural Resources and the Mines, in terms of numbers of people, is the smallest of the two at 130 or so people. So that the large body of numbers of personnel are still Natural Resources. The Mines operation in terms of numbers of people is a fairly small operation in comparison with numbers.

MR. EVANS: Okay. Just one last question on this one item before I turn the mike over to my colleague, the Member for Rupertsland. What is the breakdown then of this Item (1)(a) Salaries? We made some reference to some economists being in here, but what positions do we have now? It's a fairly large amount, 347,800.00.

MR. CRAIK: 19.2 SMYs; Executive Director's office, 2; Administration, 5; Economic and Policy Analysis, 4; and summer students, 8.2; for a total of 19.2.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. I wonder if the Minister could advise some of the projects that the economics group is engaged in. Could he describe some of the studies or reports that they're working on? I'm not asking for confidential information but to get an idea what they are doing with the taxpayers' money in their research efforts, do they do various cost-benefit studies on mineral bodies or whatever?

MR. CRAIK: Yes, generally, Mr. Chairman, they do and they have, for instance, been involved in the departmental work that has gone into the evaluation of the potash undertaking that the government has announced along with IMC and provide in-House backup support for that in addition to the consultants that we've engaged. I guess, in general, evaluation of resource development potentials in the province. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I'm

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

reminded that they are also involved in taxation policy measures.

MR. EVANS: I see. I recall some years back that there was a group in Finance also very much involved in taxation. So is that function now away from Finance into this department, or is it just an additional number of people that are working on the same problem?

MR. CRAIK: The taxation area is administered by finance, but the policy development part of it is a result of the two departments working to develop the policy. Once the policy is in place, the taxation laws are completely administered by the Department of Finance. That change took place some ten or twelve years ago when finance became completely responsible for the administration of the tax laws, but the development is a joint effort by the two departments.

MR. EVANS: Would this economic research group have any forecasts of future developments. I don't mean specific fines because you have to have a big crystal ball for some of that, but do they do any forecasting, any projecting of mineral revenues that may accrue in the province by the industry and then therefore taxation revenues accruing by the Crown and so on, and is any of this published, is any of this public information?

MR. CRAIK: Well, it hasn't been published in a formal way, Mr. Chairman, because a lot of that information comes from the mining corporations that are involved in the province and it is a matter, in that case, of doing the projections of collecting the information and putting it forth in that regard. They do do the backup and research information based on that supply of information and I don't think at this point we have put out any formal projections. They tend to be pretty speculative and they're based on judgements that are arrived at by looking at the trends that are taking place in the industry, the exploration levels that are under way by the industries, world metal prices and trends in the world market and so on, but not in a formal way is there a report put out in that regard.

MR. EVANS: Well, perhaps when we get to Mines we can talk a bit more about pricing trends for minerals and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister some questions about the administration of mineral resources generally in the province of Manitoba. I note that on January 25, 1980, the Minister put out a press release which was entitled Craik Optimistic for Mining in 1980, Exploration on the Increase, in which he compared the production in 1979 with the 1978 level. I wonder if the Minister could update that press release by indicating what the actual production was in 1979 and what, if anything, they're projecting for the year 1980?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, is the member asking for exploration or for production?

MR. BOSTROM: It's for production. I note that in the press release which was dated January 5, 1980, on the back of the press release, it was outlined Manitoba mineral production by products, the revised 1978 produced a grand total of 459,640,280 in value of metals and industrial minerals and fuels produced in the province of Manitoba and a preliminary estimate is given for 1979. I'm wondering if he has a final estimate, or a final count for the year 1979 for both quantity and value and if he has projections for the year 1980 for quantity and value. One can talk about exploration activity, but the bottom line is really what is happening in the mining industry in Manitoba in terms of production, because that's where the income to the province is produced and also where the jobs for Manitobans are produced.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, 1979 revised estimate is 461 million on metallic minerals.

MR. BOSTROM: 461 on metallic minerals?

MR. CRAIK: Yes.

MR. BOSTROM: Could the Minister indicate the other amounts for industrial minerals and fuels?

MR. CRAIK: Industrial minerals 90 million, and fuels 48 million, for a grand total of 600 million.

MR. BOSTROM: Can the Minister indicate how these compare to other years, other than the ones he mentioned in his press release of January 25, 1980. In other words, how do they compare to the years 1977-76-75 and so on? Is production in Manitoba, particularly when one considers what should be an adjustment for inflation is it, in the Minister's opinion, increasing or is it levelling off, staying approximately the same as it was in the 70s? Is there any real net change in production?

MR. CRAIK: In dollar terms it's the highest. In terms of pounds or tons, I don't have those figures here, but in dollar terms, the 1979 figures are the highest. In constant dollar figures, you'd find in metallic minerals that there were higher years. On industrial minerals it's just about fairly constant over the last three or four years, and on fuels it is fairly constant over the last several years in terms of constant dollars.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point I'm trying to pursue here is that in spite of the rhetoric that we've heard from the Progressive Conservative Government and the Progressive Conservatives while they were in Opposition, that they were going to do wonders in terms of increasing and developing the mineral resource in Manitoba, the picture that we're faced with when we look at the record of the PC government since they were elected is one of declining production. And I say this, Mr. Chairman, because the figures even produced by the Minister himself indicate a significant decline in the production, in spite of the fact that over that period of time there has been a significant increase in the value of minerals; and in fact the only reason the dollar values of the mineral production in Manitoba

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

approaches an amount comparable to the 1970s is because of the increase in the price of the minerals, and I would like to take the Minister through a comparison.

When one looks at the year 1977, the last year of the New Democratic Party government, and when one looks at the major minerals that are produced in Manitoba in terms of their impact on the production in Manitoba, there were 132,569 pounds of copper produced in Manitoba in 1977. That compares with approximately the same or a slight decline in 1978, and there is a decline in that production in 1979.

In the case of nickel, Mr. Chairman, we see in 1977 there was produced 115,781 pounds. In 1978 this dropped off by a significant amount, 33 percent decline, to 76,000 pounds. I'm sorry, 76 million pounds as compared to 115 million in 1977. And when one looks at the preliminary estimate for 1979, which is about the same as the final estimate which the Minister provided us today, we see that the quantity produced was 80 million pounds as compared to 115 million pounds of nickel in 1977.

So, Mr. Chairman, the efforts of the Progressive Conservative government are obviously failing in terms of giving incentive to the production of mineral production in Manitoba. We see a significant decline in the major mineral production. If one looks at another example, zinc, which is another important category of mineral production in Manitoba, metal minerals, 135 million pounds was produced in 1977. This dropped off to 125 million pounds in 1978 and it dropped to 101 million pounds, a decline of 25 percent, by 1979.

So, Mr. Chairman, if one compares production of these three major metals, copper, nickel and zinc, we see that between 1977 and 1978 there was a 13 percent decline in the production of these metals in Manitoba. Between 1977 and 1979 there is a 19 percent decline in the production of these metals. So that, Mr. Chairman, while the Progressive Conservative government may be using a rhetoric that they used during the election and say that they were going to be increasing production, increasing the opportunities for mineral development and encouraging the mining industry in Manitoba, what we see is that after two years of Progressive Conservative government there was a 19 percent decline in metal mineral production over those two years.

We contrast this to Saskatchewan, where they're supposed to have one of these evil, mean New Democratic Party governments that's not very fair to the mining companies; we see that Saskatchewan mineral production increased by 24 percent in 1978.

Also 1978 saw unprecedented mineral exploration activity. The Minister points to increased exploration in Manitoba as being somehow encouraged by the Progressive Conservative government policies. Mr. Chairman, in 1978, one-half of Canada's hardrock drilling activity took place where? In Saskatchewan, one-half. What is happening in Manitoba?

A MEMBER: Uranium.

MR. BOSTROM: So the question is, Mr. Chairman, where is the expanded mineral production that was to occur since the P.C. government reduced the royalties as one of its first acts in the fall session of

1977? Where are the incentives to the mining companies and what is happening to the mining companies that results in the reduction of metal mineral production over that two-year period by 19 percent? I think that's a significant decline. The Minister should be able to give us some answers on that and to indicate where his P.C. government policy is taking us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think it's significant that the Minister doesn't wish to answer that question, but I'll give him one that I think maybe he will want to answer. Would I be correct, Mr. Chairman, in assuming that the profit on the Tantalum Mine for this year, for the last year in which there is an audited statement, is over 5 million, substantially more than 5 million? I believe that the mine is now with this department.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, that comes under Manitoba Mineral Resources, who have been before the committee and presented their report.

MR. GREEN: I don't know that they presented the Tantalum Mine.

MR. CRAIK: I don't have those figures at hand but the Tantalum Mine did have a good year and produced substantial profits, but I don't have the numbers.

MR. GREEN: Could you determine from staff whether I'm correct in that it accumulated profits last year of over 5 million? Would that information be available?

MR. CRAIK: I will check and see if their report is available on that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, even if the report is not available, could we at least know very quickly, which I think somebody should be able to have it, whether I am correct in that it would be over 5 million?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the department itself doesn't deal with it. I would receive that through the Manitoba Mineral Resources, who have already been before the committee here and have presented that information. I wasn't here the day it was presented, unfortunately, I was tied up, but the . . .

MR. GREEN: I noticed that the president is here and I'm not asking him to come again but it would seem to me that the information would be readily available — and I didn't see anything about it, I'm sorry that I was not before a committee myself when it was presented — but I am aware that it made over 2 million in the previous year and I know that the price of tantalum is up and I know that we would be having a good year. So looking in the direction of the president, first of all, was this presented to committee, the Tantalum statement?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster, I think we're getting out of order here . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I really am seeking information which I think the Minister of Mines, who also is the Minister to whom Manitoba Mineral Resources reports, would be able very quickly to obtain a confirmation or a denial of that statement and I think it would be interesting. I don't know if there was any member of the House here at committee, but I don't believe it was presented at committee because I never saw anything about it. Are there any other members of the committee that were at committee?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We're getting into a little difficulty here.

MR. CRAIK: I think it's more of a point of order. The committee that heard the metallic minerals, the Manitoba minerals, would be the Economic Development Committee of the Legislature.

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. CRAIK: I don't know that members that are on this committee may well be on the other committee. I wasn't able to be at the meeting myself. I don't think I've had their report on the last year's activities. I know they've had a good year but I don't think their report has been formally filed at this point.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I had reason to think — and I say only to think and I will ask the Minister to certainly correct my thinking if I'm wrong — that the Tantalum mine made over 5 million — and this might even be after payment of taxes, in other words, 5 million net — on last year's operations. I believe that it made over 2 million in the previous year, so in the last year and a half, after the Manitoba government let go 50 percent of that mine which we had a right to take — and if anybody tells you that a right of first refusal is not a valuable asset should now realize what a right of first refusal is — because in two years that mine will have made net profit . . . First of all, they have extended their reserves which is a huge profit immediately. Secondly, the price of tantalum — and if tantalum was sort of a vital commodity to the rest of the people of Canada the federal government would step in because the price of tantalum was up from 7.00, I don't know if they measure that by the pound or by the ton, I can't remember, I think it's 7.00 — went up to 47.00, whatever the unit was and it's probably much higher now; that if that was a vital commodity to other provinces, I'm sure that the federal government would step in and say, that we cannot do that. But it made 7 million over the last 18 months approximately which, if you took that over a period of per month, it would be making in the neighbourhood of . . . For a year and a half it's 7 million so it's about 5 million per year. It would be more than 5 million if those profits are going up. But we let go a right of first refusal for 6 million, for 50 percent of that mine, which to its shareholders now produces approximately 5 million a year and produced to the shareholder who put up 6 million, 3.5 million in the first 18 months, 3.5 million. They have almost got, in value — and they can declare the dividends when they want to but I expect that

they won't because there's more money to be made there and they will be investing those dividends — but in value for 6 million, in a year and a half they got back 3.5 million and that was available, Mr. Chairman, to the people of the province of Manitoba.

Now I think that the figures that were introduced by Mr. Bostrom are very significant because what is happening here, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister is selling the mineral program in this province, in the unscrupulous way that a penny stock promoter sells mining stocks where there is nothing discovered. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister announced a program that we have, in exchange for 2 million in exploration costs, transferred to a potash company our share, less 25 percent, of the right to develop a mine which may some day happen. Now, originally I thought that what he was talking about was our share, which the Crown owned, roughly 50 percent of the known potash resource in the St. Lazare area and I thought that we gave up 75 percent of our share. The Minister seems to have said that we've now given up half our share; that the other 50 percent comes from the old shareholding that Inco had. But that for 2 million in exploration costs we now have the right to participate in 50 percent of that development when it comes along, which means that we've sold 50 percent of the known reserves for 2 million.

What appeared, Mr. Chairman, that there is a potential 300 million potash development in the province of Manitoba, with motion pictures of underground potash mining with the hope, I suppose, that people would hop on the penny stock bandwagon and buy some of the potash propaganda that was being sold by the Minister. Let us first be aware that it's an exploration program — and I certainly think that there is a mine there and hope that there is a mine there — and if this exploration results in a mine we will be entitled to only 50 percent of it and we will have given up the other 50 percent — I'm talking about the share that we are dealing with — we'll be entitled to 25 percent of the total or 50 percent of our own, for 2 million. If it is a 300 million development and it is going to produce revenue, which I'm holding my breath, if it is going to produce revenues then for 2 million we've given up the revenues on this great mine in exchange for having the right to participate to the extent of 25 percent; and the royalties were there either way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what would the Minister have thought of me? What would this Minister have thought of me if I said in 1975, that the government of Manitoba and International Nickel Company had entered into an agreement for a feasibility study of 50 percent, to then go into a development of a 300 million potash development mine and show pictures of the underground tools digging out the potash and talking about the number of jobs? He would have said that I'm a penny stock promoter. That's why, Mr. Chairman, when a similar thing was done by the previous administration, we never said that we have a potential 300 million mining development in which we're engaged with Inco at a feasibility study — I think which we put up 60,000 and they put up 60,000 or maybe it was 30 and 30 and I can't remember — but exactly that was done with the International Nickel Company of Canada and with the province of Manitoba as willing partners. These people, who the

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

Minister says won't develop anything when we're in the province, were willing partners in such a development. The only reason that it was not proceeded with, in my opinion, is that the Saskatchewan potash resources were much richer and, therefore, much more competitive and that they had a clearer access to the markets than would a new mine coming on stream.

But there was no doubt that it was not considered to be feasible at that time. Now I hope that one day it will be feasible but I certainly would not sell it to the people of the province of Manitoba that there is a potash mine going into production in which we are going to be 25 percent shareholders or 50, if we count the Crown resource only, and that really what we've done is given up 25 percent, not taken 25 percent and did it for 2 million on what the Premier says may be a sure thing. All that we are looking for is 2 million exploration costs.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that you should have come to the Legislature and said that for 2 million in exploration costs, we could be the 50 percent owners of a total mine. Or, if I'm wrong, if it's 75 percent that we've given up, which I pray that we haven't, we would be the 75 percent owners of the mine or 100 percent owner, in exchange for 2 million, and we get the royalties on top of that because the royalties come out either way. They come out of Tantalum now, we're getting royalties we would be getting out of Tantalum.

Look at the stupidity of the public as against the wisdom of the private sector when a Progressive Conservative government is in power. Under our previous Act, with the Tantalum prices going up, we would be entitled to much higher royalty because they are now in the process of making much higher profits than a normal return on investment. Kawecki Berylco was smart to see to it that they would get tantalum at a continued low price; they are one of the partners, and therefore have kept their good end of the Tantalum moneys despite the fact that it's more than the partners are getting. We've given up on it. Why aren't we as smart as they are?

The mine is still there. We weren't going to induce a tantalum mine to the province of Manitoba on the basis of no debt taxes or reducing profits. I don't think Kawecki Berylco is saying take our preferred price and we will give it back to you because we want to induce production in the province of Manitoba. That's why, Mr. Chairman, as soon as the Hudson's Bay bought Tantalum, I bought Hudson's Bay. Because the Minister won't let me own it in conjunction with the people of Manitoba, so the only way I can own it is to buy Hudson's Bay shares. He's putting me in the position of no freedom, that in order to participate in the resource development of the province of Manitoba, I have to buy into Hudson's Bay, because they're getting one of the best deals. And when they report to their shareholders, they say, oh, we made a very wonderful acquisition in the province of Manitoba. I get the material and I read it and weep, because it should be owned by all of us, that same resource, and the Minister has given it away, and gives it away on the guise that it's a terrific thing.

Now what has happened with Tantalum happened with potash and, Mr. Speaker, happened with copper. We owned 49 percent approximately of the

Trout Lake Development, and the president is here. Granges now says that we had nothing to do with that development. Manitoba Mineral Resources was involved in almost every Granges exploration program and Granges wanted them in this one and Mr. Koffman didn't have the money to go in with them. Mineral Resources had run out of their budget and therefore, he had to go under the regulation rather than going with Manitoba Mineral Resources. And we became 50 percent owners of that and really fair, and that's what the mining companies surely told me and they won't deny it. We don't think that you should be doing this. We think that you should leave it to us, but the way in which you are doing it is fair. You will not find a single mining company to challenge that statement. They said, we would prefer to do it on our own but if you are going in, it's fair. It's a fair way of doing it because you're putting up 50 percent of the money and you're taking 50 percent of the action.

Now we used to own 49 percent of Trout Lake. Now we own 24 percent or 29 percent — (Interjection)— 27 percent. The Minister says we're ahead because Hudson's Bay Mining is going to put up 29 million to have virtually the equivalent of our share. They will have 29 — (Interjection)— 44. They are putting up 29 million to have more than our share. No? Because the 29 million, Mr. Speaker, only makes them a little higher than us and Granges. Our share is certainly valued at somewhere around that figure.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks as if Hudson's Bay is stupid, that we are lucky that they are putting up the 29 million, that we're getting that from them. He thinks that mining companies put money into a province because they like the province and they don't like money. I want to tell him something. That's not the reason. They put money into a province because they like money and they're going to get back more than they are putting in. If we put up the same 29 million together with Granges and we're sensible about the requirements with regard to the use of a mill in the province of Manitoba, and if we had any trouble with them there are surely ways of dealing with it, that a mine in the province of Manitoba would not deal with our concentrate, that we needn't give away the copper. So what does the Minister come out with it? The Minister comes out with production figures which have been very well dealt with by the Member for Rupertsland and I'm glad that they have because to talk about increased activity, the Minister is really talking about increased prices because there was more activity before than there is now.

With regard to exploration, Mr. Chairman, I'll deal with it in a moment. His real program is to announce, look at the activity in the province of Manitoba. Putting up a concentrator in Snow Lake. Ruttan is digging a shaft. That's the activity that he says is based on their government. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I want to know what the Minister would have said of me or of anybody in our government if in 1970 I had said, look at the mining activity in the province of Manitoba, look at what is happening since we have become the government. Tantalum has started a mine in our province. All of these things happened, Mr. Chairman, between 1969 and 1977. Tantalum has started mining tantalum and

cesium, very exotic metals, in our province. Falconbridge has started a nickel mine at Bowden Lake. Sherritt-Gordon Mines has built an entire new town in conjunction with the government and started a new 60 million investment mine in the province of Manitoba. The Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company has started the Centennial Mine in the province of Manitoba. Now those four mines are bigger than anything that has happened under the Conservative administration. But what would the Minister have said and why would . . . it would be only a red-faced person who could say that any of those activities had to do with the New Democratic Party government coming to power in the province of Manitoba. Tantalum started before we were there. Falconbridge, the exploration and the find was there before. Ruttan Mines, the find was there before. The Centennial Mine was probably one of the Hudson's Bay reserves places that they just hadn't got to.

Isn't that true of what the Minister is now talking about, these great developments, the concentrator in Snow Lake, sinking a shaft at Ruttan? Mr. Chairman, there is only one way to describe that. That's penny stock promotion. That's the way guys who are selling stocks run around saying, buy into our company because look what we're doing and look what we're finding.

All of those things, Mr. Chairman, all of the things that I have described; the Falconbridge Mine, the Tantalum Mine, the Ruttan Mine, the Centennial Mine, they all opened and started into production after the advent of the New Democratic Party government coming into being. And I tell you it doesn't mean a thing and nothing that the Minister talks means a thing. The only thing, this notion, it's so naive, that the mining companies will come here when Craik is here and leave when Green is here or any other New Democrat. It's just stupid. The mining companies will come here when there's nickel and they will leave when there is no nickel. And if there was oil in the province of Manitoba, they would come here whichever government was in power to try to discover that oil and then make the best deal they got to keep their profits from them.

The Minister has gone and carried forward the Progressive Conservative position that in order to have mineral development in the province of Manitoba, you have to be at the dependence of the private mining company. We proved for nine years, Mr. Chairman, that you didn't have to be a dependent, or at least . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we had a far more active exploration program in 1977 than had been had under any year of previous administration, except when they were dealing with a found mine, when they were dealing with a reserve which was going to be a potential and therefore spent a lot of money.

I'll read the figures, Mr. Chairman, we're not going to deal with speculative figures. We did it and we also collected more taxes from the mining companies, we did both. Really I never expected to do both but we did both. We had more activity and we had more revenues coming to the province. And

furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we became the partners in two mines, one of which has made over 7 million in the last two years, that's the Tantalum Mine, which we own 25 percent of and which we should own 75 percent of, if it wasn't for the giveaway policies of the Tories; and the Trout Lake Mine, which we own 24 percent of, which we should own 49 percent of. So, each of these deals, Mr. Chairman, represents an abdication of responsibility on the part of the representatives of the public to private interests. If we were the directors of Inco or Sherritt they would fire us all and they would have a right to do so. Can you imagine what the shareholders of Inco would do if Inco gave up 25 percent of a sure thing, as the Premier has described, the potash thing. Well, I know what the shareholders would do, they would make short shrift of those directors and I'm hoping the same thing will happen with regard to the directors of the mineral resources of the province of Manitoba because their policy, Mr. Chairman, can be very easily summarized: hand-em the Tantalum; offer the copper; and buckwash the potash, that's what they've done with three resources in the province of Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering whether I could ask the Minister some questions with respect to the proposed potash mine in the southwestern area of Manitoba. Is this the correct time?

MR. CRAIK: Go ahead.

MR. SCHROEDER: On the expiry of the potash lease No. 5, which I assume expired on about June 25, 1977 . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order. There never was a potash lease No. 5. The member refers to it as potash lease No. 5 but in the Mining Recorder's office there never was a potash lease No. 5.

MR. SCHROEDER: Could I ask the Minister what it was referred to — what did they refer to it as, in the Mining Recorder's office?

MR. CRAIK: It is probably more appropriate if he wants to refer to it as the 1972 lease or contract.

MR. SCHROEDER: Fine, I will then refer to it as the lease which the Minister refused to allow his people to provide to me until just now, that lease is dated June 25, 1972 and if it is not cancelled prior to June 25, 1977 extended to that time.

MR. CRAIK: Another point of order, Mr. Chairman. The lease that the member has received has been provided through my office, not through the Mining Recorder's office.

MR. SCHROEDER: I accept the proposition that it came from the Minister, I got it from the Clerk, I don't really see what the relevance of that point of order was, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, but I think that if he wished to make it, that's fine. Did that

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

lease expire on June 25, 1977 or did it expire earlier?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I can only advise the member that it's expired now. I don't know on what date it expired.

MR. SCHROEDER: The lease contains a provision for a 5-year renewal and the lease further contains a provision which allows the company to abandon the lease at any time on payment of royalties up to the date of abandonment. Will the Minister get the information as to when this lease was abandoned by Prairie Potash?

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGeogr: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, it just wasn't renewed, the option was not exercised, it's there.

MR. SCHROEDER: Where there any payments made by Prairie Potash after June 25, 1977?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, if the member has a number of questions about it that are technical, then write them down or indicate them and I'll see what answers I can get for him.

MR. SCHROEDER: I don't think it's a very technical question. I see your staff indicating that there wasn't any payment. I think that if we get into areas that are very difficult to answer, then I would think that might be appropriate but what we're talking about now is when did the thing expire? The Minister should surely know that. When did you last receive payment?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't any idea when it expired, it expired long before the tenure of myself in this office, or this government. So if you want that kind of information I'll write it down and see what I can obtain.

MR. SCHROEDER: Did Prairie Potash Mines Ltd. approach the government of Manitoba, within the last several years, asking them whether they wished to purchase the interest which Prairie Potash Mines Ltd. has in leases surrounding the Crown Leases we are here referring to?

MR. CRAIK: The question, Mr. Chairman, is did Prairie Potash approach the Crown about the acquisition of the Crown mineral rights?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the Crown has certain potash properties in that area and that surrounding it are about as many potash properties as the Crown owns but those areas surrounding it are owned by private individuals or corporations, including Prairie Potash Mines Ltd. In fact, Prairie Potash Mines Ltd. probably controls almost all of the potash rights outside of the Crown rights. Now what I'm asking the Minister is whether Prairie Potash Mines Ltd. approached the Crown, within the last several years, asking the Crown whether it might be interested in purchasing Prairie Potash's rights. It is obvious that Prairie Potash would not have approached the

Crown to ask the Crown whether the Crown wished to purchase its own rights.

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Chairman, not that I'm aware of.

MR. SCHROEDER: In the agreement which has been entered into between the Crown and Prairie Potash, it is my understanding, and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong, there is no right of first refusal for the Crown to purchase Prairie Potash's rights, should Prairie Potash wish to sell; and it is further my understanding that there is such a right of first refusal on behalf of Prairie Potash. That is, if the Crown decides to give up its rights, Prairie Potash is first in line. You can't sell to — I'm sorry, not Prairie Potash, International Minerals Corporation, the current partner — the Crown can't sell to someone other than International Minerals Corporation. I'm just wondering whether there's also anything in the agreement relating to what happens with the finished product, that is, is there any suggestion that the finished product will remain in Manitoba for consumption at the Brandon fertilizer plant, for instance?

MR. CRAIK: Not at this point, Mr. Chairman, it's really too early to speculate on any number of possibilities that could take place, but that prospect is, while I can't say it isn't a prospect, it doesn't seem like a very likely one. It's probably not any great advantage in that kind of an arrangement. It would probably work itself out in the marketplace better than it would by some prior arrangement because the pricing of it would be all important. There may be some possibilities locally because of the fact that the salt by-product may have some value and use in the province.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the Minister is aware that International Minerals has the rights to, or has in fact leases on, approximately 130,000 to 140,000 acres of potash properties in Saskatchewan and I'm just wondering whether the Minister has discussed with IMC the possibility of IMC and the government entering into any kind of arrangement at all with the Can-Potash Corporation which is the organization set up in Saskatchewan that started off under the Thatcher regime as prorationing of potash production when potash had gone down to about 19 or 20 a ton in 1969 and it was continued on under the Blakeney government. It's a program under which the production total is allocated between the various potash corporations operating in the province of Saskatchewan and it also, for some period of time, set a floor price, although that's not necessary at this time in view of the world conditions. But is it the intention of the government or has the government done anything to become involved in that corporation in order to receive the benefits? There are, I believe, some real benefits to the owner of the potash rights in belonging to that kind of an organization, a marketing organization as well as an organization that controls prices?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, we'll see if we have a mine before we start concerning ourselves with that.

MR. SCHROEDER: Well then, back to what the Member for Inkster was saying previously, he was wondering whether you've given up 75 percent or 50 percent or exactly how much you have given up. Is the right of the government now, is the right of the government a right to 25 percent participation in the entire milling operation; that is, will the Crown be entitled to 25 percent participation in the entire operation, including the potash property currently leased by the Crown to IMC as well as the potash rights surrounding the Crown potash rights? What's the deal?

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and that in part is the reason why the company in question, namely IMC, has required some assurance. Their main requirement is that they have a substantial majority of the operation. The Crown, in the most likely area that's involved, owns between 40 and 50 percent of the leases. The Prairie Potash group is the other large holder in that general area but IMC is going to have to put together, out of that total package, a substantial majority for themselves, preferably they would like to own 75 percent. It remains to be seen whether they can acquire all of that. The Crown, in bringing it to a head, said that they would retain a 25 percent interest in the total accumulation of all the other properties, including the Crown property. So when it all comes into focus, if the feasibility study proves that we have a feasible mine, neither the government nor IMC is going to try and undertake a project that is not economically feasible, then the Crown will retain that 25 percent interest. It is not the Crown's intention to divest it, they've simply said that if it did that it would give the IMC the right of first refusal in the event that they wished to purchase it.

With regard to the reverse question, I can tell you that this government has no interest in owning a majority interest in a mining operation.

MR. SCHROEDER: Can the Minister advise as to the percentage of the surrounding potash property rights, other than the Crown rights, which were owned by Prairie Potash and which Prairie Potash is either selling now to IMC or what they have the right to transfer to IMC, if IMC and Prairie Potash arrive at an agreement? Do they own 90 percent of the stuff outside of the Crown rights or is it 80 percent or approximately what percentage is it?

MR. CRAIK: Of the land other than Crown land?

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I can't answer that for the reason, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of areas, there is a very large area that's involved in the total potential area but some of it is highly unlikely. There is a very likely area that is a different but smaller area, so that it depends where you draw lines and there isn't really much point in trying to say, at this time, exactly where it will end up. I think that at one time there was a smaller area, that at one time was regarded as being a potential area, where I think the Crown probably was around 44 or 45 percent. I think that Prairie Potash was probably just about the same and that would have left a residual of maybe

10 to 15 percent of scattered holders. I'm not saying that is factual information; it's just that at one time in a defined area that was regarded as being a most likely or potential area, that was the distribution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Just on that, I believe that over the years there has been a fair amount of activity on this property going back even into the 1960s and 1950s, in fact, there have been leases on that property since the 1950s. There was SAM Exploration Limited and then there was some other company and Prairie Potash, and in all of those leases there was a provision, I don't see it in the 1972 lease, but in the previous leases there was a provision requiring a certain amount of work to be done per year and any coring would be split in half and half of it would wind up in our Mines Branch. I'm just wondering whether the Mines Branch has come up with an estimate as to the amount of potash which is reasonably recoverable which is, first of all, in the area of the Crown land and, secondly, in the outlying area.

MR. CRAIK: It's too early, Mr. Chairman, really to comment on that and I don't think it's in the public interest to be doing that, and I refer back to some of the comments made by the Member for Inkster which I have no hesitation in discussing. Under any other circumstances, except that there are other private leaseholders out there and we have a corporation putting together the package who are acquiring those leases. It's not in the public interest at this point to be remarking about what I think or what he thinks. He can say it, I can't. He's on the other side of the House. He can say what he thinks they're worth; I can't say what I think they're worth. It's too early in the period of study of this to be getting into that kind of discussion and I don't think it would be in the public interest. So, therefore, I can't comment at this point in time because, while we own nearly half we don't own half, we own less than half of the total. The other half has to be acquired and then brought in. If I told you I thought they were worth far more and we ought to be using some other deal as our criteria, I'm sure that the people who owned the remaining near 60 percent would be most happy to hear that said.

MR. SCHROEDER: It seems to me if the Crown has some information available which has been available over the years, and quite properly so, I would be surprised if it wouldn't be prepared to release it to those people because I believe that ordinarily the geological people in the Mining Branch, when asked about deposits, are quite prepared to discuss them with members of the public. But could the Minister advise as to the number of acres involved in the Crown lease to IMC?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the terminology is one we have to watch. The member keeps using lease, Lease No. 5 and so on. It is not a lease; it's a permit, it's an exploration permit and we've telegraphed what our intentions are in this case because it's going to become known. There's going to be a lot of activity and it's going to IMC and

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

there are not now holders in that area and in this case it's been decided that it ought to be done in the open and publicly as they go about their work.

The permit area is described — perhaps it isn't in the release that as covering X number of townships — is a rectangular area that covers a large area that may well, and likely would not be a portion of it, would not likely be a potential area where there would be mining activity but, nevertheless, has been included. I think that when you take in that total area, the Crown's percentage, of the totals — I think the member said the surface rights or the mineral rights? You said acreage.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, I said acreage, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRAIK: You're talking about the number of acres of mineral rights?

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

MR. CRAIK: Because the mineral rights are held, in some cases, under land that is private where the Crown has still mineral rights.

MR. SCHROEDER: How many acres are contained within the land which you are permitting this company to explore on, whether the surface rights are publicly owned or privately owned, how many acres of publicly-controlled mineral rights are in the permit to IMC?

MR. CRAIK: There are eight townships involved in the defined area where they have exploration rights and the percentage that would be Crown-held mineral rights in that would be around 50 percent.

MR. SCHROEDER: So, what the Minister is saying, that the Crown-held mineral rights are in approximately a total of four townships. Is that correct?

MR. CRAIK: No, they are all over but they are sprinkled all over as the member . . .

MR. SCHROEDER: Well, then, why don't we talk about acres, Mr. Chairman, if they're sprinkled all over. How many acres of Crown-held mineral rights?

MR. CRAIK: I think the member knows it's a patchwork quilt, like all of these claims and other things that exist in the oil patch or potash or elsewhere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, for instance in the previous lease, the payment was 1 per acre. Now somebody must have calculated how many acres there were then and I don't see why it would it be difficult to do it now.

MR. CRAIK: In that block, Mr. Chairman, the Crown-held acreage is estimated at 73,600 acres.

MR. SCHROEDER: Could the Minister advise as to whether this is the acreage which was contained in the lease from the Crown to Prairie Potash?

MR. CRAIK: No, it's not, Mr. Chairman, much larger. This one is larger.

MR. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry, I'm confused. The 76,000 acres, is that the total amount including public and private rights, or is this the public rights which the Crown has leased to IMC or given them a permit for?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, that's the number of acres of Crown-held mineral rights in that total area.

MR. SCHROEDER: Just back to that buy-sell or failure to have a buy-sell agreement as the Minister I'm sure is aware, IMC did get involved in a permit type of situation in New Brunswick about five years ago. Pursuant to that permit, they did some exploration. They did it with DREE money and after they had proven some resources they sold their rights to the permit and their rights to the lease to Dennison Mines for a 24.1 million profit. Now, that may be fair ball but when the First Minister announced this project he indicated that the reason you had picked IMC was that it had expertise in terms of mining — and it certainly does, that can't be disputed, it's probably the biggest company in the world involved in it.

Secondly, it had expertise in marketing and that can also not be disputed. But when that company is given the right to examine what we have, take a look at our stocks and then turn around and sell it to a company like Dennison, which has absolutely no experience in potash and absolutely no experience in potash marketing, then I would suggest that's not a very prudent thing to do. I would say that ordinarily when two partners, large or small, get together for a business venture, a joint venture, it is especially the small partner who is concerned about the buy-out clauses. It is not the big partner who is the one who is asking for a buy-sell agreement, it's the little guy who wants to make sure that things are covered up before you get into it. I would suggest that in this particular case we are the little guy with 25 percent total interest. While we're talking about that 25 percent, does the agreement indicate that 25 percent of the total amount — and I'm especially interested now in the privately-held rights in the area — is it up to IMC to acquire the 100 percent of privately-owned potash rights in that area and then transfer 25-percent ownership of those privately-held rights to the Crown without payment by the Crown; and the Crown just pays 1 for every 4 that IMC puts into the actual building? Or does the Crown have to pay for the acquisition of the private potash rights?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, at this point, the member is ahead of things. That is still to come. When he refers to an agreement, there is not an agreement signed, nor is there is a lease signed. What has been done is that a Letter of Intent has been issued to the company withdrawing the area from exploration and giving them the right to go ahead and do their exploration work with the intent, at the end of that period of time, that if the feasibility study comes out and the negotiations that we're likely to enter into are acceptable to the Crown, then the Crown will be willing to go in themselves into the establishment and development of a mine. And so

until we get to that point, really again, there is no public interest to be served for getting into those kind of details at this point.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree with the Minister on that final statement. Just a little while ago I had thought we had cleared up the matter of the 25 percent right of participation, that it was a 25 percent right of participation throughout. My understanding was that all the Crown had to do in order to exercise its right to participate would be to pay 1 out of 4 spent on the mining equipment, but now the Minister is saying that in fact if the government wants a real 1 in 4 participation, it's going to pay for the 50 percent of the property not held by the Crown. That is, that we are going to have to pay to IMC one-quarter of the money it pays in setting up its lease on the private rights but we are going to give IMC three-quarters of our Crown-held rights and that is only in exchange for 2 million bucks. They're going to give us 2 million worth of exploration; we're giving them 75 percent of our rights and then, if we want 25 percent of the other 50 percent, we're going to have to pay for it. Because if the Minister hasn't dealt that one out yet, I suggest that today is too late. Why would the company allow the Crown a free 25-percent interest in the 50 percent which is not now held by the Crown and which that company is currently negotiating for or has finished negotiating for with Prairie Potash? Why would they play Santa Claus?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the member is not right in his assumptions.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to indicate to me where I am wrong in my assumption. Does the agreement state that the Crown will not be required to pay 25 cents on the dollar for the property acquired, the rights acquired by IMC outside of the Crown rights?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, there will be a lease in due course that will be a lease that will be somewhat along the general format of the lease that the member has before him, which incidentally was never tabled as a public document by way of Order-in-Council. When the lease arrangement and the agreement, whatever it's labelled, comes to pass, it will be tabled as a public document by Order-in-Council. At that point in time all of these matters will be dealt with. In the meantime the assertions that the member has made and his concerns are not well founded and I don't think there is any public interest at this point served in discussing it further.

MR. SCHROEDER: I find the Minister's remarks to be somewhat disquieting. Earlier he referred to having this all done publicly. When things get a little bit uncomfortable he says, oh, we can't talk about it any more because this is something that if we deal with it in public, it's not so good. All he's done is given the people of Manitoba a bunch of fluff. A few months ago he thought it would be a good idea to prance in front of the people and say, here, look, what a good boy I am, I'm going to get public participation in mining; and when we start asking questions about how that public participation is

going to be brought about, he has no answers and he just simply says that he really doesn't think it would be a good idea to talk about it. I think that maybe he should then at least begin to talk about his philosophy with respect to public ownership of our resources.

I say that because I have looked back at some of the statements made by the Minister in the past and I am concerned about them. I refer back to the debate on The Natural Resources Act which was held in 1970, the bill which permitted the very action which this government is currently going into without going before the Legislature. That was a bill which the current Minister absolutely opposed at that time and I am going to again read from Hansard, page 3346: Mr. Craik: But what is wrong in principle, Mr. Speaker, is to pass an omnibus bill of this sort that approves in principle the general involvement of government in business which members of this side do not generally agree with and with which I disagree with wholeheartedly. And he says further down on that page, This bill again provides approval in principle for the government to establish any business it so desires without reference to the Legislature or to the Manitoba Development Fund with its board of advisors, but simply by Cabinet decision, for a particular Minister to decide that, for instance, that the Manitoba buffalo pins are for the use of the province. Therefore the province should manufacture them and we'll set up an operation and without the normal checks and balances that dictate whether a business is established, that is the checks and balances of a profit and loss statement governing decisions. I do not believe that effective decisions will normally be made, that this type of action should be taken when there is a dire need for government to get into business where it should be done, where financing to get it through a critical stage is necessary, and where it can finally be turned back to a local group that can carry on after the spawning period, then this is when government should become involved.

Now here we have none of those criteria, absolutely none. A local group, IMC, they're dealing in about 300 locations throughout the world. They're the largest corporation in this type of endeavour. They have, you could say, money to burn, there is no difficulty internally in that corporation in funding this kind of an operation. Spawning period, well, I don't know what the Minister was referring to at that time. A dire need — I suppose there is a dire need to get this economy moving in this province after three years of Tory experimentation. Again, financing, there is obviously no requirement for that. That type of statement of principle by the Minister, we could follow through over the years. He's against government involvement in business and when we start asking him questions about what he has done to make sure that we're going to have 25 percent, he says, well, that's not in the public interest.

His definition of the public interest and mine, Mr. Chairman, is different. My view of the public interest would be that we should do everything possible to have the public participate to the extent of 50, 75, or 100 percent in an operation such as this. — (Interjection)— You can talk about Saunders Aircraft all you like. We're talking about potash here. I think that the public has shown a propensity to do a not

bad job where we don't walk in only as saviours of private enterprise, and I think we should be getting into our resource development — in which we have had a fairly successful track record — into our resource development as a public group, as a government, the government should be becoming involved.

But here I see, certainly ten years ago the Minister wasn't at all interested in that kind of thing. He disagreed in principle with the general involvement of government in business and here he is saying, well, we're going to give you 25 percent, maybe, maybe. But don't ask us too many questions. We've given them a right of first refusal. We don't really want to control our 25 percent. If we decide to sell it, we can't go on the market, we're going to have to sell it to IMC, we've already ceded that to them and we don't really know what it's going to cost us to have that 25 percent. We don't know whether this just means 25 percent of payments on the milling equipment or whether we're going to have to pay 25 percent of what IMC pays Prairie Potash and the other companies involved. So what we have here is just one big bag of fluff that is totally meaningless. The Minister is saying that we have to do this publicly, IMC will do it publicly, the government will do it publicly, but whenever you start asking questions about anything, the Minister says, well, I really don't think we should discuss that and the member has his assumptions wrong.

I would like the Minister to tell the House, tell this committee, whether in fact he has changed his mind since 1970. That's 10 years ago and many of us change our minds over certain issues over the years. Does he now generally agree with the general involvement of government in business? It may be that he has finally seen the light. Certainly when we look at the record of the administration in which he was previously involved, that administration in no way thought of government involvement in mining. It had its chances and previous administrations prior to that had their chances, in Thompson, in other northern areas. We can see by just opening our eyes and looking at who controls those corporations that the public got nothing out of them. And so if it is the case that the Minister now believes that the public should at least have 25 percent, well, we've come some way as a result of eight years of NDP government.

Obviously this government has learned something from the experience of the previous government. I would only hope again that rather than walking, kicking, and screaming into an era of public participation in the development of our province, that we do so on a joyous basis, on the basis that yes, we can do it, we are capable of doing it, we can hire people who have the knowledge. Saskatchewan has done it. Just look at Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman. Look at what they've done with potash. They've done a brilliant job for their people and I would hope that the Minister would seriously consider doing the same thing here in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I would like to follow up on the comments I made earlier and also make reference to

some of the concepts discussed by my colleague, the Member for Rossmere.

As I was indicating when I finished my comments, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the provincial government's rhetoric in their election campaign and in their first few years in office, they have obviously failed miserably in bringing about any increase in the production of minerals in Manitoba. When we look at the major minerals — and I indicated that if you look at copper, nickel, and zinc, from 1977 to the production in 1978 and 1979, we see that there was at least a 19 percent decrease overall in those three minerals and they make up the majority of the production in Manitoba. If you look at two of the major minerals, Mr. Chairman, nickel and zinc, we see that from 1977 to 1979 there was a 34.8 million pound decrease, which is representing a 33 percent decline in production of nickel. If you look at zinc, you see there was a 33.7 million pound decrease, which represents a 35 percent decrease in overall production from 1977 to 1979. So, Mr. Chairman, there was a significant decline in the metal mineral production over the two calendar years 1978-79 as compared to 1977.

If you compare the dollar value, even with the increased prices, the production in Manitoba is not good. It's a dismal picture. The Minister has the nerve to put out a document saying, Craik optimistic for mining in 1980, which is almost a dishonest document in that he compares 1979 with 1978, which was the worst year on record, Mr. Chairman, the worst year with metal mineral production of 330 million pounds. I'm sorry, no, 330 million, dollar value, and this is the worst production in dollar value since 1972. If you make adjustments for inflation, Mr. Chairman, it's the worst level on record over the last 10 years. So that for him to make a comparison from 1979 to 1978 and then call that an optimistic outlook, it's certainly stretching the truth.

Mr. Chairman, to follow up on what my colleague has been saying, I believe that the government is failing in its efforts to provide incentive for development in Manitoba. Their claim that if they reduce the taxation level to companies entering Manitoba would increase production in Manitoba, is simply not proving out to be the case. If they want to hang their hat on exploration, Mr. Chairman, all they have to do is compare exploration in Manitoba to exploration in Saskatchewan, then you will see that the exploration picture of 1978 is certainly much better in Saskatchewan than here.

Mr. Chairman, the government, I believe, must get directly involved in developing the natural resources of our province. I believe we must obtain a fair return from the resources that are now being developed which is something that this government is not doing, and we must ensure that there is a development of future resources which can benefit the people of Manitoba. That is something that this government is failing miserably in providing for the people of Manitoba. If there is any kind of program, any kind of comprehensive program of development for the people of Manitoba, to be able to say this is what we hope to see and this is what we as a government are going to do in order to make sure that our resources are developed in such a way as to produce maximum benefits to the people of this province.

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

We believe the government must be more aggressive in promoting development and in fact, actually developing the resource where it's of benefit to Manitoba. If you contrast the development ideas in philosophy of the Conservative government in Manitoba to the Saskatchewan government, which I would like to do, Mr. Chairman, but my time is running out, but I would like to continue this at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour, and will return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 42 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education, Resolution No. 55, Clause 6, Universities Grants Commission, Item (a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I just wondered whether the Minister had any information he wanted to provide us that had been backlogged. We've asked many questions. I don't know if he has any he wishes to answer at this time. Secondly, I don't know whether he has any particular statement he wants to make at this point in time on universities and colleges. If not, then I will proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I do have some written material with me that was requested during previous sessions and I will send this across to the honourable member during this particular sitting. But as far as any oral answers, I don't think that they were requested nor required at this time. It is not my intention to give a statement regarding this particular section of my estimates. I believe the amounts of money, the grants that have been provided to the Universities Grants Commission for dispersal to the universities is a matter of public knowledge and has been for some time. Matters such as tuition fees, enrolments and so on, again, are public knowledge and are discussed on several occasions. There are probably going to be several opportunities for me to enlarge on particular areas of concern in the university community as we proceed with these estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think that when we come to an area where the government has failed in its programs for Manitoba in the 1980s, this must stand out as pre-eminent among them and I intend to say some fairly strong things to the Minister during the course of this debate, which I anticipate will probably last a day, may be terminated tonight or may continue briefly beyond, but it is our intention essentially to attempt to deal with the department today. But I want to say that in discussing the failures of the government and of the Minister, in particular, I want to say that I believe that every

statement can be backed up either by university presidents, by university students, or by qualified observers of the scene, including members of the faculty, and so on. That the actions of the government in the past three years have been highly detrimental to the universities of Manitoba.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat staggered today to read an editorial in the Alumni Journal of the University of Manitoba which raised the question of, can we afford three universities? That's a topic that I haven't heard discussed for some time but it's, I think, because of the government policy and because of the direction we're going, namely, not providing sufficient funding for the universities, people are beginning to ask that question. So we are going backwards, Mr. Chairman, whereas in the 1960s, when I first entered this Chamber we had one university, then we expanded to the University of Winnipeg and to the University of Brandon. There are now some people in the academic community who are wondering whether because of government policy and the attitude of the government in providing funding for higher education may be a solution. It's as drastic a solution as I can even imagine. Maybe a solution would be to eliminate one of the universities. That's the direction, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister and the government is taking us, because I submit that the Lyon administration is strangling and starving our universities.

I want to quote some of the effects that have been felt in the past two-and-a-half years from a statement in the form of a letter made by the President of the University of Manitoba Faculty Association. He points out, first of all, that there has been a period of restraint for the past couple of years and now there is an 8 percent increase in funding. Then he points out the fact of the matter, namely, that inflation alone has been running at about some 9 percent and so, consequently, the universities have been cutting back. They have been raising tuition fees, which really was not done or permitted during our administration, there has been continuous increases in student fees; there's been a deterioration of programming and a deterioration of the physical plant of the universities. I want to, just to begin with, read a couple of paragraphs from the letter from the president of the Faculty Association. He says that, first of all, the faculty is underpaid in comparison to their counterparts in comparable western Canadian universities. The consequence of that, Mr. Chairman, is that people will leave; they will find jobs elsewhere if they find out that they are underpaid for similar work. He says that the library system's acquisition rate has slipped by nearly 40 percent so that, We can no longer boast of a proper research library. He says that lab instruction has been savagely curtailed so that we are preparing students for industry who are, actually less well trained in an age of rapid technological advance. He talks about programs being cut and he says that you can destroy quickly, but when you come rebuild it will take years. So that is a statement that comes from the president of the Faculty Association.

I look now at an editorial in the Tribune, March 6, which quotes, Brandon University president, Dr. John Perkins, and he says that capital projects have been so severely curtailed that he says they are delighted

to note there's some improvement in that area because now they can have the leaks in the diningroom fixed so the rain doesn't fall through on the floor when the students are eating. Again, this editorial mentions that the library has suffered dreadfully in the last few years. The question the Tribune puts to the Minister and to the people responsible is, without a top-notch library, can there be a university? Then we see the increases in fees that have been going on at the U of M, I guess about 8 percent. Students protest claiming boost will strike at lower income students. Brandon raising tuition fees 8 percent. The U of W raising tuition fees by 7 percent. So there's been a continuing and steady increase in student tuition fees and students have called for a freeze or they've called for lesser amounts, but that's what's happened. Of course, the Minister is used to this. He has given the community colleges even a higher privilege and allowed them to go up by 10 1/2 percent. I note that fees for the certificate courses have gone up at the community college in Manitoba 330 percent since the government took office, and fees for diploma courses have increased by 50 percent. So the government, — I guess it's the old user fee or something — they think that's okay.

Then what about quality. Quality is harder to measure. You know, Mr. Chairman, it's easy to measure grants and it's easy to measure percentages; it's more difficult to attempt to measure the quality and the adverse effects of the government's restraint program when you come to courses and when you come to the number of courses and the quality of the courses, as well. I refer the Minister to disturbing statements in the press and disturbing rumours that are circulating. I go back a couple of months to March, when Dr. Arnold Naimark, who is a Dean of Medicine, was worried about the cuts in programs in his department. He said that, They will inevitably have an effect on the quality of our department. He said, We have difficulties at the post graduate level in certain areas and that will be endangered. We know we've had problems in engineering and we know we've had problems at the dental school. The university president, Ralph Campbell, said that the university will be forced to cut entire programs in the near future because of poor provincial government funding. That is the statement that comes from the education reporter of the Tribune, that's not a direct quote but that is attributed to Dr. Campbell, that it's because of poor provincial government funding.

I'd be very interested to hear the Minister deny that. So perhaps I'll give him an opportunity to do so at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having the opportunity to respond to some of the honourable member's remarks because in some cases he's incorrect and other cases he is quoting material that is incorrect and in others there is some distortion in what he is saying and he is weighing it a certain way.

He starts off by implying that the government has failed the universities; that things are in a deplorable situation. I only point out to the honourable member

that if he looks at the situation across the country he will find that the same characteristics appear to hold in all provinces of this country as far as government funding of universities is concerned. I would point out to the honourable member that the increase in operating grants at the universities of this province received this year, through the Grants Commission, amounted to some 8.3 percent. I would then refer him to the similar increases in our sister provinces to the west and east. In Ontario the increase was some 7.2 percent, less, Mr. Chairman, than the increase in Manitoba. In our sister province to the west, Saskatchewan, an increase of 8.4, almost identical to the increase, Mr. Chairman, that the universities of this province received this year.

So whether the honourable member wishes to admit or not, or wishes to maintain that the universities are not receiving enough, the point is that on a comparative basis with our sister provinces, with the exception of course of oil-rich Alberta who can manage increases in the 9 percent area, and B.C. who also come in in that particular area, we are not out of step in the level of funding increases, Mr. Chairman.

The honourable member refers to all sorts of drastic things that have happened in the last three years and he points to the library situation at the University of Manitoba. He highlights this as a situation that has deteriorated over the years, and if he makes that statement, Mr. Chairman, he's quite correct. I am told that the library situation at the University of Manitoba has deteriorated over the last few years but not just the last three years, Mr. Chairman, the very same statement could have been made four years ago. That there's been further deterioration, that's quite true. But I have to remind the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, that as a government we do not allocate the moneys that go to the libraries at any university, the moneys are allocated by the University Grants Commission to the universities who, in turn, decide what allocation of moneys will go to libraries, to salaries and to the operation of the different faculties within the university, and of course, the maintenance of the plant. Those decisions are made by the universities themselves, not by the government.

So I suggest to the honourable member that the situation in the library — and it's one I certainly deplore also — but that situation is not one that has happened in the last two or three years. I am told by people at the university that it's been taking place for a number of years and was taking place during the previous administration as well. Of course, during a time of great inflation and increasing costs in printed materials, and particularly in the area of textbooks and reference books and reference materials generally, it is very difficult to catch up. So I wanted to touch on that particular point, Mr. Chairman.

There are a number of others that the honourable member refers to. He talks about tuition fee increases and he made an interesting statement, Mr. Chairman. He said, that during our time we did not permit tuition increases. I find that rather interesting, Mr. Chairman, I find it very interesting. Because to my knowledge and on my reading of the Act, the government does not have the say as to whether the universities will increase fees or not, that is the

universities' decision. So if his particular government was controlling that particular aspect of the universities, I suggest that they were encroaching on what is within the universities jurisdiction and probably not respecting that autonomy of the universities that we are prepared to respect.

He talks about tuition fees, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to point out the tuition fee comparisons across this country, to the honourable member because I think they are rather interesting and it perhaps is a fact that is not well known. I'm going to speak generally of the faculties of Arts, Science and Education because these are the three faculties where we find the largest enrolments in most universities across the country, at the undergraduate level.

The tuition fees for the 1980-81 session in Arts and Science, in the three universities in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, will be 615.00. That is an 8 percent increase over last year, 615.00. Now let us look, Mr. Chairman, at what similar fees are across this country. In Saskatchewan, fees for the same faculties, Arts and Science, 688.00 in Saskatchewan; 728.00 in Regina. Alberta, oil-rich Alberta, Mr. Chairman, the fees are very close to ours, at 605.00 in comparison to 615.00. British Columbia has raised their fees some 10.3 percent this year. They are slightly below us at 591.00. But when we move into the other provinces, Mr. Chairman, here are the fees that are charged in the Maritimes for the same faculties, Arts, Science, Education. Moncton, 700.00; New Brunswick, 790.00; Mount Allison, 865.00; Acadia, 813.00; Dalhousie, 840.00; compared to our 615.00, Mr. Chairman. Mount St. Vincent, 840.00; St. Francis Xavier, 840.00; St. Mary's, 835.00; Prince Edward Island, 790.00; Memorial in Newfoundland, and I don't have this year's fees but last year's, Mr. Chairman, — and I don't know if they're having an increase or not — but last year they were higher than what will exist in Manitoba this fall, at 630.00.

Then let us move to our other sister province, to the east, Ontario, and here are the particular tuition fees that are charged in that province. In 1980-81 in Arts and Science again, Mr. Chairman, the University of Toronto, 835.00 as compared to our 615.00; York University, 815.00; MacMaster, 820.00; Queens, 845.00; Ottawa, 784.00, a little bit lower; Carlton, 823.00. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I could go through the long list of universities in that province and they all range either at the very high 700 or in the 800 range. The other point that is of interest, that in Ontario this year, tuition fees increased somewhere in the neighbourhood of an average of 12 to 14 percent, if we take it across the board. Well, those are, I think, rather interesting figures, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest that they dispel the particular type of propaganda that the members opposite would like to spread that we are coming down very very hard on the university students of this province. This is one of the cheapest provinces to decide to attend university in, Mr. Chairman, absolutely, in that particular category. But I do return to the point, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope that the Honourable Member for Elmwood will expand on that point as to the fact that they did not permit the universities to increase their tuition fees, an area that falls under the jurisdiction of the universities. I'd like to know just how they accomplished that at the same time

respecting the autonomy of the universities. He refers to a leak in the roof that had been mentioned by the president, I believe, of Brandon University, partly in jest, Mr. Chairman, because is he seriously suggesting that if he looks at the capital allocation which was received by the different universities in this province, that something that maybe is minor, or at least something that could be attended to, such as a leak in the roof, is impossible. If he looks at the actual capital allocations it's a matter of priorities I suppose. I would find it difficult to understand where a leak in the roof that was causing some problems in the dining hall would not be a priority and I suggest to him that to fasten on that type of statement, which again, knowing the President of the University of Brandon, was said half in jest, is certainly misleading, to say the least.

The honourable member talks about accreditation, and says that as a result of the government's funding policies toward the universities that all sorts of different faculties are in danger of losing their accreditation. I was interested, Mr. Chairman, because he referred to the dental school. Well, as I remember, and he can correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm absolutely sure that the problems with accreditation in the dental school took place under the previous government. I have received no information regarding the dental school since I've been in office, Mr. Chairman, and I was aware that there had been problems in the years previous to our becoming government. Certainly the Faculty of Engineering has had problems in that regard, I understand from information from the University of Manitoba that they have increased the allocation to engineering and that problem has been overcome.

The honourable member refers to all sorts of other faculties and throws out this faculty and that as being in danger of losing their accreditation. I have a letter that the President of the University of Manitoba sent to the editor of the Winnipeg Tribune as of June 5th, Mr. Chairman, and in the letter he is deploring a certain article that apparently appeared in that paper about the University of Manitoba and he says, this is signed by the President of the University of Manitoba, Doctor Campbell and he says, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I'm referring to probably the same article in the Tribune that was dealing with restraint at the University of Manitoba. At this point I'd like to just read a couple of lines from Dr. Campbell's letter to the editor of the Winnipeg Tribune. In regard to accreditation, Mr. Chairman, he has this to say, he says Your article states that Law and Architecture are close to losing their accreditation. The fact is that there are no Canadian accreditation procedures for either. Furthermore, both are good sound faculties, more of our Architecture students have won CMHC scholarships, which is an indicator of quality, over the past three years than students of any other faculty in Canada. Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to see how that sits with the statement of the honourable member that these faculties supposedly are in danger of losing their accreditation. The president of the university points out that there is no accrediting body for them. But the Honourable Member for Elmwood finds it quite easy to get up and make statements like that which are in fact not true, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly refer him to the

statement, in this particular letter, of the President of the University of Manitoba, who went on to say, I could point out error after error in your article and refers to exaggeration and a number of other things that are not correct. He says, Contrary to your statement, first year students in biology and chemistry do have laboratory facilities, and he goes on to deal with some other aspects where he feels that the statements were not correct at all. And of course he ends with a statement, Mr. Chairman, that this is a fine university, that it offers good education, good research, good community service and he says, of course, that they would like to have more money, I think that's only natural, Mr. Chairman, that a university president would say, we need more money, that's only part of his job. In fact, I asked a former president of the University of Manitoba, who I was talking to during Convocation, if he could remember any time when he was president of the university when he felt they received enough money and he said, no, I can't. He said, we would have to go back to those years right after the war, World War II, to find a time when universities felt that they were receiving funding in line with what their needs actually were, but he said, following that period into the late '60s, early '70s we certainly have never felt that we've received the type of funding that was completely adequate to our needs. So I only point out those things, Mr. Chairman, to, in fact, refute some of the rather wild statements that the honourable member is making because, for one reason, Mr. Chairman, I am rather proud of our universities in Manitoba. I am a graduate of the University of Manitoba and I was fortunate enough to be able to study for three degrees at that university; I have always held it in very high respect. I consider that not only the University of Manitoba but the University of Brandon, the University of Winnipeg are very essential and very excellent institutions and they are providing a very essential, adequate, necessary service and function in our society, we could not afford to be without them. And, Mr. Chairman, for someone to stand up and try to spread almost scare stories that would, in fact, perhaps affect some young people's thinking about whether to go to university or not, I would say is working a disservice to our universities and it's the type of approach that I call rather cheap, Mr. Chairman. There are problems at our universities and the honourable member is well aware of those problems, I am sure he has concern, as I have. They have had to cope with declining enrolments. I could refer you, Mr. Chairman, to certain figures in that regard. In 1975-76 the full-time enrolment in our universities in Manitoba was some 18,080 students, I'm talking about full-time enrollment; last year 1979-80 the enrolment was some 15,555 students, a drop, Mr. Chairman, of about 2,500 over those three years and unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is no indication that type of decline is going to stop. There are certainly encouraging signs here and there in certain faculties of increased interest, by the young people coming out of our school system but, Mr. Chairman, that reservoir of talent and interest, that reservoir of young people, perhaps reservoir is not a good word to use, but that potential supply to the universities is becoming smaller and will become increasingly smaller, certainly up to 1985 and perhaps beyond.

But let us, to illustrate that particular point, in 1979, Mr. Chairman, we had some 14,356 young people graduate from our Grade 12 classes in this province. Of that group some 18 percent went on to the universities, 14,356, Mr. Chairman. The possible figure for 1985, if everyone was to graduate, Mr. Chairman, is 11,019, a drop of over 4,000 students. I haven't worked out the percentage but, again, I point out to the honourable member and all honourable members that one of the problems the universities are faced with is the problem of declining enrolment and they are attempting to cope with this as the public school system is attempting to cope with it. Of course I'm aware, as you certainly are, Mr. Chairman, that if one looks at the problem in a simplistic way, it's very easy to say less students then obviously it doesn't cost as much to operate the university. Unfortunately, there are not always the economies of scale that result. —(Interjection)—

Well, the honourable member now wants to talk about public schools. I thought we were on universities. Mr. Chairman, our funding levels for the public school system and the universities have corresponded rather closely I would suggest; 8.3, I think the universities, as opposed, was it 8.4 to the public schools this year? Not much of discrepancy, Mr. Chairman. I believe they both came in around 6 percent last year, so the honourable member's point if he is concerned or would like to make an argument that we are showing some favouritism there or there is some discrepancy, is not valid. He also talks about the matter of quality and I've already touched on the fact that the universities certainly are looking at declining enrolments and attempting to cope with them. But when we talk about quality, Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that at a university, I would think that you could judge your quality on the number of full-time professors, fully qualified professors and dean. And if I look at the figures in our particular system, in 1978-79 we had 452 deans and full professors; in 1979-80, last year, the number rose to 473, Mr. Chairman. Now if the honourable member wants to scream and say, Whoa, government funding has resulted in a decline in quality, then I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that is not true, that a quality of a university can be judged in large part on the quality of your professors and your instructors and I have not seen that type of decline according to the figures that I have before me, Mr. Chairman. Certainly if we move from 452 full professors and deans to 473, I would suggest that we are strengthening that particular quality.

Also, Mr. Chairman, if we want to talk about quality, and I know that the honourable member would like to make some connection between quality and government funding, then I would suggest we also have to look at the number of instructors, in spite of the fact that we have seen a decline in enrolment that the number of instructional staff has not changed at all dramatically. I would expect that it might have changed more dramatically than it has, Mr. Chairman, but according to these figures, over the last three or four years, there hasn't been a significant decline. In 1976-77, Mr. Chairman, there was 1,575 as the total for instructional staff in the universities of Manitoba. That was 1976-77. In 1979-80, Mr. Chairman, here is the interesting comparison. Remember we have seen a decline of — what did I

mention earlier — some 2,500 students; the teaching staff, the instructional staff was 1,590. In fact an increase, Mr. Chairman, over the figure for 1976-77. Then I suppose the honourable member — and I shouldn't anticipate and take away his arguments because he can make them and make them quite well — will probably say, Ah, yes, but this funding has resulted in such a terrible situation that people don't want to teach at the university, they want to leave those particular institutions. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, you know the year in Manitoba, a recent year, where we had the highest number of resignations was in 1974-75 when 78 people resigned. In 1975-76, 68 people resigned. How many resigned last year, Mr. Chairman? 54. In fact, we are seeing in the last three years a lower staff turnover than we saw previous to that. But the honourable member wants to talk about the public school system now, Mr. Chairman. We had our opportunity to talk about the public school system; let's talk about our universities and let's look at the facts because I say to him we haven't seen a decline in the quality of instructors. The most important single element in any university, as far as I am concerned, the quality of instruction and the qualifications and experience of the professors. We have not seen a decline in that quality; we have not seen a decline in the number of instructors, Mr. Chairman. We are not seeing the number of resignations in the last three years that we saw previous to that under the so-called golden age that my honourable friend likes to refer to when it suits him. So, Mr. Chairman, having broached those particular topics that I know are of interest to the honourable member, I would be quite prepared to sit down and hear if he wishes to expand on some of these particular areas.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one important point that has to be cleared up immediately is that the honourable minister has a very interesting technique. His first technique is to say that everything is fine. There are no problems at all. That's his first point. The second point is, he always says that I am saying this, as if I am doing all this research and all this writing and all this talking and all this discussion. I have to tell him that when I speak I am giving him references that come from —(Interjection)— yes, newspaper articles, alumni journal articles, radio interviews, television interviews and so on. Yes, it does come that way and some of it has come direct. I have met with people who attend the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg, etc., and I have spoken to the faculties and I have spoken to people who are observers of the scene. So, if he wants to say that I am alone, making these statements, then he is wrong. I am making these statements and I am standing by these statements, but I am also quoting people. I want to tell him that from the beginning, that it is not just my opinion, it is the opinion of many people who are observers of the scene, who are concerned about education and who believe, on very good grounds, that the situation in our universities is deteriorating.

Now the Minister — I guess we're into the old battle of statistics here — started out by showing that there was an 8-something or other increase and this compared to other universities, and he stood there and he read this whole list of Canadian

universities. I was beginning to wonder whether he would read the list of American universities. — (Interjection)— Just Canadian, but he could have read the American as well. What would it have proved? What did he prove by that point? What he did was he showed that in one year we were roughly in line. But he has to answer for his administration; he has to stand up and defend the other couple of years. So the fact that we were more or less in line this year and had very low percentages the other couple of years, that is the point. We have to look at the pattern and the pattern over the three years has been that there have been inadequate amounts of funding provided by the government.

Last year, for example, in Operating Grants, if I can recall the figures, was something 65 million to 67 million or something; 3 percent increase. Well, you know, anybody, and we'll deal with this later on capital, you want to save money you can save it on capital. You know, this government saves money on capital. It does so in this building; it has cleaners now from private firms who clean our buildings, whereas it was done by government before and there is no inspection, very little inspection, and the standard is lower, but it's cheaper; it's cheaper. It's like running your car, don't get your oil changed very often; don't have any annual maintenance work done, any tune-ups done. Wait till the thing blows up or wait till it just grinds to a halt someday and then get it fixed. You can save a lot of money on repairs that way, Mr. Chairman, or some people seem to think so. Well, I certainly don't think so.

Then he continually wants to disassociate himself from decision-making — maybe it's because I've been a politician longer — he and I were both teachers and now we're both in the political arena, and he wants to always disassociate himself from responsibility. He doesn't do this consciously. I don't think that if you asked him this he would say that, but when you listen to him, this is what he does. He did this today, he did it before. He said he doesn't make these decision, Mr. Chairman. All he does, is he gives the money to the university. He hands over a block of money, and it's up to them. If they want to raise the tuition fee, it's their responsibility. If they want to let their plant go to rack and ruin, well, that's their problem. If they want to lay off teachers, or they want to not have books in their library, or they want to cancel subscriptions to magazines and so on, well, that's their decision. They're free to do whatever they want. He just provides the funding.

Mr. Chairman, it's like somebody coming along, a starving beggar who hasn't eaten in days, and they ask you for money and you give them a quarter. You say: Here's a quarter, my good man — buy whatever you like. If you want to have a turkey sandwich or you want to have a fillet or you want to have lobster or you want to have a cup of coffee, it's up to you. I'm not going to tell you what to order, I'm giving you the money, and once you have that money, my good man, you are free to order whatever you like. You are a free man, take your pick, it's up to you. This is the kind of logic that I keep hearing. So the Minister thinks that he is going to embarrass me and embarrass our administration because we had an attitude of attempting to discourage tuition fees. No, we couldn't tell, no, we couldn't tell the universities what to do.

But I think that the attitude or the posture of the government is known, just as in the United States — if I could take an example — the Supreme Court, which is an independent body, it's part of that system, that the Legislature's there, and the executives are there, and the judiciaries are there, and they are separate division of powers and all that. But there is a saying in the Supreme Court of the United States, and that is that they have to follow the election returns. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the court must be sensitive to the attitude of the government, and if the government is more liberal in one period, they should tend to go in that direction. If the government is more conservative in one area, they should tend to go in that direction.

Now, I'm simply saying that our government had an attitude, if I can use that expression, or a philosophy, that they did not favour tuition increases. They couldn't order them; they couldn't rescind them, but they could indicate or express. I mean, my God, Mr. Chairman, I assume the Minister must have some attitude towards higher education. Or when he meets with the presidents, what does he do? I mean, what do they do when they go for lunch? — (Interjection)— He buys them coffee. Yes, he says, Here, I'll buy my lunch and I'll give you a quarter for yours. You can have whatever you like. I mean, what does he do when he has these men in his office when they come to see him? He just says, uh huh, yep, right, m'huh, very interesting, good point, I'll think about it. What, he never says anything? I mean, they just come in there and they bounce all his stuff off his head, and he doesn't respond. He gives them an enigmatic smile, but he never indicates which way he thinks, which way he feels, which way the government . . . because there's no government policy on higher education, right? And there's no government policy on public education, is that right? Well, Mr. Chairman, this must be a peculiar government. It's a government without a philosophy and a government without a direction. All they do is provide the bucks. They provide the bucks. Not enough. Quarters, not the bucks, the quarters, as my colleague says.

Mr. Chairman, when we dealt with the city of Winnipeg I have to tell you, I might be letting the cat out of the bag, but you know we didn't like increases in public transit, that was our position. We didn't want higher and higher and higher fares charged to people who ride public transit, that was an attitude of our government and I stand by that attitude. I also stand by an attitude of trying to have lower tuition fees and high bursaries and trying to make higher education as well as public education available to everyone. I don't favour private and parochial schools, like this Minister does. I feel that this is sort of a basic philosophy, namely that education should not be for people with money or people with connections. Those people, they have all the advantages anyway. If you come from a professional home, if you come from a family with money, you can have all the encyclopedias you want. You can go to Europe in the summertime. You can have private tutors. You can have private lessons. You can go to St. Johns Ravenscourt. You can go to Harvard University. That's wonderful, be my guest, but not at public expense. That will have to come out of the income and that will have to come out of the

priorities, but it will not come out of the taxation that goes into the provincial coffers if I can help it.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister also talked about fees. He gave us lists and lists and lists of fees and he compared Manitoba's fees to fees across Canada. Well, that was a very interesting exercise, I'm glad he did it. I found it interesting. I haven't heard them read to me in a while. But I have to tell him that that does not stand to the credit of his administration. Those fees, in relation to other provinces, they are not because of the efforts of his administration. I think if we went back and dredged up the figures and looked at the percentages of fees in the various universities to other universities from 1969 on, or go back to 1958 and the Roblin administration, it would be an interesting pattern to see. But I think it's because of a general holding of fees during our administration that he can read those fees out to us, because he's been bumping fees up every year at a fairly good clip. So I don't think that his administration can stand up and take any credit.

Then he read one of the most interesting things I've ever heard and this is where it's called, Never mind the statements of what may be fact, it's the conclusions that you draw. This is one of the things you learn in logic and I guess we'd have to look at the premises. But if you have all these premises, presumably you should all draw the same conclusion, or presumably the conclusion should be consistent with the premises.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister who seemed to be arguing, he appeared to be arguing to me, that the cutbacks and the restraint program of the Lyon administration have been good for the people. They've been good for people. A little belt-tightening never hurt anybody. No, no. If you have a 44-inch waist and you tighten your belt a couple of inches, you probably could have used it anyway, you probably were too fat in the first place. But if your belt is maybe only 28 or 30 inches and you tighten it a couple of inches, it could hurt, or you might have pains or pangs in the stomach. And he seemed to argue . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. COSENS: On a point of privilege. I did not make that particular statement and I did not make any statement in that regard and I feel the honourable member is really misinterpreting any remarks that I made, and distorting them to his own particular advantage, and I rather resent that particular approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that the Minister resents that. I will attempt to be clearer yet. I resent his use of the word cheap, but I won't make a point of privilege about that. I want to tell him the impression that he created and he can stand up in a couple of minutes and he can re-explain his point.

He seemed to argue that in spite of cutbacks and in spite of belt-tightening and in spite of restraint, the university was winning more medals than ever. Now he was quoting the university president, so I

heard what he said. I have to tell him that I personally know the presidents of the University of Winnipeg and Manitoba, as he does, and I have a very high opinion of them. I don't really know the president of the University of Brandon, so I just cannot really speak about him. But I know these other gentlemen and so on.

But what was the implication that the Minister was making? What was the impression that he certainly created? Namely, that is you have this type of a belt-tightening exercise it'll result in a lot of awards. I mean the logic to me was very clear. He was saying, tighten it up, give them less money and they'll win more, they'll win more medals. Cutbacks, the greater the cutbacks the greater the awards. I don't know if my colleague from Winnipeg Centre got that message but I certainly got that message. That's what he was saying. He's saying it had no effect, it hasn't hurt the academic excellence and here's the proof. Well, if you carry that logic to its extreme, it would seem to me the greater the cutbacks the greater the awards. Skinny students are smart students, that seems to be the theory.

There's a famous architect, and this may work in architecture I don't know, named Mies van der Rohe. He said less is more, Mr. Chairman, that was his dictum, less is more. And that may be true in geometry, it may be true in engineering, may be true in architecture, I don't know, I'm not a science man, I'm an arts man. But it certainly appears to be the opinion of the Minister that when it comes to academic excellence, boy, this belt-tightening hasn't hurt them one little bit. So if that's true then maybe he should try to tighten it a little more and the medals will just start popping out at the other end.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply say at this point in time, actions speak louder than words. The Minister is saying one thing and he seems to be doing another. He said he went to the U of M and he acquired three degrees. I can't say that I have that many degrees. I only have two-and-a-half. I have a B.A. and a B.A. Honours and a certificate, so I guess that's about two-and-a-half, but he has three. But I went to two universities, so I know these universities too. I went to what was then United College and what was —(Interjection)— Well, I know I'm dating myself but you'll note I didn't say Wesley College, which would have dated myself further.

I want to say in conclusion at this point, I have much more to say, but I want to say at this point that the Minister keeps saying — and I think it's because he's still relatively new to politics — he seems to believe that when we criticize the government and that when we criticize him, that this is disloyal. I think he used the word disloyal. If he didn't he used an synonym, but it struck me that he said something along those lines. I have to say to him a couple of things, Mr. Chairman, in that regard. I have to refer him to the statements of a former leader of his party, the Honourable Sid Spivak.

He said many times in this Chamber, he said, I do not come here to applaud the government. When you look for applause don't look to the opposition for applause. I say in similar words to this Minister, that it is the duty and the responsibility of the opposition to criticize the government and to look for flaws in their policy. They are never going to get resounding and desk-thumping applause from this

opposition and when we are in government and they are in opposition —(Interjection)— Yes, that's right, you should be. And when the roles are reversed again, then the same will be true. The opposition will not applaud the government. I say in my own words to paraphrase the words of Shakespeare, that I come to bury the Lyon government, not to praise it.

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

MR. WAIDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might get a little statistical information from the Minister. I would like, if he could give me a breakdown of the grants that went from the Universities Grants Commission to the University of Manitoba. I wonder if he could give them to me on a scale similar to that given on page 37 of the Annual Report of the University. Under Schedule 14, Government Grants, it lists half a dozen or so different headings. Could the Minister give us the appropriate figures for the 1980-81 year, please?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I won't be quoting from that particular document, I don't have it in front of me. But the allocations to the universities are as follows, and it will take me a minute to find the University of Manitoba allocation. I have the totals here but not that particular breakdown. So perhaps if the honourable member would like to pursue his questions, I can give that to him in a minute.

MR. WALDING: No, Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions at the moment. I just wanted that breakdown on a comparable basis to Schedule 14.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to read some specifics here from the Winnipeg Tribune and I want to ask the Minister to give us some specific reactions to some very disturbing statements. The Minister, I believe, was quoting a letter. I assume it was written by a Dr. Campbell about an article written by Frances Russell. —(Interjection)— Right. I want to go over these points and I want to ask the Minister to comment on each one because she made half-a-dozen, some of which are very well known and some of which were less known. I did ask the Minister some questions about this, I think, about a week or so ago when they first came out. I think he said he'd look into them. So he's certainly known of the article and he's known of my questions and I think he can answer most of them.

Let's take the first point, I'm now quoting from the article of June 4th, Restraint Rocks the U of M, Accreditations Threatened.. The first point was that two professional faculties, Law and Engineering, are skating on the edge of losing their accreditation. Architecture was threatened. Secondly, another professional faculty, Medicine, can no longer provide training in certain specialties. Could the Minister comment?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think I've commented on that earlier and I believe the appropriate comments that I read from the president's letter to the newspaper, as of June 5th,

also addressed that particular point where he said there are no accrediting bodies for those particular faculties and that there was no indication that, in fact, they were in any danger, as my honourable friend would imply. So he is quite free to quote all of the particular statements that he may find in any particular newspaper. I'm more inclined, Mr. Chairman, to look to the validity of statements by the presidents of the universities.

Really while I'm on that point, perhaps the I could read him a letter from the president of Brandon University to the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, written March 3rd. He says, Brandon University is grateful for the recognition by the government of Manitoba and the Grants Commission of the difficult financial times in which we have found ourselves in the past two years. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem in agreeing that the two years that he refers to certainly were times where there was not the amount of funds that the university would like to have had available to work with. That is something that I certainly do not deny. But he goes on to say, The operating grant increase of approximately 8 percent for Brandon University will ensure our continued operation at a level that will not require us to terminate any employees for financial exigency, although we should still find ourselves heavily pressed in the area of preventative maintenance and renovation of our physical plant. The miscellaneous allocation for fiscal year 1980-81, coupled with the supplementary allocation in this category at the end of the fiscal year 1979-80, will permit us to maintain the operations at roughly the same level as last year.

So the kind of gloom and doom that the honourable member continually refers to . . . And I appreciate the fact, Mr. Chairman, that his particular job is criticize as constructively, I would hope, as possible. I would be very concerned if he ever started to agree with me completely, or if I was receiving great applause from him; in fact, Mr. Chairman, I would be very concerned I was doing something wrong if that particular situation started to appear on the scene.

I only say to him that yes, over the last three years the government has asked the universities, as it has asked a number of different services in our community, to join with us, as a government, in trying to control our costs and our spending and, at the same time, to maintain services at as high a level as possible. I say, yes, the universities, as have other services, have found that this at times can be a very difficult exercise, as we in government at times have found that it can be a very difficult exercise, but I do appreciate their approach to this particular problem and I do appreciate that in most cases — I suppose we can always find some exception in a particular program or in a particular facility — but in most cases, Mr. Chairman, they have been able to cope and cope quite effectively. I will reiterate for the sake of the honourable member, we have not seen the universities cutting huge numbers of staff. I gave him these figures earlier. He doesn't apparently want to talk about that. I have said to him, I don't see them cutting highly qualified people and I gave him the numbers of full professors and deans and showed him that those numbers in fact had increased and he didn't comment on that all, Mr. Chairman, because

that's rather positive and his job is to only comment on negative things.

I'm surprised that he hasn't mentioned the so-called rats in Tache Hall, that someone told me occurred in a newspaper article. Well, Mr. Chairman, if there were rats in Tache Hall, they probably joined a whole menagerie of animals that I can think of that were brought into that residence during some of the years that I lived there. I don't know whether they were white rats that had been more or less seconded from the zoology lab., or what the reference was. But that's ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, to point out to that type of an example and say, oh, that illustrates that our universities are going to rack and ruin.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I know why the honourable member doesn't want to talk about Tache Hall because for eight years the government, where he was a minister, did watch Tache Hall go to rack and ruin. It was our government, within a matter of months, Mr. Chairman, of coming in to office, that took action and did set aside some 5.2 million to renovate that venerable old building, a very very fine building, in fact, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member doesn't want to talk about that particular point. That's a positive action. He likes to concentrate on what he feels or what he can imply are rather disastrous situations.

Well, I say to him, yes, the universities have had to tighten their belts over the last three years, as has the government had to tighten theirs and certain other services within our system, but I compliment them on the fact that they have been able to do that, not without some pain, Mr. Chairman, because I know it's a painful process; it's a painful process for any of us, as individuals, to have to do that sort of thing. But they have done it and they have maintained services and they have maintained quality and I certainly commend them for it. Certainly now as we see the economic picture in this province improving, I'm optimistic that the support that we can give to the universities will increase and that we will be able to enhance their particular position. Of course I don't have to reiterate the opinion that I hold of our universities, I mentioned that earlier. They are necessary; they are most worthwhile; they are productive; they are part of the whole fabric of our province and a valuable part of it and I think sometimes that is something that we should be talking about to a greater extent that we do. They support the economic development of the province; they support the human development, a very essential part of our fabric, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the Minister that it isn't this side that talks about rat infestation, it's the First Minister who continually makes that type of reference in the Chamber.

I do want to say though — and I don't know if the Minister is definite or if he is talking to the best of his knowledge about accreditation of engineering and law because I cannot say that I know for certain myself — all I can say is that it has been repeatedly reported in the media, and I refer back to March 1980, about engineering granted a renewed accreditation for only three years instead of the

Thursday, 12 June, 1980

standard five, so I assume that there is an accreditation body for engineering. —(Interjection)— Now the Minister is saying, yes. —(Interjection)— All right, you didn't say no. I didn't understand you then; I thought you said, no, or you didn't say that there was but you are now saying that there is such a body and I'm simply saying that the suggestion has been on a number of occasions that some of the faculties are in danger of losing their accreditation.

Now, you know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes an interesting comment and he draws a more interesting conclusion. He says that they asked the universities to join them in a restraint program; they asked them to join them. That reminds me of an uneven invitation, like the famous one that's most treasured on this side, of Tommy Douglas's story about the elephant dancing among the chickens while he said, every man for himself, and it also reminds me of one of the most amusing things I ever saw on TV — and I believe I once mentioned this to you, Mr. Chairman — the famous heavyweight boxing champion, a very — well I don't know if he was a colourful character but he certainly was a bad actor, Sonny Liston. He was heavyweight champion of the world. He had underworld connections and he was as mean a man as ever walked this earth. And although I never saw this program, I heard about it, and it reminds me of the Minister inviting the universities to join with them in a restraint exercise. Sonny Liston was on the program 'Sports Hot Seat' and he was asked by a reporter how old he was, and I think he gave his age at 32 or something. The reporter said to him, Look, Sonny, according to my information, you're 36 or 38, and Sonny said, I'm 32. This reporter said, Yes, but Sonny, I have this information here and according to such and such a record, you were born on such and such a date and you're 36, 37 or 38, whatever the reporter kept saying, and Sonny said I'm 32 and he gave him a very baleful stare. Finally, when the reporter persisted again, Sonny interrupted and said Are you calling my mother a liar? I can assure you that no man in this Chamber, faced with that question, would say that to Sonny Liston because they would face the prospect of certain death.

So, as my colleague from Logan says, the Minister, like the 'Godfather', made the universities an offer they couldn't refuse. He may have asked them to join but what was their option; what was their option? I mean, what do you expect Ralph Campbell to do? Picket the Legislature? Did you really think that Dr. Duckworth would take to the air and make charged political comment against you? Or give you a baleful glare, ask you to step outside of the Chamber? Or Dr. Perkins sending threatening letters to the Minister, talking about closing up Brandon University? I mean, what could these men do when they were confronted by a government, which they asked the government, Mr. Chairman, for a loaf of bread and the Minister gave them a stone.

So the Minister says, in his own inimitable way, he said, they were asked to join in. You know, why don't we have a little restraint exercise fellas for a couple of years and then before the election, oh yes, before the election, Mr. Chairman, a few months before, we'll loosen up the old purse strings and spread around a few goodies and everything will be fine. Just like before the by-elections, do you remember

that? Remember the SAFER program and a few little goodies, the grant to the arena, that sort of stuff. We know this is going to happen. I mean I know it's going to happen. I don't know what's going to be announced; I just know that they are going to announce that everything's fine, they've turned it all around and the economy is booming and now people can benefit from all the goodies. We know that that's about to hit somewhere in the next year or so.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a few more small detailed questions and ask the Minister if he has information on these, or if he has any comment on these, and I raised this question with him a week ago. Again on the libraries, an allegation made in Francis Russell's column, saying that Arts professors are xeroxing or photostating their own books for their students because the university's library cannot afford to buy them. Now if that's true, that's a good example of the stupidity of restraint as opposed to the effectiveness of restraint. If professors are actually being told that they can't buy certain books and they're going in there and photostating vast numbers of pages for numbers of students, that costs more than the textbooks; it's also illegal, maybe it is. But what's a professor to do? I mean supposing he needs that for his courses, supposing that he's had textbooks and now he has less money and he feels that the quality of the course is being affected and so on, what is he to do? Well, the Minister would say, he'll just have to live with it but if that's the type of end run that's being made, then on one hand we'll look and it will say, so much money being given for textbooks but then, on the other hand, it will say, big increase in the amount of photostating. So, you know, that's from one pocket to the other. I just wonder if the Minister has any information on that particular point?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could respond, first of all to the question from the Member for St. Vital regarding 1980-81 operating grants to the University of Manitoba. They total 82.4 million, Mr. Chairman, and the miscellaneous capital totals 1.485 million.

In response to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, who got back to the creditation topic, he's quite correct that the engineering faculty does follow the accreditation procedures that are followed by other engineering faculties across the Dominion, and it is quite true that they encountered some difficulty and received a three-year accreditation rather than a five. There are a number of reasons for this. That particular faculty had expanded its enrolment quite dramatically. The other reason, Mr. Chairman, that I have received from the engineering faculty in discussions with them is that they have been underfunded for a large number of years. In fact, they say that this went back for some seven years previous to this government coming into office.

And once again, Mr. Chairman, I can't particularly blame the honourable members opposite for that situation, because they did not fund the engineering faculty. They funded the university, and the university in turn, decided how much money it would allocate to engineering as it decides how much it will allocate to dentistry and architecture and so on. But this is not a situation that happened as a result of our government coming into power. The situation was

there. Now the allocations have been increased, I understand, by the University of Manitoba to that faculty and the particular problems associated with that accreditation have been addressed.

So I say that to the honourable member, and I think it is a fair way of approaching that particular problem. As I say, I don't blame his particular government specifically for that, because they funded the universities in those seven years where engineering felt that it had been drastically underfunded, and again the university allocated the money as it saw fit. Subsequently, engineering has maintained that they had suffered under that particular allocation for those seven years. That impact has been addressed, Mr. Chairman.

The library, as I mentioned earlier, certainly is a problem situation, and not one that has occurred just in the last three years. But I am a bit appalled, Mr. Chairman, as well as the honourable member, to find out that it ranks very low status across the country as far as university libraries are concerned. I'm absolutely appalled to think that situation has been allowed to take place over a number of perhaps 10 or 12 years, where there has been a continued deterioration. But once again, Mr. Chairman, I do not make the allocation to the library, nor does the government make the allocation to the library. Perhaps the honourable member is suggesting that the government should, in their dispensation of funds to universities, allocate certain amount of moneys for libraries. But I suggest to him that when governments start taking that type of initiative and start directing programs at the universities by specific and categorical grants, then the autonomy, which is something that our government at least, is anxious to maintain, will be seriously threatened.

He refers to some, I believe it was a newspaper article, that talked about a professor, or professors, who were xeroxing books. I suggest to the honourable member that, first of all, that's illegal and breaking copyright laws, and secondly, it's much more expensive than buying the books in the first place, and it just doesn't make sense if that is happening and is happening on a large scale, because there is certainly no economy being accomplished by that type of move, Mr. Chairman.

But once again, I do not make the allocation for those particular types of supplies at a university. The Universities Grants Commission decides the particular allocation that will go to universities. They then adopt their particular priorities and provide the sums of money for each of these particular categories in turn.

So I have some problem with the honourable member's line of debate in this case, Mr. Chairman, because on the one hand he seems to be saying the government should be directing this and that at the universities; on the other hand, I think if hard pressed, he would certainly stand up as a defender of the autonomy of the universities, although maybe he wouldn't, maybe he believes that governments should be directly involved. He earlier made some reference to the fact that when we were in government, we talked to the universities, and he made some reference to some type of subtle type of government manipulation. I know he didn't call it that, but he more or less inferred that when we were government, we made it quite plain to the

universities what they should do here and what they should do there. Mr. Chairman, that is direct government interference. That is manipulation by the government of the day. That's not a practice that we are prepared to follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, as I said, I think there were areas in which the government did express preferences, but this Minister tells me that he wouldn't do that, that he's like the Buddha, he sits there, and when the university professors ask him questions, they get no response. They cannot tell by the manner of his expression or in any hint of any preference that he has personally or his government has. It's like talking to a brick wall and that is the way that a Minister of Education should act. He shouldn't have ideas. He shouldn't have values. He shouldn't have preferences. He should just not ever indicate which way he's leaning.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the government should have policies when it comes to education. The only policy I have seen come from this Minister is that he wants to make some improvements in aid to private and parochial schools. That's the one guarantee policy that stands beside this Minister. That's his accomplishment, in his view, and I must say that the rest of the picture is bleak. I am saying that by the manner in which the government funds the universities, we've had all these problems. This is my central point. He keeps saying that he doesn't want to direct money to university libraries, he doesn't want to direct money to the Faculty of Engineering, he doesn't want to direct money here and he doesn't want to direct money there. It's up to the universities. They have the money. It's called . . . what is it called? Not bulk, block funding, block funding. But I say to the Minister that he is not providing sufficient funding, that the block is not large enough, and that because of the overall percentage increases vis-a-vis the high rate of inflation and vis-a-vis enrolment decline, we're now having scrapping in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, between the three universities. They are fighting for students. They are fighting for dollars. This is all in addition to traditional tussels within the departments as to whether the U. of W. should have this type of a faculty or whether they should go to the U. of M. and so on and so on. It's because of the fact that the Progressive Conservative Government has not provided adequate funding, and there have been de facto cutbacks in terms of the amount of dollars provided, and there have been cutbacks in terms of quality, the quality of education.

I have to be concerned about that, Mr. Chairman, because when I think of what makes Manitoba unique, what really makes us unique, and I'm not a hunter and a fisherman, but I'll certainly agree that our recreation areas in hunting and fishing in Manitoba is very good. But to me, what makes us unique, as well as the wide open spaces, are the cultural facilities that we are fortunate in having in a small province with a small population, extraordinary cultural facilities. I always think first of the Arts. I always think first of the Arts, as my colleague says, the Winnipeg Ballet, the Theatre Centre, the

Symphony and the Art Gallery and the Museum and the ethnic groups. We have a professional hockey team. We have a professional football team, and so on and so on. Our universities are in that group. Our universities stand in the forefront of what makes Manitoba unique, and they have to be jealously guarded, because once you start taking those things away, or you start depreciating them, then I think it affects the quality of life as a whole throughout the province.

It's all too easy, Mr. Chairman, to cut back on library grants and arts grants. It's all too easy, and it's frequently done. It's much more interesting to spend money on other things that are considered politically sexy or that have a higher political profile. But when you start cutting the quality, when you start cutting the research, when you start cutting the salaries and so on, then it's going to take some time. And when you start depreciating the plant, it's very hard to see what you're doing when you're depreciating the physical plant, but once it starts to go down the road, it's always down the road, then the chickens come home to roost.

I want to ask the Minister this question, a couple more remaining from this article, and then get on to some other points. I want to ask him whether he can confirm this statement that I'm looking at, June 4th, Winnipeg Tribune, that says that the provincial operating grant to the university has declined in real dollar terms for three years in a row, that the university is now getting less money in actual terms from the province than it did in 1975 to 1976. I wonder if the Minister has any figures. We're not talking about the fact that the university gets more dollars every year. We know that. We know that there is a thing called absolute and relative, and that in absolute terms there are more dollars going to the universities, but in terms of real dollars, the suggestion is clearly made, that because of inflation and because of the grants that have been made, the university is now in fact receiving less money than it did in overall terms, than it was say, five years ago, and in terms operating dollars, it's now getting less money every year. I wonder if the Minister would like to clarify that point or confirm it.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three points that I would like to respond to. First of all, the honourable member made some reference to research at the university and again, I of course like to be positive, whereas it's his role to be negative. But I point out to him that the research component, and that is the other very important component at the university besides the teaching component, has been growing. Last year I believe the total amount amounted to some 18.5 million and this, if he will check back the last three or four years, is an increase, and of course, more or less belies the point that he makes that things at universities are deteriorating sadly. I have every reason to believe that amount of research money will increase again this year in significant proportions.

He makes the point also that the universities are fighting amongst themselves — That may not have been quite his term, although it was very close to that — for students, and this is because of the government's funding. I suggest to the honourable member that there probably is a healthy competition

among our three universities for students, mainly not because of government funding but because of the fact that there are less students available. Each university, in its own way, is anxious to maintain its enrolments as far as possible. Each particular university has its own unique strengths, its own faculties that certainly make each one of them particularly competitive as far as certain types of learning are concerned. I suggest to him that, yes, there is competition. Again, I don't think that is unhealthy, but it is not competition that's due to government funding.

He makes the statement that of course the funding today in constant dollars is not keeping up with inflation. I have to agree with him, he's right. I don't think that this government has ever pretended that it's funding is keeping up with inflation because our funding levels have been below inflation and, as a result, he's quite correct when he makes that statement. But that has never been the particular goal that we had was to outstrip inflation. We have asked people to attempt to help us control inflation by looking at expenditures and, where possible, controlling those expenditures that would not have any dire effects on quality of services.

MR. DOERN: What about highway construction?

MR. COSENS: I say to the honourable member to his final question, yes, he's quite correct.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be interesting to look at some of the values of the government and I know that, I think a couple of years ago — and I'm not sure of the exact figures today — but if you looked at the priorities of this government, the first priority in some cases was roads, build roads. That was considered No. 1. Well, that's not my priority.

The other point I ask of the Minister is this statement that a paper is quoted here prepared by President, Dr. Ralph Campbell, in May, 1979, which shows the University of Manitoba to be funded at a level 11 percent below that of the average of 14 major Canadian universities. Just to expand on that again — and now this is a quote coming from Dr. Noel Bentley, who is the head of the Faculty quoted in the same article, comparing the University of Manitoba to other western universities, which is a good comparison, over the same period — Manitoba's operating and capital expenditures have shown a 14.6 percent decline in actual dollars over the past five years, while all other universities have registered increases of between 14 and 34 percent. So again, Mr. Chairman, it looks like in relative terms the University of Manitoba is slipping, especially in regard to western Canadian universities and, secondly, in regard to Canadian universities.

I simply ask the Minister if the Lyon administration is going to continue its policy of research, how long is it going to be before people will say that they will, for a variety of reasons, send their sons and daughters out of the province, or how long will it be if we start racking up such dubious distinctions as 23rd out of 24 universities for our library and

continuing restraint in relation to other universities? I mean, isn't it only going to be a matter of time that our universities will fall to the bottom and that, if so, that will have an adverse effect on their ability to attract students and attract faculty? That if they are not attracting money from the present administration, isn't it only a matter of time when that will have a hard impact on the universities and that we will all be the losers, as a result?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure governments have a number of priorities, and the honourable member talks about highways and roads, and saying that's a priority of this government. I would have to agree with him; I think it is a priority of this government, and there is a reality that exists there; that in an agricultural-based province, where one of the chief industries is agriculture and grain growing and in a climate where we are seeing more and more railway lines being abandoned, then there certainly is reason that highways and roads must also achieve some priority.

The honourable member says he doesn't care about those, but I suggest to him that if he doesn't care about those things that are basic to our economy, then we are going to have some trouble finding the revenues that help support valuable institutions like our universities. One buttresses the other and I think we have to look at the complete package. He asked the question, what is the government's policy in regard to our universities and he, of course, prophesized dire things happening in the future. I suggest to him that the policy of this government is and will continue to be that we will maintain a funding level to our universities that will not jeopardize the quality of educational training that they provide to the young people of this province and in fact people from other provinces and other countries who come here for a university education.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is now beginning to sound like D.L. Campbell, and I have a lot of respect for D.L. Campbell. I sat in this House with him, but I certainly never shared his views. He was far too conservative for me and one of his approaches — I don't know if he ever said this but it was certainly widely believed in the academic community — that I think he was once quoted as saying, well, there might be a raise for the university if the crops were good. That's sort of the attitude of this Minister. He is going to say that if we have a bumper crop, there is going to be a little something extra in your pay envelope, and if there is droughts, then you're going to have to take cut and drink less water, among other things, because we need the water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the Minister — and he won't be able to answer this at this point in time — when we talk about priorities, I assume that he doesn't go into Cabinet . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is now 4:30, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and committee will resume at 8 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're now under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business on Thursdays is Public Bills, followed by Private Bills and then Resolutions.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 40 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The first public bill is Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The honourable member has 16 minutes remaining.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have one of pages bring me a copy of the bill. I remember what it says, but I'd like a copy of it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to put government intervention on the collective bargaining process by requiring a collective agreement to permit a person who, for religious reasons, does not believe in trade unions, to have his dues sent to a charity of his choice or a charity that was agreed to as between the union and the member or, if there is no agreement, I believe that the charity can be chosen by the Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, say that this kind of law is not an unexpected extension of those laws which permit the state to involve itself in the collective bargaining process. Once the state, Mr. Speaker, passes a law that says that once a collective agreement is entered into there shall be deducted a certain amount from every employee's wages and sent to the union as a compulsory check-off, then the thin edge of the wedge as to what a collective agreement is to contain, as between management and labour, is pursued by people who think that they know better what a collective agreement should contain.

So I don't wish to blame, Mr. Speaker, the member who is proposing the amendment or the government, who conceives of these type of things as being guilty of original sin. The original sin is the attempt to determine by legislation what will be contained in collective agreement. I think, Mr. Speaker, and in this I'm not certain that my memory serves me properly, but when the original enactment was made which put into statute what is known as rand formula, namely that where the collective agreement is entered into, that amount of union dues will be paid to the union, I believe — and members will be able to check whether I'm right or wrong — that I said that this could have a negative effect, because an employer who wishes to resist such a section will resist signing a collective agreement. In other words, it will be an impediment, rather than a facility.

The present section applies only if a collective agreement is entered into. Now, that's like throwing up a red flag to the employer who doesn't want to have this type of union security. He says, if I don't enter into a collective agreement, then I won't be

required to pay union dues, and therefore, I will resist entering into a collective agreement. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that that has happened, because grant formula has become so much an accepted facet of any union management negotiating, that the fact of deduction of union dues may not be the impediment that it could be. But it is, Mr. Speaker, whether it acts as an immediate impediment or not, it is the thin edge of the wedge. When the Act was passed permitting this type of union security to be legislated, I did — and this I do trust my memory — indicate that the allowance to any of the individuals to have their dues sent to a place other than the union, was a negative thing, Mr. Speaker, was a feature of the bargaining process which would work negative results. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it was most unfair, and would be so regarded that eventually it would mean legislating out of any union security. Eventually, Mr. Speaker, by logical analysis, this is the so-called — and I put this in quotation marks — right to work legislation.

Now how do I come to that conclusion, Mr. Speaker? I believe that a person who doesn't believe in unions on the basis of fundamental principle — and there are such people and I respect them — has as much right to say that he doesn't want his dues sent to a union as somebody who does it on religious grounds. Why are we elevating religious beliefs to other beliefs? Somebody will come into this Legislature after you've passed this legislation and they'll say, you permit a person to designate his union dues to somebody else on religious grounds. A Conservative member will get up and say what I am saying now, he'll say, why religious grounds? Surely if a man honestly believes that unions are bad, for whatever reasons, for fundamentally in his mind, sound principled reasons, then he will say, why are you requiring that person to do what you don't require a religious person to do?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the Manitoba Federation of Labour, when we brought in the legislation, agreed with what is now being pursued. Then he said, we don't mind that, and I have to, Mr. Speaker, even though it's going to sound at the risk of I told you so, say that I in the Legislature said that I am going along with this only because it is being acquiesced in, only because the labour movement appears to think that it's acceptable, not because I think it's acceptable, but the Minister of Labour is bringing in this bill and the bill, as a whole, is something that I go with and therefore I'm not going to oppose the bill on the basis of that particular section. Within two years, Mr. Speaker, within two years what I said turned out to be correct, and we reversed it.

Mr. Speaker, if a member on that side came in and said, that we see now that the state intervention is not helping at all, if we will allow the parties to come to a conclusion as to the kind of union security they have, I tell the members that my present inclination and my historical implications would be to say, you're right, let the parties agree as to union securities. Let that be part of the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat something which I said to my trade union classes every year when I talked for the Manitoba Federation of Labour at the University of Manitoba, in which I said in this House

and which I believe today to be true, that a working man, like anybody else, has the right to say that I will work with somebody else or I will not work with somebody else. That a man who says that I don't want to be part of a union and won't work with union people, has got a right to say, I'm going to stop working with these people. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, they've done it in Ontario. I am going to hold up a sign, standing outside the premises and say, I don't believe in unions, I don't believe that you should buy from this employer because he has a union shop, which I disapprove of. I have never interfered with that person's right to do so and I am the person to protect it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina is nodding his head. I believe that a union man has the right to say, I will not work with another person who doesn't join a union. Indeed, I will walk outside of that plant and say, non-union people employed here, and try to force that company, through my economic strength, to see to it that everybody joins the union. And I will defend that person's right to do so, Mr. Speaker, indeed I have done so, not only in this Legislative Chamber but in the Supreme Court of Canada and the courts below that, and did get a law passed to that effect. I hope the Member for Pembina will see the equality of the two conditions and vote for both of them, Mr. Speaker, as I would, as I would.

I don't believe that union solidarity comes from the compulsory statutory checkoff. In England, Mr. Speaker, they didn't know what it meant. Do you know what the checkoff was, and I believe is, in England? The union steward, Mr. Speaker, would come to the manager and he would say to the manager, you see that man over there working on that machine? He did not pay his union dues. If he is here this afternoon he will be all alone. That was union security, Mr. Speaker, and it meant that the people together had to decide whether they were going to permit a freeloader, because that's what they are. Mr. Speaker, are you going to pass a law?

Is the Member for Emerson going to bring in a law saying that any member of the Law Society who doesn't believe in Law Societies, would have the right to designate that his Law Society fee shall be paid to the religious organization of his choice. Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Matthews says it's a good idea. I challenge him to bring in a bill or make an amendment. No, he won't be able to make an amendment to this one, because I don't think this one's going to get to committee. But I challenge him to bring in a bill saying that no member of any association, required now by law — that's right, doctors and dentists and there are lots of them — shall be required to pay their union dues, union meaning trade association, meaning professional association, and if they don't wish to they can designate that it will be paid to a charity of their choice.

No Conservative will bring in such a bill, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think any New Democrats will bring in such a bill. I don't think any such bill will ever be brought in, because I think, Mr. Speaker, the little things that working people have had to hit the bricks for, walk in picket lines for, has to be obtained through their bargaining strength and their solidarity, have been handed on a silver platter to upper class

groups in our society and trade association, and enforced by the state on penalty of fine and imprisonment, something that no union has ever got, Mr. Speaker, and which was put in — and I admit it — to The Labour Relations Act as a matter of choice if there was a collective agreement.

I think it is a dangerous section, and I said so at the time, because all it does is bring about, Mr. Speaker, the principle that the state knows better what should be contained in a collective agreement. And, Mr. Speaker, this type of extension of that is exactly the extension, not of the legislation that we brought in in 1973, 1972, whenever it was, it's an extension, Mr. Speaker, of stateism in the field of industrial relations. It is an extension of that notion which was acquiesced in by people who didn't know any better, that worker solidarity and the rights of workers depend on some state legislating them terms upon which they will be able to bargain more successfully; and has been a sickness of certain features of trade unionism ever since it's been done, and has never done them any good and has done them a lot of potential harm, and this type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, is the evidence of that harm. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt that I will not support this. If the member thinks that somehow he is making some type of intimidating remark, let him know that I didn't support it previously, and stood up and said so; that before I got into this Legislature I didn't support it and stood up and said so; that when we changed it I stood up and applauded the fact that we had changed it; and when it is before us now I tell you that I do not support it.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the same type of people, the same type of legislation will be pursued. The next bill — and you know there have been some like this — will be that any member of a union shall have the right to designate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has four minutes left.

MR. GREEN: . . . will have a right to designate, Mr. Speaker, that no part of his dues shall be used for political purposes. The Member for Pembina agrees with that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I — (Interjection)— that's a point, yes. I am a shareholder in the International Nickel Company and the Hudson Bay Mining Company and the Royal Bank of Canada, all of whom make substantial contributions to the Conservative Party and to the Liberal Party. I wonder, when they are bringing in this law, they will pass a law that no part of my money, as a shareholder, Mr. Speaker, nobody has to be a member of a union, and you'll say, he needs it to make a living. I need those shares to make a living too. We are talking about the same needs, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— We are talking about the same needs. We are talking about an economic need, Mr. Speaker, and the member who doesn't wish to be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. We can only have one speaker at a time in the Chamber.

MR. GREEN: The member who doesn't wish to be in a union which, by majority vote, decides that they

are going to make a financial contribution, has got the same rights as I do. He can sell his shares or can leave his job and go to another job and find another way of making a living. That is his choice; that is my choice. But I want to know when they are going to bring in a law saying that all of the shareholders in a company can designate, Mr. Speaker, that no part of money which would be available to pay dividends to them will be paid to any political party, and that that money will either be paid as a dividend to them or sent to another political party. When are they going to bring in such a law? The answer is never. The answer is never, and the Member for Pembina has said never, and I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that there may be a union some day, indeed I think that there will be unions — there is an association in Ontario that calls itself the Christian Union of Workers, or something, howsoever. They may give money to the Conservative Party and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative Party in the province of Ontario will be in no great sweat, nor will the Conservative Party in Manitoba, to say that they are going to interfere with the right of that association to pay money to a political party. They have never interfered, Mr. Speaker, with the right of the Builders Exchange to publish such literature as they want to. They have never interfered with the right of the Chamber of Commerce to, by majority vote, decide what kind of literature they are going to publish to support whatever political parties, and the man will say, You don't have to be a member of the Chamber of Commerce.

You don't have to be a member, Mr. Speaker, of a trade union. All of these memberships are based, Mr. Speaker — you can be a non-member of a union, and it's too often the case, it is too often the case, you can be not a member of a union and get a job in the province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in many cases, that's the preferred position.

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

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Springfield, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 44, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster, An Act to amend The Medical Act. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

BILL NO. 69 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FATALITY INQUIRIES ACT (2)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 69. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN presented Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Fatality Inquiries Act (2) for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the Honourable Member for Inkster and the Honourable Minister of Transportation want to carry on their private debate, I think there's an excellent place for it other than this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should, at the outset, address members' attention to the fact that this bill is the second bill with respect to amendments to this particular Act that has been put on the order paper of our Assembly this session. For those who are keeping score, Bill No. 59, a bill introduced by the Honourable Attorney-General, also deals with the same Act and for that matter, Mr. Speaker, the same general subject matter. The rationale, of course, for the presentation of this bill is that we, of course, take a different direction with respect to this legislation and I will be explaining that in some detail in a few moments.

I suppose, I should though, at the outset, indicate that a portion of this Bill No. 69, our bill, is the same in terms of content as a bill that was presented by myself and our caucus last year. This is the portion of the bill that relates to mandatory inquest with respect to persons dying in public institutions. This would include involuntary residents of all public institutions within the province, Mr. Speaker, inclusive therefore of correctional institutions, mental health institutions and hospitals.

We felt that there should be some compulsion on the government in order to assure that an inquest is mandatory with respect to all deaths in such situations. I'm pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that our advice was taken to heart by the government. I note that a section of the government Bill No. 59 deals with this situation and of course is virtually identical to the provisions included in last year's private bill, introduced by us, and of course, this year's proposed amendments as well.

So obviously, Mr. Speaker, the government and the Opposition have now become of one mind with respect to this particular situation and, Mr. Speaker, recalling the Chenier case at the Manitoba Home for Retardates, the unfortunate case of the gentleman who was scalded to death in the Brandon Mental Health Institution in the winter months of this year, and several other cases involving deaths in public institutions that were topical over the course of the last 12 months, we would indicate that this, in our submission, is very timely indeed and, in our submission, will lead to progress with respect to this area of law.

There are, Mr. Speaker, though, decided differences not only of emphasis but in terms of our approach towards this particular piece of legislation, and I'd like to address in the context of our bill, how we would delineate the differences.

In our bill, Mr. Speaker, we have included provisions for mandatory inquests into all police-related fatalities. This, Mr. Speaker, was not a provision of the bill we presented last year. I'm willing to admit, Mr. Speaker, that this came to mind in the inter-session as a result of the unfortunate death of a Gladstone area farm boy, his name was Lyle Dean Enns. There was a considerable amount of discussion in the media, Mr. Speaker, respecting the circumstances of that death and the appropriateness

of the Fatality Inquiries Act in the context of that situation. It occurred to me and other members on this side, Mr. Speaker, that one way to redress the law in that area would be to compel the holding of a formal inquest into the circumstances of all deaths that relate or flow from police activity.

As members, I'm sure will remember, in the case of the Enns fatality, there was controversy over the appropriateness of police action and, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think there was a need for the air to be cleared. It was my feeling that it was a two-edged sword in the sense that I thought that the police possibly were being unfairly castigated insofar as there was no forum for them to clear their own name. They were in a position where there were suggestions being made publicly about the propriety and appropriateness of their conduct; there were intimations through the press that their actions were as a result of self-defence, but there was no mechanism, there was no legislative mechanism by which the police could come forward under oath and publicly testify and tell their side of the story. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate that there was no opportunity, either, for other people who had participated in that situation — and most notably, of course, family — to do likewise. So there was a considerable amount of speculation as to the cause, the motivation; there was a considerable amount of, I think, unnecessary vitriol surrounding the entire case, and so what we are proposing, Mr. Speaker, is a mechanism by which both police and public can come forward and state their case, under oath, in a public forum so that the reputations of all people and law enforcement agencies will be maintained. So this, Mr. Speaker, is an extension in our bill that has not been provided in the government initiative before the House.

Also, Mr. Speaker, another area where there's some variance is the question of the mechanism which would govern inquest proceedings when other proceedings are before the courts. Section, well we're not supposed to mention sections . . . A section of both bills, Mr. Speaker, deal with situations where there is a hearing before a court which relates to the death of a person whose death might be the subject of an inquest. Formerly, Mr. Speaker, the law was such, while there was considerable consternation as to the state of the law but some thought and among that number, the Honourable Attorney-General, that it was not possible for an inquest to be completed when there was a charge relating to the death of a person before the court. So in the Enns case, to use a hard example, Mr. Speaker, we found that the inquest of the lad that was killed, by the RCM Police, could not be heard because there were criminal proceedings pending before a provincial judge's court, with respect to related activities, specifically, I think, a charge of obstruction of a police officer against a brother of the deceased, relating to the incident which led to the death of the boy in question.

So, Mr. Speaker, both the government and the Opposition obviously are motivated to see this law changed. The difference is that the government bill presents a revision that would put the determination of when there would be an adjournment or when there would be a continuation of an inquest wholly within the discretion of the Attorney-General or, of

course, his department. We, Mr. Speaker, have rather put that discretion solely within the hands of the court. We have said that only a provincial judge can make a decision whether the inquest should proceed or should be suspended, pending the determination of the other matter. The reason we, Mr. Speaker, take that position, is because we feel that the Attorney-General has essentially a conflict of interest with respect to matters that he bringing before the court.

By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General and his officers are, of course, responsible for prosecutions in the court, and obviously, Mr. Speaker, in certain situations — and I suppose some would say the Enns case would be a good example — in certain circumstances it could be said that it is not to the advantage of the prosecution's side to have a discovery, by way of an inquest, of evidence that might otherwise not be adducible at the trial. In other words, it is simply to the advantage of the prosecution to advance its own case at the trial as opposed to having all the facts come out and be heard by the public at a pre-trial inquest process, so we are saying that should be within the purview and discretion of a judge. That way both sides to the case, the defence and the prosecution, can make their arguments. The judge presumably, and I think rather obviously, is a person in an objective position hearing both sides argue. It is, I think, fairly safe to presume that he or she would make a determination based solely on what is in the best interests of the public and the course of justice. The Attorney-General's Department would not be precluded from making arguments, and the difference would be that they would have to make their arguments publicly in a court of law where they could be reported and where the other side could make a rebuttal.

In the context of the government's bill, No. 59, Mr. Speaker, that wouldn't be necessary. The Minister, simply by fiat could exercise unilateral discretion and that would, of course, terminate the matter. There would be no further review. —(Interjection)— The Honourable Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, says that is good. I would remind him, Mr. Speaker, that even Ministers of Highways sometimes get into trouble. It has not been unknown for members of this House to be before the courts, Mr. Speaker, and when and if that happens, Mr. Speaker, I would direct his attention to the fact that he, too, will want to know that all his rights are subject to protection of the courts. He will want full judicial review and rights of appeal. Mr. Speaker, under the government legislation this will simply be precluded and will not be an option available to a member of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest —(Interjection)— He says he would hire a good lawyer, Mr. Speaker. A good lawyer wouldn't help him, Mr. Speaker, because the prosecutor could simply say the inquest proceeding is stayed and there would be no review of that. It wouldn't matter if he had the best lawyer in the world, Mr. Speaker, there would be no judicial review. His lawyer would never get off the seat of his pants in a courtroom.

Mr. Speaker, we suggest that these matters should be solely within the purview of the courts and should not ever be the subject of governmental discretion. There is a real danger in that, Mr. Speaker, and those sorts of laws are really quite undemocratic.

They simply belie the principles that are supposed to underscore and lay the foundation for any justice system.

Mr. Speaker, we suggest that our bill is commendable in that it addresses the problem presented by the Enns case, the Shenier case, and so on, in a manner that is more consistent with both logic and the true ends of justice. I would also indicate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has 5 minutes.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Prior to completing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would also draw members' attention to the provision of a reporting mechanism in the opposition bill. The government when they adopted the terminology of last year's private members' bill, did not adopt that provision, Mr. Speaker. For reasons best known to them, they chose to omit the reporting mechanism which would require that there be a full disclosure in this House by way of an annual report, disclosing the names of all those persons who died in public institutions while involuntary residents. This would not include voluntary residents, but involuntary residents of public institutions. That, Mr. Speaker, is very important, because that of course is the way by which we would establish accountability. That's, if you will, Mr. Speaker, the safe check, the backstop. We feel that it's not only important that there be an inherently implicitly just system, but we also feel that the government should be in a position where any member of the public should have access to information that will allow them to establish that the government has done what it promises to do by legislation. That to me, and I think to all members on our side, makes very good sense, Mr. Speaker. That is why we have pressed in the past two years for freedom of information legislation in this province.

This is essentially a freedom of information provision in our bill which is not recognized in the government bill. By doing this, Mr. Speaker, there would be an assurance that all members of the public could go down the list at least once a year and find out the name and other particulars of every person who died in a prison or a mental institution in this province. That, Mr. Speaker, is important, because there was a case not too long ago, within the last decade, in Oklahoma, where it was found that over a dozen inmates of a correctional institution in that state had been tortured, mutilated, and after their death buried in unmarked paupers' graves in the corner of the prison. And, Mr. Speaker, it had nothing to do with the government. In this case it had a lot to do with cover-ups on the part of the administration of that institution. I'm not suggesting I would ever expect any government to cover up such information, Mr. Speaker, but it can happen. The potential for that sort of mischief is always there, and if it happens, Mr. Speaker, I would like an accountability mechanism, so that when it is discovered it is also found that there was a failure to make a report, and then of course it's just a question of establishing whether the report was made by the administrative staff or whether it was withheld by the government itself.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in the case of Malcolm Shenier, there was no report of the death of that young man at the Portage Mental Institution for over three months, and only after it was raised in this House, it seems to me that it makes imminent good sense to require by legislative sanction that there be full disclosure of all such deaths annually.

Mr. Speaker, we ask members to seriously review the two pieces of legislation before the House and consider each on its merits. We suggest that if the government can adopt parts of our legislation from last year, they may be willing upon seeing this year's legislation to adopt more, and since this is essentially a nonpartisan issue, Mr. Speaker, we would feel that that would be not only noteworthy, but would be appropriate in the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 71 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SOCIAL ALLOWANCES ACT (2)

MR. CORRIN, Presented Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION Presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment was discussed briefly yesterday in the course of the debate that took place respecting the government's bill to amend this particular piece of legislation. I indicated yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope I won't be repetitive — for fear of being redundant, Mr. Speaker, that the government bill did not go far enough, in that in its provisions, although it set out certain things that had to be done when a social allowance recipient filed an appeal to the Welfare Appeal Board, it didn't set out succinctly what that person's rights were with respect to access to counsel, Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, again for fear of being redundant, in our submission it is very important that there be some legislative requirement that forces the social assistance bureaucracy to detail to all persons applying for the benefit of that program their rights with respect to their allowances.

Mr. Speaker, we have received on this side reports that very few people who appear before the appeal board do so with counsel present. This is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, because 100 percent of those appellants qualify for legal aid assistance. Virtually every single person in that category by way of entitlement can obtain legal aid assistance, so it is an anomalous situation, Mr. Speaker, that by all reports only some 5 to 10 or 12 percent of the

people appearing before the board do so in the accompaniment of legal counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday, and again I'm being repetitive, but I think it bears some restatement, that these are people who generally have certain handicaps. I think it's fair to say, and I think few people, particularly those people who are affected, would argue that these are people who are generally lacking in social skills, communicative skills; generally are not well versed in terms of their personal rights; certainly not well versed in terms of the law. We feel that it is absolutely imperative that that class of citizens have special inducements that will enable them to achieve their rights. We feel that our bill is a suitable mechanism to give effect to that purpose. We would simply require, to state it simply, that every single person who is denied any benefit pursuant to the regulations made under The Social Allowances Act be given written notice that they are entitled by way of law to appear in the company of legal aid counsel before the Welfare Appeal Board. And this is very important, Mr. Speaker.

As I said again yesterday, prior to the implementation of the act creating legal aid, a very very very few cases were heard with respect to the social allowances' legislation of this province. It was very rare indeed, Mr. Speaker, when a case ever came before the courts in that regard and, Mr. Speaker, this I'm sure wasn't because there weren't litigious points to be made, and it certainly, I presume, wasn't because people always felt the government bureaucracy had treated them fairly. It was, Mr. Speaker, simply because none of those people had access to counsel. None of them had access to people who could advocate their positions before the Welfare Appeal Board and, if necessary, before the Appeal Court of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we had vast areas of law that was never judiciously tested. Mr. Speaker, this simply was wrong, and that of course was recognized by the government in 1977 when they decided not to impose user fees on welfare recipients who applied for legal aid. Candidates who were successful in their applications to Legal Aid, Mr. Speaker, were given special exempt status, which we of course commend. Not that we for a moment, would accept the user fee principle with respect to legal aid. But not to deviate, Mr. Speaker, we wonder in view of that, why there can't be some more activist position taken by the government in order to assure that those people will not only have access to counsel but will also be notified of their rights and of that access to counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I would indicate, for those who were concerned about the cost, because the Member for Wolseley wants to know, Mr. Speaker, what amounts of money we would be speaking about if we afforded these people knowledge of their rights, I would suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that you can't put a price on justice. I say that, because there is not a person who can't fall prey to deficiencies and inequities in a law.

Mr. Speaker, I say that, and I said it when I made my remarks with respect to the predecessor bill, there is no person who should regard him or herself as being above the impact of any law. We, Mr. Speaker, as legislators, should be more cognizant of that than anybody else in society, because we work in that milieu. It's our job, Mr. Speaker, as

legislators, to create the fabric which ties and binds society. Quite literally we create the foundation, we establish what duties will be reciprocal as between members of our society, and we establish what obligations shall fall on people within our society. We establish literally classes of people within society, Mr. Speaker. We say that certain people only have rights if they do certain things by way of conditioned precedent. We say other people, in order to establish their rights, must do other things, and we do that, Mr. Speaker, in a responsible fashion and only after considerable reflection on the impact and import of what we propose to do.

Mr. Speaker, it's not beyond the realm of possibility that one day even a member of the legislature of this province could be a recipient of social allowances. I know, Mr. Speaker, it may seem difficult to believe, but it's possible. Not through lack of intelligence, Mr. Speaker, not for perhaps will to work, but it can happen, Mr. Speaker. I know of people in my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, who have fallen several rungs on life's ladder in the course of their lifetime, in sometimes most unexpected circumstances and as a result of most unexpected situations, people who had a stroke. I can think of one individual who suffered a stroke . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize that I have given the honourable member a great deal of latitude in this field. I was just wondering if he could get back to the subject matter of the bill.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think we want to assure ourselves, and that's what I think the argument would be on the other side, that the bill addresses a real need; that it pertains to rights that should be accorded to all our citizenry, and that won't entail an unnecessary cost, and that is, of course, the direction I'm trying to give my remarks.

But Mr. Speaker, having said that, I don't want to belabour it. I suggest that there is absolutely no reason why the government couldn't incorporate our bill into their legislation, and of course as a result of so doing, obviate the need for further debate or discussion of this opposition initiative. We will be, as I said yesterday, unable to accept without revision, many of the provisions of the government bill, but perhaps if there could be some candid exchange by way of discussion between the members, Mr. Speaker, some compromises could be reached and all the legislation that affects this particular Act could go forward with some unanimity prior to the expiration of the term of this session.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise on Bill 71 to respond to the Member for Wellington, inasmuch as having been a councillor with city council, I can assure the member that as a person reviewing welfare appeals on the sub-committee of the inner city, we at all times, sided with the recipient whenever possible against the civil servant, and I do believe they get a fair hearing.

What I think, if we're involving lawyers in a matter involving 5,200, we are in fact taking the money that the workers had, the incentive they had to police the recipients, we're taking that incentive away, and we are taking the saving that they may have had because of some abuse of 90 and really transferring it into some sort of a welfare program for legal aid lawyers. I really can't see why we need a lawyer in a lot of these instances. The whole point is, we have a department there that's dealing with people who are on some form of social assistance, and I agree, nobody should be denied justice, and if it is felt that after all other means have been exhausted, then possibly at that particular point in time. But to put it that every person that has a complaint against the welfare department can have access to counsel is too liberal, too rich a scheme for my liking, and I would like to see it only as a matter of last resort that somebody who really feels that they had been dealt with unfairly by the welfare appeal board, at that particular point in time, there should be some appeal mechanism.

But I cannot support the bill that is going to allow every person on social assistance access to a lawyer to complain about not being given 60 for clothing, and only be given 45, because a 15 argument, to turn around and pay, according to the Attorney-General, he's been requested to pay them 50 an hour, I cannot see spending 50 or 100 to have — and I'm sure the case would take all morning, because what would be a simple case between a citizen and the board would turn into a two or three-day trial.

So with those few remarks, I wanted to oppose that aspect of Bill 71.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning (Friday).