

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 17 March, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 55 students of grade 11 standing of the Warren Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. George Shadlock and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will table with this House the announcement that he referred to in his press conference this morning that was made by his Deputy Minister regarding the recent American proposals about the Garrison Project, this announcement having been made, to my understanding, at the annual meeting of the Action Against Garrison Committee's meeting last March 6th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. AL. MACKLING (ST. JAMES): Mr. Speaker, I assume the honourable member is referring to the amendments in phasing that has been well known in respect to Garrison for some time. The Garrison Project is one that involves phasing of certain develop-

ments, and the Garrison proponents indicated some time ago that they were altering their phasing and that has been made public. It wasn't our announcement; we heard the announcement; we have understood and accepted their phasing; we have reported on that publicly, both at a meeting that was held in this building and also in the Garrison Focus Office that we've set up in this building. There are map displays and visual aids to indicate the nature of the present Garrison proposition. Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat puzzled. The question arises out of this Minister's press conference held just this morning at 10:30 a.m. I remind the Honourable Minister that he indicated to the media this morning that the report that the Provincial Government kept secret recent American proposals to reduce the size of the Garrison Diversion Project were totally unfounded.

Since they were announced by his Deputy Minister, Mr. Carter, at the annual meeting of the Action Committee Against Garrison, March 6th, Mr. Speaker, I'm specifically asking whether the Minister will do the House the courtesy of including the members of this Chamber with the announcements of this magnitude with matters concerning — we have always demonstrated a wholehearted support of this government as indeed they supported us when they were Opposition on the Garrison question.

So, Mr. Speaker, my question again is, what did the Minister mean in his morning's press conference when he refers to a specific announcement that his Deputy Minister made on March 6th?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, since the initiative on this matter of the alteration in phasing in respect to the Garrison Development was made by, presumably, the proponents of that development, my Deputy Minister was not making an announcement of something over which we have any control. He was reporting publicly as to the information that he had obtained while in Washington, which was available to all and which was confirmed by visual presentation in the Focus Office. There has never been any secret about anything dealing with the Garrison so far as this government is concerned. We are bending every effort to try and ensure that more Manitobans, including some of the media, understand what the Garrison Project is all about.

MR. ENNS: Can the Minister indicate whether or not he and his government is in possession of what has been referred to as recent proposals by American authorities having to do with the Garrison project, and if so, would he not be prepared to share them with all members of the House so that we can, in a truly non-partisan way, continue our support from this Chamber to voice our support in the strongest manner, our concern, to our American cousins?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the honourable member or any of his colleagues have taken the time to visit the Garrison Focus Office. If he

has, he will know that for some time the information that has been provided to us in respect to the Garrison proposals are on public display, and are open to everyone and there is no secrecy about them.

Let me say for the edification of the honourable member, that what was involved in the new phasing of the Garrison development was a proposal, or is a proposal, that the Garrison phasing be altered somewhat so that the irrigation projects will have a greater thrust in South Dakota than in North Dakota, but the overall project has not been changed.

The overall project, Mr. Speaker, involves a transfer of Missouri River water across a natural divide into the area that drains into the Hudson's Bay basin, and that is the development of the Lone Tree Reservoir. From the basic reservoir systems are being developed in phase to provide for irrigation of lands in the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister if he is aware that the Garrison Focus Office is not open to provide information to the public from at least a quarter to twelve until two o'clock?

A MEMBER: They're out to lunch.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'll confess that perhaps staff has to have lunch, but I'm sure that in usual hours that they are there. We'll have to spend more money perhaps on staff, and I hope that the honourable member will warmly welcome that.

MR. ENNS: I direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I've attempted to raise this as a Matter of House Privilege, but I will frame it as a question.

We are currently dealing with the Minister of Natural Resources' Estimates. We dealt at length on Monday night with respect to the question of Garrison. Mr. Speaker, at no time, in fact under very direct questioning from my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Minister offered absolutely no new advice, no new news or information, regarding the developments that are now being talked about in the Chamber and in the media.

My question to the Honourable First Minister is, I would hope, that he will not change the non-partisan approach that we have shown traditionally in this House, and that he will include, and he will indeed seek the support of the Opposition on the matter dealing with the Garrison. We want to support and help the government on this issue.

Is the First Minister going to instruct his Ministers to help us or allow us to do that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY, Premier, (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I don't know just precisely the import of the statement with some implication of some question at the tail-end from the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

The Minister of Natural Resources has indicated

very, very clearly that this matter has indeed been made public for quite some time; has invited honourable members to make arrangements to visit the Garrison Office; see the displays there; made reference to the fact that the information was made available at earlier meetings by the Deputy Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that this has been an issue that is so important to the entire provincial community, that indeed it has been an issue on which certainly, while we were in Opposition, it remained non-partisan. I trust that members of the Opposition will ensure that it remains non-partisan while they are members of the Opposition just as we did and while we are in government.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House whether the recent proposals that were announced by his Deputy Minister are significant in terms of the overall question of Garrison?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm at a loss to understand what the honourable member is referring to. My Deputy Minister has not announced any proposals.

I would like to just know what the honourable member is talking about?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I quote to the Honourable Minister that, "The Minister said that reports that the provincial government kept secret recent American proposals to reduce the size of the Garrison Diversion Project were totally unfounded since they were announced by his Deputy Minister, Nick Carter, at the annual meeting of the Action Committee Against Garrison on March 6th, which was attended by the news media."

Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent proposals which were announced by the Minister's Deputy Minister, can he advise the House whether he considers that those proposals were significant with respect to the overall question of Garrison?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wants to play upon the word "announced" and play he might. —(Interjection)— All right. All right.

The news service announcement does reflect that the Deputy Minister commented on recent American proposals and responded to the suggestion that there was some secrecy in connection with them. The Deputy Minister announced, if you will, to the people that were present that these proposals were a phasing, a change in the phasing of Garrison, and if that's an announcement, that's fair game.

I wish to announce that I detect some negative attitude on the part of the Opposition in respect to any increased opposition to Garrison, because I think, Mr. Speaker, they're sensitive that they didn't do enough.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister whether, consistent with the statement given to this House by the First Minister a few days ago, that each Minister approves press releases before they go out? Can the Minister advise the House whether he, in fact,

approved this press release?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I did.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, having established then that the Minister was in agreement with the wording of this press release, which said that recent proposals were announced, I assume that they were significant enough to warrant an announcement, and if they were significant enough to do that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister why he did not make that announcement within this House instead of having his Deputy Minister announce them, and short of announcing them to this Chamber, why were they not discussed in Estimates?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member clearly just does not want to appreciate what he's being told. I have indicated that this government, this administration, has not announced any changes in Garrison. We are not in a position to do that. He knows that it is not open to Deputy Ministers to make formal announcements. This is a reporting of what the proponents of Garrison have indicated, and if the word "announced" is troubling the honourable member, he can appreciate that that can be interpreted in the way that he is indicating, or it can be indicated in a common sense way that he was giving this information to the Action Committee Against Garrison and the general public, and the honourable member knows that's what was intended.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question was why did the Minister not make the announcement in the House, or bring forward this information when he was directly questioned in Committee?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this is not the State Legislature of North Dakota and this government is not formally pronouncing changes in Garrison.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether he considers that this information, this new proposal put forth by North Dakota, has any relevance; whether he considers it significant in the overall question of Garrison?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate. The Garrison Project . . . well maybe the Honourable member would like the floor to answer the question —(Interjection)— Oh, I think he'd like to try, but you don't have that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable members —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Since the Honourable Minister has been asked a question perhaps members would be courteous enough to give him a fair hearing of the answer.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members know or ought to have known, because he did spend some time in government, that the Garrison Project is a very ambitious one and it's a phase project. The basic component of the project is the transfer of water from the Missouri River Watershed, northward over a natural divide. Phase I of that project

is the establishment of Lone Tree Reservoir. Once that component is in place, a violation, Mr. Speaker, of the environment takes place.

Now, the honourable member wants to indicate that if there's some change down the way in Phase II or Phase III juxtaposition, that makes all the difference and apparently we shouldn't be concerned. The change in phasing that was announced does not alter our problem and the Opposition's problem, the problem of the people of Manitoba, in respect to the Garrison Development. It doesn't alter anything. It merely provides for irrigation earlier in South Dakota as against earlier irrigation in North Dakota.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon): I have a question for the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation Board.

In view of the fact that many Manitobans are anxiously awaiting the report, the review of the Workers Compensation Board, I wonder if the Minister can indicate to the House the status of that review; the review of the certain allegations which were made concerning the Workers Compensation Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, well in response to the question for the Member for Flin Flon and through you to the Legislature, I'm pleased to announce that I have, along with the Attorney-General, received the bulk of that report. There are some finishing touches that are yet to come but the bulk of the presentation on the part of the person undertaking the review have been presented to me.

MR. STORIE: Can the Minister then indicate to the House what action he'll be taking as a response to this report?

MR. COWAN: By way of an answer I'd like to first commend the author of that report. It is a very extensive document and takes in several hundred pages with the additions, and I am now in the midst of a detailed study of the document. I will be reviewing the recommendations or at least the observations; there are no recommendations, but the observations contained within that document. I'll be providing that to a comparison of the Lampe Report which has come out previously and at the appropriate time will be making recommendations and taking actions which, I hope, will tend to resolve any difficulties which are shown to be existing now with the present Workers Compensation system.

I might add that the document that was presented to me is a confidential report in that it contains the testimony of certain individuals which was given under confidential cover, so I will be discussing the document in general terms once we've had a bit of time to review the entire presentation and to come forward with what we believe to be specific recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his previous answer.

I gather from that answer that he indeed regarded the proposal as being insignificant with respect to the overall question of Garrison.

I would ask the Minister whether or not then, as reported, that this proposal would have involved the suspension of Garrison's more contentious Second Phase and additional modifications to ensure that no water from the Missouri River system runs north into the Red River and Lake Winnipeg? Both Canada and the U.S. would have to be satisfied that the threat was eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, is that an accurate portrayal of the proposals put forward by North Dakota and, if so, does the Minister still believe that is an insignificant event in the overall saga of the Garrison?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is correct in the modifications in the phrasing. I do not accept that this takes away from the generality of the threat to Manitoba waters, because it still provides for the establishment of the Lone Tree Reservoir and that is the key in this whole development.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether or not he discussed these proposals with the Federal Government?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government and my officials have been in communication and the Federal Government are well aware of these modifications.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the Garrison issue in Estimates review a few days ago, when the Minister was being questioned, he said, among other things, "It does not mean that proponents of the project are going to give up, they have a plan; they have a scheme; they're going to work towards the fulfillment of it."

Mr. Speaker, he then proceeded to say — in response to a question from myself as to whether or not there were any proposals that might possibly lead to the deauthorization of the project, in fact it was a very straightforward question — "Does the Minister have any indication or any information concerning the probability of the Garrison project being deauthorized within the next few months?" That was after a long line of questioning about any changes that might be taking place. The Minister said, in fact, there were changes. He now acknowledges that, indeed, there are proposals that could conceivably eliminate the transfer of water. The issue was important enough to be discussed with the Federal Government. My question to the Minister remains: Why wasn't it important enough to be discussed with the committee?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member read his question. His question was to the

effect whether there were any changes that would deauthorize the development of Garrison, and I said, no. And if the honourable members would take time to listen to what the American proponents are saying — they're saying we have a development and that development hasn't changed in all the time that the honourable members have been sitting over there. It's a phase development and they are prepared to alter some phases of their development, but they're not prepared to give up on Garrison. They're not prepared to give up on Phase 1, which is the establishment of the Lone Tree Reservoir and the transference of water from one area across a natural divide into an area where the waters drain into Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Was he aware that his Deputy Minister was to speak to, or did he authorize his Deputy Minister to speak to the committee against Garrison on Saturday, March 6th?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was well aware of the fact that my Deputy Minister would provide all the information we had in respect to all of the developments in respect to Garrison to the Action Committee on Garrison, to the media, and we have for that purpose set up a Focus Office that is available to all. — (Interjection) — Well, it's right in this building.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the Minister was aware of his Deputy Minister being at the meeting and of the information that he was giving, and as he phrases it in his press release today, that he made an announcement, could the Minister provide this House now, some ten days later, the copy of the announcement made by his Deputy Minister at that meeting?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, my Deputy Minister made no announcement. He advised the Action Committee on Garrison and in doing so was announcing to that committee the information that he had obtained and that is public knowledge.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, in the press release this morning the Minister used the word "announcement"; just now in his answer he used that his Deputy Minister was "announcing" information.

Would the Minister, please, provide members of this House with the announcement and the information given by his Deputy Minister that day, which the Minister saw fit not to provide to members of the committee reviewing his Estimates on Monday night of this week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources; maybe an easier one; one that he'll be able to answer.

I wonder if the Minister could advise this House whether or not the Member for River East has access to files in the Department of Natural Resources?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. MACKLING: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could confirm that one Paula Eyer is Supervisor of Leases and Permits in the Crown Land Section of his department?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I believe that's the case, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister might advise this House whether or not the Paula Eyer, the Supervisor of Crown Lands and Permits, is related to the Member for River East.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park): I have a question to the Minister of the Environment. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House, as well as the residents of St. James-Assiniboia, of the current status of the appeal against the discharge of treated effluent from the Warren Sewage Lagoon to Sturgeon Creek?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, well that is a fairly detailed question and one which I would want to be able to provide fullest information to the member for, I would advise the member that I will take it under notice and reply to her in great detail as soon as that opportunity presents itself.

MRS. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister inform the House which method he is proposing of the several that his department was instructed to consider by the previous government?

MR. COWAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, I would want to ensure that I was able to provide to the member the fullest information in respect to her question and for that reason I would consider it advisable and would suggest to the member that I will attempt to provide that sort of detail and full information to her at the next opportunity that I have to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker,

my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him, in view of the fact that March 31st, which is the termination of the existing fee schedule agreement between the Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association, is now just two weeks away, whether he can advise the House of the status of negotiations on a new fee schedule with the Manitoba Medical Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I met with the executive of the MMA yesterday morning; we've had an exchange of letters since then and there is a reply that should be prepared. I expect to make a statement in this House either tomorrow or the next day.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is about to make a statement within the next day or two that precludes a number of other questions, but I would like to ask one supplementary; that supplementary being whether the Commission, as instructed by the Minister, has made a counter-offer on a fee increase for 1982-83 to the original position put by the MMA on the 1st of February?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I've repeatedly asked the MMA if they would discuss the situation of fees independently. Yesterday they made that position very clear again, that before there could be meaningful discussion, they're ready to discuss, but they insist in saying that even if there was a tentative arrangement reached between the two groups negotiating they would not bring this to their membership until and unless, first of all, they receive a letter from me that I would approve, in principle, the question of binding arbitration and that the discussion of binding arbitration would take place after I've approved it for the government in principle.

They also state that one thing that would not, as far as they're concerned, be part of their policy, even if there was compulsory binding arbitration, is that the members of the Association could still opt out. They've also made about four or five different requests that I would approve in principle before they would go back to meaningful discussion, and under these circumstances I can't see where we have any alternative but to stay away until they're ready to have meaningful discussions between the MMA and the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Has the Minister received any indication from the MMA or from the Manitoba Health Services Commission or any of the health facilities in the province with whom he is in regular communication or from patients, Manitoba residents, that the proposed work slowdown by some members of the MMA as urged by the President of the MMA, Dr. Pearson, is in place or about to take place or is in any degree under way at the present time or appears as though it will be under way within the next matter of a few days?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I think the best way to answer the honourable member is to read

the statement that I was presented with yesterday at the 8:00 o'clock meeting. If there is any objection, that's fine. —(Interjection)— You don't want me to read it. I will give it to you outside the House if you wish.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Could the Minister provide myself and members of the House with a recent press release put out by his colleague, the MLA for Flin Flon, and, I believe the MLA for Thompson indicating changes in television service to Northern Manitobans?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, those members are responsible for their own press releases. I did not write their press releases.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I quite realize that the Minister may not be responsible for their press releases, but since I am at a disadvantage in not being able to ask them questions directly, and since it is a matter of communications, could the Minister undertake, through his good offices, to provide myself with a copy of that press release which is of some importance to the House?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen copies of those press releases, but I'm sure, considering the amiable nature of my colleagues on this side of the House, they'd be glad to discuss this with you and perhaps make a copy available to you.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I take it from the phrases that the Minister has used that those two members were speaking on behalf of the government and issuing government policy?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, they, as freely elected members of this Assembly in a democratic society where there is free speech, they are entitled to make the statements they choose; they are responsible for their statements.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the freedom of speech and access to information. That is all that I am requesting, is access to information, and would the Minister please answer my question as to whether those two MLAs were presenting government policy?

MR. EVANS: As I stated just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet seen those statements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there were some questions raised with respect to the amount of space occupied

by the Premier's Office. I would like to advise the House that the amount of space or increase in space for the Premier's Office amounts to some 26 percent or some 701 square feet additional to what existed prior to a month ago or so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also indicate that there was a question raised with respect to the space for the Clerk's Office, and I would like to respond by suggesting or pointing out to members opposite that the quarters that are occupied by one member of the Clerk's office are temporary in nature. It is a previous ministerial office, which will be turned back to a ministerial office, I presume, some time in the future. When that happens, of course, there will be a reduction of space that will take place for that particular office.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, it might be of some interest to members opposite, that the increase in space for the Leader of the Opposition is a 35 percent increase.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure that members who have been here, around this building for a long long time would appreciate the fact that there ought to be a public reception area for the Premier's Office, which I have not yet consulted on with the Premier, Mr. Speaker, because as the former Premier knows, and I am sure our current Premier knows, that when one has to do a little bit extra or put a little extra effort into hospitality, one has to use the Premier's washroom in order to service the people that are in the Office of the Premier at that particular time. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Leader of the Opposition would very much appreciate that a bar and a washroom is not the best place to have one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in view of the non-partisan nature of the comment that was just made by the Minister, I'm sure that he would expect a rejoinder from me to thank him on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, present and future, referring to his colleagues for the extra space that has been accorded to the Office of the Leader of the Opposition, and to tell him secondly, Mr. Speaker, that when I was the occupant of the Premier's office I experienced no such problems with respect to the washroom that obviously the present incumbent is experiencing.

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

MR. JAMES DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are approximately 30,000 farmers in Manitoba that are feeling the pressure of high interest rates, increased costs of production of crops, and are facing the planting season, could the Minister at this time tell the members of this Assembly and the people of Manitoba how many farmers have now qualified for the Interest Relief Program?

HON. W. URUSKI (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I am given to understand that there are approximately 500 applications under way.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there would be

a thousand applications if it was a program worth considering. Could the Minister tell me how many people have qualified and received assistance?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the honourable member that I'll take that question as notice as to the actual number who have qualified for assistance. There is no one at this point in time, until the monies are approved in order that the money is to be paid out. If the members wish to proceed and pass the bill that is before the Legislature, I am sure that those payments will be made.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it was an emergency interest relief program, is the Minister now telling us that it's going to come as quickly as the beef program that was promised by the members opposite who are now in government, that in fact there isn't really any Interest Relief Program, that it's all a smoke screen and no honest or meaningful program to help the farm community?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, at least the Beef Income Assurance Program and the Beef Assistance Program that will be developed will not be of the nature that the former Minister gave to farmers of Manitoba, telling them that he had no money and there was no producer support, and there was no assistance to be given to the farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Following upon his statement to the House of a few weeks ago that the Government of Manitoba was now discussing with the Government of Saskatchewan the joint Crown corporation development of potash in Manitoba, could the First Minister advise if there has been any further progress with respect to this liaison, or with respect to this joint venture, with the Government of Saskatchewan on a nationalized potash mine?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: The discussion pertained to markets and there's been no further discussions pertaining to that.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, and if the First Minister wishes to make a correction, of course he can do so, but as I understood it his comment at the time was that discussions were going on with respect to a joint Crown corporation venture between Saskatchewan and Manitoba for the development of a potash mine as well as for marketing.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Leader of Opposition would check Hansard he would see that the discussions were pertaining to markets, potential involvement with SaskPotash, with IMC or with any other corporation, but did not involve any question of nationalization or any negotiations or anything of that nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: This question is for the Minister of Finance. I'm wondering how the Minister could advise the House how the consultations on federal-provincial funding arrangements within the province are taking place, in view of the fact that the announcement was made that the Member for Kildonan, the Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Finance, would be conducting those discussions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I missed the first half of that question. Could the member repeat that, please?

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to a press release of January 8th in which it says that, "The Member for Kildonan, Legislative Assistant to the Finance Minister, Vic Schroeder, with immediate responsibility for consultation within the province on current federal-provincial fiscal negotiations"; I am asking the Minister of Finance if he could report to the House how those consultations that were to be carried out by his Legislative Assistant are proceeding?

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I welcome that question and the opportunity to answer it. My Legislative Assistant, the Member for Kildonan, has in fact been assisting me since her appointment in terms of the necessary examination of the issues and providing advice, and has been involved in helping to establish our specific position. She has done an excellent job of it, I have been very happy. I have been most pleased to have her with me.

I could advise the House as well that she is working on pension reform, she is working in a number of areas with respect to labour legislation, and I am finding, Mr. Speaker, that my job load has indeed been lightened by that appointment and I am very appreciative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

The Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would like to raise a question of privilege as it affects the privilege, I believe, of the House.

I would refer you to the fact that in Beauschene it is said that a question must adhere to the proprieties of the House in term of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it; and, I believe, this does raise a question of the Privilege of the House and the way in which the House can function.

I am advised that it is the tradition of the House that members of the House who have, by their position, enormous power, do not attack, directly or indirectly, as was the case this afternoon, a member of the Civil Service, attack the integrity of a member of the Civil Service, in the House.

I regret very much that that was done, because it

must be appreciated that civil servants attacked in that way, and worse, by name, by directly naming that person, are defenseless, they have no way of defending themselves. They are in a sense in the employment of the House and when they are attacked, as a civil servant was today, it not only offends the rules with respect to questions it a question of the Privilege of the House.

I regret that has been done; I think that an apology is due and I would hope that one comes and is given by the Leader of the Opposition. It should not happen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think any careful reading of what actually transpired, both last night in Committee, as was accurately reported by the media, and indeed the careful reading of today's questioning by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, will indicate that a very cautious responsible approach was taken in this place.

A question was made whether or not a particular member, with all the authority that he has, has access to specific files, and the answer was given, "No."

Mr. Speaker, the kind of information that was being offered by the Member for River East had to come from departmental files; and the question then, in my judgment, regrettably as it is — and I tried to warn the Honourable Member for River East about the approach that he was taking last night, but he chose to ignore that advise and start to refer to specific names of people that had dealings with the Crown Lands Branch. As it was, he named people and their names were subsequently printed in the media, and they were incorrect. He suggested that the nephew of the Honourable Member for Virden had in some way, without making any case for it, got some extra privilege or consideration from the Crown Lands Branch.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that that member's wife happens to have a responsible position in the Crown Lands Leasing Division was not something that we wanted to raise in this House.

So, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable Attorney-General that the practice that we felt ourselves forced to indulge in is not a desirable one; but I ask the Honourable Government House Leader to refer to last night's activities in the committees and then, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we can, if I may presume to offer you some advice, that the matter be taken under advisement until that is done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs to the same point.

MR. COWAN: Yes, speaking to the Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think that the members of the Opposition, especially the member who has just made his point, should be aware that this incident, and the people that were involved in this incident, was brought to my attention, I would suggest, well over a year ago, and not by a member of the Civil Service, but by a citizen of the area who had some questions as to why that particular procedure was used in respect to granting that land. I had discussed that with the Leader of the Opposition at that time, the now Premier

of the Province, and so this information has been of a public nature, and has been so without any so-called leaks or any so-called preference being given to anyone in this House; it is a matter of public information because there are concerned citizens in the area who have been advised of the action and who wanted some answers in respect to that particular situation.

So, I think if they are going to suggest now that it must have been that individual who brought that information forward, they should be aware of the fact that this information has been of a public nature for quite some time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Attorney-General, the Government House Leader, had raised what he considered to be a Point of Privilege. Well, Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege has to be followed by a substantive motion. The Attorney-General did not have a substantive motion following his point of privilege; he therefore had no point of privilege and the discussion which took place following is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Minister wish to speak to the same point.

MR. PENNER: No.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the Government House Leader for raising the point. There is obviously some validity in any attacks or imputed attacks on civil servants and, I think, members do know that it is not proper for such comments to be made in question period; that a Minister of a department has the full responsibility for that department and civil servants names should not be used.

However, I understand that there is some background at a committee, at which I was not present and not so aware of that; whatever was said might be put down to a lack of experience by the member concerned.

The Opposition House Leader is quite correct that a Matter of Privilege of the House must be followed by a substantive motion to allow the House to deal with the matter, which it was not done; therefore, there is no Matter of Privilege of the House before the House and we have reached Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Orders of the Day I would ask that you call the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading.

MR. SPEAKER: On the Adjourned Debate, Bill No. 4, the Honourable Member for Pembina. (Stand)
On Bill No. 5, The Honourable Member for St.

Norbert (Stand)

On Bill No. 7, The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park. (Stand)

Does the Honourable Government House Leader wish to proceed with Second Readings.

MR. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please proceed with Second Reading on Bills 9 and 11?

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS BILL NO. 9 — THE INSURANCE ACT

HON. EUGENE M. KOSTYRA (Seven Oaks) presented Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Insurance Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 9 contains a series of amendments to The Insurance Act, none of which introduce any significant new policy directions. All of the amendments deal with four basic issues. In principle these are:

Firstly, an extension of the period during which an action may be commenced against an insurer for recovery of a claim, from one year to two years.

Secondly, the requirement that monies payable to a minor must be paid into court as revised to permit the money to be paid directly to the public trustee.

Thirdly, it provides for an increase in the minimum liability limits under The Highway Traffic Act.

Fourthly, there is a provision to control the establishment of agencies that are set up for the sole purpose of placing insurance requirements for a single client or a group of clients.

As far as possible and practical it is desirable to maintain a high level of uniformity of insurance law in all jurisdictions in Canada. Some other jurisdictions have already incorporated these amendments into their statutes and after careful consideration these changes have been recommended for Manitoba.

These recommendations have been accepted and the introduction of these amendments approved and I commend them to the members for their consideration and enactment.

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

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM Virden): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 11 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 11, The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 11, an Act to Amend The Highway Department Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the members opposite that this is a technical piece of legislation. I don't believe that there's any policy changes that are being introduced here. It simply reflects the fact that the department has been reorganized and responsibilities have been added to the department over the last number of years, namely in the area of marine transportation, aircraft transportation and things of that nature that have been added to the role of the department.

The Provincial Auditor has drawn to the attention of the department some while ago as I understand it, that we ought to tidy up the Act in order to spell out the responsibilities of the Department of Highways having to do with, not only road transport but air transport and marine transport and this legislation gives effect to those technical changes.

There is also provision here which will provide for regulations which will spell out how we handle interest on holdback charges. Those are the two main areas encompassed in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I commend it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned on this Bill.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

BILL NO. 14 — THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, (1982)

MR. SCHROEDER presented Bill No. 14, The Interim Appropriation Act (1982) for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 14, The Interim Appropriation Act 1982 is required to provide interim spending authority for departmental expenditures in the 1982-83 fiscal year commencing April 1st pending approval of The Appropriation Act (1982).

The amount of spending authority requested is \$794,236,590 being 30 percent of the total amount to be voted excluding statutory items as set forth in the Main Estimates of expenditure as follows:

Total general statutory appropriations, \$136,258,600;

Total sums to be voted, \$2,647,455,300;

Total Main Estimates of expenditure, \$2,783,713,900;

The Interim Supply calculation is 30 percent of the \$2,647,455,300. sum to be voted, which equals \$794,236,590. The requested percentage of 30 percent for 1982-83 is the same as that used in The Interim Appropriation Act (1981) and should provide

spending authority until early July.

In 1981-82 actual expenditure to the end of June, excluding statutory items, was 25.9 percent of the total sum voted under The Appropriation Act (1981).

Bill 14 is required to provide interim departmental spending authority effective April 1st to insure the continued operation of government. When Bill 14 reaches the Committee stage I can provide members with a section-by-section explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Community Services and Corrections and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): We're on Page 97 on Lands on 6.(a)(1), and I'm wondering if we can go item by item rather than spanning the whole parameter; I think we would make more progress if we stuck to item by item.

The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in the comments that were made last night by the Minister and as well some of the answers that have been given and I ask for your direction if I'm not in the particular area that I should be in these questions but it's in relationship to the Department of Natural Resources or the Department of Natural Resources in relationship to the Department of Agriculture. We have been given answers by the Minister of Agriculture that anything to do with Crown lands would be answered by the Minister of Natural Resources. Is that the case? Or has there been any policy changes in the responsibility within the two departments?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, not to my knowledge. It is my understanding that there is some overlap in the interests of the two departments naturally, but certainly I will endeavour to answer questions here in respect to Crown lands generally.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, in that regard, then,

the Department of Agriculture will be administering the leases of Crown lands when it comes to the operating of them, and when it comes to the sale of them the Department of Natural Resources will be the lead ministry or the ministry that's in charge of the sale policy of the Crown lands.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I believe that will continue to be the process.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member last night referred to the study that was taking place being referred to the Department of Government or the subcommittee of Cabinet, who are the Ministers on the Provincial Land Use Committee?

MR. MACKLING: I'll try and recall them from memory; I don't have the list in front of me, Mr. Chairman: the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Uruski; the Minister of Highways and Government Services, Mr. Uskiw; the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Peter Adam; the Minister of Northern Affairs and Environment, Mr. Cowan; and I think, other than myself, that's the committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: When the Committee has made the assessment that you referred to last night, will it be you as the Minister that reports to the members or will it be the Chairman of the PLUC Committee, who can we look forward to presenting that report?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure how that policy decision will be announced, but whatever is the appropriate manner will be followed.

MR. DOWNEY: I don't know why the member put the special emphasis on the word "announced" . . .

MR. MACKLING: Because that would be a policy decision of this government, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: It hasn't been the practice in the past, Mr. Chairman, to see announcements made, other than by Deputy Ministers. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, he does have fairly large tracts of land that fall within the Crown lands administration and the Department of Natural Resources — two particular areas in the province that are of fairly major interest to the farm community, does the Minister plan to follow the same policy guidelines as were introduced under The Farmlands Protection Act for non-residents of Canada — non-residents of Canada which by changes in legislation were made by our administration, members of the Progressive Conservative Party, that non-residents were restricted to 20 acres — does he plan to carry out that particular policy as it relates to the administration or the letting of leases for Crown lands in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, as the Throne Speech indicated, the speech read by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, there will be legislation being brought forward to strengthen the farmlands protection in this province.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister missed

the point of my question. I asked him if the same policy application would apply to the allocation of Crown land leases as will be applied to the ownership of agricultural land in this province?

MR. MACKLING: Well of course, Mr. Chairman, in respect to farmlands protection, I've indicated that that matter is under policy review and there will be legislation being brought in. In respect, therefore, the determinants that will be applied, of course, that will be subject to review.

MR. DOWNEY: To be more specific, Mr. Chairman, the previous Minister in two particular areas had proposed a plan or program to put in place an operational committee for some large tracts of Crown land or to be more specific: (1) the Saskeram area in the Province of Manitoba, (2) in the Plum Lakes area of Manitoba which is in the Arthur Constituency. The policy question that I was asking, is the Minister going to follow the same guidelines as they're preparing for the ownership of Crown land to apply to the large tracts of either agricultural land or non-agricultural land as it relates to the resources of Manitoba.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the honourable member knows the determinants that his previous administration had or had in mind in respect to these developments. I'm not as familiar with them obviously as he is. I'm not altogether sure what the honourable member is trying to get at and I'm at somewhat of a loss to therefore be able to respond to his questions.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, if I can be of help to the Minister then I'll be more specific. In the area of the Saskeram of the Province of Manitoba which is in The Pas area which I'm sure you, Mr. Chairman, have some knowledge of — is a large tract of land which is operated by the Crown. It has been under lease by an organization known as Ducks Unlimited which, by the way, in a lot of cases have been part of the development of a lot of land in this province.

I am aware of the fact that the lease agreement is up on the — something like 1983. The land has, as the Minister has indicated, and I again will pursue this in another question, but I would like to further pursue it at a later time, but the land has got and it's been identified by both the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources, has both agricultural potential capabilities as well as it has some wild life and other capabilities.

Is the Minister going to be consistent with the leasing of that property? Is he going to be consistent with restricting it to residents of Canada, operators of that particular area, or is he going to allow nonresidents to lease large tracts of land like the Saskeram to nonresidents of this country?

MR. MACKLING: Well, I would like to know what non-resident the — if he's talking about Ducks Unlimited as being a non-resident — would the member clarify that?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I will leave that for the Minister to decipher for himself. I am talking about his

own policy that he is a member of a government that believes that residents should operate the farm land. Does he carry that same policy through when it comes to the use and the operation of multi-use land, that it should be available to the residents of Manitoba and not leased out to large corporations or corporations that are from outside of Canada?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the honourable member's questions are designed to determine. Presumably, he wants to identify this administration as being against the ownership or leasing of land by non-residents. He's trying, I suppose, to indicate that Ducks Unlimited with whom lease arrangements have been made throughout this province over the years, would therefore have some difficulty in continuing a lease arrangement in the Saskeram or Plum Lakes or elsewhere. I don't know whether it's helpful to pursue that kind of questioning.

Both the Saskeram and Plum Lakes are unique in respect to the challenge that they present in respect to use of that property for both wildlife habitat, being ducks and muskrats and other fur bearing animals, and also the interests of agriculture. Those aren't easy areas to deal with and I don't think that I'm going to commit myself to being very strongly in favour of the predominant use by agriculture or the predominant use by wildlife. I think that we have to be pragmatic in respect to the use of areas like that.

As I indicated earlier, obviously there'll be times when, because of climatic conditions where we have — and have had drought circumstances where we feel constrained to encroach somewhat on wildlife refuge to provide for the harvesting of hay or other forage and I think this is only sensible. One has to be pragmatic in respect to the problems involved in multi-use areas and I can inform the honourable member that my officials will and are actively pursuing meetings with local people at this stage particularly in respect to the Saskeram because, as the honourable member points out, lease is coming up for renewal in the following year and we are certainly pursuing in discussion with the people affected; farmers in the area, the Indian people in the area and the people interested in the game and wildlife habitat in the area, to try and determine reasonable usage of these areas.

That will be our policy, a very pragmatic and reasonable one, and I don't know whether I can give the honourable member any more assurance than that.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, in that line of thought there was a proposal put forward following meetings and consultations with the people from The Pas and the people from the Plum Lake area which I have to compliment your predecessor, who did an excellent job in bringing together the groups in those particular affected regions, the Member for Lakeside. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister through you, at what stage is the appointment of the committees at? Is there, in fact, people, have they been named, is that process in place, because I think it is urgent that policy be carried on with. Because I do agree that there is room for multi-use in those areas; I do believe that it's a matter of keeping a balance in society; I have certainly nothing against Ducks Unlimited; what I am trying to do is find out what the policy of this govern-

ment is in relationship to leasing large tracts of land versus private ownership. Does it hold consistent or do they believe that for certain groups in society there should be large tracts of land leased whereas large tracts of land from outside of Canada shouldn't be owned?

Ducks Unlimited have done some good work in putting together some programs in specific areas. However, I would like to see, a further recognition of the fact that the farm community, in a lot of cases, provide a lot of feed in the Government of Manitoba and if Canada have put in place programs to deter the damage done by the ducks that are bred in some of the areas, I would think that it would be positive direction to take to further work on the compensation program, if they have money to spend to put in the hatching and the mechanisms to further work with the government and the department to put in place those kinds of programs to assist in the feeding of the ducks.

But, more specifically, I want the answer, is the program of putting together a local management committee for Saskeram and Plum Lake being carried on and have there been members named, and when do they expect that committee to exercise its activity?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that my officials have been in communication with interested parties, parties that obviously have an interest in the multi-use of the Saskeram and an advisory committee presumably will be formed shortly. We are going to be asking for recommendations from the people interested in the best use and how the area is to be used effectively for the common interests of all.

In respect to the Plum Lake area, as the honourable member probably knows, there is some difference of opinion as to lake level, appropriate lake level there, and its not an easy matter to determine. That matter will be referred to the Manitoba Water Commission, so that hearings can be held so that all interested people, including farm people interested in the agricultural use of more land, the people interested in the recreational use of that area and all interested people will have an opportunity of making representation in respect to the use of and the advancement of that area and certainly we will be interested in having that, the Water Commission have that public dialogue and make recommendations to government.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, specifically on that, when and where does he expect the Commission hearings to start?

MR. MACKLING: I haven't got the details. That matter has been referred to the Commission and I'll be getting specifics later on. I assume that I may be in a position to announce that later during the course of this Session of the legislature, but I don't have those particulars now.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on the allocation of lands used for multi-purpose, the Minister last evening gave us some examples. Would that be in list of priority, or does he have a list of priority on how his department looks at the use of land? I will give him an example. He indicated that there were uses for recrea-

tion, there were uses for wildlife and then of course we found agriculture coming along number third. Is there any particular area of priority or is there a working committee within the two departments to make sure that each group in society gets equal say as to the capabilities and the need for it within the different communities?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think each parcel of land has to be looked at individually. One can't take all of the Crown Lands in Manitoba and say, well the first priority in use will be this or that. One has to look at the land and then get the best advice you can from people interested and knowledgeable about the best use of the land and where that's indicated to be agricultural and that's the best advice you're going to get, obviously the policy decision will reflect that or hopefully it will.

In respect to another use, it may be that the highest and best use recommended by the most knowledgeable people will be for wildlife habitat, recreation, natural resource protection, whatever. That advice will certainly be looked at, but to say that there will be priority — agriculture, first; wildlife habitat, recreation, second, third; that I don't think enters into it. You look at each area like you look at the Saskeram or the Plum Lakes.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, can we expect the Minister to reintroduce a policy of purchasing agricultural land to turn into wildlife management areas as was a policy under the administration prior to 1977 when we took office?

If I could just add a little more to it, there were some 400 and some thousand acres of agricultural land bought by the Department of Resources up to that particular time. Does he plan to reintroduce that policy?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if priorities permit and it is obviously desirable in specific areas to increase wildlife habitat certainly we will want to pursue that.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that when the province buys land for wildlife management areas that land is taken off the tax rolls — in a particular municipality in my own constituency I think there was some 11,000 acres removed from the tax roll which is an immediate burden on the additional taxpayers to carry the road costs and all those other costs because governments have removed the land from their tax base. And in lieu of the fact that the government-owned buildings in cities and to towns, for example, liquor commissions and other government buildings get grants in lieu of taxes, would the Minister, when he is considering this policy consider the payment of grant in lieu of taxes when it comes to the government purchasing the land base in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I must speak — now, the honourable members say you can't speak as an individual — well, this is a matter, as I indicated in my contribution to the Throne Speech where my personal preference is to provide some incentive for indi-

viduals, let alone government to return marginal land to wildlife habitat or wet land rather than exploiting the land for borderline agricultural practice. That is an incentive that we provide, and this is my own thinking, a provision where these lands wouldn't be taxed.

However, it's not an easy question as the honourable member knows because he was a member of an administration that, of course, presumably did or might have considered this problem and it costs a lot of money and the honourable member knows what budgetary constraints government has, and to the extent that government can move towards this kind of thing, I think that's desirable and I'm sure the honourable member has that view himself. But whether or not all the things we want are possible as quickly as we want, it's difficult to say.

MR. DOWNEY: I think that the Minister did get the specific point that there is, what I would consider somewhat of a discrimination between those taxpayers in the country and those in the city where we have government buildings, they receive — the town or the city jurisdictions — get a grant in lieu of taxes to pay for the services that are provided in the towns, villages and cities. What I'm asking, and the Minister has not given me a direct answer, but he's given me, it would be nice if he had the money. I'm sure the rural municipalities can use that in a lot of cases and I would certainly think, as he indicated, we were administration for a few years too. We didn't implement it but I would hope, and that was one of the feelings that I had, that that should be moved on, that there shouldn't be a discrimination against the rural communities that have to carry the costs of a government decision buying wildlife management area; removing it from the tax rolls without, at the same time, particularly when he says he's prepared to introduce this program again, particularly at the same time he introduces it, that that would go along with it, that he would provide a grant in lieu of taxes if land was taken off the tax role for the benefit — remember this — for the benefit for all the people of Manitoba, not just for a specific small area in the province. So I think to remove the discrimination should be definitely considered when introducing any change in policy.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, obviously I think the honourable member wishes that I have more success in advocating some of the concepts that he seems to share with me than he had with his colleagues when he was in government then.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if he's referring to the success that I had, we had a lot of success. — (Interjection) — That's right, Mr. Chairman, the Minister now has stopped the process of selling land which put Crown land onto the tax base for the municipalities to receive it. On that particular issue, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, he referred to the number of 560 applications for some, how many, 1400 and some parcels?

MR. MACKLING: Yes. 1400 and . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Could he tell me what constitutes a parcel of land?

MR. MACKLING: A quarter section generally, or somewhat less, maybe 158.

MR. DOWNEY: So then, we could deduct from that the current applications that are in place. I'm trying to get away from the whole argument of the reason that I've heard again from the members opposite that they're stopping it because 21 quarters or certain large parcels may be going to one or two individuals. We would say on the average, Mr. Chairman, at that rate there are 560 applications currently in place for some 14 or 1500 parcels of land. Mr. Chairman, that fits right along the lines with what the Member for Springfield indicated he wanted to see happening; that he wanted to see people, young and small farmers getting land. It averages out, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the members of the committee — a three-quarter section per individual on that basis. I would really have to question the reasoning for stopping that program. It's a matter of some 560 people applying for some three-quarters each, Mr. Chairman, and I would definitely think it is a policy that was helping young people get ahold of a parcel of land. It, in fact, was putting those parcels of land on the tax rolls of those municipalities so that those municipalities could help the community with better roads, better services and everything else. So I would have to think, if you look at it in the total picture, that we have the kind of policies that were very much in the best interests of the people of Manitoba.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is obviously wanting to make a case that the sale of these agricultural Crown lands is advantageous from the point of the municipal governments because they'll get taxes that they otherwise wouldn't get.

The honourable member should know that they receive taxes because the land is leased and so there's no change at all there, and so his argument isn't worth reviewing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, for the member's information, saying that it isn't worth pursuing, we will pursue it because when the land is bought by a wildlife or for a wildlife management area, it is taken off the tax roll, and that's the point I was making. It is taken off the tax roll, and if he thinks that's a trivial argument, let him make it to the municipalities.

I will also concede that if there is agricultural leases on it, that there is in fact a small tax being paid to the municipalities. I agree with that, but certainly, Mr. Chairman, we don't want to mix the two issues.

MR. MACKLING: You did. You did.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there is a case that can be made for the municipalities who in fact should be treated as equal citizens or equal jurisdictions in this province, the same as cities and towns.

Mr. Chairman, I think probably in light of some of the answers the Minister has given, it will raise cause for further debate and discussion when it comes to other areas of the committee.

There's just one other point, when he talks of multi-jurisdictions at time of drought, does he have a mech-

anism or a working relationship with, in particular, Ducks Unlimited who are holders of lease land that have capabilities of having hay taken off them for cattle producers or people who need that particular parcel of land during times of difficulty, does he have a working agreement with Ducks Unlimited where the farmer can harvest the hay and remove it from that land that is under lease to Ducks Unlimited or is he working in that area to put in place a mechanism that can give the farmer the assurance that even though the land is leased by the government to Ducks Unlimited that the province can go in and say, we would like that hay for that livestock producer.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge there hasn't been and I don't know whether it necessarily would be a formality to arrangements in that respect.

It's my belief and understanding that the people in Ducks Unlimited are people of good will, and that when in the past there has been a request for consideration, that it hasn't been an insurmountable problem. I might say further in respect to the whole question that the honourable member was talking about — he was talking about Crown land sales — and we're talking about agricultural Crown lands — and he seemed to be going back and forth in respect to the effect on municipal taxation, and I think now that we both understand what he was talking about, fine, I'll let that pass; but let me say in respect to Crown lands that are wildlife habitat, generally those lands as the honourable member knows, are so marginal in nature in respect to their value for agriculture, that there's a minimal tax base on them in any event. Not to say that there's nothing, and I'm not disagreeing with the concern about extensive amount of Crown land left in wildlife habitat and its effect on the municipalities. We share the same concern, but I don't think it's as large a problem and hopefully therefore there might be more opportunity there for something to be done than what he implies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had a fairly substantial discussion as to why the Minister has halted the sale of agricultural Crown lands last night, and my colleagues, the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Emerson, I believe, the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Member for Morris all posed various questions to the Minister as to really what he hoped to discover in this review.

As my colleague, the Member for Arthur, has pointed out, it's of benefit to a great number of smaller operators in this province to purchase one, two or three-quarter sections of Crown land, and it seemed to me that last night the only valid reason that the Minister could offer was this spectre of 20 quarters being sold to one applicant . . .

MR. MACKLING: Thirty-three.

MR. ORCHARD: . . . and I guess, Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister since he very adroitly avoided answering it last night to the number of questioners, is whether he agrees or disagrees with the sale of agri-

cultural Crown land to leaseholders.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his backhanded compliment. I will take any compliment, I guess.

In reference to the numbers, of course, I did mention the number 21, but I also mentioned the number 33. That is the top of the scale, and certainly I think that I indicated last night that I am not, and I don't believe my colleagues are philosophically blinded in respect to forms of ownership. I question sometimes whether or not that's the case with my honourable friends, because they seem to believe that any form of public ownership is something that has to be put down as something unhealthy and there is no question but we are going to have some measure of public ownership of Crown land.

We're going to have to consider individual applications and areas where obviously it's in the interest of the farmers, of the ranchers and cattlemen — cattlemen such as the Honourable Member for Lakeside — not to be forced to buy Crown land but to be able to lease Crown land. That policy certainly will be a pragmatic one and it won't be based on ideological commitment that is blind to reality.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister doesn't know what he's talking about. If he leaves the impression that our policy forced Crown land leaseholders to buy the land, if he's leaving that impression with this committee, then I suggest he check with his department and find out what the facts are before he makes that kind of a statement. That is not true, Mr. Chairman.

Now once again, I just want to return to the simple question I had because once again the Minister adroitly avoided it. He said he didn't think that his colleagues had any adverse feelings towards sale of agricultural Crown land. That is not an answer. I'm asking him — is he willing — will he uphold a policy of Crown land sales to farmers or is he philosophically opposed to it — yes or no?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I've indicated that I am not philosophically opposed to sale of land or the purchase of Crown land. I think the honourable member who put the question is philosophically opposed to the Crown buying land and holding it and leasing it to young farmers to give them an opportunity to get into farming. I think that's a real problem with my honourable friend. It isn't with me.

MR. ORCHARD: Then, Mr. Chairman, last night after several questioners in which the Minister in very good large lawyer jargon said that if these parameters of sale are sound we will indicate so. That was his answer to a direct question as to whether he would continue the sale of Crown lands. All he said was if the policies are good under which we sold the land to farmers, if the criterion were good, that he'll tell us they were good, but he didn't tell us whether he'd continue selling the Crown land.

Now I take it today when he said that he is not philosophically opposed to the sale of that Crown land if these criterion are sound, are good and he indicates so, then I take it from his remarks that he will

continue to sell agricultural Crown land to leaseholders.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know how often I want to reiterate for my honourable friend what should be obvious to him, that we are not a doctrinaire political party in power. We believe that we must husband our resources for the benefit of all our people and we do not hesitate or back away from public ownership and the involvement of the people of Manitoba in ownership at whatever level. We are not going to, as the previous government did, endeavour to sell off public land as fast as we can as it's an embarrassment to us because that is not an embarrassment to us to own Crown land and, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think it is a point of order when there's a deliberate attempt made to impute actions to a member, in this case a member that was a former Minister to the Crown and responsible in this particular area. I just make this short point of order. I think the Honourable Minister, upon reflection, will retract that statement and certainly upon reflection and consultation with his staff, will retract that statement inasmuch as there was absolutely no effort, no direction given by myself as the last Minister responsible in the previous administration for the sale of Crown land. If an application was received, it was made available.

Now, Mr. Minister, I myself perhaps am the best example as having enjoyed and hopefully continue to enjoy a long-term lease and took no advantage of trying to buy that land.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wish you would overrule some of my unruly colleagues here because I have a distinct point of order. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I realize that members do have differences of opinion on occasion in debate, but the purpose of a point of order is to point out a violation or infraction of the rules of our debate. Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside feels very strongly that the Minister is representing his party or certain members of his party's position in a way that he feels is incorrect. That certainly is a matter for debate, but not a point of order I would submit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no point of order.
Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, actions speak louder than words and I don't know whether the honourable member can indicate to me when at any time the previous administration went out to buy agricultural land and put it in the public domain, prime agricultural land, even though there may have been and probably were opportunities for the banking of prime agricultural land to facilitate the later sale or lease to

young farmers within Manitoba. The honourable member is shaking his head because I know that their doctrinaire position would not permit them to do that, but there is no doctrinaire encumbrance on this administration.

We will both buy and sell agricultural Crown land and we'll lease it. We will be pragmatic to insure the advancement of agriculture in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: If the Minister would like to revert for the next couple of hours to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation I'd be glad to oblige him and point out some of the weaknesses and utter fallacy in his latest argument, but I don't think we should do that this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and I would impose upon you to control the Minister.

But, Mr. Chairman, the —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now they're leaving.

Mr. Chairman, there's been a number of references today and a number of references last night by this Minister about this doctrinaire hangup that us old Tories have and that his party is as pure as the driven snow, that they don't have any doctrinaire hangups. If there's anything more doctrinaire than a socialist philosophy, I don't know what it is, Mr. Chairman. I find it extremely amusing to listen to this Minister, extremely amusing, Mr. Chairman, that we read in the Throne Speech Debate that this administration and all of the back benchers and all of the Ministers and including the present Minister contributed to.

They all said they contributed to the Throne Speech Debate and in that Throne Speech Debate, there was the line on the family farm and how this government appreciated the values and the virtues of the farm community. I want to point out to the Minister because obviously he wasn't around when they wrote that speech, that line in the Throne Speech, because the virtues that he refers to and his government refers to that is predominant in the rural Manitoba area and indeed all of rural Canada, is built upon one principle, the principle that founded this country, that the pioneers moved out to this country for, that our early forefathers and settlers moved out to this country for, and that principle was not doctrinaire. It wasn't a hangup and it certainly wasn't socialist because it was the right and the privilege to own their own farm land. That's what people moved to this country for.

Now, they bought that land from whom; from the Crown. We instituted a policy that paralleled the settlement of this country in 1977, namely the sale of suitable agricultural Crown land which had to pass a series of hoops which I think were very very very detailed, to assure that we sold only agricultural farm land and not land that was more suited to any other purpose, then all of a sudden that reinstitution of the policy that settled this country, settled Canada and all of Western Canada, is being described by this Minister as doctrinaire. He should go back to the founding of this country and find out why Canada exists.

Canada exists because people from Europe, Russia, South America, all over the European and African continents, moved to Canada to own land and they bought it from the Crown. We instituted a policy to allow them to buy that land and it is doctrinaire on our part.

Now, the strange part about this is, Mr. Chairman, is that this Minister and this government are now reviewing this policy and he has fudged the issue up until he made a fairly definite statement today, that they don't have philosophical hang-up about the sale of the Crown land. Last night, he dodged and ducked around the issue to heaven-wouldn't-have-it, about whether he would actually continue the sale. He says it is under review right now. When asked when the review is going to be over, he doesn't know.

So, do we expect a four-year review of the procedures under which we sold agricultural Crown land and in the meantime those 400-and-some small farmers and ranchers in Manitoba are going to wait for this government to decide whether their doctrinaire philosophy will comply with what founded and settled this country. So, when the Minister refers to us as being ideologically hung up on Crown-ownership versus private-ownership, I would suggest that he check how this country was founded, why the settlers came here, and he would see the infinite wisdom in the program that we instituted at the behest of those Crown land leaseholders.

He will follow that policy. I would ask the Minister not to take four years to complete his review because there are leaseholders out there very, very interested, very anxious and very desirous of owning their own land, to make improvements to it for the long-run betterment of agriculture. No doctrinaire hang-up on our side but I am greatly afraid there is one in the Minister's head and possibly on the government's.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that all of what I thought were reasonable comments that I made indicating the practical approach that modern-day government has to ownership just kind of flew over the head of the honourable member.

It is obvious that it has taken a long time but little has changed in that process. The honourable member is one of those few, and I hope it's a growing few, who has such a strong feeling about traditional forms of enterprise that they don't consider any change possible. Since the days when this land was settled, we have seen the development of co-operatives. We even have some Hutterite colonies that do very well in respect to agriculture. I suppose they would be an offensive matter for the honourable member to consider.

But, we don't have that kind of problem within our party; we don't have that at all. We don't take the attitude that, in respect to agriculture, we cannot help individual young farmers get started by buying land and leasing it back to them and then allowing them to buy the land, when they are in a position to, because that is the program we had, prior to the election in 1977. We bought prime land, we leased it to them with an option to purchase. Now, the honourable member shakes his head, that is the fact, Mr. Chairman, and that is a program that facilitated young men getting into farming rather than foreign owners buying our

land and holding it. We are not hung up about the government being used in a constructive way, as I have indicated, to facilitate young farmers getting into farming.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one question to the Minister. He indicated that he may well, if the need arises go out and buy lands for wildlife management areas. Would the Minister undertake to give this Committee the commitment that he would, before purchase of land for wildlife management areas, consult with the Reeves, Councillors and residents of the area?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that any program of land acquisition will be such that will be welcomed by local government.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, once again, the Minister didn't answer in his legal jargon. Will he undertake to consult with the people effected with that land purchase, before he moves on with it?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, any land acquisitions, I'm sure, will be done openly, publicly and I won't guarantee that in every instance the honourable member or anyone else will be consulted, but we won't do things by way of clandestine technique.

MR. ORCHARD: Then there won't be a repeat of the Garrison debacle then?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of privilege. The honourable member is adopting a bit of a sneer in that, and I resent that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I have before me a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press, of October 26th, headed, "NDP Calls for Enquiry to Investigate the Sale of Crown Land." It says, "A legislative enquiry should be set up to investigate the sale of Crown lands under the Lyon government during the last four years, NDP leader Howard Pawley said last night. Pawley said an N.D.P government would set up an enquiry, if it is elected November 17th." The last paragraph of the article says, "It will be a major issue," — that's quoting Mr. Pawley — "in the next legislative session, adding that even if the NDP lose the election, they will still press for an investigation."

Mr. Chairman, my question is, has that investigation commenced?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there has not been a public enquiry. If the honourable member is suggesting we ought to have one, I will take that as constructive suggestion.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister persists in trying to put words into my mouth. I'm simply reading for him a pledge that was made by his leader. I asked him a question, has it commenced? The answer is no. I will then ask him the question, will it commence?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if it is deemed

necessary to have a public enquiry, certainly it will commence. At this time, I have indicated that as has been publicly announced, Crown land sales were put into a freeze as of December 9th and only those applications that were in progress, and where we are legally bound to pursue them, are being put through the administrative process.

Whether or not it will be in the interests of the public to have a formal public enquiry is something that yet has to be determined.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, then I take it the charges that were made during the election by the now member for Interlake and the Leader of the N.D.P. who is now the Premier of the Province, to the effect that there had been patronage, and that something had gone terribly wrong with the Tories and their administration of this land, that those charges are no longer valid and that the Minister's internal evaluation of the situation has determined that an investigation is not necessary.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I haven't made such an internal investigation. The matter is under review as I indicate, and I am not the only one reviewing all of that process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)(1) to 6.(d)(1) were each read and passed.

6.(d)(2) Other Expenditures.

MR. MACKLING: Order, let the Chairman look at the matter. —(Interjection)— That's true and so we're patient; we're not like children, impatient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of 6.(d)(2) please say aye. All those opposed. The ayes have it.

MR. DOWNEY: Ayes and Nays.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, could I ask for that On Division please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On Division.

MR. ANSTETT: I mean a recorded vote On Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Members.

SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): This meeting will come to order. Continuing with the Estimates on Community Services and Corrections, Item No. 7. Corrections and Probation Services. The first item under consideration is No. 7.(a) Office of the Commissioner: 7.(a)(1) Salaries — the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, there is no significant difference in the appropriation being requested under this item in 1982-83 compared to the print vote for 1981-82. Could the Minister just advise the Committee please whether there is any change in the Office of the Commissioner

in the 1982-83 plans, or not?

MR. EVANS: There are no changes in the Office of the Commissioner itself as the member may know. If he doesn't I'll tell him now. There are 14 people in the Commissioner's office and that remains unchanged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(a)(1)—pass; 7.(a)(2) Other Expenditures — the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Again, I would just put the same question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. I know that the print arithmetic in the book indicates that there is no change really with respect to those activities that are included under the umbrella of other expenditures but I would appreciate that confirmation from the Minister. Are the activities conducted from the Commissioner's office changed or changing in any way in 1982-83? If so, would they reflect themselves somewhere other than under the Other Expenditure's item.

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(a)(2)—pass; 7.(a)—pass. 7.(b) Care and Rehabilitation of Adult Offenders: 7.(b)(1) Salaries — the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Any staffing increase, Mr. Chairman, in this particular area? The salaries line wouldn't indicate anything terribly significant but it's approximately \$350,000, that may not accommodate anything more than inflation and general cost price increase. But then again, my inquiry of the Minister is for information from him as to whether it accommodates staffing increases in this component of these appropriations for this branch.

MR. EVANS: There is an increase from 459.5 staff years to 465. In other words an increase of 5.5 staff years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(b)(1) — the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Where are those new staff man years assigned, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: The new positions are dispersed as follows: one at the Brandon Correctional Institute for Security; one in Dauphin; one-half staff year at Headingley; one staff year at Portage; and one security person at the Remand Centre, plus one nurse at the Remand Centre.

MR. SHERMAN: Are the new positions at Brandon and Dauphin, for example, or Portage, are those positions related to the security of the institutions? Are they security staff or some other category?

MR. EVANS: They're all security at Brandon, Dauphin and Portage, and one at the Remand are security; one-half a staff year at Headingley is program; and as I said a minute ago, the one of the two additional at the Remand Centre is a nurse.

MR. SHERMAN: How many positions are there in the central directorate, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: Eleven and one-half, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Eleven and one-half out of the total establishment of 465. Could the Minister give us the makeup of that central directorate in terms of the personnel, not names but classifications?

MR. EVANS: Yes, there is one director, one administrative assistant, one operation's assistant, one secretary and 7.5 positions are staff training relief. So really the central directorate is a very small group of four people.

MR. SHERMAN: The actual directorate staff that could be described as a permanent staff cadre then is four of that 11, the rest are for relief.

MR. EVANS: Yes, four of the positions are permanent, the other 7.5 are a pool of people, it's a pool of staff capacity utilized for placing people around the system. It gives us a bit of flexibility.

MR. SHERMAN: It would consist of more than 7.5 people but it would add up to 7.5 SMYs.

Mr. Chairman, could the Minister confirm the spectrum or range of adult correctional institutions in the province? Has there been any change in the number? Are there more or fewer work camps in the system than has been the case in previous years. I would appreciate if he'd review for the Committee the range of adult correctional institutions including the camps.

MR. EVANS: We still have six institutions and three work camps. There are no changes. When we deal with External Agencies there is a modest development there but there are no changes in the institutions or the work camp complement from last year. There is no change.

MR. SHERMAN: What are the budgetary positions of those institutions and camps for 1982-83?

MR. EVANS: The Brandon Correctional Institution is budgeted in 1982-83 for \$1,398,100; Dauphin, \$589,100; Headingley, \$446,400; The Portage Correctional Centre for Women, \$555,900; The Pas, \$1,018,000; the Winnipeg Remand Centre, \$1,299,200; Bannock Point Camp, \$341,000; Spruce Woods Camp, \$250,000 and Egg Lake Camp, \$271,700 for a total of \$10,399,200.00.

MR. SHERMAN: \$10,399,000.00?

MR. EVANS: Yes, this adds up to line (b)(1). That's the Other Expenditures that we're talking about. I'm sorry, these are the Salaries we're talking about and that's the breakdown of line (b)(1) Salaries - \$10,399,000.00.

Now there are institutional expenses which I can give the member as well, if he's interested in that. I have just given him the Salaries which is the biggest item but I didn't know whether he had further discussion on that. In fact I'm not sure, are we off (a) yet?

Excuse me, I should clarify this. If you look at line (b)(1) Salaries - \$10,399,200, those salary figures that I just gave for the six institutions and the three work camps add up to that figure if you add in the salaries of the Central Directorate which are \$269,800.00. So the Central Directorate plus the Institutions and the Work Camps comprise that figure of \$10.399 million.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that information. Yes, I would be interested in the Other Expenditures for those institutions and work camps but I assume we had better deal with them on the next line.

On this Salaries line, I wonder if the Minister has got a breakdown, or could supply me with a breakdown of the staffing in those institutions and camps as between categories of staff.

MR. EVANS: As I said before the Central Office has 11.5 staff; Brandon 65.

MR. SHERMAN: Sixty-five?

MR. EVANS: Yes. Dauphin 27; Headingley 197; Portage 25; The Pas 48; the Winnipeg Remand Centre 61; Bannock Point 11.5; Egg Lake 9.5 and Spruce Woods 9.5.

MR. SHERMAN: I presume the figures for The Pas are simply for the adult component of the institution at The Pas, or is it all lumped together in this appropriation?

MR. EVANS: It's altogether, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: It's altogether. So we haven't got to Care and Rehabilitation of Juvenile Offenders yet, Mr. Chairman, but I just ask the Minister, is The Pas not classified as an institution under that category too?

MR. EVANS: The budget for the whole institution is under the adults category. Where there are juveniles with the adults under the same roof, they are separated, segregated rather, but the budget figures are together.

MR. SHERMAN: In that staffing complement of which the Minister just provided me the institution-by-institution breakdown, does that include medical personnel, health personnel, physicians, and/or nurses?

MR. EVANS: Yes, it includes everyone. The 465 is all categories, including 21 nurses, for instance.

MR. SHERMAN: Twenty-one nurses. What about physicians? I seem to recall and I am some distance removed from the activities of this particular division, but I seem to recall that physicians were employed on a contract basis at correctional institutions. Are there any permanent physician SMY's?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there are no permanent SMY positions for doctors as such. There continues the one medical doctor on a contract basis as briefed previously and this is under Other Expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(b)(1)—pass; 7.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Could the Minister provide the Committee, Mr. Chairman, with the Other Expenditures in the budgets for the institutions and camps in the manner that he provided information on the Salary totals?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Other Expenditures with Central Directorate for the 1982-83 are \$180,600.00. At the institutions the Other Expenditures are; Brandon, \$390,500; Dauphin, \$176,900; Headingley, \$1,490,200; Portage, \$134,500; The Pas, \$228,800; the Winnipeg Remand Centre, \$260,100; Bannock Point Camp, \$193,600; Egg Lake Camp, \$184,200 and the Spruce Woods Camp is \$144,200 and this adds up to a total of \$3,383,600, which is the figure shown in the Estimates.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, under the Central Office directorate what would the amount be? I believe for 1981-82, the government of the day included a provision of some \$56,000 for placement of inmates in federal institutions under the Federal-Provincial Exchange of Services Agreement. I presume that agreement is still in existence, and have any terms of that agreement been changed and what is the amount projected for '82-83 under that agreement?

MR. EVANS: 56,700, Mr. Chairman, is the answer to the last question and the answer is that agreement continues as previously.

MR. SHERMAN: I wanted to ask a couple of questions about Halfway Houses, but they would come under the next line of the Estimates. I think that's all the questions I have on this line, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie): I wonder if I could have the Minister confirm just whether there has been two additional staff hired to the Womens Correctional Institution in Portage la Prairie, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: Perhaps the member was out. We had just gone over the staffing and we indicated there would be one additional person for the Portage institution.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I have the information handed to me that there were two additional staff recently hired, and I believe to be in the category of engineers at the Ladies Correctional Institute?

MR. EVANS: Perhaps the member is referring to staff of the Department of Government Services; Engineering Services come under the Department of Government Services. The Government Services Department in effect is the custodian of buildings and in effect provides the servicing and those staff persons involved in servicing, including engineers.

MR. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm glad my colleague, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, had that question because I had forgotten I had wanted to ask the Minister where we can deal with the subject of populations of the institutions and the camps? Would we deal with them under this line, or the next line, or at what point in this particular branch appropriation? I would like to have some discussion with him on the respective populations of the institutions and the whole population question and some questions related to temporary releases and provisions for offenders.

MR. EVANS: Yes, specifically, as the honourable member knows, having had some responsibility in this area, there are various ways you can tabulate the occupation of these institutions. The figures we have traditionally used, I gather, are resident days; and the other set of figures are average daily population. So, I wonder exactly which set of statistics the honourable member would like to have? Is he interested in resident days, or is he interested in the average daily population?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, my main concern is whether we are looking at a condition of overcrowding in any of the institutions, and I would have in mind the Headingley Correctional Institution for one, specifically because there have been chronic difficulties with available accommodation at Headingley. I think successive governments in the province have wrestled with that challenge from time to time. What is the average daily population at Headingley in 1981, which would be the last year for which the department would have complete figures? How does it compare with previous years? What does it represent in terms of occupancy? We have had overcrowding difficulties there; are we having any such difficulties on a continuing basis?

I cite Headingley in particular, Mr. Chairman, because it has been the, I suppose, most frequently encountered example in the past, but I would have the same question of all the institutions. I don't think that we've had any difficulty in terms of overcrowding problems at any of the three work camps, Bannock Point, or Spruce Woods, or Egg Lake, not to my knowledge. But certainly there have been problems of this kind from time to time at Headingley and also from time to time at the Winnipeg Remand Centre.

I would expect that the new correctional institution in The Pas has functioned without that kind of difficulty since it came into being, because it's only been in existence for approximately a year and hopefully it was designed to accommodate a potential population that was fairly accurately projected and hopefully one that would not have changed much in that short period of time.

But I think with respect to Headingley, Dauphin, Portage and possibly Brandon and the Winnipeg Remand Centre, there is always the question as to whether there is sufficient space to meet the obligations that are placed on the system by the court system and the legal system of this province. I don't ask the question from the perspective of criticism of the Commissioner, or the Chief Executive Officers of the

Institutions, because they have to respond in keeping with the laws of the province, to the obligations that are imposed upon them by the judicial system and the court system.

But we've heard from time to time, and I would say fairly recently, of situations where certain offenders have been sentenced to incarceration at Headingley, for example, and have not been admitted to Headingley because there has not been room to admit them. The alternative is a form of enforced parole or probation because there is no place else to keep them.

That may not be the normal condition or the continuing condition but it has been a situation that has cropped up from time to time on a chronic basis, in a chronic way, and I do request of the Minister that he provide some information to the Committee with respect to that overall question of accommodation, possible overcrowding and pressures for accommodation.

MR. EVANS: Well, for some time now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a situation of more people being in certain of our institutions than are — that is on an average daily population basis — than the so-called desired level indicated by someone who studied the size of these institutions and has designated some rated bed capacity.

There's no question at Headingley in '80-81, the actual average daily population was 330; the rated bed capacity was 309. That doesn't mean that 21 people have no beds, I'm advised, but they are accommodated somehow.

There are some of our institutions that are not fully utilized. The Pas, for instance, '80-81, the average daily population was 46 compared to a rated capacity of 52 but perhaps that's more of an exception because in Brandon in '80-81 it was, if you like, underutilized, 94 compared to a capacity of 124.

I think it should be observed that the courts do not decide where a prisoner or a potential prisoner is to go. A prisoner who is being sentenced is sentenced to whatever he is sentenced to. He or she is sentenced to X number of months or years and it's the correctional institution, our department in effect, the correctional offices who decide where the prisoner or that person should go then. So we don't turn anybody away.

I hope the member isn't going to then get up and make the suggestion we build more facilities because while there may be some room for modifications and improvements of facilities, I would trust we don't want to build bigger and greater sized institutions because surely we should be working as a society to somehow or other create situations where we have fewer people committing crimes and fewer people therefore being sentenced to institutions.

Certainly we should be looking at different options. As the member knows there are various options that are being utilized. community work orders, alternative types of sentencing and so on. What happens in the courts, the collective decisions made by judges will have a bearing on the population coming into these institutions.

One of the reasons for the crowding at Headingley is that a number of people are held there on a remand basis and the government is looking at the possibility of a new remand facility, but we are a long way from

making a decision. We would hope to get some input from various people and organizations in the community including the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Societies.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I assure the Minister that I am not advocating that we build more correctional institutions. We need sufficient correctional institutions. There certainly was no argument that we required the new facility in The Pas. There certainly was no argument that we required the new facility in Brandon although there was considerable argument over the utilization of space in that new Brandon facility.

There may well be a case that can be made for redevelopment or regeneration of some existing facilities but I'm not about to advocate the building of more correctional facilities. The question of overcrowding is important because it goes straight to the heart of the questions of staffing, staff training and staff morale.

Is there a comparison in the Annual Report that provides information as to the changes in the average daily population at Headingley, for example, or at any of the other institutions on a year-by-year basis?

I note there is in Section 78, there is a Section 7. (b) Table 4 of the Annual Report, there is a breakdown of the institutions which provides the total of admissions and releases, the average daily population and other information of that kind for the year 1981; but I don't see any Table giving comparisons with other years. That doesn't say it isn't here. It may be here somewhere.

But the Minister, for example, a few moments ago mentioned that the average daily population in Headingley was approximately 349 for the year 1981 and that the rated capacity of Headingley I believe, is 306.

The question that occurs is notwithstanding the fact that it's admittedly not terribly desirable to have 349 persons in a facility or an institution that is rated for 306 — I suppose there's something to be said for familiarity — and if the facility or an institution operates on that basis for a period of time then the adjustment generally flows fairly normally to those kinds of numbers, and the institution adjusts to that kind of a population. That's why really a one-year reading doesn't get at the question. If we had a critical path indication that the average daily population of Headingley is going up every year, and has gone up let us say from 250 now to 349, and that indications are that then it will go up by another 20 or 25 in the next year and continue in that vein, then the fact that its rated capacity is 306 becomes very important, very significant. So I wonder if the Minister could provide us with some reassurance on that score, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: I can read off some figures for adult corrections on the daily average population at Headingley. In 1977, the average daily population was 354; in 1978, 335; 1979, 365; 1980, 339; and 1981, 349. So the member can see that there's no upward or downward trend. I'd say if anything it's pretty well status quo. In 1977 it was 354, last year it was 349, actually slightly smaller. I can't detect any upward or downward trend from these figures, it's fairly constant.

Looking at Brandon, I'm not sure whether we're

talking about the same building, I know because we moved into a new building in 1978, in '77 it was 81; in 1978, 67; 1979, 80; 1980, 90; 1981, 91. Brandon, as the member may know, is somewhat different because it has different types of population.

Dauphin, again I don't see any trends; 36 in 1977; 32 in '78; 41 in 1979; 40 in 1980; and 36 in 1981.

The Portage Institution Correctional Center for Women; 24 in 1977; 24 in '78; 32 in '79; 34 in '80; and 30 in '81.

The Pas 39 in 1977; 43 in 1978; 47 in '79; 45 in 1980; and 43 in 1981.

The Remand Center in Winnipeg wasn't open in '77. In 1978 the number was 92; in '79 it was 97; in 1980 it jumped up to 130; but in 1981 it was down to 105.

I think that covers all of them, Brandon, Dauphin, Headingley, Portage, The Pas, and Winnipeg.

MR. SHERMAN: And the camps all run about 24 inmates or residents at a given time, approximately, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: Yes, the camps similarly don't show any specific pattern. If you take the three together, the average daily population in 1977 was 68; 1978 it was 75; 1979 it was 90; 1980 was 87; 1981 down to 77.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, thank you. So on average they'd be in the sort of 24 to 26 range, varying with the individual differences in sizes of the camps themselves. The figures for Dauphin sounded a little worrisome. What is the rate of capacity of the Dauphin Correctional Institution.

MR. EVANS: The rated bed capacity in '80-81 at Dauphin was 20.

MR. SHERMAN: We're operating there, generally speaking, with an average daily population of approximately 30, so that's 50 percent overload, which is certainly much more serious than the overload at Headingley in relevant terms. Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise how many of the inmate population at Headingley, or in the remand portion of the Headingley Institution, on a rough daily basis, are we talking 25 of the residents at Headingley in the remand component or 50 or 100?

MR. EVANS: About 70 to 80 are being held in the remand category. I'm also reminded that not all of the people at some of these institutions such as Dauphin are necessarily occupying a dormitory cell. There is some flexibility with regard to space.

MR. SHERMAN: The 75 or 80 who are in the remand portion of Headingley though, are included in the figure of 349 that we're looking at, the average daily population, is that correct? For Headingley 348.9, to quote the report.

MR. EVANS: Yes, 349 for '81. I guess if it's on a fiscal year basis it works out to 330, but one is on a calendar basis, the other's on a fiscal basis. Anyway they are included.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister did comment a moment

of two ago, Mr. Chairman, that the department was looking and the division, were looking at the remand situation at Headingley and the problems attendant upon housing a remand facility anywhere, particularly in a correctional institution that is designed for offenders who are in other categories, other than the remand category. Can he indicate whether it's the consideration of the government that the remand capability be removed from Headingley and be established on a separate site somewhere, or is the government looking at renovation work at Headingley that would retain the remand capability, but separate it more distinctly from the general jail population.

MR. EVANS: First of all, let me make it clear that the Remand Centre that is talked about would be a centre that would not only house the remands at Headingley, but would also take over the remand facility in the City of Winnipeg. Secondly, I cannot say precisely at this time just how soon or where that facility would be built, but one proposal is that it be located near the courts.

MR. SHERMAN: What is the difficulty or is there any difficulty in terms of staffing distribution at Headingley, for example, that would result from the fact that there is a fairly substantial remand population there? Of the overall staff at Headingley which the Minister provided the figures on a few moments ago, it's approximately 200 SMYs, would there be a very heavy component of that total complement that was committed to the remand capability or is that staffed on pretty much the same basis as the general institution?

MR. EVANS: I think the question was, of the 197, what percentage or how many are involved in holding the remand people. We don't differentiate that, so that information is not available, but we can tell you that the staff-to-inmate ratio is 1 to 1.8 at both the Headingley institution and the Winnipeg Remand Center. But there's no breakdown; I can't tell you of the 197, how many are required for remand people because that information is simply not tabulated.

MR. SHERMAN: The information that the Minister has given me really provides the answer, Mr. Chairman. I infer from those figures that maintenance of a remand capability does not require any greater staffing than the general institution as such. It doesn't put any particular staffing pressures on an institution. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: I'm advised in the negative, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there was some concern again a few years ago, fairly recently, about the Temporary Absence Program at Headingley and I know that the Minister of the day and the Commissioner of the day, who was the same Commissioner of this day, took some steps to tighten up the TA program and the TA procedures and qualifications. I wonder if the Minister could advise the Committee as to the status of that program at the present time; who has the authority in the institutions for issuing temporary absences; whether all such privileges have to

be approved by the Commissioner; whether the system and the department and the division are experiencing any difficulties in the temporary absence area at the present time?

MR. EVANS: There are a set of guidelines that have been established and those guidelines dictate the way the decisions are made. I imagine ultimately the final decision is made by the senior administrator and there's another problem too. The amount of temporary absences possible, do relate to the employment opportunities, so if employment opportunities fall off then it's not as easy to give temporary absences. These people generally are going to work some place where they're accepted by the employer.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm sorry, I missed the initial remarks of the Minister in his response, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask him again where the authority for issuing temporary absence permits rests; does it rest with senior staff at the institutions or does it repose entirely with the chief executive officer of the institution or does it repose entirely with the Commissioner?

MR. EVANS: The authority is with the Director of Adult Corrections.

MR. SHERMAN: So that the CEO or director of an institution as such, has to clear temporary absence permits with the Director of Adult Corrections; is that correct?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(b)(2)—pass; 7.(b)(3) External Agencies and Halfway Houses — The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister outline for the Committee the extent, or range, or network of External Agencies and Halfway Houses that come under the aegis of this office?

MR. EVANS: The External Agencies and Halfway Houses with which we are involved are as follows: John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society; Native Clan Organization; Manitoba Society of Criminology; Open Circle, a small grant; Frontier College; those are External Agencies and then there are a number of Halfway Houses. There are six Halfway Houses and there's a proposal to bring forth a seventh Halfway House to be operated by the Native Clan. This is a facility in Northern Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Those six Halfway Houses, now becoming seven with the Native Clan initiative and I want to ask the Minister about that in a minute, Mr. Chairman; those six Halfway Houses include what precise facilities? What are the six?

MR. EVANS: The facilities in 1981-82 are Grosvenor Place; the Native Halfway House; the United Church Halfway House; Scotia Residents; X-Kalay and the Salvation Army Rehabilitation Centre. As the member

perhaps knows they have community based programs, not only room and board, but they provide counseling and assistance in obtaining jobs and assistance in getting into academic and institutions of learning.

MR. SHERMAN: Of those six halfway houses and the external agencies cited by the Minister would all be supported by direct grants from this department.

Are there any personnel or any services supplied by the division to the agencies or halfway houses, or is it simply a matter of direct funding grants which those agencies then utilize to acquire whatever personnel and whatever program services they need?

MR. EVANS: The answer is no, except with the recent addition, the Native Clan Facility. We have a person working on a short-term or temporary basis to help them get established, I understand. But other than that we do not provide staffing. We provide funding, we provide grants and per diem rates.

MR. SHERMAN: Does the department provide staff training or staff training opportunities for these External Agencies and halfway houses?

MR. EVANS: The answer is no, we do not provide staff training opportunities. I might add that these facilities are also available to the Federal Government. The Federal Penitentiaries System may wish to use the facilities and indeed do.

MR. SHERMAN: In his opening statement, Mr. Chairman, the Minister advised the Committee that one of the major initiatives in this area to be undertaken by the government in 1982-83 is the establishment of a halfway house in Northern Manitoba — the establishment won't be undertaken by the government but will be undertaken by the Native Clan Organization — and funding will be provided by the government to the Native Clan Organization to pursue that objective.

The amount specified I think was \$75,000.00. Is that the total amount insofar as the Minister knows of the cost of establishing that halfway house or is it a grant in aid?

MR. EVANS: The \$75,000 is our estimate of the amount of money that will be paid out on a per diem basis and this is for approximately one-half of a year's operation. In other words the facility will only be in operation, we guesstimate approximately a half of this coming fiscal year, so therefore we support it in the following year, the operating funds will be larger. Our best estimate for this year and the amount we've allocated is \$75,000.00.

MR. SHERMAN: Where will that halfway house be located, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: The matter is still under negotiation but it is likely to be somewhere in the very general vicinity of The Pas. —(Interjection)— Yes, it will be in the North.

MR. SHERMAN: It's an adult facility presumably. Will

it serve males and females or is it unisexual, or not bisexual, but exclusively male or female or will it serve all adult population?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it could serve both male and female but I guess originally it's meant probably primarily for males.

MR. SHERMAN: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Is it specifically for Natives, or is it for the general population?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it is a program for Natives to be run by Natives.

MR. SHERMAN: Will it work in liason with, I hope, the Alcoholism Foundation?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Is it reasonable Mr. Chairman, to ask the Minister whether he has any guesstimate as to the capacity of this halfway house? Would we be looking at 6 beds, 12 beds or has such an estimate been attempted?

MR. EVANS: The aim is to provide accommodation for 20 in the first year.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that is very encouraging, Mr. Chairman. I compliment the department and the division on that initiative. There is no question, that particularly in the northern part of the province and the more remote areas of our province there is a lack of facilities for those in our population who are in need of services of this kind, I would hope that it is the forerunner.

Although I said a few moments ago that I am not advocating the building of more facilities in the correctional field, I perhaps should qualify that and say that I am not advocating the building of more brick and mortar jails.

I think there is a very substantial need for additional facilities of this kind, particularly in Northern Manitoba, simply because distance geography and various factors of that kind have short-changed residents of that part of the province of many of these needed facilities. So I would hope that this is a forerunner of a program initiative in this direction.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not concluding my remarks on this item but I note that you have other duties, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. HARAPIAK: While the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255, while in discussion of Natural Resources on Lands, there was opposition to the passing of 6.(d)(2). A voice vote was taken and a formal vote was requested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: While the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Committee Room 255 was reviewing Resolution No. 106, Item 6.(d)(2), Item 6.(3)(2) was put to a voice vote and a formal vote was requested. All those in favour? All those opposed? In my opinion the ayes have it.

MR. ENNS: Ayes and nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

The question before us is, shall Resolution No. 106, Item 6.(d)(2) pass?

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows: Yeas, 25; Nays, 19.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the Motion carried. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that the House do not adjourn.

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