



**Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

31-32 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable D. James Walding  
Speaker*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 58A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 2 MAY, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANSTETT, Andy</b>	Springfield	NDP
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>BUCKLASCHUK, John M.</b>	Gimli	NDP
<b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>	Brandon West	IND
<b>CORRIN, Brian</b>	Ellice	NDP
<b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DODICK, Doreen</b>	Riel	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOLIN, Mary Beth</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>EYLER, Phil</b>	River East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>	Virten	PC
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Niakwa	PC
<b>LECUYER, Gérard</b>	Radisson	NDP
<b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>	St. James	NDP
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>MANNES, Clayton</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b>	St. Norbert	PC
<b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>	Fort Rouge	NDP
<b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>	Wolseley	NDP
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SCOTT, Don</b>	Inkster	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>	Osborne	NDP
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>STORIE, Jerry T.</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 2 May, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. This week of May 1st to 7th is National Forest Week across Canada and in Manitoba. This week is proclaimed each year to draw attention to the importance of forests in our lives. For many Manitobans, the forests play a principal part in their livelihoods, either in the forest industry itself or in other industries that spring from the use of the wood and wood products. As well, each year thousands of Manitobans spend at least part of their leisure time in the forested areas of our province.

The Manitoba Forestry Association, a non-profit volunteer organization, is happy to sponsor this week each year. The Association provides an opportunity for thousands of Manitoba children to get a first-hand look at the forest, how it grows and what can threaten it, at their demonstration area near Hadashville. This year the slogan for the week reflects the work of the Association, forests growing futures. The blue spruce trees you see on your desks today, were provided through the Association to help draw attention to the potential in our forests and to ensure it will be there for our children to enjoy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** The official opposition would certainly wish to associate ourselves with the remarks by the Minister in recognition of the importance of the forestry industry to Manitoba, indeed to our country. We appreciate the continuing custom that has been a custom as long as I've been in this Chamber that on this occasion we are favoured with a living example of those forestries growing. I only wonder how come it happens that my leader gets the lousiest specimen of the tree deformity - it will need tender loving care to survive the rigours of a Manitoba winter, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to that, I do note some slight increase in the Estimates for forestry in the Department of Natural Resources which we'll be getting into later on this afternoon and I'll look forward to discussing the issue along with my colleagues of the importance to forestries to Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring a statement to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make an announcement which signals in an important way, a return of confidence and renewed optimism in Manitoba's mining industry.

Following discussions over the past two weeks with Mr. Charles Baird, Chairman of the Board of Inco Limited, and other company executives, I am pleased to announce the resumption of the open pit mining development at Thompson which was deferred by the company last July.

A similar announcement is also being released by Mr. Baird in Toronto and Thompson.

Members will be aware that this is the first major investment of capital in the province's mining sector since the recession began to affect the industry in 1981.

Discussions have ranged over a wide variety of topics during the past two weeks and included the involvement of Premier Howard Pawley. Our government feels that today's announcement lays the groundwork for continued co-operation and mutually beneficial planning to insure the production, investment and employment stability of the Thompson mines operation.

The first phase of the development of this mine estimated to cost in excess of \$90 million (Cdn.) involves the dredging of some 26 million cubic yards of overburden scheduled to recommence by September and will employ about 100 contract employees. When complete in 1986, it will permit open pit mining of a portion of the Thompson mine ore body from surface to the underground 400 foot level.

The second phase of mine development will require the dredging of a further 21 million cubic yards of overburden to provide access to the remainder of the ore body. This phase, expected to begin in 1989 with production by 1992, will cost approximately \$77 million.

Discussions with Inco are continuing to ensure the stability of the Thompson mine operation into the next century and to further other mining possibilities in Manitoba. To this end, the government and Inco will consider a number of measures including joint venture exploration and development possibilities.

In closing, I would like to remind members of the important role the Province of Manitoba played in co-operation with the Federal Government during recent layoffs at Thompson. A successful community employment program funded from the Mining Community Reserve helped maintain the town's spirit and hold its work force. The province's contribution will amount to \$477,000 and we believe it is money well invested.

Now that it appears an economic upturn is slowly taking shape, the productive work force maintained in Thompson by the short-term employment program, will now be able to contribute fully to the long-term development of the Thompson area operations.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We join with the Minister and the government in expressing

satisfaction that this planned development, which was first planned and announced in 1981 and had since been put on the shelf, is now back in the realm of reality again. It is, no doubt, going to have a beneficial effect on the immediate and the long-term economic future of the North.

If the government is now just able to accomplish something similar in co-operation with Alcan to get the Alcan smelter back to where it was in 1981, and the Power Grid back to where it was in 1981, and the IMC megaproject back to where it was in 1981, this province may yet have a reasonable economic future.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Environmental Council for 1982.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Provincial Police Act.

**HON. L. EVANS** introduced Bill No. 69, The Marriage Act; Loi sur le mariage (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 70, The Vital Statistics Act; Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor).

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Child Custody Enforcement Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 18 students of Grade 9 standing from the Elmwood High School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Bilawka, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

### ORAL QUESTION

#### Open pit mining - Thompson

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the statement just made by the Minister of Energy and Mines indicates that the decision with respect to the open pit mine at Thompson was taken within the last two weeks and hinged to some extent on the involvement of the Premier. My question to the First Minister would be, exactly what involvement did the First Minister have in seeing this decision made?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have the opportunity to attend at a meeting with the Inco executives in which they outlined to us their long-term plans in respect to nickel development and the development in the Thompson area this past Thursday. It was a most impressive presentation and encouraging insofar as future mining development in the Province of Manitoba, and mining potential.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, we've all had occasion to be briefed by a company, Inco in this case, as to what their plans are. The announcement indicates that the Premier had a hand in having this positive decision made. My question to the First Minister was: What input did he have towards seeing this positive development come about?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member ought to know that certainly I have a hand, and all members of the Treasury Bench, in developing government policy and programs, government development of programs - initiatives, policies and thrusts. I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that that kind of initiative by the government has resulted in a positive response on the part of Inco. We take some degree of pleasure in the fact that there has been a positive response on the part of Inco.

#### Careerstart Program

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that today, I believe, is the first day on which students can make application at the Hire Student offices for jobs under the Careerstart Program, would the Minister indicate how many jobs are available to students and young people in the province under that program?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to share with members that the program, as I indicated before, is an overwhelming success. We will be reporting the exact tally of jobs available both in the private and the non-profit sector very shortly.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in 1981, there were some 5,000 jobs created under a Youth Employment Program under our government. Last year under the program of the NDP Government, there were some 4,000. Can the Minister indicate whether there will be more than 4,000 jobs created for young people under the Careerstart Program this year?

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, the 5,000 jobs referred to by the honourable member were not verified by the auditor. That's exactly why he suggested that we change some of the criteria for the program, which we did, and that program then resulted in the 4,000 or so jobs

that were created last year. I can assure members that this year's program, which takes the best facets of both of the previous programs and puts them together into a single program, will be more successful than either of them.

### Payment of Wages Fund

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour and I have had discussions and correspondence concerning payment of some young people out of the Payment of Wages Fund. Those discussions have dated back to mid-January, and the Minister has given her assurance that indeed these 12 young people will be paid. Can the Minister advise exactly when they could expect to be paid?

**HON. M. B. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Director of the Employment Standards Branch spoke to the public trustee in this case just today and was assured that the reply to our letters is in the mail, and that we could therefore be paying these young people within this week. I can assure the member that if we don't receive that reply, which has been promised to us for the last month and which they now do say is in the mail, if we don't receive that reply by mid-week, we will be pursuing some other route so that these young people can receive payment, as have their colleagues.

### Private nursing homes - government support

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. If the Attorney-General allows me to, I will certainly express, on behalf of our members, our pleasure at seeing the Minister of Health back in his seat.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Health is that over the weekend, the government was encouraged to withdraw support from private nursing care homes or health facilities, and I would ask the Honourable Minister to assure both the patients and the operators of these homes that patient care, indeed quality of that care, would be the determining factor as to support and non-support by this government, and that party ideology or resolutions of this nature will not in fact be listened to.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to first of all thank the honourable member for his kind words. My health has not deteriorated enough that I am under the illusion that this will last forever, but I will take everything he can give for the time being.

I might say that I am not too familiar with the statement or the reason why the statement was made,

but I can assure the honourable member that the standard of care that we give Manitobans are what will guide the department and this government.

### South Winnipeg Vocational Centre

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Education. I have a piece of information that has come into my hands since we passed this particular item in her Estimates, so I hope that it's permissible to ask the question. We have a letter that was sent out to the constituents of Winnipeg, Fort Garry, by the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, which appears to imply that the total funding for the construction of the new South Winnipeg Vocational Centre was federal funding. I wonder if the Minister could indicate, since she and the Minister of Labour were both at the opening, whether or not there is any provincial funding at all in the construction of that facility?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I can give a very quick response to that now, and perhaps suggest to the Member for Tuxedo that although he may feel that we have passed this item in my Estimates, the entire area of capital is still to come up. I have absolutely no objections about going into details or providing information on any capital project when we reach that area, including the vocational. There is provincial and federal money in that program and perhaps we can get into the details when we hit that program in my Estimates.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Axworthy says in his letter, in part, that he is pleased personally to announce the construction of the \$11.5 million facility as part of the Federal Government's initiative.

Secondly, he expresses his "appreciation to Provincial Ministers Maureen Hemphill and Mary Beth Dolin, who have worked with me on this." That's the extent of the credit that he gives for this.

I'm just wondering whether or not there is some error in the manner in which he's expressed this?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Well, we'll take turns answering this one.

The National Training Act is administered by my department, so perhaps I can explain to the Member for Tuxedo just how it happens that Mr. Axworthy took credit for this particular announcement. The Skills Growth Fund, which is a new part of The National Training Act, it wasn't in the previous agreement, is the section under which this facility is being funded for this year. These are the funds that will provide for the construction of the facility.

The ongoing upkeep and programming of the facility is a provincial responsibility. So that is why it really falls within both Education, and Labour and

Employment Services as far as jurisdiction is concerned, but ours in the initial start-up funding. That funding was, in fact, all federal.

So the announcement that was heard the other day was an announcement of federal funds, but it had to be done through a long series of negotiations with people in my department, people in the Department of Education, so that the province knew what it was getting into in the long term.

Also that the kinds of things that were needed the most, the kinds of training that we felt were important in Manitoba, even though they may not be on the national list of designated occupations were, in fact, dealt with through these training programs.

I was very pleased, and I'm sure the Minister of Education was too, as should be all people who wish to have training and retraining in Manitoba, that we were able to get into that series of announcements, those series of programs, those that dealt with the needs of Manitobans.

**MR. G. FILMON:** So, Mr. Speaker, if I can just seek clarification from the Minister of Labour then, leaving aside the matter of operating funds, there are no capital funds that are provincial funds in the construction of this facility.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** What we're just trying to decide in whose jurisdiction the answer falls I guess, Mr. Speaker.

We are co-operatively planning both the Adult Education Centre that is going into, and that is being funded under the Skills Growth Fund, and a proposal that was on my desk for a vocational centre for the three school divisions. I'm glad to say that by co-operating with the Federal Government by building a facility whose equipment will be made available for both the adults and the high school students, we are able to provide a vocational institution for those three school division with much less money. But the Provincial Government has certainly made a commitment at this point to provide funding for the high school component for the vocational education centre for the students.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, how much provincial money, Mr. Speaker, will be spent on the capital cost of the construction of the south Winnipeg vocational facility?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I want to give the correct, the exact, correct amount of that, Mr. Speaker, so perhaps we could give that exact dollar figure. I know the range. It's about \$4 million. We can give him the exact amount in Estimates, perhaps this afternoon or this evening.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister then be contacting Mr. Axworthy to ensure that in future he gives proper credit to her government for their contribution towards this facility?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for Tuxedo for his deep concern that the Provincial Government get all the credit they should be getting for the programs and the funding, and we will certainly pass on his concern to the Federal Minister.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that our government worked at great length in ensuring that

the groundwork was laid for this facility to be announced then I believe that the taxpayers of Manitoba, more particularly, ought to be given proper credit and I urge her to do that.

### Flyer Industries - resignation

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Flyer Industries, and would ask him whether he could confirm that the General Manager and Chief Executive Officer of Flyer is no longer in the employment of the government-owned bus business, Flyer Industries?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the C.E.O. has resigned but will be functioning at Flyer until October 1st by mutual agreement.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you. A supplementary question to the Minister of Economic Development. Could she tell the House why this particular individual has resigned?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I think that's a question that the Board of Flyer is in the better position to answer. But I just repeat that it was by mutual agreement and that the C.E.O. will be working for Flyer until the first of October.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting resignation by mutual agreement. I want to ask the Minister, in light of the fact that the House Leader several weeks ago postponed the hearing of Flyer before the committee because of the Chief Executive Officer not, in his words I think, "being healthy", or "being ill" I wonder if she could assure this House that this particular individual that will be acting as Chief Executive Officer until October - I believe she indicated - will be appearing before the committee when it is called in the near future?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the delay in the hearing was because the President had asked for a health break, not the C.E.O. They're two different people and both will be appearing at the Estimates hearing.

### Oak Lake - Plum Lake study

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. The Minister of Natural Resources, some time ago, commissioned a study of the Oak Lake, Plum Lake area in the western region of Manitoba to determine what the best future use would be of that particular region of the province. When will the Minister be tabling that report so that we have an opportunity to observe it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm what the honourable member has indicated. Some time ago, we referred the matter of Oak Lake and Plum Lake and the problems associated with various issues relating to the level of lakes to the Manitoba Water Commission. Study hearings were held, particularly in places in the immediate proximity to those lakes. A report, in draft form, has been submitted and is under review. When the report is finally released by the Commission, certainly I will table it in the House.

### Mosquito Abatement Program

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the Environmental Council's recommendation that the Government of Manitoba take action to make the Mosquito Abatement Program safer and more effective, and in view of the fact that the horse population has increased somewhat and the PMU business is a fairly important industry in Manitoba, and the fact that the horse is an animal which transmits or, in fact, would transmit the equine encephalitis to those individuals, what has he done to introduce a program, or worked in a co-ordinated effort with the Minister of Health to introduce an inoculation program to avoid the kind of outbreak in the horse population that could happen if the recommendations or the speculation of this year's problem comes about?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the honourable member wants us to inoculate the horses or the mosquitoes, Sir. I will take the . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member indicated that the horses do the spreading of the disease. I believe it is the mosquitoes that do the spreading of the disease, but I will take the specifics of the honourable member's question as notice to ascertain from our officials as to whether in fact an inoculation program would be the best way of dealing with this situation.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the Minister finally has taken the question seriously. It's the horses, of course, and there should be a program looked at to inoculate the horses. It is a program that I think could be helpful. I don't understand it, but I would think, and if he doesn't know, I believe that humans can contract sleeping sickness from horses that have been infected by infected mosquitoes, for his information. If he doesn't want to respond, that's fine, Mr. Speaker.

### Bankruptcies - farmers

Another question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that his attempt to deal with farm bankruptcies has so far failed, the specific case, Mr. Speaker, of the bankruptcy at Portage, as I understand it, the individual owed the Portage Credit Union some \$200-and-some-odd thousand dollars and an additional \$500,000 to other creditors in that community. Who were those creditors and how many small businesses will be affected because this individual has now packed up and gone back to Ontario, and this Minister has failed to inform the public of the specifics of that particular situation?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, it appears that the honourable members are making some assertions and questions that we have no jurisdiction in. Those questions should properly be related to the receiver and the people involved, Sir. With regard to panels, we are the first province in this country to move in the area of trying to deal with difficulties as between farmers and their creditors, and, in fact, I'm pleased to say that we have and are able to put into place this week - effective today as a matter of fact, anyone who requires assistance, where there has been a falling away of communications as between a farmer and institutions, can call our regional offices and if they require the assistance of a panel, they will be put into place immediately. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I hope to make a further announcement on this matter tomorrow.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a fairly simple question, and in view of the fact the Minister already has had a group of staff working with the individual at Portage, could he not tell us how many other businesses or individuals now are hurt because the government lacked a program to put in place several months ago to deal with the situation? How many small businesses or other creditors are hurt with the loss of some \$500,000 in that Portage community?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's question, as I said, should be directed to the receiver. There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, the information that the staff of the department and the panels have provided were confidential to the individual involved and to the lending institution. They were not to be made public in terms of the recommendations made. It was for those two parties' consideration as to whether or not some alternate means of preventing that farm from going into bankruptcy or for being foreclosed upon could be reached. Sir, obviously this was not the case in this instance, but whenever there is a bankruptcy or foreclosure where there is money involved, there are many creditors, in most instances, that are hurt by this very fact of life. But for me to stand up in this House and to give that kind of information, or even attempt to provide that kind of information, would not be proper, Sir.

### Tourist Information Centres

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is the Minister of Tourism. There are a number of Tourist

Information Centres located along the International Boundary, which normally would be opening today, I believe. It's my understanding that this year there is a delay in the opening of these centres. My question to the Minister of Tourism would be, can she confirm that indeed there is a delay, and if so, why?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

### Abortion clinic - Dr. Morgentaler

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Can he assure Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, that he intends to reject the application of Dr. Morgentaler to have his illegal abortion clinic declared a hospital?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I should say that a few months ago, I was directed by Cabinet to investigate to see if an expansion was necessary. This paper is practically ready now. It will be presented in the Cabinet fairly soon and we will recommend that that should be done within the publicly-owned hospital, and also that the problem of therapeutic abortions be addressed in a wider context; that is, that we look at the counselling and also the context of a reinforced and strengthened program of family planning.

As far as the direct request from Dr. Morgentaler, I've written to him and I have refused it, and I give two reasons for this. One is that the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba has advised me that this procedure should be performed more safely in hospital where appropriate facilities and backup facilities exist and, secondly, that this government's policy is not to approve private health facilities. So I have refused the request of Dr. Morgentaler to declare his clinic a hospital.

### Provincial park entrance pass

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the last number of years, it has been a policy of the Parks Department to allow people who are passing through going to another destination, to pass through the provincial parks without having to buy or have a day pass or a season sticker, without them having to purchase it. I wonder if the Minister of Parks could inform the House why that particular policy has changed and why residents, such as the owners of cottages on Ingolf, will now have to pay the park entrance fee to get to their park even though there is no other way of getting to that particular facility by any other road network.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, now that the catcalls have ended, I'm not aware of any change in policy. If there has been . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, there are some people in this Legislature that cannot see the forest for the trees. Mr. Speaker, there has been no directive from myself or from anyone in my department, to my knowledge, that has changed any policy in respect to park entrance. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, under the previous NDP Government, those who owned cottages in our parks were, by right, given a free entrance pass to the park. The previous administration changed that policy and charged cottage owners a seasonal pass. Mr. Speaker, when we returned to office, we rescinded that charge to cottage owners, believing that if they're paying taxes, if they're paying fees in the parks, they should be entitled to entry as of right to their cottages.

Mr. Speaker, if there has been some misunderstanding and someone has charged someone for the right of free passage through the park, I will certainly look into it and make sure that is rescinded.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the cottage owners will be very pleased now that they have to pay \$500 instead of \$200, that they won't have to pay the \$5 for the increase, but I wonder if the Minister could check with his department. It has come to my attention that there have been letters going out from his department saying that the traditional rights of somebody to pass through a park, that they will now be charged. The specific instance that I refer to are the cottage owners at Ingolf, and I wonder if he could check and inform me whether or not that has been changed.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had made myself very clear, and perhaps the honourable member was not listening. I said that if through any misunderstanding, anyone has been asked to pay a charge for the free right of travelling through our park to reach their cottage outside of the park, I would see that misunderstanding was rescinded. Now, I can't speak for people travelling through national parks, because of course we don't have jurisdiction for that.

### Hog Income Assurance Plan

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the past several days, the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture's backup in the Legislature have taken a number of questions as notice for which we are anxiously awaiting the answers. Could the Minister provide us with those answers today?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.



**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I have some of the information that was asked of the Premier on one question specifically that was provided to me by the department. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain raised a question on the 29th of April dealing with possible changes and assurances in the Hog Income Assurance Plan, based on concerns that were raised by 20 producers or approximately 20 producers in the Somerset area.

I would like to advise the honourable member that those concerns were discussed and we will be responding to them specifically, but those concerns were discussed at the annual meeting of the Hog Producers' Board meeting in Winnipeg. As I understand it, the only issue that the delegates did raise at the annual meeting and wanted brought forward for possible change was to place a ceiling above which the producer premium could not go. Sir, as such a limit would be above the present premium, there will be from our end, as one could say, no sweetening of the pot and no reason to change the provisions of the plan with regard to late entries. The meeting that was held in Somerset, I was advised during that time, that 50 producers were in attendance, but only 20 supported that position.

I should mention to the honourable member that those concerns that were raised are being responded to by myself after discussions with the committee so that those issues would be addressed specifically as they have raised them.

### Loan Guarantee Program

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now, has the Minister got answers to a number of questions that have been posed to him, particularly about the Loan Guarantee Program that he announced some several months ago?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we are, as I indicated last week, reviewing the program. I should tell the honourable member that basically in terms of allowing farmers under the Loan Guarantee Program, that while equity is being considered, the overall consideration is the viability of the farm unit and the ability to repay that loan. However, at this point in time, I cannot give the honourable member a specific guarantee that the equity position will be changed downward from 80 percent to 90 percent. However, what is being viewed by MACC is the total viability of the farm unit to be able to repay those funds that are borrowed. That is being used as the major criteria, as well as the equity owned, but the overriding one is the ability to repay the debt load.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Could the Minister answer one further question? In view of the fact that he hasn't answered a number of very clear questions to him on that loan program, could he answer whether Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation has refused any loan applications which have been approved and sent in by the participating lending institutions?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Clearly where viability is at question, the MACC would have refused those applications had they been forwarded. They would have. The number

of which have been refused, I do not have the information for the honourable member in terms of which applications have been declined and not declined.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Could you find that out please?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes.

### Thompson Improvement Projects Employment Program

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Earlier today in a statement with regard to the reopening of the Thompson open pit project, he made reference to the Thompson Improvement Projects which have been under way in Thompson for the last number of months. I was wondering whether the Minister could confirm that the Thompson Improvement Projects Employment Program has been extended to June 30th?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That process had been under way for some time. We found that the earlier projects had helped the community tremendously. They had helped the morale of the community and they had kept the work force productive. We felt that an extension of that would certainly go further, keep that work force in good shape so that when the upturn takes place, they will be very productive, long-term mining employees.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** I was wondering if the Minister could confirm that the program, which is funded by both the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, through his department, and is jointly administered with the Department of Labour, has created in excess of 370 jobs thus far, more than \$2.7 million worth of public assets on more than 70 hospitals, school and community group projects in Thompson over the last three or four months.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be pleased to confirm that. I note that the Member for Thompson was a very important part of the local community involvement with those projects, and I must say that he has helped contribute to the long-term viability of that community.

### Agricultural research funding

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, today the Federal Minister of Agriculture made an announcement of some \$9 million of farmers' money to be spent in agriculture research. Could the Minister of Agriculture tell us how much of that will be spent in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I will take that question as notice.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, did the Minister ask the Federal Minister of Agriculture for any funds to be spent in Manitoba?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should recall our concerns which we raised with the Federal Government prior to the new year dealing with the reduction of research staff in Western Canada and specifically when we attended the Outlook Conference, where we were assured at that time that there would be no diminution in the research monies and staff in Western Canada. However, subsequently the announcement came from the Federal Government where, in fact, staff persons were reduced and we did voice our opposition with them. In fact, copies of some of that correspondence were given to the Honourable Member for Gladstone who raised this matter with me during the Estimates debate.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that under this government and this Minister of Agriculture, there hasn't been an increase in crop research or research in agriculture at the University of Manitoba, and in view of the fact that we have been aware for some time now that there was going to be funds available from this research fund, why did the Minister not request funds from that fund? If he hasn't done so, will he now contact the Minister of Agriculture and ask for specific funds to be spent in Manitoba and just not take the willy-nilly approach that he takes on all other agricultural issues, Mr. Speaker?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I don't accept the honourable member's premise that there is no greater funding for agricultural research in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the level of funding of direct provincial monies is held in terms of annual increases in terms of the last decade. In proportion, we are going into the third year of similar funding that was in place previously. As well, Mr. Speaker, there is an increase in funding that's available to universities in research from government, and that is through the Agro-Man Agreement, which is jointly funded, and there is an increase this year over last year. That doesn't mean to say, Sir, that governments are the only research funding agencies for the universities. The universities do receive much of their funding from outside sources. We have kept pace in a traditional sense of the amount of monies available to the university and we have increased the funding through the Agro-Man Agreement, Sir.

### Tourist Information Centres

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Member for La Verendrye enquired about whether there had been a delay in the opening of the Tourism Information Centres. I have information now that they normally open on the May long weekend. In this case,

that will be the 21st of May, so it follows; there has been no delay.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister of Tourism whether there has been any change in the staffing patterns for the tourist booths?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been some change, but I would like to take that under notice in order to get the details.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** As a further supplementary to the Minister, would she have her staff check again on the opening dates of some of the tourist booths, because it's my understanding that some of them opened at the beginning of May.

### Telephone solicitation

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Has the Minister been receiving many complaints regarding what appears to be an unusual increase in telephone solicitation that goes on these evenings and days when one is at home?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, I know that the Telephone System has received complaints from that, Mr. Speaker, but I have not received a number of complaints in my office on that, although I am aware that there are people who have been soliciting over the phone more and more. Certainly, it is something the Telephone System is looking into, but it is something that they cannot very easily control as the honourable member is certainly aware.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of at least one complaint that the Minister has in writing because I have received a copy of it as well as he. Indeed, the individual involved makes the case that the Telephone System not only can control it, but in this particular case, does he agree with the position that's been put forward that Manitoba Telephone System is contributing to it by the publication of the Who Called Me Directory, which indicates the person to whom each phone is assigned, and under these circumstances is very very much now encouraging and increasing the amount of telephone solicitation since the people now know the name of the person they are calling and can make a very polished direct appeal over the telephone. Does he agree with the position that the telephones are, in fact, contributing towards it by this sort of publication?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a report from the Telephone System on that and asked for more information. I have not received that

report as yet. When I do, I'd be pleased to share the information with the honourable member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

Time for Oral Questions having expired, Orders of the Day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### COMMITTEE CHANGE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** A change, Mr. Speaker. Public Utilities and Natural Resources - the Member for Radisson will substitute for the Member for Springfield.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Education, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** The committee please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply will now be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources. As is customary, we shall begin with a statement from the Honourable Minister who is responsible for the department.

The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and other members of the Legislature for this opportunity. As is often the case when I have some formal remarks to present, I ask staff if they can to make me some notes so that I won't ignore some of the details of important programs either through omission or neglect on my part. So I will follow the prepared text of some notes that my staff have prepared for me and they do quite properly, I think, highlight the major thrust of the department. But before doing so, they did not outline for me some kind words that I ought to say about the department itself. Obviously they felt that if I wanted to say anything, I should prepare those remarks myself.

I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I find the Department of Natural Resources a department of interesting challenge. It has a great diversity of departmental program, and with that diversity comes a great deal of initiative and program that affects many, many people in Manitoba. It is a department that,

therefore, has a very high level of contact with individuals, and it is a department that requires a good deal of talent on the part of staff in meeting and coping with the multitude of details that involve such a broad range of program.

I want to indicate my appreciation. I don't often do that even informally, because - I don't know - I just suppose I hesitate to say nice things about people because they think I'm flattering them. I dislike flattery, Mr. Chairman, and maybe that's why I have a natural reluctance to say things that people may think are just kind words said just because it is formal to do so. Therefore, when I say that I appreciate my staff, I say that with all the sincerity I can muster.

I have a Deputy with whom I am proud to be associated. He copes with an enormous amount of detail. I make very heavy demands on him and I must say that I find him totally co-operative, and I don't know how anyone could run a department without having a Deputy as Nick Carter is.

I also have two excellent Assistant Deputy Ministers in the person of Derek Doyle and Dale Stewart, thoroughly knowledgeable about the department, very co-operative, still very, very much full of ideas and initiative, and that certainly assists me and, of course, Mr. Carter in formulating answers to the multitude of problems, and trying to deal with the problem of ongoing demands within the department in a time when we are forced to retrench somewhat, and practice some measure of fiscal restraint because of the difficult financial times that we in the province are facing.

I should go on perhaps and detail the excellence of the personal initiatives on my behalf by my staff, Linda Crilley, and Kathy. My Executive Assistant Ranne Dowbiggin, whom I can quite candidly say is on leave right now out helping Dave Barrett, I hope, form the new government in the province of British Columbia. She's away at her own expense and at her own time.

My Special Assistant Lee Monk is like my left arm. She is very, very knowledgeable now of the department, and is a delight to have with me, assisting in meeting the problems that face us, and particularly in the area of assisting where there is personell development in program because she is just marvelous in that area.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I could spend a good deal of time talking with sincere delight at the department. Yes, I should also note that my Legislative Assistant Don Scott is someone who - and I don't need, Mr. Chairman, a great deal of firing up at the best of times, but I can tell you that Don Scott can fire me up to a white heat in respect to some issues that affect us as citizens of Manitoba in respect to protecting the diversity, and the beauty, and the tremendous worth that our natural resources bring to the people of Manitoba. It is with a very heavy sense of responsibility that we address problems in respect to natural resource management, protection, and enhancement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having said those things that are off text, let me follow what is perhaps much more effectively worded in respect to the prepared text.

In introducing the Estimates for the Department of Natural Resources, I would like to highlight some of the main points we will encounter as we go through the details. As you know, of paramount importance in discharging the responsibilities of the department is the need to conserve the natural resource heritage of

Manitoba and future generations. We try to maximize the long-term economic and social benefits of these resources to Manitobans through an integrated resource management approach which focuses on four distinct program areas:

1. Outdoor Recreation - The department is responsible for ensuring that Manitobans, wherever they live, are provided with a diversity of outdoor recreational opportunities which consider the enduring needs of society;

2. Economic Development - Through protection, enhancement and management of the natural resource base, the department is responsible for ensuring that existing resource harvesting operations can be sustained and that new development opportunities can be undertaken. The department's programs also recognize the importance of resource harvesting and water management to the economic development and prosperity of local areas within the province;

3. Subsistence - The department is responsible for providing the needs of subsistence users in a management and allocation of resources; and

4. Public Safety and Protection of Property - The department is responsible for providing protection to Manitobans from floods and from forest fires in the wooded districts of the province, and for minimizing the adverse effects of natural resources and resource uses on public safety and property.

In addition to these four major program areas, a diversity of support services essential to program delivery and to the delivery of programs by other departments or agencies is also provided. Included are engineering and construction services, survey and mapping, and water-related assistance to conservation districts, municipalities and other agencies. If it is to do these things well, the department must determine the advantages and drawbacks of the diverse and often conflicting potential uses of resources, both consumptive and non-consumptive, in order to arrive at sound and fair allocation decisions which reflect the best long-term interests of Manitobans. We have very many lines of communication and co-operative working relationships within the department and with others who utilize or are affected by natural resources management.

The development and maintenance of legislation which reflects the needs and aspirations of Manitobans is essential to the meeting of the objectives I have outlined. Members will be familiar already, with the proposed revised Water Rights Act, the main thrusts of which are to tighten our licencing procedures, clarify transferability, make sure that water can be reallocated if not used, and tighten up the regulations regarding unlicensed use, obstructions and diversions.

This is the point to mention the proposed new Wild Rice Act as one element in our task of trying to bring order to this industry. This has been a difficult task throughout the past year, and only experience in implementing a new approach will help us tune the benefits. I hope that this resource can be managed to provide a real opportunity for those involved to earn a reasonable return, and that a high proportion of Native people can be encouraged to take a leading role. I will provide details when I introduce the bill in the House.

Let me talk about forestry, because I am quite proud of the pace at which we are going as a part of what

amounts to the correction, all over the country, of past omissions to ensure this resource is sustained. The numbers will come up when we reach the Capital Estimates. We have seedlings already growing in the new nursery at Clearwater lake, in greenhouses constructed in 1982. I think I should also mention that I expect to reach an agreement with the Federal Government very shortly on a cost-shared, regeneration and renewal agreement. Last in this list of forestry achievements of the past year, the attack on Dutch elm disease has been pressed with rigour in co-operation with the municipalities.

We push on two fronts in the fur industry. On the one hand, an attack on trapping and trapping methods in Canada's market countries is not confined to seals alone; we support the Federal Government in its efforts to preserve the fur industry as a whole, realizing that it is an important source of income to Manitobans. On the other hand, though over the long haul we expect the Fur Institute of Canada to pick up further work on humane trapping, in the last year we field-tested nine models in co-operation with local trappers, familiarized staff and mounted an extension effort to 100 trappers.

I visited many fishing communities in 1982. I cannot profess success in resolving the problems of allowing more entries to the fishery or enlarging the quotas in the face of declining market prices, but substantial progress was made in providing more, say, in the management of this resource to communities, and this effort must continue. I would like the department to maximize the authority given to local people to manage the resource - my managers should see themselves as facilitators for the fishermen and experts on the kind and quantity of fish to be harvested.

Our efforts on the Garrison are directly pertinent to the welfare of Manitoba fishermen. You will see that these Estimates provide for a continuation of the 1982 thrust, the high point of which was the information that the House of Representatives voted 252 to 152 against new funding for the Garrison Diversion Project. I do not claim that the Manitoba-Canada influence had an enormous effect - I simply say that I think we were right in the activities we set up and they have helped thus far.

I would like to invite members to look at the apparatus in the Surveys and Mapping Branch office at 1007 Century Street, which is being utilized in a series of experimental programs in co-operation with the Federal Government. Through satellite imagery, projected on computer screens, we can now make accurate measurements of the amount and kind of ground cover, inventory, our forest stock, the habitat characteristics, etc. This, to my mind, is a very sophisticated advance over past methods in these fields.

You will have noticed that the new Atlas of Manitoba is now available. I am certain that this work is second to none in the country - a real bargain, to be sold at cost for \$51.00.

This committee needs no re-introduction to the parks system of the province - while I expect to be questioned at length on fees. But there are one or two important highlights. We will rebuild the fishing facility for the handicapped at the Portage Diversion. All through the parks we move to accommodate their special needs. Oak Hammock Marsh facilities are another example already completed.

The Whiteshell Master Plan has again received a tremendous amount of attention in the last year. We will act on the matter in the very near future.

Lightning detectors, to provide the patterns of strikes, will be operational in 1983. These devices will enable us to better direct surveillance efforts. Coupled with substantial continued attention to great efficiency in modern fire attack methods in the Regional Services Branch, I am particularly proud of the way Manitoba is fighting forest fires.

I should say something about the necessarily delicate nature of some of our enforcement efforts. I think we fail, as individuals in government and as residents of Manitoba, to acknowledge the dedication of our front-line forces - the 200 or so natural resource officers who put into practice the actual management of the resources and interact all the time with people who make use of them. This is a doubly difficult task when the rights of one group in society appear in conflict with common practices or perceived preferences of another. I refer, of course, to Treaty Indian hunting and the many representations I am receiving on that matter. I can proceed only with caution as the debate continues. Until there is a reasonably specific outcome within the context of Native rights under the Constitution, I do not believe the department's enforcement role can be other than to ensure that the existing law is upheld.

As I hope the discussions in the House have made clear, I see no advantage in pursuing the Federal Government on altering Section 13 of The Natural Resources Transfer Agreement. On the other hand, there is no doubt that some of our game is being taken at a pace which threatens the existence of the species. I have initiated consultations and discussions which I hope will make the situation very apparent to treaty people. I have considerable faith in this government's ability to ameliorate excessive domestic hunting through means other than the pursuit of new laws - laws which, over the long haul, are unenforceable unless massive amounts of funds and personnel are applied.

Finally, as we move into the details, I expect the usual tight questioning on when we can expect to build Joe Smith's particular piece of drain or why we didn't allow Mary Jones to put up the third story on her boat house. I suggest that the rules, in very many respects, were invented over the past several decades in face of need rather than political persuasion. I know that partisan debate is the way and the weft of our collective lives. I do urge, however, that your examination appeals to common sense and that your inquiries, as they undoubtedly can be, will be strongly slanted to the improvement of this enjoyable portfolio for which I am responsible.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Chair wants to react to what the Minister said about giving recognition to people. If there is one thing that motivates people towards faithful and efficient performance of duties, it is the generous giving by executives and supervisors of recognition wherever merited. I would have no hesitancy giving recognition to employees who perform their duties well.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We now hear from the main opposition critic, the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's proving to be an interesting start to the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources. Let me, in the first instance, thank the Honourable Minister for his statement and ask him whether or not it would be possible, as it has been somewhat of a custom although not a requirement, if copies of that statement could be at some time during the portion of the Estimates made available to members of the opposition. I'm sure we'll find them interesting.

Mr. Chairman, certainly I would like to associate myself and my colleagues with the comments made by the Minister with respect to the staff of the Department of Natural Resources. Unlike the Vice-President of the Metis Federation, we don't regard them as alien individuals and we have a highest regard for their professionalism and for their capability and dedication to carry out their departmental functions as guided and as dictated to from time to time by the Government of the Day.

Mr. Minister, I mention this only because you mentioned it, that it was a privilege on your part, and you thanked us for giving you the opportunity of presenting these Estimates to us. I want to remind you, it's not a matter of privilege or not a matter of thanking us. It's a matter of legislative requirement. It is the most important legislative requirement. It is the whole reason why we have a parliament. What in effect you are doing, sir, is acting in the capacity of a representative of our gracious sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, that asks to take some \$81 million from the taxpayers of Manitoba and then spend it in a prescribed way, and the whole *raison d'etre* for parliament began by common people saying to kings and monarchs many centuries ago, no, you can't have that money until we approve of your spending of that money. That really is the function that we're carrying out here.

By the way, it is perhaps one of the more fundamental differences between members opposite and members on this side. We regard that to be the most important function of parliament rather than seeing how much legislation we can clutter up the books with, whether it's compulsory seat belt legislation, or helmet laws, or what have you. It's the people's money that parliament has its roots in terms of its being. I know the Member for The Pas appreciates that little history lesson because it is an important one.

Mr. Chairman, more so for the benefit of my own members who last year got out of hand in the consideration of Estimates of this department, allow me and I will ask and seek the Chairman's support in this matter. It would be our intention, Mr. Chairman, to pursue in the departments, in a proper form, and not engage in any lengthy dissertations on subject matters that are more legitimately discussed under the last item, the Minister's Salary.

Furthermore it's not our intention to use what has, in fact, become the custom the 2<sup>nd</sup> cond item, Administrative costs, or the item for Executive Administration, which has often been used to, in effect, debate the Minister's Salary in a general form, in so much is that the Minister's Administration costs do impinge on all aspects of the department.

Therefore, we would leave matters of great importance such as the Garrison, or the question of major water development programs or the lack of them, some of the fundamental issues on wildlife management that we are, of course, interested in as a result of work done by the department such as the five-year study, to the Minister's Salary and will debate them at that particular time.

So with those few comments, Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to proceed. We note, of course, that there is not fundamental difference in the dollar requests before us. Last year the department year ending March 31, 1983, it totalled some 81,397,000; the request for this year is \$81,882,100.00.

We will, of course, be asking questions about shifts that are occurring within the department. We see some areas that obviously have received some higher prioritization; some that we will agree with, some perhaps that we'll disagree with.

Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to deal with the first item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before we start formally with the second item in the Estimates, the Chair wishes to invite the members of the departmental staff to take their respective places.

Deferring the Minister's Salary to later consideration, we are now starting the Departmental Estimates with Item No. 1.(a)(2), in the Estimates.

The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** The Minister can facilitate the Estimates by indicating where there have been any significant increases in staff. We note that in this item, the increase would appear to be nominal and no particular increase in staff has been made.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the change is a very small one; this is in the staff itself. The change is from \$33,200 to \$34,200.00. It's the same component of staff-years. I don't see that there is any significant change there at all.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)(2)—pass; 1.(a)(3)—pass; 1.(a)(4)—pass; 1.(b)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate to us what particular studies are in front of the Manitoba Water Commission at this time?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Manitoba Water Commission have completed a draft in respect to the Oak-Plum Lakes study. They have had referred to it a study of Lake Dauphin, and they have another matter that - I don't think it has crystalized - has it crystalized to a point yet where? - no, all right. We have another matter which we have in mind to refer to them very shortly, but I guess I'd better not confirm that yet.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, did the Manitoba Water Commission deal with the situation on Pelican Lakes?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, I didn't think it was important.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, these studies - the Minister answered the question just a little while ago

in the House on Oak Lake and Plum Lake - these are in draft stage and not ready for release at this time.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's correct.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass; 1.(c)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I take it this salary request for some \$51,200 principally involves the office known as "Focus on Garrison" in the legislative basement.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The 51,000 is salaries in the Focus office. That's correct, for two people. That's Mr. Clarkson and his secretary, and 128,000 is other Garrison expenses.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate to us where we're at? We're aware of what the Garrison office is fundamentally about downstairs; they gather a lot of the information, news releases and they are sent to us. But what kind of a public role are they currently playing? Can the Minister give us some indication of the kinds of calls upon their office, what kind of traffic is going through that office, or is it essentially a matter of interdepartmental or even intergovernmental, municipal and otherwise, dealings that the office deals with? Are Manitoba citizens calling upon the function of this office in any large numbers?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Clarkson has been co-opted for a number of studies related to other matters within the Department of Natural Resources, but his salary is charged to the Focus office. I can say that, in respect to the operation of that office, it is not only an area where people can get information, but we do assist the individual voluntary groups in co-ordinating any efforts that they are formulating in respect to the anti-Garrison activities that they have had ongoing for some time.

Gerry McKinney at Brandon co-ordinates his activities through that office, advises as to when he plans to go down to Washington. He was down there recently. He did a lot of the arrangements through the Focus office. He had his news conference in the Focus office. The Action Committee on Garrison here in Winnipeg too, utilizes the facilities. We provide, through that office, a gathering point and a focus for anti-Garrison activities.

Mr. Clarkson is engaged on a fairly steady basis in communication with our legal firm in Washington confirming timing of initiatives, in communicating with the Federal Government on my behalf, and there is a fair bit of activity taken up in that kind of day-to-day work by Mr. Clarkson.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, one further question. Is this appropriation, \$51,000 which is for the maintenance of the Garrison Focus office - where in the Estimates, indeed if anywhere in this Minister's Estimates, are any additional funds that the public has called upon in support of the Garrison cause?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Nowhere.

**MR. H. ENNS:** That's it? So Mr. McKinney or other citizen groups do not receive from this department direct funding for their activities?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Chairman. While different action groups wanted to have funding from government, we felt that it was inappropriate for a number of reasons. One is that it could, perhaps in the eyes of the proponents of Garrison, indicate that there was some subterfuge, that government was arming private individuals to being lawsuits or do things that we were not prepared to do ourselves. We thought that funding should be restricted to only those matters which government does itself.

We do, however, give to those groups support services. That is, if they have a need for information, we can either try to find that information ourselves or facilitate their finding the information. We have telephone services, communication services which we put at their disposal when they need it. There is indirect assistance, but no formal funding at all.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, with the keeping of my earlier remarks in mind, we are prepared to pass this item, not for a moment indicating to the Minister that he won't hear considerably more about the Garrison Diversion. The opposition feels strongly about some of the positions that we are finding ourselves in with respect to the Garrison and what future course of action should be taken, but my judgment is that it can be better dealt with in the Minister's Salary.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Very well. Mr. Chairman, I might add that, depending on when we arrive at that item, I may wish to confirm to members other information about developments as they proceed. As I've indicated in the House, in response to the honourable member's earlier question, we have had discussions with people in Washington - I have and others - about the timing of any further delegations or individual visits there and the makeup of those delegations. I had those discussions with people in Washington and with people in the Federal Government, and that's very, very much in the work at the present time and I will be coming back with further information to members in respect to that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(c)(1)—pass; 1.(c)(2)—pass; 1.(d)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the action taken by some of this Minister's colleagues, who are well on the way to successfully emasculating the Government Information Services Department, most notably the acquisition by the Minister of Education, for instance, for some six of seven people headed by a director, one Wayne Boyce, taken from the Government Information Services Branch to develop in each Minister's office, a super propaganda group, can the Minister indicate to me, is this the case in his department? I notice a salary increase of some \$50,000.00. Does that just reflect a general salary increase of the Civil Service or, in fact, has the Minister seconded or taken from Government Information Services staff members, in addition to the normal complement of the Public Information Services of the Department of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the latter fact is the case. It's the normal increase in dollars, resulting from general salary increase - no increase in staff.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I note in the Annual Report that the Information Services Branch indicates increasing requests from the general public. I believe the figure of 21 percent is used in terms of numbers of calls that the department is handling, dissemination of various information that the department is called upon. I would assume that most of that has to do with the ongoing functions of the department, in terms of tourist information, in terms of parks information, in terms of fishing information, terms of parks information, terms of fishing information, sports angling and so forth. Would that not be the case Mr. Minister?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, very much so, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass; 2.(a)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, this Administrative Services is currently directed by whom?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** By Mr. Peter J. Lockett and there's really no change in this section of the department over last year, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, a little bit too fast.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** The Minister indicated in his opening remarks about the tremendous assistance that he was getting, I believe he described it that he was truly his left arm. I pondered over that momentarily and if I had to describe somebody's assistance to me as being as great as my left arm, that may or may not be considered a compliment, being right-handed - I haven't noticed which hand the Minister normally uses. But seriously, in Personnel Services, there's of course, the line function of the department, the Director of Personnel Services, which involves personnel problems within the department, as distinct from anybody operating directly out of the Minister's office. Has this area of the department seen any changes in terms of staff or additions of staff?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No additional staff, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, over the past, I suppose, three to four years now, because of some very fundamental realignments within the department, it would be fair to say - and I would certainly acknowledge that as a former Minister - that one doesn't undertake these kinds of changes without creating in some cases legitimate, in other cases not so legitimate, but nonetheless serious staff problems. The Minister is aware of what I'm speaking of. Can the Minister, in general terms, indicate to us that he is satisfied that these have, by and large, been overcome or are there continuing difficulties in terms of staff allocations, staff moves? I'm thinking particularly of the melding of the Parks Branch within the staff and the realignment of some of the Water Resources personnel, etc.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do want to confirm what the honourable member has indicated, that very significant changes in the organization of the department had taken place, reorganization which I think was necessary. It's true that when you get consolidations, you do get upheaval, you do get change that is unacceptable at times to certain individuals, but by and large, I think that there is a good cohesion of the department. There are still a lot of working-together matters to continue to look at and from time to time we'll want to be able to redeploy people within the department for specific tasks. But the very significant reorganizations that occurred have been completed and I think most people, if not all now, within the department recognize the worth of the reorganization and are adjusted to it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering to the Minister, under what section would the wild rice aspect be able to be discussed?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Under Crown Lands.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass; 2.(c)(1)—pass; 2.(c)(2)—pass; 2.(d)(1)—pass; 2.(d)(2)—pass; 2.(e)(1)—pass; 2.(e)(2)—pass.

Resolution 170: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,555,900 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1984—pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister - this is relatively small group of specialists advising the department and the Minister on the larger resource questions facing the department, could the Minister just indicate who those people are at the current time?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Under the first item, Resource Administration, we have the two Deputy-Ministers who I have already acknowledged, Derek Doyle and Dale Stewart and their staff. If you're looking at the next item, Resource Allocation, we're looking at Mr. Bossenmaier's staff and his staff comprises of Mr. Maydaniuk, Thomasson, Barto, Vogel, Glasgow, Schell, Marriott and there is one Biologist 4 position that is presently vacant. All those positions have been filled by those people for some time, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(1)—pass; 3.(a)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass; 3.(c)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Again as in the case of the Manitoba Water Commission, can the Minister indicate whether or not there are any very specific problem areas or programs that this group is directing their energies towards? I cite for example, the continuing problem of loss of habitat for wildlife or the reaction to and some departmental planning to the five-year report on wildlife.

Have they been assigned - what I am asking for is what is on their hot grills at this time?

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Front burner, Harry.

**MR. H. ENNS:** That's right, what's on the front burner, that's what I was looking for?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, this group headed by Wayne Fisher is kind of like an overview group and perhaps if I could read what the manual indicates as their activities, it would give the generality of their activities. The Economics and Program Review section provides the department with an economic advisory and analytical service aimed at assisting program managers in achieving the efficient effective use of public funds. Activities include evaluating the effectiveness and/or impact of existing programs.

Mr. Carter tells me now, they are looking at, for example, the efficiency of our firefighting technique, analysis of the statistics, the fire statistics, an analysis of the method of operation and the success of our water bombers, evaluation of vehicle use, and the evaluation of user surveys, both angling and hunter surveys.

Those are some of the things they have ongoing. They evaluate the effectiveness - oh, I've read that one - assessing the potential impact of proposed new programs, undertake feasibility and benefit cost studies. I have mentioned the user studies in connection with angling and hunting, assisting program managers in establishing measurable goals and objectives, undertake management information reviews, review and recommend changes in departmental fees and charges. I guess we had them busy on that just recently.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Is this the group then that recommended the increase in the rates that cottage holders will be paying at this stage again?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the actual rate decision is a political one. I mean the buck stops with the politicians, but the department brings forth the alternatives in adjustments that can be considered and gives the department information as to what is being charged elsewhere and what are the norms, etc.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** The reason I raise the question, the Minister says the buck stops at his place. Was it his decision then or was staff recommending an increase, or was staff not recommending an increase, or was this the Minister's whole decision then regarding the increase?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in respect to fees, I don't think that's an area where we try or would expect, or anyone would want to say that it's a staff decision or it's a staff area. They give us the comparisons, but any increase or no increases is one that I make in conjunction with my colleagues. I am sure it was the same in the previous administration.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Then the Minister accepts the sole responsibility for that decision?



**HON. A. MACKLING:** Sure, I'll accept it.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Pursuing that a little further then, if I may, Mr. Chairman, there has always been lots of reference made to consultation by this government to consult with everybody. Maybe to pursue that a little further, if the Minister made that decision regarding the increase in rates, I wonder whether he would want to clarify the consultation that has taken place between him and the cottage owners, by and large, who seem to feel there has not been consultation taking place.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in respect to rate increases, I guess it's true of a good many governments that sometimes you don't consult where you know the answer is going to be, you know, do you want higher taxes, do you want to pay heavier impositions. I think the consultation would indicate no. There has been extensive consultation with particularly the Whiteshell cottagers in respect to the development of the Whiteshell plan, general policies in connection with it. So far as consultation is concerned, I have always indicated to groups like the Whiteshell Cottage Owners' Association, their presidents and so on, my door is open, I welcome their dialogue. As a matter of fact, I am going to be meeting with them at 5:30.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(c)(1)—pass; 3.(c)(2)—pass.

Resolution 118: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$760,100 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

4.(a)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I notice an increase of some \$70,000 here. I would simply ask the Minister again if that is, by and large, the general Civil Service salary increase, or whether or not there is any new staff?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the case. It arises from the general staff increase. The increase in salaries are 13 staff years unchanged from the previous year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(a)(1)—pass; 4.(a)(2)—pass; 4.(b)(1) - The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** On the Water Licensing aspect of it, I have a few questions here that I would like to direct to the Minister. Could the Minister maybe clarify the system that is in place right now in terms of the licencing, if somebody wants to for example apply for a licence for irrigation, what is the procedure that is taking place right now, because we have a bill in front of us in the House that is dealing with this aspect of it to some degree, and I would like to pursue that to some degree?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, because of the concern in respect to the need to provide for a more effective regulation of water use, there has been no new licences issued for irrigation for some time.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Are there applications coming in though quite regularly for applications for licence for irrigation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There hasn't been any significant number, particularly since the tightening of markets and the economic difficulties that the province, and farmers are no exception, have encountered generally.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, what happens to those that do make an application? Are they being deferred, or are they being rejected out of hand?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** If there is an applicant; that is, if the honourable member has a constituent or whatever that was intending - he puts his application in, it would be processed in the normal way, and pursuant to the provisions of this Act, there would be a licence issued for that.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Is the Minister telling us then that actually no licences will be approved until the present bill that is before the House is passed?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the present system will prevail until this bill is passed, but given the economic circumstances we've had no flood of people wanting to invest money in expensive irrigation systems.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** If this bill then gets passed in the House, hopefully with some amendments, would the supposed moratorium then be lifted at that stage of the game? Would applications then be processed for those that do make applications or this freeze, supposed freeze, or sort of freeze going to be in effect for a long period of time?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, maybe I'm guilty of the confusion. If I indicated there was a moratorium or freeze, such isn't the case.

There has been a continuation of existing policy, and when the new Act is passed then it will be possible to licence irrigation applications in a more effective way we believe.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Then I'd like to get down to the licensing aspect itself. The bill is before us, and I know we have the opportunity to debate it there, I have some concern about when does a licence terminate. If a person sells property where an irrigation system is on right now, my impression was that licence will automatically terminate. Am I correct in that assumption?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman, but the purchaser of the land can make application for the water licence that the vendor holds, and I would believe that in almost all instances those applications would be approved. Where there would be any conflict, then there would be an opportunity to look at that.

If there was a decision, a refusal, on the part of the Minister to transfer the water licence, then an appeal could be taken to the municipal board in respect to that. So the clear intention is to provide for transferability of the water licence upon disposition of the land. But there are instances where it will be important to have the water licence severable from the land; instances where people will not want to give up to their water licence, but they may want to sell half of their land or whatever.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, I have some concerns about that, some grave concerns. With the termination of the licence, the moment somebody is selling land, I personally would like to see more of a transferable type of a situation where if a person sells a property where an irrigation system is in place that it would be an automatic transfer unless there was certain reasons to the contrary.

What we're doing now, we're terminating that licence and then the individual has to reapply and that creates concern. I don't know why we can't, because next thing I can envision the Minister getting involved and saying, well listen, you're paying too much money for this irrigation system, because there's a government licence, and then getting involved in that aspect of it.

I personally feel very strongly that the licence should go with the property. If the man has spend thousands and thousands of dollars putting in the system, and for whatever reason quits farming, or wants to get out of the business, that he should be able to recover his capital input into that thing. By not being able to transfer the licence, I feel there's going to be difficulty coming out of that. I think the possibility of unjust treatment for some of these people is definitely going to be there.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest when the honourable member spoke on this proposed bill, the bill we have before us in the Legislature, and I will respond to those arguments when I speak again in the Legislature.

I'm sure that there'll be representations at the committee stage in respect to these matters, and there will be more than ample time to weigh the arguments that members may have in respect to the particular principles embodied in the bill.

I would hesitate to endeavour to do that on this occasion because there will be that added opportunity to do it later. While I'm prepared to make argument generally, I wouldn't want to get into the detail of it, because there will be another opportunity for it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague raises a very important point and it's certainly one, as he's already indicated, we will discuss with the Minister in further discussion on Bill 12, the Water Rights Bill currently before the House.

Allow me simply to indicate to the Minister, though, that while I can agree or share to some extent his conviction that in most cases the transferability will be provided by perhaps the present Minister, or with the act as it now stands, it doesn't have with it the certainty that investors of land often require.

Let me, for the Minister's edification, simply relate a little bit of history. I can recall, Mr. Chairman, when I first was thinking about buying my ranch property up in the Woodlands municipality, I was, of course, extremely interested, and was not interested in buying the deeded land unless I was assured of getting the Crown land that was currently being leased to the party that I was buying the land from.

What I was then required to do, in fact, was the mode of operation. One had to kind of make a deal under

the table with the departmental employees. You would take the person that you were going to purchase the land from, and go and visit them up in the Norquay Building and assure yourself, to the point where staff just about agreed to sign the lease should the sale proceed. Because, you see, I wouldn't proceed with the sale unless I knew the Crown land was going to accrue to that same property. That is how for many years transferability problems were dealt with in the area of agricultural Crown lands.

It then took an enlightened Conservative administration to come along and to change all that and put it on the table, and where we have, and the Minister in his Crown lands deals with that, in the case of agricultural Crown lands, transferability is automatically put into the lease. I have such a lease now. As a result, it does two things. It assures a potential purchaser - should I be rewarded in some not too distant future and perhaps grace the Canadian Senate and leave ranching . . .

**A MEMBER:** Come on. You might become leader, Harry. Don't write yourself out of it yet.

**MR. H. ENNS:** . . . that the purchaser knows with certainty that that transferability of land, that economic unit, will be one. He doesn't have to depend on the Minister's good will or the good sense of the departmental officials administering that department.

Mr. Chairman, the point that my colleague, the Member for Emerson, makes is extremely valid, because it is precisely in those nuances where a great deal of difference lies in terms of whether or not a prospective purchaser is prepared to commit and sign documents, in some instances worth several hundreds of thousands or half-millions of dollars, and without that kind of automatic assurance.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Minister that what we are doing, of course, is telegraphing to him some of the positions that we will be taking on The Water Rights Bill and we think there is nothing wrong with that; some of the amendments, in fact, we will be introducing to that bill and speaking very strongly for. But I thought in support of what my colleague was saying, that ought to be put on the record.

The fact that the department is not receiving a great deal of applications at this current time is not surprising in lieu of what's happening in agriculture generally. We have had some tremendous strain and difficulties in the agriculture community. Some of our very promising irrigation operators have been literally forced out of business as a result of falling commodity in grain and cereal grain prices plus rising costs of fuel and energy that has made, for the time being, the demands on irrigation and water rights not as imperative as they were, say, three or four years ago. But I would sincerely challenge the department that this is precisely the time to get your house in order.

I do commend the Minister for using this time to bring in the Water Rights legislation. If, regrettably, economic conditions provide the department a bit of breathing space to get their program together supported by legislation, then that, of course, is what this time should be utilized for. There is no question in my mind that the day will come where the demand

for water and the attendant licensing requirements for water will pick up sharply again and the department would be well-served to then be in a position to respond to it.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, regarding the legislation and the studies that have been done on the groundwater situation, I wonder, can the Minister advise how serious is the water problem, because the headlines that hit the weekly papers in Roblin on the weekend says, "Drought prospects loom. Government plan for water shortage," and then the article was signed off by the Minister's comments that we should be ready for a drought. Is it a general problem all across the province or are we referring here to the study that was done in the Swan River along the western part of the boundary by PFRA a couple years ago that indicated a shortage of groundwater?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I hope that people don't take my concerns out of context. Our concern, when we look at water supply, is a long-range concern. The department hasn't suggested, nor have I indicated, that there is a drought problem very imminent; that is, that we have a serious decline in groundwater supplies or surface water supplies.

We have one or two aquifers where there has been stress and we are concerned about that but, by and large, we have been very fortunate. Our groundwater supplies are good. We have, however, been looking at the longer-term problems associated with water supply, because we know that it's important to have a continuation of good level in our aquifers. So we don't want people to take water for granted, because we know that the demands are increasing.

As I indicated in my remarks in the House, the demands for use of water have escalated very, very substantially in our western provinces and in provinces west of here. We can expect, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has indicated, that the demand will grow and the irrigators will want more water, more groundwater. They'll want more water from our rivers and streams.

We have been involved with the Federal Government in what is called an Interim Agreement on Water Supply and Drought Proofing. It's a federal-provincial study and, through that study, we look at ways of ensuring a supply of water for - as the term indicates - ensuring that communities will have sufficient water and there will be sufficient water for the use of those people who have already developed a reliance upon those water supplies for irrigation or farming generally.

For example, one of the concerns that has been evidenced to me in respect to some of our rivers and streams is that, if there is a dam that is offensive, take it out but over the course of years, some of these dams were put in to ensure a stock watering supply for agriculture . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I hope it's the Hartney Dam.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Honourable Member for Arthur has triggered on the one I was referring to; I know that there are some people would like to see that dam removed. But we do have structures throughout the province that have been put in there to ensure that there will be a supply of water for agricultural purposes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I have a few follow-up questions on the Water Licensing aspect of it. What is the cost involved at the present time when somebody applies for a licence?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, we could get the specifics of that, but it is a pretty nominal fee arrangement, just the costs of processing the documentation, something like \$5 or \$10 - I don't know.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Is it anticipated that there will be an increase when the bill passes; that in the future there is going to be an increase? The reason I raise that question is - and the Minister is sort of looking a little skeptical of that - it illustrates all the more the reason why there should be a unilateral transfer allowed, rather than a termination of a licence and then the reapplication which gives the Minister then the power to . . . as he has done on his own with the increases for cottage owners, etc. The same thing could happen here. I bring that up only because that gives him that power again to generate some revenue if he wants to, and make it exceedingly difficult. I just want to illustrate that. I still believe there should be a unilateral transfer allowed in the sale of a purchased property that has irrigation equipment on it.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I recognize the honourable member's arguments. I will address those arguments later in the bill but, in respect to him saying that the park increases, etc., are just mine, I said that the buck stops with me. I didn't say that they're unique to my thinking or that I am the only one that has anything to say about them.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Looking at the Annual Report, under Water Licensing, it indicates there were 156 applications received in the last fiscal year. Is the Minister indicating that all of these were not proceeded with, that they've all been put on hold?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I am given to understand that the bulk of those, if not all of them, would be relatively small livestock watering operations; no major irrigation applications. We might be wrong about that, but that's the information I have.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** So these were approved though.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(b)(1)—pass; 4.(b)(2) - the Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. First of all, Mr. Minister, I would like to inquire about

what position the Clandeboye Dam is in now. What are your plans for that? Has the construction started? Is it completed, or what?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the Clandeboye Dam, blocking the water flowing from Lake Manitoba into Clandeboye Bay in the Delta Marsh area, was in serious disrepair. There were arguments about the need for that dam at all. Arguments were advanced that it should be removed. Those arguments were finally acceded to and the dam is being removed, so the water now flows freely from Lake Manitoba into Clandeboye Bay. There is no plan presently under consideration to replace it.

**MR. L. HYDE:** I'm glad to hear that, what you are saying then, The removal of the total dam is completed?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes. So far as I know, it is. I was there and looked at the operation as it was ongoing, and I believe it is now complete.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Minister, is there any chance, Sir, that you would be doing much of the same practice in the western marshes, that is, west of the village of Delta itself? Over the years, I understand that the channels have plugged, whether by natural causes I don't know, but however they presently are plugged. I am wondering if you would be considering doing likewise to the west side as you have to the eastern portion.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'll be happy to look at that. I haven't heard of any plans, or I really don't know the specifics of what channels the honourable member is referring to. Perhaps they are channels that have silted up over the years.

**MR. L. HYDE:** I would like to be able to name the actual channels by name, but I can't. I know that they are there.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The west side of the Delta Marsh.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Yes. I know they're there, Sir, and have, I believe plugged up, as you say, through silt.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I see.

**MR. L. HYDE:** One more question, if I may, what are your plans - have you any plans on the construction of a Holland dam? What is your thinking on that?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, that "dam" question has arisen and it's been brought forward to a number of Ministers of Natural Resources. I understand that it is part of the PFRA study, a long range study, and it's still very much, I guess, a gleam in someone's eye. It hasn't been written out, but it's far from being approved either.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** That Assiniboine-South Hespler Study, there is a great deal of concern in the Holland area and, of course, stories running rampant about what kind of a dam and how high and how far it's going to back up the water, and how many farms it is going to destroy . . .

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, pardon me. Can we deal with Water Licensing first?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I thought we had.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. H. ENNS:** I bloody well run my ship the way I run it, that's the trouble with your ship, you guys got no discipline.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(b)(1) is passed. 4.(b)(2) is under consideration. Is it passed? 4.(b)(2)—pass.

Now the Member for Gladstone has the floor.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you. As I was saying when I was interrupted by my colleague, there is great concern in that area. Last summer, I think it was July, there was a meeting in the community of Holland at which time there was a great deal of discussion about keeping the citizens informed of what was going on. I am wondering, Mr. Minister, if you have any plans or your department has any plans to hold regular meetings in the area to explain the stages of this program.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Just a moment. I just want to refresh my memory on that.

Mr. Chairman, that Assiniboine-South Hespler is in such a preliminary stage, a pre-feasibility stage, that it is not considered appropriate to endeavour to elevate expectations by commencing a consultative process, because it could well be that the pre-feasibility studies will indicate that it shouldn't go at all. So we are not at the stage yet where we would want to elevate expectations. But, Mr. Chairman, when we do have concerns made to us in respect to the possibility of that development, we do respond and provide information as to where the pre-feasibility study is at and what the expectations are.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I keep getting inquiries from people in the area who are concerned about their farming operations and just how much long-range planning they can do and how much money they can invest in their farms when this is looming in the distance. I am wondering if the study is on target as to the report. Have you any idea if the report will be ready by 1984, as it is supposed to be?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The information we have, that's just been given to me is that it's late 1984 the pre-feasibility study information should be available.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Late 1984.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the time is slipping away and I have quite a few questions to ask, but I will start out by asking the Minister basically, is the reason that Tommy Weber's not with us during the Water Resource Estimates that he has been removed from the position, or not here to provoke questions from the opposition, or what would be the particular reason that Mr. Weber is not with us today? I would ask if he has been removed from the department or doing something else.

Mr. Chairman . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Can I answer that one, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before you go to another question, the Minister wants to answer the first question.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'd be pleased if he would.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I had the benefit of Tommy Weber's assistance earlier on today in respect to a matter. He had to rush out to Portage la Prairie to deal with another matter out there, and that's why he is not here today. He will be with us tomorrow morning.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** In other words, he's got him on the flood patrol, Mr. Chairman. He is out fighting floods, not fires.

Mr. Chairman, the concerns I have dealing with the management of water are not new to the Department of Water Resources or the Department of Natural Resources. They have been with us for quite a few years through several administrations. I guess a more basic question is, in view of the fact that the Provincial Government, as of an hour ago, the NDP Party's credit rating has been reduced to a AA minus, and the fact that there is a shortage of funds, Mr. Chairman, that any proposed water projects - whether it be dams, major reservoirs, any major ditching, or that type of thing, will not be taken on in the next year or two. That, in fact, any proposals, or any programs that this government have are strictly on a hold pattern. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I believe we'll be getting to a point in the Estimates where there's Acquisition and Construction. We'll be dealing in detail with those questions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4(c)(1) - the Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, Mr. Chairman. Well if the Minister doesn't want to deal with it at this particular time, well then, let us ask, in the Water Management area, some two weeks ago there was a group from the R.M. of Pipestone in, requesting the Minister establish a Water Management Committee dealing with the Pipestone Creek, dealing with the Moosomin Dam, to make sure that Manitoba gets enough water, or the people living along the Pipestone Creek - towns like Reston and farm communities in Manitoba - that we, in fact, get our share of the water, not in one shot at the spring of the year, where we're supposed to get 50 percent

of it, but that it in fact, be regulated over the period of the year and that we, as Manitobans, whether it be local people or governmental people, be involved in the Management Committee of the reservoir at Moosomin.

I understand that the Minister met with these people. I was unable to meet with them that day. They were pleased with the meeting and left that meeting with the feeling the Minister would request Saskatchewan or the PFRA and Saskatchewan Governments to ask Manitobans to participate in that management committee. Has the Minister taken any action or will he take action immediately to establish such a management team on that reservoir?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to confirm what the honourable member has said. I had a very good meeting with a group of interested people in that area dealing with the Pipestone Creek and the release of water from the Saskatchewan Dam. I share the concern that perhaps the releases are not made in a manner that gives a reasonable allocation of the water to Manitoba users, and accordingly, have written to the Saskatchewan Minister, asking him to facilitate a meeting of the officials to deal with the equitable sharing of water from the Pipestone Creek.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** So, as I understand it, the officials are going to meet to discuss how a committee could be established. Is that correct?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I've written to the Saskatchewan Minister, in whose jurisdiction the dam is, and asked him to facilitate a meeting of the officials to review the equitable allocation of water, because I believe that there should be a review of how that water is released.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, before the time runs out for this afternoon's meeting, I would ask - and I will have some more questions on it later on today. But I'd particularly like to know, because of the flooding on the Souris River at this particular time, what is the current status of the outflow of the Lake Darling Dam, which is apparently causing a lot more water to come into the Souris River watershed at this particular time, than say several weeks ago. What is the current status of the flow out of the Lake Darling Dam? Is it wide open or is under some control at this particular time, as of today?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I think that specific measurement of flow, we'd have to give to you - perhaps, I don't know whether we can get that for this evening, but we'll try and get it as soon as possible.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'd appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. As well, Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago, I had written a letter to the Premier and I'm not sure whether he got a copy - I think the Premier did send a copy to the Minister of Natural Resources, where the Governor of the State of North Dakota and the Premier of Saskatchewan had established a joint committee of the two jurisdictions headed by the Premier and the Governor of the State, and asked the Premier of

Manitoba to participate or have someone from his government participate on a Souris River Management Team, where citizens or a local committee, not so much of local people, but . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Sounds like 4:30 p.m., gentlemen.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 4:30 p.m. . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I've talked into a lot of mikes, but that's the first one that's talked back. Is it 4:30 p.m., Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, it's 4:30 p.m.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'll get into this again after supper, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 4:30 p.m., the committee will break up its proceedings for the Private Members' Hour.

### SUPPLY - EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 5, Post-Secondary, Adult and Continuing Education. (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if before we get into this item I could ask the Minister's consideration. We were going rather quickly through a number of items at the end of Thursday evening, and we were attempting, on this side at least, to enable the Estimates to proceed relatively quickly through to the present stage.

I have a number of notes that I've made along the way of things that I wanted to ask the Minister and I went by one item. I wonder if I could ask her one question. I could leave it until Minister's Salary, but if I ask the question now, perhaps she could bring back a response at the beginning of tonight.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, I'd be quite happy to have the question asked now.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, the question has to do with the general area of curriculum development, new programming, and sort of presenting a balanced due, which I assume that is still the objective of the department in all areas of curriculum that we don't particularly attempt to sort of direct the peoples thinking into one area.

There were times when I know there were disagreements as to the amount of content of, say, labour education that was in curricula. There was suggestions that perhaps too much emphasis was on the free enterprise system or something else, and on and on.

The one area that was brought to my attention about a month or six weeks ago, there was a person in the city who was speaking to a number of groups about the theory of creation as opposed to the theory of

evolution as a legitimate and valid theory, as he called it, that ought to be taught in the public school system. He put forth the position, which seemed to me to have some validity, that if evolution is considered to be a valid theory and, of course, a century ago or even less than that there were tremendous battles as to whether or not that should be taught in our public school system, and it has gone to the point that it is taught and accepted by educators throughout North America at least and, in fact, was placed in that position by a legal decision, and that the pendulum has swung to the extent that because there is a religious connotation or a perceived religious connotation to the theory of creation, that it is virtually not allowed to be taught in public schools throughout North America. This person is more or less a crusader putting that postulation forward in his travels across the country.

The position that was brought to my attention, by some who discussed it, was that the man was treading on ground that made a lot of sense and he wondered as to whether or not there is any prohibition to teaching the theory of creation in Manitoba, whether or not it's encouraged in public schools, whether or not it's disallowed, and whether or not the Minister had any views on whether or not it ought to be recognized as an alternative theory and not as necessarily the only answer.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Tuxedo was suggesting that he would communicate the area and that perhaps we could respond tonight. I could give some response now. I think there is some information that I can recall having with my curriculum material that will probably allow me to provide a little more complete one, so I'd appreciate putting it over until this evening.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Then as we proceed to the Item of Post-Secondary, Adult and Continuing Education, I wonder if the Minister would like to just give us an overview of the changes that have been made in this area and perhaps with a new administrative structure in this area, whether or not she could set forth the goals that she might have in the near future, at least, in dealing with this very large and important area of education?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** The Member for Tuxedo has asked a very small question with a very big answer. I'm going to try and touch on the main elements of it without sort of making a major address.

The first thing he mentioned is that we had changed the organization of the department, and I might just comment on that, where we brought Student Aid, Adult Education and Colleges and Post-Secondary Career Development all together under the umbrella of the Post-Secondary Adult and Continuing Education Division.

I think that one of the reasons that we did that is that we recognized the importances. All of our areas in education are important and all have their unique sort of responsibilities and roles to play in the educating of the people of Manitoba.

I think that when we pulled these groups all together, we really were beginning to recognize the increasing

importance of the delivery of programs that would be delivered through the Post-Secondary Adult and Continuing Education Division and the importance of co-ordinating them and developing and working on them together, because they really were a number of sections all responsible for delivering programs in this area, who were working in isolation. I think we've found that it's much better for us to pull them together and to be able to see what development and what changes need to go on in each of the areas so that we're doing it from sort of a rational, logical approach.

The post-secondary education, the training, I would say that we've recognized a number of areas that are particularly important and that would have an effect on what I would call the goals. I will mention the areas of importance, and our goals and our programs will follow from them, but equity and accessibility certainly would have to be one of them. I might mention that the enrolment in general is up to what I think was the previous maximum in about 1975, as all of our post-secondary institutions have been increasing for many obvious reasons.

One is the employment situation, but I think another is the wish and the intention and the desire of many people, who didn't have an opportunity for education previously, to now be trained and to get skills so that they can expand their job opportunities and their skills and their horizons. So these are the post-secondary institutions that are opening up access to post-secondary training opportunities for people who didn't have a chance before. A lot of the programs are addressing the Native needs, the women - sort of single parent, immigrant, people who don't have what we might call traditional formal education; so equity and accessibility, I think, would be very important.

Another one that we have identified, of course, is the training for the technologies, the industrial technological world that we're moving into, and the need for what would be our major training institutions in the skills, the training, the industrial training area, to keep pace so that the students are being trained to meet the reality of what the needs are in our industry.

I think flexibility and diversity - one of the things that we want to do with our post-secondary institutions is recognize that we can't keep continuing to deliver them perhaps in exactly the same old ways that we did before; that is, through the building of sophisticated large institutions with a lot of equipment, and the people in the province who want that training travel to the institutions. There is a growing recognition that we need to use other innovative ways of delivering education to people, particularly in northern rural and remote areas, using innovative ways and the technologies in combination to deliver these. A couple of examples I could give would be the mobile training units that we're developing through the Skills Growth Fund, that we'll be able to go into some of these remote and Northern areas. Distance education I think, is another good example where we use the technologies related to distance education to get programs out to the communities.

I think by providing a range of programs through the colleges and Post-secondary Education Training Program do a number of things that recognize and meet the demands and the needs of society for the changes taking place in society; everything from that,

the societal changes and the needs for programs to the high technology. An example of that kind of diversity and capacity could be seen also through the Skills Growth Fund Program that we have just approved, where we are expanding child care on the one hand to recognizing and having adequate abilities to look after children, recognizing that large large numbers of our mothers are working and large large numbers of them are single parent who, if they're ever going to have an opportunity to get back to school and to get the skills and the training that they presently don't have, that they're going to have to have help with their children. So we have moved on both creativity, flexibility and covering the range of needs so that we're doing the social.

I think we're moving and we need to move in areas like the handicapped where we're recognizing that people with visual or other handicaps should not be precluded from opportunities to train and to receive post-secondary education opportunities. Our two programs in this area related to the visually impaired for translation and computer programming would be an example there.

We also want to move in areas where we have not been moving before. I'm trying to remember, but we are training our conservation officers for the first time in Manitoba, so I think in some cases it's logical for us to rely on other provinces and to have Inter-Provincial Training Agreements and in some cases we should be looking at developing our own capacity and our own training. We are trying to get a good balance there where we don't set up, unnecessarily, programs that can better and more cheaply be delivered by other institutions and some of those we'll be able to discuss when we come to the Inter-Provincial Training Agreement.

We do move in areas where we perhaps can take the lead and the translation services might be an example, where we're going to set up a capacity to train translators as I think the need is not just in Manitoba but perhaps all the western provinces. We might indeed be developing our capacity to train where we are able to provide support and deliver programs to other provinces. So it's being flexible enough to bring in the range of the training, program and education needs, being flexible in our methods of delivering, so that we're not delivering them in the same old traditional ways because we can't afford to continue doing that and there is too many needs that aren't being met.

I think the combination of the money and programs and expansion in capital facilities, expansion in our post-secondary education programs, increased money that's going into the colleges. Certainly, one of the clear indicators about this government's commitment to education and particularly this area, is our willingness to allow access to the Skills Growth Fund for both colleges and universities, which allows them to expand and provide programs that are going to improve both the numbers of students that we can train and the range, to meet both society's needs and the technological needs.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the Minister's introductory remarks on that area of her

Estimates. I know that there has been a great deal of ongoing reorganization and redirection of resources and efforts towards ensuring that women, particularly women with dependents, are placed in a position of having equal access to post-secondary education in our province. The Minister and I discussed that at some length last year, and I'm sure that we'll have an additional opportunity as we get to the item of Student Aid to discuss that particular aspect, one which concerns us and I'm sure concerns most Manitobans, to ensure that all Manitobans, regardless of their circumstances, have equal opportunity or access to post-secondary education in the province and certainly one identifiable group and this has certainly been demonstrated to me from my own vocational background that women need extra consideration and particular consideration, in order to ensure their access, particularly if they have dependents.

The Minister indicated a special program that has been instituted for visually impaired. Could she tell me a little more about what the program does and what its cost is?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the 27 programs that was announced under the Skills Growth Fund; it's computer programmer training for the blind and we have \$115,000 for that program. The University of Manitoba will purchase equipment for 12 stations to teach 24 visually impaired students to become computer programmers, and the course will include microcomputer training as well. I think we all recognize that a lot of people have been limited in their capacity because of both public perception of their capabilities and also the changes or the things being made available in the education system that would allow them access to the same things. So this a beginning.

The other one is the computer programmer operator for braille. We've put \$195,000 for that; it's to establish a facility to develop computer braille programmer expertise for the production of braille training materials. There will be four training stations there.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What the Minister is saying is that they will utilize computers to do the translation into braille or produce braille materials? That's obviously a worthwhile program. I know that when we were doing programs for training of visually impaired in the past, we had to either hire or obtain volunteers to put the materials on tapes, teaching materials on tapes. We dealt with and worked with the vocational counsellors at the CNIB to a large extent and this obviously mechanizes it to the point that you can do this much more quickly, because there were limitations on people's time in the past and I'm pleased to learn of that.

Can the Minister indicate now, on the Division Administration, what the staff complement is; whether that's an increase over last year?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, we're presently 9.01 staff years up from last year. Oh, I'm sorry. That information that I gave was for the total division. Were you asking the total or Administration?

**MR. G. FILMON:** If I may just go item-by-item, Mr. Chairman, and see where the increases in staff are.

Last year we had \$689,000 in Salaries; this year we have \$864,000.00. What's the comparative staff complement?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** It's the same staff as last year, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Has there been an upgrading in position? I believe this division now has an Assistant Deputy Minister as its head, and what other corresponding changes have taken place as a result of that?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, it previously did have an Associate Deputy Minister and Director. It's basically the same.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, it's okay, we'll pass that then, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass; 5.(b)(1) Programming Branch, Salaries - the Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What are the responsibilities of this branch, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** This branch is the one that is responsible for programs, for both planning, development, evaluation of courses, and it provides consultative and supporting services to the division.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Any change in staff complement?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(b)(1)—pass; 5.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 5.(c)(1) Red River Community College, Salaries - the Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, we're now going into the three community colleges and I wonder, because some of the topics that I'd like to discuss will fall in the realm of each of them, whether we can deal with them all as a group and then pass them all as a group?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes.

**MR. G. FILMON:** If I may begin, Mr. Chairman, by referring to the news release of April 15th, in which the Minister announced the redeployment of resources at the community colleges. It dealt with the cancellation of nine full-time community college courses and the retraining and redeployment opportunities which were being explored for 38 of the 670 instructors at the community colleges. In reviewing the matter, and as the Minister might expect, from my own experience in some of the fields that were affected, there have been a number of questions raised.

The Minister's rationale for the cancellation and redeployment of resources was that these were courses largely for which there had either been a loss of demand for graduates or they were being well offered by other institutions and other institutions were capable of providing the training and, therefore, the resources



could be better used in new technology areas, in fields of greater demand. In some cases, I think there was a lack of student demand for entry was given as a possible rationale, and the overall desire to make maximum use of the training dollars that were and are available in this area.

I will say that I have not had any discussions with people who felt aggrieved or badly treated by the cancellation, for instance, of the clerk-typist courses. I find nothing within the information I have at my disposal to quarrel with that decision. There seemed to be, and I again can confirm it from my own experience, a decreasing demand.

Similarly for hairdressing, I am aware of many institutions who are adequately providing this sort of training and, in many respects, have certain advantages over the community colleges in their downtown locations and being able to offer many more clients for practice for the students. The experience that they get in hands-on working with clients is of great value to these students, and I know that this was an ongoing thing. The phasing-out of the hairdressing course, had begun with Red River some time ago and it was just being completed by this announcement.

I will say that I was called by students or prospective students for the Social Services course at Assiniboine Community College. The information which they have given me seems to indicate that students, at least from Assiniboine - and I will also say for the Minister's benefit that I recall many years ago that when it was phased-out at Red River, the statistics were terrible in terms of the placement which those students achieved, but they were training a much larger number, something in the range of 150 a year, I believe, at Red River when it was phased-out. In any case, the placement statistics, because they were competing in Winnipeg with graduates of the Bachelor and Masters degree programs in Social Work, were just awful. There was no rationale to continuing it.

The case that's been put to me for Assiniboine is that graduates of the University of Manitoba here in Winnipeg aren't as desirous of moving out to the Brandon, southwestern rural Manitoba area to obtain employment. It seemed as though that sort of competition wasn't as great for the students coming out of the course at Assiniboine. If the statistics are correct, there was an indication that there were good employment opportunities for those graduates. I wonder if the Minister has information that she could share that might change the view that's been given to me on that.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate that this is the subject that the Member for Tuxedo has chosen to discuss and to raise the questions about, because perhaps the reasons are not quite as clear. The clerk-typist things were much clearer, the Feds were not buying; the enrolment was down; there were other institutions offering the course; and so it's clearly seen, perhaps not just by us and by people in the institutions, but the question is the people that are in the program and what their feelings are.

The Social Work program - first of all the needs in this area are high in the social work area in general. We're not filling all of the major needs in a number of

major areas that are going to become much more important. At the same time, we were providing some courses that were seen to be very generalist, very - we'll even go so far as to say, a little fuzzy in nature - that did give students some training. What they were trained for, it really wasn't clear, and to what use they were being put when they were being hired wasn't really clear.

In a number of cases, and we found when we looked at it, that although they were getting employed, that quite often they were getting employed in jobs that were not appropriate for the training that they had had, because they didn't have sort of a clear skill or knowledge for specific jobs. So they were put in very generalist, very low sort of level supporting positions to the people who had the training in the social services area.

So I think there are also indications that some of the major employers - and if my memory serves me correctly, one of them was the City of Winnipeg - has been indicating that they are moving away from hiring, or will be, these people. The demands are growing for more specific training and more qualified training. They are moving, I think, towards the Bachelors of Social Work. In some cases, these people were employed in areas there was such high need that they would take anybody with any kind of - even a little bit of training was better than no training at all - but that doesn't mean that they didn't want more or that they didn't need more in some of those positions.

I guess while that is being phased out that we believe that we are replacing it with what I would call a far superior program; where there will be very specific training in an area of high need; where the students will be able to get employment that will be needed for years down the road, and it will be clear what kind of jobs they are being trained for. Certainly the child care training and the expansions that will be going on there are one of the areas. We expect that a lot of the students that were into this program may indeed still be interested in the social service arena, and may opt for the opportunities to take more specific training that will allow them chances to get specific jobs.

So I would say that in general the employment opportunities were poor, perhaps getting poorer as the people who were doing the employing are getting more determined to have people in jobs who have the training that they require to do those jobs. The sort of generalist, fuzziness nature of the program and the high needs in other areas in the social service arena, which we are not presently meeting - and I think we can redirect both programs and students into some of those.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I am just wondering whether or not the Minister and I are speaking about the same area. As I understand it, this program was offered only at Assiniboine and with an enrolment of 30. The Minister referred to the City of Winnipeg as being a major employer, and then went into the emphasis on different areas such as child care and so on. I could be wrong, but my impression was that was part of the Skills Growth Fund application in the core area.

I am just wondering whether or not we are indeed supplanting that source of people in the southwestern Manitoba area which Assiniboine serves, and is this

indeed the reasoning behind that? Because my impressions was that these people were being employed out in that southwestern Manitoba area.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Actually, Mr. Chairman, some of my comments were - as the Member for Tuxedo mentioned himself, we're talking about some specific colleges and we are also talking about general trends and issues - I think, sometimes, I start to talk a specific and I get off into the general. I was talking that, in general, the needs are down and the demands are down. There is about 25 percent, I think, unemployment in this area.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Does the Minister have some recent statistics about that particular course, because I was given information over the phone that seemed to indicate that from last year's course and all previous years, the employment rate was much greater than 75 percent?

Now if it were indeed 75 percent, that isn't much different from the kind of experience that the Minister has been having overall with employment of community college graduates. As her Annual Report indicates, for the first year in many years, at least a half-dozen years, we have had a massive unemployment rate in last year's graduates of the community college system. It has gone up to 12 percent, whereas it was less than half of that for the previous many years. So I'm just wondering whether she has some specific figures that justify that kind of decision.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the information that I have - I have two pieces of information related to this specific course. One is the job outlook, percentage increase in U.I. claimants, 1983 over 1982, where they're up 15 percent. We do a community college follow-up of the previous year's graduates, and that is showing a 25 percent unemployment rate.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Is that specifically for the social services program at Assiniboine Community College?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Was that the first year that there was a significant unemployment rate shown for that class?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** It's the second year, Mr. Chairman, 20 percent last year.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What area of training that is being emphasized now will replace that type of student that was graduating out of that program?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I would think that the main area of increase, our Child Care services programs are doubling. They are going from 30 to 60 students and that will certainly be an area where there will be an increased demand and an increased opportunity. That is just at the college level.

**MR. G. FILMON:** At Assiniboine?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** There is a proposed course for Assiniboine. The other is in the area of Gerontology.

**MR. G. FILMON:** When will these courses begin at Assiniboine, the Child Care and the Gerontology?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** September for the child care, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, S. Ashton:** The Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** And how many students will be enrolled?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Fifteen to twenty, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FILMON:** So these 15 to 20 students in child care at Assiniboine will replace the 30 that were being trained in social services?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I think there are 25 that were in the social services at Assiniboine. No, not necessarily, Mr. Chairman. It will depend on their wish to enter into new programs. I mean, what we're doing is making some new programs available and moving into programs in high need areas where we believe there will be better employment opportunities throughout the province. Students will have the opportunities to move into those areas.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I am not trying to get the Minister upset about this, but her release does say, 30 students, not the 25 that she has indicated. If we are to assume that last year, 25 percent of those didn't get jobs, there were still over 20 who did get jobs, and we are now saying that we may have 15 or 20 child care workers. I would assume that not all of those social services grads went into child care, so I'm just wondering whether or not the matter has been looked into in enough depth to ensure that there will not be employers out there in the southwestern Manitoba area who will be looking for people with some social services background.

We all know that there will be graduates perhaps from Masters and degree programs in Social Work here who will go unemployed, but whether or not they would go to southwestern Manitoba to take a job that was being fulfilled by this type of graduate in the past remains to be seen. It seems to me that there is a little gap in this area.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I guess we are looking at a lot of information and sort of pulling it together and making some decisions that are difficult decisions, and that you do with the best and the most comprehensive information that you have available. The long-range outlook for that program is bad in terms of employment opportunities and needs in the field. That information seems clear. Whether or not some students could still continue to be employed if we kept the program going for another year or so is slightly possible. There is a possibility, but that still doesn't get away from the fact that employers are clearly saying that's not what they require and that's not what they want. They want the bachelor's degree and I think we have to recognize that and move into training in areas where we're actually providing the skills and the abilities that the employers and the people in the field need.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I appreciate what the Minister is saying, but I don't see a concurrent move taking place that will provide those bachelor's or master's degree people that the employers out there are saying they want in place of these that are no longer being trained. For instance, is there an intention therefore to offer a Bachelor of Social Work degree or expand one if it is there? I don't think it is at Brandon University.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the University of Brandon is now offering a master's in social work in Manitoba. The University of Manitoba is offering a master's in social work in Brandon.

**MR. G. FILMON:** How many students will be trained?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Twenty, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FILMON:** When will the first class complete?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, that program is part-time studies, so it may take a few years for them to complete their program.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I am not criticizing the overall thrust of what our Minister's department is after. Looking at long-range employment statistics and opportunities is obviously a responsibility that they have, and one that they ought to make decision on because otherwise, you have the situation as it occurred in many instances in the early '70s where we were training people for jobs that weren't there. There was no responsiveness in the overall post-secondary training field in Manitoba. I know that I made presentations on it before I was ever involved in government and tried to encourage this kind of thing. I know that there is a great deal of support from the Federal Department of Employment and Immigration in this field where they are now keeping statistics, computerized statistics that forecast demands like COFOR and so on for five years hence, and they are now able to support you with things they weren't able to in the early '70s and so on. So I say that you ought to do as you are and make use of these statistics, but I say in this particular instance, I am not sure that the gap doesn't exist and that the short-term needs may not go unfilled. I leave it at that.

I proceed to the next item that I have been contacted on and that is the photographic technician course at Red River with a maximum enrolment of 24 students. I wonder what the rationale was in canceling that program?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, in this area we have in the community college follow up of graduates, we have 23 percent unemployed. We have 36 percent increase in U.I. claimants, '82 over '83. This is a course also that was a very high-cost course. It was training graduates for very low-paying jobs and the training was available in other jurisdictions, our regional and our secondary schools. There was quite a bit of interest in this area, but the interest isn't an area where the interest leads to employment.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that this was one of the courses in which there was an industry or

professional based advisory board. I know that there are advisory boards for most of the areas of technology and training, particularly the specialized ones at Red River. I believe that there is an advisory board made up of professional and industry based resource people. I wonder whether or not they were consulted in this decision.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the advisory committee does exist, as the Member for Tuxedo has indicated. They were consulted on this issue. There were discussions with them. They wanted the course kept and I think in the course of discussions that took place, although it was clear that they would like the courses to be kept, they didn't have the justification that would indicate that there is a solid basis to do so.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, I must say I am surprised at that response, Mr. Chairman, because the information which I have, and it was gathered together by, as I understand it, this particular advisory board. It says that, out of the 24 students who have taken the course annually for quite a number of years, the employment statistics varied between somewhere in the range of about 18 and 20 of them being employed each year. For instance, the June, 1980 group of graduates, there were 22 who completed and 19 were employed. It seems to indicate a very strong employment opportunity rate for them. They had 12 in photo laboratory positions; two as studio assistants; one as a retoucher; two in television photo departments; two working as freelance photographers.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I guess we have a discrepancy between the figures that the Member for Tuxedo has and the figures that we have. I am not sure where his have come from except I do know that ours have come from hard data and direct survey and we have 23 percent unemployed in a high-cost course for graduates going into low-paying jobs.

**MR. G. FILMON:** The information I have is that as a result of the closure of this course, those Manitobans who wish to take this training will be faced with a choice of going either to VCIT in Vancouver or to Ryerson in Toronto. The courses that are currently offered at the regional secondary schools are not equivalent, as I understand it. They cover certain areas but not all of the areas and the training that's offered, for instance, in other courses at the community college, where you may have Creative Communications, or you may have - well there's another, Graphic arts, I believe, they're very limited in their scope. The amount of photographic training is something in the range of 15 or 20 hours total in those courses, and as a consequence, there really isn't a similar alternative.

Those students who qualify, and I understand that there are 79 qualified applicants for this year's training alone; 136 applied and 79 qualified applicants were turned up. Those people will be faced with the decision to go out of the province and should they go out of the province, they would undoubtedly stay out of the province - for many of them, and yet, there are labs here and photographic studios and commercial photography areas that are looking for this type of

person that won't be able to find it within the resources that are currently available in Manitoba.

As much as though this is a costly - and I can understand that the amount of equipment involved makes it a costly program to offer - it seems to me as though, again, there's a case to be made for the department having pulled out of an area with either insufficient information, or slightly inaccurate data, or just simply on a cost-effective measure whereas the employment opportunities and the demands still exist.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Madam Minister.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think, first of all, we've always suggested, we've always known that given your preference, everybody would continue, that all of the courses that are presently being taught always continue to be taught, and that there not be any changes, and that there not be any courses that are removed. And, of course, we also know that we don't have that luxury anymore, that we cannot continue to offer courses, nor can we perhaps offer all the courses that people would like us to offer. We're going to have to make some choices about that.

I have been advised that the combination of our regional secondary schools and the programs that are available that are at Red River Community College - the combination of the two of them - would provide the same quality training as the previous courses. That the regional secondary schools give three years of training and approximately the same hours as our one-year course, and that if there are - you know I talked previously about recognizing that we have to, in some areas, depend on some of the other provinces and as they depend on us, we depend on them for optometry, veterinary - I can't think of the list, because I don't have it in front of me, but there are four or five courses that we clearly recognize we can have provided for better, by using the training capacities in the provinces, and to set up our own would be very expensive.

I don't think, particularly, in very high-cost, very specific training programs, I think that is probably the way to go. There might be some differences of opinion about whether this course and that course is exactly equivalent to a previous course, particularly if the information is coming from the people who are providing the course and the programming and feel very strongly about what a good program it is, and I can understand that.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'll accept the Minister's rationale as saying that we should make maximum use of our resources and if some courses are available outside of province, then we use our resources to pay for people, through Student Aid, to go to Ryerson, or to go to BCIT. I'm not sure that that's acceptable to the majority of Manitobans, but if that's the rationale, than so be it. I just make the point that the comparison of a post-secondary program with a regional secondary school program, without belittling the opportunities at a regional secondary school, is not a good one. Because I believe that in many cases, people forego much of their general background training in order to arrive at a vocational course in high school, and they do not carry along with it all of the other additional high school

general training and specific academic training that they would get in completing high school first and then going on into a post-secondary institution.

As usual, I'm told by the people in the field of photography, the employers, that the equipment that's available in the regional secondary schools does not match the level and complexity of equipment that was in the course at the community college. In fact, there are many types of lab processes and procedures that were not able to be done in regional secondary schools, that could be done in the course, and that kind of hands-on experience in doing processing and lab work, just simply isn't available presently at the regional secondary schools.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Tuxedo is making a reasonable point - he always makes reasonable points - but I recognize the point he's making. He's saying that the equipment and the facilities at the regional schools were not quite up to snuff and not quite at the level of both the equipment and the facilities offered through this program, and I think we're prepared to recognize that that may be true. They were not perhaps quite up to the level, but that doesn't mean, that does not sort of justify maintaining two totally separate programs, one of which is almost up to snuff and delivers the same quality of program, and one of which is a little bit better, and on that basis of it being a little bit better, say that we're going to continue to duplicate and provide programs through both sources.

What I can say is that I think we will be looking very closely at the equipment and facilities and things that were available through this program, because the obvious place to make this equipment available, I think, and give access to it, is the other institutions that are delivering those kinds of programs. If they do not have quite the capacity to deliver quite the quality, than perhaps the solution is to make available and give them access to some of the equipment that will not now be used for this program.

**MR. G. FILMON:** That wasn't the only criticism I laid at the Minister and I accept that aspect of it. But I say to her, in general terms, that to accept that a course that's offered in a vocational sense, in a regional secondary school, is equivalent to having completed high school and then taking a vocational training program, is not so in my view. I don't want to call upon my years of experience in the field, but I say to you that the time that is foregone by students taking their vocational training as part of their high school course eliminates the possibility of them getting a much stronger and sounder, background in the academic courses, and in general knowledge that they would obtain in a complete high school course because that time has to be spent of the labs, and the hours, and hours that are spent in the vocational training aspect of the course.

I just don't think that the two are equivalent, and I don't believe that employers, and knowledgeable people in the field will think that the two are equivalent in the professional development sense.

I mean why then do we have people such as accountants societies who formerly used to take people with a grade 11 background into Chartered Accounting

Programs now saying that, you know, you must have a university degree to even enter the field? It's a sense of the level of professionalism of people that they're dealing with. I don't believe that most will accept that somebody having had a complete high school training, and then taking some post-secondary training is only equivalent to somebody who has just taken it as part of a vocational secondary course. But that's a very large issue and it's not one obviously that we ought to debate at any length here.

I say this though, that the criticism that I believe the Minister ought to be sensitive to is the one that I do not believe, certainly from the information I've been given, that the advisory board of this program was adequately involved in the final decision. And I say to her, and to those in the department responsible that if you're going to set up advisory boards that you ought not to set them up so that they are, in fact, a perfunctory organization that really doesn't advise you on the critical decisions and issues that you face. This certainly is one of them.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I think perhaps we're both at the point where we're summing up sort of our major points in this area. I wasn't for a minute trying to suggest that it was only the equipment and the capacity, that I was responding to that specific point.

What I would say in response is that I think, and to get back to the points he made about the secondary and the perception of, the quality of the programs that are coming out of those schools, you know, I think it just isn't acceptable that we put huge amounts of money into institutions that are delivering programs, and then say but we know that what they're delivering is not so hot and you can't do so much with it, or that they don't have the capacity or the ability to train at that level.

I do think we have to look at making decisions about what the colleges are going to do; what the regional secondary schools are going to do; and the universities; and make really conscious decisions that this is where some of the programs will be delivered. And if that's the decision that they'll be delivered there then I think it's our responsibility to improve the delivery, and the quality of those programs so that they are up to a reasonable position. The colleges clearly are moving into sort of the high skill area, and cannot continue to do all of them.

So I think we have to make decisions about the role and the activities of our universities or colleges and all of our post-secondary institutions.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I want to very quickly assure the Minister that I was in no way denigrating the role, or the achievements of the regional secondary schools, and at no time did I imply that the graduates, or the course that was offered in the regional secondary school, was not so hot. It's a question of comparison between good and better in my view and that's where I'd like to leave it.

The other area that I have been contacted on was that of truck driver training at Red River Community College. Again in this particular case, the person approaching me assures me that there are many qualified applicants who wish to take such training and can't understand why we therefore are getting out of it.

Again I can see with the kind of equipment involved that there is a major cost-per-student to this particular training. So as long as the Minister assures me that there is an alternative then I can perhaps talk to the people who have contacted me about it and see whether or not the alternative is acceptable to them.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we have presently got, the Member for Tuxedo, is quite right when he recognizes the high cost of training in this area.

We do have a high unemployment rate here too, and we have two private trade schools, and a third one who has an application in to provide training in this area. I am advised that on request it could be, TDT, truck driver training, could be made available at KCC and ACC through specific requests by CEIC.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Minister would permit dealing with all three of the community colleges in the sense of doing a comparison of staff years and salaries.

I've done some approximations of the percentage increases but I'd like to know what the equivalent numbers are in terms of staff years for Red River, Assiniboine and Keewatin, under Items (1) in each of those areas.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Under Red River Community College we are down 5.12 staff years.

**MR. G. FILMON:** 5.12?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** 5.12, and the percentage increase is 17.3. Keewatin Community College is down 13, and the percentage increase is up 10.1. Keewatin Community College is down 13, and up 10.1. Oh, I think I gave the wrong figure the last time. Keewatin, I was looking at Assiniboine, is 13, and 10.1. Assiniboine was 20.7.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Up 20.7 percent and staff positions?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Assiniboine is 5.12, and 17.3 percent increase.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I'd been given that for Red River . . .

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Let's try it again, I need a ruler. Red River is 5.12 and 17.3; Assiniboine is 7.3 and 20.7. That's where we got mixed up. Keewatin is 13 down and 10.1.

**MR. G. FILMON:** This decrease of 25.42 staff years amongst the three community colleges, is that part of the effect of the redeployment? Is that taken into account with the redeployment? Does that mean that 38 were redeployed, but in fact there is an actual shrinking of 25.42 positions, so some of those redeployed people may get other jobs immediately and others will be retrained for something that comes up through attrition?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FILMON:** My question then becomes, where in these Estimates are those resources that have been

saved by the cancellation of nine courses? Where do they show up?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, when you are running courses, you don't cut courses off in the middle of the year, so there isn't a dollar saving of decisions to cut programs. These courses are going to the end of June and some of them will be going through until September.

I think that we talked about the dollars related to the reductions or the cancelling of the courses, but talked about redistributing money for other programs and courses that we're going into. The increases would have been a lot larger had we not brought in these program changes.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, but the bottom line is that there are 25.42 fewer staff positions in the community colleges.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, while 24 sounds like a large amount when you're talking about individual people, when you are talking about the numbers of staff employed by the colleges, you're talking about over 1,000 people, so the 24 is a very small percentage.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Nevertheless, the redeployment and the reorganization represents a reduction in program offering and in resources being made available to those community colleges.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. We missed the question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I am not sure I can repeat it verbatim. Nevertheless, the reduction or the redeployment or reorganization of the community colleges represents a reduction in staff and resources to the community colleges of Manitoba.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, that is accurate on the one side; there is a reduction. I remind the Member for Tuxedo that we're picking up 11.5 million through the Skills Growth Fund, and Manitoba is one of the only, and perhaps the only province that is allowing access of Skills Growth money to the colleges and universities. With the \$11.5 million, we're looking at 60 staff, between 50 and 60 staff; we're looking at 15 training spaces that are going to train 4,000 additional students. So while we are looking at some reorganization and even some changes, reductions of courses on the one side, we are looking at a major expansion on the other side.

Even with all that, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Member for Tuxedo that the colleges, I believe, are getting an increase of 14.9 percent overall, that we are going into major capital facility expansion. They got a 14.9 percent increase over last year's money. We are adding four new programs that are in both the province's and the Federal Government's High Skills-High Need area for which, I might also add, we get 100 percent recovery. But the combination of the increase in money, programs and the upgrading of capital facilities in the colleges, plus the access to a large amount of money for a large number of projects

that are going to have effect and affect every college and every institution in the province and their ability to deliver and expand to the tune of, I think, \$3.5 million going into the three colleges from the Skills Growth Fund and 60 new staff - it's 27 proposals. I can't remember the number of the 27 that are going into the colleges, but I believe it is about two-thirds, the major portion of the programs coming through the Skills Growth are going into colleges.

The combination of all of those activities are indicating a lot of importance being placed, a lot of expansion movement and support for these post-secondary institutions.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the Minister because she, earlier on in her Estimates, told us that to maintain the same staff complement this year versus last year, the approximate change in salary load is about 20 percent. So giving a 14-point-something percent increase to community colleges leaves them woefully behind in terms of status quo. That 20 percent, I remind her from her explanation to me, was the effect of the 27th pay period, the merit increases and making up for the amount of last year's Civil Service settlement that wasn't in last year's Estimates. So the base grew by so much that we had a 20 percent just to maintain the same salary complement.

So, in fact, we are looking at an area - Skills Growth Fund aside, and I would like the Minister to explain a little more to me about that Skills Growth Fund - we are looking at a reduction of resources and people to the community colleges.

Mr. Chairman, maybe if I could just focus in. Could the Minister tell me about the Skills Growth Fund? How is it funded, what are its mandates and what is it doing?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I will give a bit of an overview about the Skills Growth Fund. This is a major sort of negotiating effort between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government that has both my department taking some responsibility, and the Minister of Labour, who is responsible for signing the agreement. She signs the agreement, they put up the money, and we deliver the program. I think that the Federal Government had a fairly significant pot of money - I believe it was in the neighbourhood of \$100 million - for Skills Growth Fund Programs. That was money for which you had to apply, and the provinces were the only body or authority that could determine access to the Skills Growth Fund; while there were several categories that could receive funding, it was up to the Provincial Governments to make decisions about which groups they would submit proposals for to receive this money.

We made a decision to give access to our post-secondary training in institutions, colleges and universities in large measure, and I think that was a determination by us to really recognize the importance of upgrading and keeping pace, and expanding and continuing to develop our training and our education capacities at our post-secondary institutions; and to use this opportunity to the full extent that we could. I think we are proud to say that we, in Manitoba, I think received, well we know we received far more money

than we could be expected to receive had it just been done on a per capita basis. In other words, I believe that by submitting quite, both innovative and creative and wide-ranging proposals, that we were able to get support and funding that was about three times beyond that which we would have received had they just done what they were doing in many other provinces, and that is, funding on a per capita basis. I think we got almost as much as B.C. did and they've got double the population.

There were criteria; they were federal criteria and provincial criteria. I think the other thing that we were able, often, to develop programs that they recognized as being innovative, creative and needed, but that also met the provincial criteria that we had in the areas where we wanted to expand and develop, such as, child care, the computer training program, and to support the innovative creative ways of delivering programs to northern and remote communities, like distance education and the mobile unit. So that we got, I think it's about \$11.3 million-plus, I think, it's just under 4 is our portion of the vocational institute that the Member for Tuxedo was discussing before. There are 27 proposals. We were very conscious of getting programs to the north, in other words, when we looked at allocation of proposals to put forward, we wanted to use this money and these programs to put money into the North and into the Assiniboine and Keewatin, and I think we put over a million dollars into delivery of an expansion of programs in the North.

It goes to every institution, every college, using non-traditional ways of delivering; covering the fields from the social service to the opening up of new opportunities like the handicapped; beginning to develop some training in areas where we presently don't provide it, like our conservation officers; and moving into the technologies in computer-assisted training programs.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, it gets very confusing being on the outside looking in, but maybe the Minister can indicate; she has mentioned the figure of 11.3 million as Manitoba's portion of the Skills Growth Fund, I am just wondering - because they're so similar - whether or not this relates to the figure in Mr. Axworthy's letter, from which I quoted earlier today, in which he says, "I am very pleased to inform you that, as part of the Federal Government's 11.5 million Initiative for New Training Facilities in Manitoba, there will be a new vocational training centre in south Winnipeg." Is that the same figure or is this a different one?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** It's the same.

**MR. G. FILMON:** So the Skills Growth Fund is going then, according to Mr. Axworthy, to establish new training facilities in Manitoba. If he counts, as part of that, the vocational training centre in south Winnipeg, he goes on, after his expression of appreciation to the two Manitoba Ministers who have worked with him on it, he goes on to say, "in addition to the vocational centre, other new training facilities to be funded by the Federal Government include 1.2 million microcomputer teacher facility and computer programming equipment for the visually handicapped at the University of Manitoba" - that's not the same program that the

Minister was earlier taking credit for, was it? "And a major computer resource facility and microelectronic diagnosis training component for Red River Community College".

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is the same course. Just so that we make sure about who's taking or getting credit for what, we have always recognized and said, and appreciated that the Federal Government is putting up the money for the Skills Growth. I wouldn't say that was the easiest part of it because money is very important, but the fact is we have to deliver the programs, and delivering the programs means that we have to have the programs, and we have to have the qualified staff, and we have the capacity to deliver major expansion in programs in our colleges and universities. The level of support that we got, I believe, is directly related to our ability to develop creative and innovative programs and proposals in the areas where both the Provincial Government and the Federal Government agree we must be moving.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What is the amount of provincial money that's involved in this exercise, Mr. Chairman, and what does it do?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** \$4 million, and it is for our portion, or for our development of the south vocational institution for vocational training for the students in the high schools, the co-operative program between the three school divisions.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Into that south Winnipeg High School we are putting \$4 million in Capital funding? As well then, what are we putting into these other facilities that the Minister of Employment has announced, the microcomputer teaching facility, the computer programming equipment for the visually handicapped, the major computer resource, and micro-electronic diagnosis training equipment for Red River Community College?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** None, nor do we want to. — (Interjection) — I'm not quite finished. No, this is a federal program where the Federal Government has money under the Skills Growth Fund for which the provinces apply. Through negotiations between the Federal and the Provincial Governments, we agreed to the level of funding, the numbers of programs, which programs and where the programs will be delivered. So that we have done the best job that we were able, and I must say I believe a much better job than most other provinces in tapping the Skills Growth Fund and bringing large amounts of that money into the Province of Manitoba to expand our programs, our facilities and improve the training ability in the post-secondary institutions.

We've never suggested we were putting up money. We are the trainers; we're the developers of the programs. We deliver these educational programs in our institutions and that is our part of this job, this responsibility.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, that is a historical-shared responsibility that has gone on in the past whereby the Federal Government contributed very largely towards the capital cost of the establishment

of all the community college facilities, of all the regional secondary vocational facilities, and so on, and the operation of those facilities remains the responsibility of the province. Although the feds are still involved in funding, through the purchase of spots in all the community colleges, and so they do contribute in their way to the ongoing operation. I know that they consider that contribution to be such, towards the ongoing operations.

However, we now get down to the point that I think the Minister was making with me, and that is I wanted to, for my own satisfaction, try and understand where all these funds were coming from, and she says having applied creatively and I can't remember what the other word was, but creatively and skillfully to the Federal Government for these funds by presenting them with programs that were just so good they couldn't resist. We have made up, in essence, for the cutbacks in funding to the community colleges by involving federal funds through the Skills Growth Fund to sort of give us the total package that represents as much as we were doing in the past. So we, in effect, have gotten away with putting in less provincial funding because we've been able to get more federal funding into the whole picture during the past year to enable us to provide all of these programs to the community colleges.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest that the package that we have put forward that is coming through both in our Estimates presentation and in the signing of the Skills Growth Agreement shows an ability to plan, shows an ability to sort of co-ordinate, shows an ability to develop and create and to do it in the best way possible. I think that we, as I said, are one of the only provinces that gave access to our colleges and our universities through the Skills Growth Fund. The universities got \$2.5 million additional money and the colleges got \$3.5 million. We knew we were doing that. You know, we were negotiating that package. It's been going on for a number of years. The proposals, we've been developing them over a long period of time, and I think that we did an excellent job of both maintaining and recognizing and giving support to our institutions ourselves, and adding to it a very significant expansion and enrichment by giving them access to the Skills Growth Fund.

The combination of all of them puts our colleges and our universities in a position that I believe is unparalleled in the country in this year in terms of level of funding, expansion, and innovative progressive moves in very important areas.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly will not criticize the Minister for getting a generous block of federal funding into the overall picture to enable the province to carry on programs that it has designed and developed and wants to carry on for the future of post-secondary education in Manitoba. I find it, though, very strangely parallel to the circumstances in the late '70s, when changes were made in the overall Federal-Provincial Block Funding Agreements for Health and Post-Secondary Education whereby certain members on her side of the House argued that because we were utilizing more federal funds that we were somehow getting away with murder in utilizing fewer provincial

funds, because the federal funds were available and that we were therefore subverting or prostituting the intent of the Federal-Provincial Post-Secondary Education and Health funding in this province.

All we were doing was making maximum use of the funds available to us and there was no question that they were made and put forth in a desire to carry on the programs in post-secondary education. I find it strangely parallel though, and I would hope that when I read back some of her colleague's speeches on the matter that they won't be embarrassed by, in essence, doing the same thing today when they find that federal funding is available to them and enables them to perhaps cut back in certain ways in their own funding in order to achieve their purposes.

Mr. Chairman, would you like to call (c) . . . sorry, before you do, just one, again, general comment. Can you give me an indication as to why Other Expenditures appear to have gone up very substantially at the three community colleges - 40 percent at Assiniboine, for instance?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the large increase at Assiniboine is because we're carrying the full cost of courses that were started last year. I think sometimes we bring programs in; they're brought in at different times of the year. Sometimes in a budget, we're carrying the beginnings of the programs and perhaps only a quarter or a half. This is one where the programs were begun, but this is the first year that we're carrying the full brunt of the programs for an entire year.

**MR. G. FILMON:** That was due to the expansion that occurred the previous year at Assiniboine Community College?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, four programs.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm familiar with that. In fact, I know that expansion had been committed under our government, and in fact was just about complete when the Minister took over and that occasioned some new courses to be offered at the community college.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c)(1) to 5.(e)(2)—pass; 5.(f)(1), Personnel Branch, Salaries.

Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. The committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

## IN SESSION PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the agenda for Private Members' Hour on Monday is proposed resolutions.

Resolution No. 11.

## RES. II - UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.



**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas that:

WHEREAS Canada has a health care system designed to provide comprehensive medical care to all Canadians regardless of income; and,

WHEREAS a number of Provincial Governments have authorized deterrent fees for hospital and other medical care, and have authorized extra billing for medical services; and,

WHEREAS these practices seriously threaten the universal accessibility of the health care system and thereby threaten the integrity of our entire health care system; and,

WHEREAS the integrity of Canada's Health Care System had been further threatened by federal cutbacks and transfer payments to the provinces;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Legislative Assembly reaffirm its commitment to a universal health care system that is accessible to all Canadians regardless of income;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Assembly opposes deterrent fees and extra billing for medical services; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Assembly calls upon the Federal Government to maintain its financial support of Canada's Health Care System.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In introducing the resolution before us today I'd like to indicate that I do so out of great concern for the future of our entire health care system, not only in the Province of Manitoba but across this country.

In recent months there have been a number of developments that concern me very greatly and I'm sure developments that concern many members of this House very greatly. I'd like to address some of those issues along with some of the long-term issues that threaten the viability of our health-care system in Canada at the present time.

I don't want to spend too much time on the background of health-care system, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure most of the members of this House are more than aware of it. I would like to highlight, though, the importance of a universal health-care system to members of this side of the House. I would like to point out in this regard that it was the CCF, the forerunner of the NDP and the NDP itself which for many years carried the issue to the people of this country, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, it was in large part due to the lobbying efforts of successive CCF and NDP Members of Parliament, it was due to the example set by the CCF government of Saskatchewan, that we have the present medical system that we have today.

It had a number of developments critical to its development, the introduction of hospital insurance in 1957 and it was capped of course by The Medical Care Act of 1968. It was out of the passage of this Act

that we came to have what is generally called Medicare although that more technically refers specifically to health care other than hospital care.

But in addressing the issue of health care and hospital care today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to look at the broad range of areas and the broad range of problems that we're faced with at the present time.

Out of the system that we have today, I think there are a number of principles that can be identified as being partially or completely fulfilled. Those principles, Mr. Speaker, are universality, accessibility, portability, comprehensiveness and public non-profit administration. And as I've said, Mr. Speaker, in some cases I feel at least that those principles are not completely followed, they're not completely embodied by our present system, but while that system is not perfect I do feel that it does carry out many of these principles in a large part. It's a very important aspect of Canadian society, Mr. Speaker. I think that's shown specifically by the fact that in 1981 we spent 7.8 percent of gross national product on health care. That's a total of \$23 billion, rather a significant commitment by the people of this country to their health-care system.

But, that health-care system, Mr. Speaker, is being threatened. It's being threatened on a number of fronts. It's being threatened in some very visible ways and some very insidious ways, Mr. Speaker. It's being threatened by government fees, government action, by extra billing, opting out by physicians and it's being threatened by funding cutbacks. I'd like to address each of those three general areas today, Mr. Speaker.

I think the most visible threat in the last few months has been in terms of government fees and more specifically some developments in the Province of Alberta. For those members who are not aware of what has taken place, Mr. Speaker, in that province, perhaps one of the most rich provinces in this country at the present time with their great Heritage Fund, that province has recently instituted a charge of up to \$20.00 a day for hospital patients - \$20.00 a day, Mr. Speaker. That province has increased admission fees to a maximum of \$20.00. They have doubled charges for private and semi-private rooms, Mr. Speaker, and they've also increased their medicare fees. They've increased those to the range now where they're between \$168 and \$336 a year to Albertans.

I feel that is a shame - it's shameful. As a matter of fact, I think it's absolutely disgusting, but I will address my own personal thoughts on that perhaps a bit later because I want to point out that what has happened in Alberta, what has happened there in the recent months is perhaps not a unique development. In British Columbia, where there are already some charges, for example, there are charges for acute-care spaces in that province, there were recently proposals which were leaked because of perhaps the election campaign being on, but they were recently released and they indicated that British Columbia was also looking at the possibility of a similar sort of system for charging patients in their province extra fees for hospital admission and for daily charges. So it's not unique to Alberta alone, Mr. Speaker. Neither is the continued existence of medicare premiums unique to Alberta. As I mentioned in that province, they range between \$168 and \$336, while in B.C. for example, Mr. Speaker, they still have medicare fees and they range from \$180 to \$384 a year. That's

two very well-off provinces, I think, Mr. Speaker. Let's take a third one, perhaps one of the other provinces which ranks up with those two provinces as being amongst the wealthiest in the country.

That province is Ontario. Thanks to recent increases that took place, coincidentally very shortly after the recent election victory by the Conservatives in that province, they now pay between \$324 and \$648 a year for medicare premiums. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, a member on this side of the House says, shame. I agree with that. That is most shameful for a province with resources like that to have to tax the sick the way in which they're doing, Mr. Speaker, in a very, very regressive manner.

So as you can see, Mr. Speaker, there are basically two levels in which this threat is developing. The one level is through the continued existence and the expansion of medicare fees, one of the most regressive forms of taxation, Mr. Speaker, one of the most regressive. But beyond that, there is a new and more insidious threat and that is through the addition of these various daily charges, admission charges, whatever you want to call them. I call them deterrent fees, because that is exactly what they will do for hospital access in those provinces. They will deter people; they will deter poor people; they will deter middle-income people, Mr. Speaker, from having access to the medical facilities that they need.

I would point in this regards, Mr. Speaker, to a survey in Alberta that showed quite recently that as many as 25 percent of Albertans indicated they would be reluctant to take advantage of the health care that they might otherwise take advantage of. They would be reluctant, Mr. Speaker, to do that, because of additional charges. This survey, Mr. Speaker, was before the recently announced changes by the Alberta Government, so I hate to think how many Albertans are going to stay at home when they are sick or going to keep their children home when they are sick because of those extra charges. I hate to think of it, Mr. Speaker.

Those of course, are developments in provinces other than our own. Should we be concerned about that here in Manitoba? Should we just look after our own situation where, of course, we don't have medicare fees, thanks to the move by the Schreyer Government to eliminate them back in the early '70s, where we don't have to deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker. Should we be concerned about the situation in other provinces?

Well I say we should, Mr. Speaker, for basically two reasons: One is, we should be concerned as Canadians for the plight of our fellow Canadians; in this particular case, the plight of our fellow Canadians in Alberta, in British Columbia, in Ontario, in other provinces such as Newfoundland where they are also charging for medical services. We should be concerned, Mr. Speaker, because those charges violate the very spirit of medicare; they violate the very spirit of the health care system that we have in Canada today. So we should be concerned at that particular level out of concern for our fellow Canadians, but I think it should go beyond that, Mr. Speaker.

I feel that we should be concerned for the very integrity of the system itself because, if one province starts charging these fees, who knows what province will do it next? If the Conservatives in Alberta are going to do it, why now the Conservatives in Ontario? Why

not the Conservatives in Newfoundland? Why not in Nova Scotia? Why not in New Brunswick? What is to stop them from imposing the same kind of shameful deterrent fees, the same kind of taxes on the sick, Mr. Speaker?

Well, there is very little legally that can be done. I know the Federal Government is trying. They are trying to prevent the Alberta Government from going ahead and instituting these charges, but there is some question as to whether they can do it, Mr. Speaker. I feel the only way of preventing that is through political pressure from people in other provinces and from within those provinces themselves which say to those governments that, no, we want to keep our medicare system the way it is. We do not want these deterrent charges. We do not want these taxes on the sick.

Those are the two reasons why I feel it is important to speak up today on that particular aspect of the issue, Mr. Speaker, but I wouldn't want to suggest that is the only threat to the health care system and, more specifically, the only threat to the accessibility of the health care system. There are other threats as well, Mr. Speaker. In many provinces, there was a threat not just from the government's charging deterrent fees, but from extra billing and opting out. That varies from province to province, Mr. Speaker.

I know in Ontario, for example, approximately 15 percent of physicians have opted out or are extra billing, whereas in Alberta it's an astonishing 50 percent. Those people of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, who are going to be paying deterrent fees for hospital care, also have to pay in a lot of cases for extra billing from their physicians. So once again, they face the same kind of deterrent. Once again, they face the problem, the decision whether to send their children for the badly-needed medical care that they require, simply because they cannot afford it. Once again, they're faced with that dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure some members will say, well how significant are these figures? What does it mean to the average person? For example, what does it mean in some of the provinces where the figures are somewhat lower than other provinces? Well it can still mean a great deal, Mr. Speaker. In those provinces where there is a smaller percentage of doctors opting out, there is often a very high percentage of certain specialists who have opted out, a very high percentage. In some cases, you may go to a city or town and find that all the specialists - in fact, in some cities or towns, as many as 80 percent of all doctors have opted out or are extra billing, Mr. Speaker, however one wants to refer to it.

So what it means for people living in those communities, they have no choice. They have to pay the extra amount. What it means in actual terms, Mr. Speaker, is that medicare just doesn't function in those communities. It just doesn't mean anything. Those principles I mentioned earlier, they just don't mean anything. The universal accessibility, you know, the non-profit aspect of it, the comprehensiveness of it, those principles may be fine in abstract terms but they don't mean much to someone in a community that doesn't have the choice and has to pay the extra fees. So it means a lot in those terms, Mr. Speaker.

What does it mean in monetary amounts? Well it can also mean quite a considerable amount when it's added

up, Mr. Speaker. For example, statistics have shown that the average physician who is extra billing is receiving an additional \$1,400 a month, Mr. Speaker. That's more than many people make as their entire salary, so it's a very significant amount. Figures, I think, have shown that could amount to something in the range of between \$50 million and \$100 million in Canada in terms of extra billing, so it's quite a significant problem.

So as I said, Mr. Speaker, the threat comes not just from government action directly, but the continued existence of opting out, of extra billing, which as far as I'm concerned is in total violation of those very important principles of The National Health Care Act which I outlined earlier.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, those are only two of the three major threats. There is a third one as well, and that impacts directly on Manitoba. That, Mr. Speaker, is in terms of the cutbacks of funding that are taking place at the present time in regards to federal transfers to the provinces. This relates back, Mr. Speaker, for those who are interested in this matter, as I'm sure are most members of this House, to the switchover in 1977 to block funding, the EPF funding system and the recent changes to that system which will result in losses to the provinces of \$6.2 billion over the next five years. That's \$6.2 billion, Mr. Speaker. That impact is already being felt.

In 1982-83, for example, increases in EPF in terms of health and education accounted for approximately 5 percent, whereas provincial spending, which had to be increased to compensate for this decline in EPF was up by 15 percent. That is a trend that is going to accelerate over the next few years, Mr. Speaker, as the Federal Government cuts back further on EPF funding. It is a trend that we have to face here in Manitoba. It is one of the reasons why we have been faced with increased deficits for example, Mr. Speaker, in the last two years. It is because of those very same cut backs.

We here in the Province of Manitoba, the NDP Government of Manitoba, we have said that we are not going to follow the shameful course of other provinces. We are not going to make up that money by taxing the sick. We're not going to make up that money by taxing the sick. We're not going to impose the deterrent fees and tax them that way. We're not going to bring in medicare premiums because that would be abandoning the very principles of the health care system that we have at the present time. We said, we will maintain those services and we realize that will result in higher deficits. It will result in a higher financial burden on the province but we are willing to do it because it has to be done.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it's a trend that will continue and accelerate in the upcoming years. Even the last two or three years we've seen it very extensively. For example, 1979-1980, 47.8 percent of total spending on health was from the Federal Government. By 1982-1983 that had dropped to 40 percent. That is a drop of 7.8 percent in that short time period alone. So, it's a very very serious problem, Mr. Speaker.

So those are the three problems that I outlined in the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I think some of them have been developing for years. Some of them are more recent developments. I would say at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I would acknowledge that the system we

have is not a perfect system. There are many ways in which it could be improved. I personally would like to see greater attention paid to preventive health care, rather than merely a treatment of sickness and illness itself. I think those things have to be discussed, Mr. Speaker, and looked into in terms of the future.

But while our system is not perfect, I think it is an excellent system, Mr. Speaker. It stands up very well to other systems throughout the world. I would point out in this regard, Mr. Speaker, in comparison to our neighbours to the south, how well our system is functioning. In the United States, for example, the recent 1975 survey showed that 20 cents out of every health care dollar, was spent on health care administration because of their profit-oriented hospitals; because of the proliferation of various facilities in that country and that compared to approximately two cents in Canada; a dramatic difference, Mr. Speaker.

Because of differences like that, well we spend a smaller percentage of our GNP on health care. We actually have a much better system than they do in the United States, Mr. Speaker. That is in very large part, due to Medicare itself. It is due to the rationalizations that is part of that. It's due to the very access itself. It is a very fundamental reason why we have such an excellent health care system.

If we continue to allow these developments, Mr. Speaker, if we continue to allow provinces to tax the sick through Medicare premiums; to impose deterrent fees on hospital patients; if we continue to allow that the system will erode; it will crumble. If we continue to allow extensive opting out, Mr. Speaker, extensive extra billing, that system will erode. If we continue to watch the Federal Government cut back its support for health care in this country, Mr. Speaker, that system will erode.

Those principles I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, of universality, of accessibility, of portability, of comprehensiveness, of public non-profit administration, those very things will erode. What we will lose in the process is a system that has taken many years to develop; the people throughout this country have fought for; members of this party as the CCF or the NDP and members of other parties, Mr. Speaker, who come to see the wisdom of a universal health care system in this country; members of those parties who have come to see the wisdom of that; and the vast majority of Canadians who share the concern about the future of this system, if we continue to allow these things, Mr. Speaker, it will erode; it will destroy the system. We will have lost all that has happened in the last few years, Mr. Speaker, we will have lost all the progress that we have had in the last few years in terms of our health care system.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this resolution, I hope that we will get unanimous support from all members of this House. I truthfully do. There are times when we disagree, I realize that, but on an issue as important as this, on issues related directly to the health care of Manitobans and of Canadians, I would plead with all members of this House to support this resolution and to stop the erosion of our health care system, our Medicare system before it is too late.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the member for bringing forward this resolution. It's time that a resolution such as this was discussed within this Legislature.

The member proposes a resolution which, of course, has become a motherhood resolution and a motherhood issue in Canada, that is providing comprehensive medical care to all Canadians regardless of income.

All of us in Manitoba are proud of the Medicare system that is provided to our citizens. The excellent care patients receive is certainly appreciated by our citizens. This was brought to my attention again during the past months when my dad was confined to a hospital for a period of six weeks. I personally wish to thank first of all the medical staff and the nursing staff at the Bethel Hospital in Winkler for the excellent care that they provided, and later on the medical staff, the nursing care of Ward 6A Urology, at the St. Boniface Hospital. My dad is 85 years of age and experienced a very difficult time. Our family appreciated very much the excellent care he received during his stay in hospital.

In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, the patients that complain about rough beds, sleeping on tarps, or receiving only two strips of bacon maybe do not deserve the excellent care that is made available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I also want us in Manitoba to retain this health care program available to all Manitobans. I would like to refer to the sections which the member already read. In the second paragraph it says:

"WHEREAS a number of Provincial Governments have authorized deterrent fees for hospital and other medical care and have authorized extra billing for medical services, and

WHEREAS these practices seriously threaten the universal accessibility of the health care system and thereby threaten the integrity of our entire health care system, and

WHEREAS the integrity of Canada's health care system has been further threatened by federal cutbacks in transfer of payments to the provinces,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly reaffirm its commitment to a universal health care system that is accessible to all Canadians regardless of income."

This section however, Mr. Speaker, does not refer to Manitobans only. Other provinces may have just cause to justify their actions. I don't know the situation in these provinces and I'm sure that neither does the member who just spoke on this resolution. We do know that the cost of health care in Manitoba is presenting a big problem for all of us.

Ten years ago when I first became a member, I believe the cost of health care was \$300 per person in this province. Now we are spending \$1,023,000,000 on health care, or \$1,000 for every man, woman and child in this province. If we are to continue in this direction, with an average increase of 13 percent, which we are witnessing and which is about the average increase that we have seen in health care in Manitoba, then in six years the cost will be \$2,000 per person, for every man, woman and child in Manitoba; and in 12 years, it's going to be \$4,000 for every man, woman and child. Under the present circumstances, Mr. Speaker, then Manitoba certainly cannot afford this.

During the past two years, our tax base has diminished, rather than increased in Manitoba. This is

due to bankruptcies, and the poor economic conditions, generally. This is why the former government worked hard to attract new industry, such as, Alcan, potash, the Western Power Grid and all the ancillary businesses these projects would generate, so that we would have a growing tax base and be able to share costs of programs, such as, health care, among many other taxpayers and industries in Manitoba.

We will have to face reality sometime; the longer we wait the more difficult will be the decisions. Department of Health, the largest department in Manitoba, action must be taken now so that we can get some of these costs under control. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see a task force which would include all providers of health care to come up with the most efficient plan to control escalating costs.

We would have to start with administration, there certainly is duplication of administration, there is a waste of administration; we can do much looking at administration. We must pay more attention to preventative medicine than what we have been paying up to now, because it is in this area where great savings can be generated.

Also, with the Mental Health Program, we have been procrastinating with the Mental Health Program, especially the program for adolescents, for years and years. Ten years ago, when I first came in again, it was brought to our attention that we desperately needed a children's mental health hospital. We still don't have it today, although the program is supposed to get under way in a few months, which is going to be a big plus, but this should have been done much sooner.

We will have to take a good look at our geriatric program, this is where huge expenditures are made. We have more older people every year and we are really not facing up to the situation as to looking after them in the most efficient way that we can. We have to look after our personal care program, still a lot more needs to be done in that area.

And what about abuse of our health care system? Mr. Speaker, we have no statistics, there is nobody who has ever done a study on seeing how much abuse there is so we can't really make any valid observations on that particular end of it, whether user fees would be a deterrent, would be saving money for Manitobans. We just don't know because we don't have those type of statistics.

The No. 1 problem in coping with all these problems is that there is no trust between the various providers of health care. We see confrontation, rather co-operation in every aspect of health care. There is confrontation between the doctors versus the Minister; there is confrontation between the doctors and the R.N.s; there is confrontation between the R.N.s and the LPNs. Really no concerted effort has been made to try to get all these people around one table and discuss health within the Province of Manitoba and how can we deal with this most efficiently.

What about funding for hospitals, Mr. Speaker? The present setup that we have, the funding is approved for a hospital and if that hospital should have a particular saving in that particular year, if they had been operating very efficiently, then next year's funding is cut back by the amount that they saved in that year. This is one of the biggest problems possibly that we have in Manitoba right now. There is absolutely no incentive

to save and we certainly have to take a look at the way that we do funding towards hospitals.

I'm also concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the activities that are taken by other provinces, but we have to face reality. There is just no way that we can continue to wear blinkers and say that we will forever and ever and ever be able to keep up the way that we are at the present time. Yes, Alberta is charging a user fee, at the present time, or at least they are going to, but I don't know if that is all that important, Mr. Speaker. What matters is the final cost of the service to everybody. The Member for Thompson is very concerned about the poor people who will not be able to afford this deterrent cost. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a very simple matter, that people who cannot afford they don't pay it, there is no problem there, but we have to take a look. I'm sure the member does not know what the overall cost is in Alberta. Is it \$1,000 cost per person, every man, woman and child in Alberta the same as what it is in Manitoba? I don't know; he doesn't know.

These are all questions that have to be taken into consideration when we talk about a resolution such as this and we should be looking at the overall provision of health care in Manitoba and, indeed, all of Canada.

The previous member said that he is quite willing in order to retain the health care system that we have in Manitoba, to go into higher deficits because he feels that these higher deficits are justified. Again, Mr. Speaker, I must say that we can only go so and so far with higher deficits. Sometime or other a day of reckoning is going to come, and the sooner that we are going to realize this the sooner that we are going to pay attention to where we are going, as far as health care is concerned, the less painful it's going to be; the longer we wait the more painful it is going to be. I would just like to say, let us get a task force going that is going to include all providers of health care and, let us all, for once, build on a feeling of trust, work together and see what kind of a health plan we can come up with which is going to serve Manitobans the best.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking for myself on this resolution. The resolution has not been caucused, but we have to take a look at the complete picture before we can go along with some of the suggestions that are made in here. For instance, I, myself at this present time, until I have more information, statistics to justify this statement, be it further resolved that this Assembly oppose deterrent fees and extra billing for medical services.

I don't know if that at the present time is what we need. We need statistics. So, Mr. Speaker, then I must say that I believe that there will be an amendment coming forward, but at this particular time there are some things within this resolution that I would feel difficult to support.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I thought following the comments by my good colleague, the Member for Thompson, that one would not have any trouble whatsoever in this resolution with having a fair degree of unanimity in this House. It seems right now, as is expressed by the Member

for Sturgeon Creek who's stomping out of the House and he doesn't seem to want to stay in the House to defend his position, just talking a few minutes ago, he was referring - this is the Member for Sturgeon Creek - that someday you're going to have pay, that someday you're going to have to face up to reality. The Member for Turtle Mountain just inferred to us that the credit rating, from his verbal utterances from his bench, I assume that what he is saying is that the credit ratings are going to determine whether or not if he was in government we would have extra billing, or whether we would have user fees both for hospitals and for doctor's visits. It's quite incredible, but it worries me more now, quite frankly, than when we brought this resolution forward.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I disassociate myself from the remarks that the Member for Inkster is making. He's trying to attribute comments to me that I did not make. I just want it on the record, if that's the case.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the honourable member for that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I clearly heard him state, when we were speaking on this particular issue, he was commenting from his seat about a credit rating. When we're talking about health charges and he's talking about credit ratings, I tend to feel that he's making some comment on the health system, of our affordability of that system.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get sidetracked and run down any side roads here. I'd like to comment on the situation that our health system really is in today. There is a crisis, there's no question about it. It's a crisis that's not simply a motherhood issue any more unfortunately; it's gone past what we figure should be a motherhood issue. It is obvious that several governments, pretty near universally of a blue stripe, are not seeing this as a motherhood issue at all any more of Medicare and the maintenance of good health services for Canadians from coast to coast, Canadians in any province, no matter what party is in power.

Some of the problems that we've got, and I'd like to deal with a few of the problems in Medicare, quite frankly, I think that the system has become far, far too institutionalized. Basically, the doctors in their operations use hospitals far too freely in many instances. They have the public service at their beck and call at rates that are very very expensive, as we all well know, to be able to put people into hospitals when in many instances they could be serviced as outpatients. We tend, by trying to focus our Medicare system around institutions themselves, I think that we have over time done a disservice to the future of Medicare. The reason I say that is because by doing that the cost multiplies. The costs are far, far higher, both on a per visit basis, and the cost per day when people are having to stay in a hospital situation.

I think the system has become far, far too oriented toward the highest qualified sector of the health

professionals, and that is medical doctors, in particular. Something that's become a phenomenon really of the past 15 years or so is the number of so-called specialists where people go back in for postgraduate training, be it in orthopedics or be it in obstetrics or whatever. It's not that one does not want to have doctors with the fullest expertise in particular areas and specialists, but there are many areas where our greatest shortage now is in GPs, in general practitioners.

An awful lot of the work that GPs do and that specialists do as well can be serviced very well by the group of professionals who are often classified as paramedics, such as registered nurses, such as physiotherapists, occupational therapists, people in these groupings. I know for a fact from association with physiotherapists, which is quite longstanding now, that in most instances a person has to go, or had in the past at least, and there has been some legislative change in regard to this, and finally it is coming through and I'm glad to see that it has come through, and to give the physios a little bit more leeway in their practice, for previously every client that they saw had to be referred to them through a medical doctor. From our association, I know that an awful lot of people, the physios, in the order forms, as far as prescribing a treatment for the patient, had simple things like a sore neck. It was up to the physio to define what the problem is and to come up with a treatment for that injury, which is the way it should be. The question is whether or not it always has to go through a medical doctor who has much less training in those particular areas than does someone trained as a physiotherapist.

So we have a health system that is, I would say, top heavy as far as having to channel anyone through one particular segment of it before they get down to the actual people who are giving the services. I'm not trying to say that I want all the physiotherapists and the paraprofessionals or paramedics to end up having doctors' fees, not at all. By having a greater number of people first off involved with high qualifications and certainly fully competent qualifications, one can provide a service which is not inferior at all to the present system that we have; in many instances would maybe even make it more accessible without having to spend more money. You do not always have to spend more and more money; you don't have to throw money at problems. You have to work through the problems to find out where you can use your money more effectively.

What I'm afraid of, because of the situation that the whole country's in now and as far as a financial crisis as well, is that we are looking for scapegoats. We're looking for areas we're spending lots of dollars, and we're looking for simplistic solutions in order to try and reduce the amount of dollars committed to those particular services. The two biggest areas, of course, are health and education.

I just said you don't throw money at problems and perhaps we have thrown money and I'm sure we have thrown money in the past at problems in the health and education fields. You have to try and look carefully at how the money is being spent, who the benefactors are, who the actual people who are giving the services are, and how you can get the patient directly to the people who are giving the service to the patient.

We have, because of the financial crisis, the simplistic solutions of taxing the sick and that is what health

premiums are, taxes on the sick, as the Member for Thompson pointed out, that's simply all they are. Even a more crass one - they can be called a tax insurance - even more crass tax on the sick is the user fees themselves.

Look at what's happening in other provinces. We have Alberta, by far the richest province in the whole country. They not only have premiums and their premium fees, for a family with an income, a taxable income at least, of \$5,000; they only give a 50 percent subsidy so they still have to pay half of their health cost if they earn somewhere in the vicinity, I believe, of about \$17,000-\$18,000, you have a \$5,000 taxable income and that's given a fair number of deductions. So \$17,000 is not a very big income today and to have to end up paying not only a premium, a health care premium, starting at that income level and that health care premium, by the way, is \$384 a year for a family; a family struggling in times as they are today.

Other provinces dealing with the premium structures themselves, perhaps the most conservative of them at all, the true conservatives, are the Social Credit Party in British Columbia and theirs is \$384 for a family of three or more. I correct myself. Alberta is \$336, not \$384.00. I was quoting the wrong province; I apologize to Alberta for saying that they were charging \$50 more than they actually are charging. B.C.'s rate, and they're talking of even increasing this more, the taxable income is half of that, almost half of that, of Alberta's, \$2,800 and then they have to start paying 50 percent of their premiums.

In Ontario, formerly the wealthiest of all the provinces, but the one I believe that's got the longest history of health premiums, it had them right from the start I believe, families there are paying \$648 a year. All of these have some exemptions to them. Ontario's exemption is rather complex; I don't want to go through the whole thing here now, but the thing that bothers me more than anything else about them is that an awful lot of them are negotiated in companies and in public services where there are unions strong enough to be able to negotiate the payment of these premiums, it's paid for, but for the working poor, for the people without unions, without the benefit of collective bargaining, they are the ones that end up having to pay the highest premiums and they're the ones that can least afford it, Mr. Speaker.

It's an incredibly - I don't want to say corrupt because it's corrupt as far as Medicare is concerned, it is certainly most inequitable as far as taxation goes. With user fees, when user fees are the direct on-the-spot taxes on people who are sick because you don't go to the hospital unless you are, and if you do your doctor should inform you very quickly not to be returning over chronic complaints or something where there really is no medical evidence of any problems in a person, and that's a doctor's responsibility and the health professional's responsibility. But in British Columbia they currently have \$7.50 per day charge on people using a hospital and for rehab as well, I might add.

In Alberta the current charge is \$5.00 a day for admission charges and \$8.00 a day for a charge for each day over 120 days. They're talking about doubling these, Mr. Speaker, doubling them. \$10.00 a day just to walk into the door of the hospital and hospitals may charge up to \$20 a day, depending on their own

circumstances of whether that hospital's operating at a deficit or not. So if the hospital's operating at a deficit, the people who can least afford it are going to be the ones that are most likely to end up paying a charge.

An awful lot of health problems that people have today are related to their work and if one does not have authorization or recognition that the problem is caused by industrial pollution or caused by workplace, if they're not recognized by the Workers Compensation Board they have to go to the doctor. They go to a doctor for treatment, and I would suggest that that's a good number of the cases of people who are ending up in hospital, be it with emphysema in later life, there are other problems, heart disease and arterial diseases, as well as lung diseases, and they're the ones that are going to end up paying by far the most of it, because most of us, especially in so-called white collar work, you don't have the same risks, your health isn't put at the same risk as those people who are out, be it on a farm, with all the dust and what-not from the farm and the chemicals that they're using today on the farm and the health hazards that come along with that, or people in industries, and especially the heavier industries.

Most industries are doing a remarkable job in attempting to meet a problem which previously was ignored or, in many instances, not recognized and I give them full credit for the moves that they have been making over the years. But for an awful lot of the people that have been working in those plants for 20 or 30 years and are now having the health consequences of them, that's long beyond a company's responsibility; it's a public responsibility. And every time they go to a hospital in Alberta now they're going to end up paying up to \$20 a day to be able to stay in that hospital, plus a \$10 fee just to walk in the door.

Newfoundland, by far the poorest province in the whole country and desperate for revenues, has also got a \$5 a day fee for people that have been in, I believe, it's over 15 days.

So we end up with a health care system which right now is complete, but under the threats of health premiums are they levied in British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario, that's a severe infringement I believe on the basic concept of what medicare is supposed to be, the user fees are that much more, Mr. Speaker, of a direct violation of the principles of medicare.

Now we come to opting out, and a doctor's opting out of the service. Because the service is so centred around medical doctors, one has a problem that they can basically hold the whole system up to ransom by opting out, and therefore, not having the poorer people in the society or the people that just don't feel that they should be paying for the services, ending up receiving the medical services that they require.

There's an awful lot of people won't go and can't afford to go and I certainly run into people almost daily, in my constituency, who are having a heck of a difficult time making ends meet, and for them, if one of their kids is sick or if a parent is sick and they're afraid to go to the hospital because they're not going to be able to afford to pay a fee, and afraid to go to their doctor because their doctor has opted out, because they're going to have to pay extra over and above what they're going to be reimbursed. In many instances they're not

going to be able to pay up front. They don't have the cash up front to be able to pay for the service, to be able to pay the \$20 or \$30 for the visit to the doctor's office.

You see it right now in dental care, and dental care has a direct relationship, if you do any looking at all, between income levels and the care and the state of people's teeth, and I submit that the main reason for that is financial, because the people cannot afford it, and you can be - and I'm looking at some of my own family in this case - without healthy teeth, one is in one heck of a difficult time to be able to eat properly and get good nutrition. You have so many older folks in particular who have lost their teeth.

I've seen areas, I've taught school in the Lac-St.-Jean district in Quebec where there was just the worst teeth I've ever seen in my life, kids, 15-year-old kids, having all their teeth pulled because their parents couldn't afford to send them to the dentist, and because the dentists in the area were anything but progressive as well. In many instances, the parents sent the kids with the instructions, get your teeth pulled because if I spend \$15 filling it now, I don't want to spend another \$15 or \$30, or whatever it is to fill a tooth today, another year down the road. So you get rid of the tooth and you get rid of recurring bills.

We're running into the very same thing when we have MD's opting out, when we have MD's charging extra, and you see in Saskatchewan where an estimated 50 percent to 60 percent of the practitioners have opted out of Medicare. That puts an incredible strain on the whole system and the chances of one having a doctor who isn't opted out is basically 50-50. You're going to have to start picking and choosing your doctors, not according to what the bedside manner is, or how that doctor deals with the individual, and your faith in that doctor, but having to deal, instead, on what it's going to cost you and trying to go to the doctors that are covered under the public plan, whether they be better, or whether they be worse.

In Ontario, in some areas, I understand 100 percent of the doctors have opted out; overall, it's about 15 percent, with 7 percent extra billing. We're at a state where it is not, as the Member for Rhineland said in his closing remarks, what matters is the final cost to the system. Certainly the matter of cost is very important, but the fundamental and the most important aspect of all is the quality of health care. Paying for health care does not mean anything at all as far as high quality, we have to recognize that very clearly.

So, what we have today, in my conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is we have a health system that is in crisis; we have to address it, and the way you do not address it is taking a simplistic solution, a simplistic look; encouraging opting out or allowing opting out on doctor's behalves; and bringing in premium structures or bringing in user fees. That will only serve to destroy Medicare, as was brought in in the late 60s in Canada and gave us what is probably the best health system in the whole world.

Let of look at reallocation of existing funds; let us look at the basic guts of our health care system and improving that, not eroding what we have today and eroding, especially, on the basis of income.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, by leave, if we can call it 5:30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the wish of the House to call it 5:30. (Agreed) That being so, the Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and subject to the members reconvening in committee this evening the House do now adjourn and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday).