

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Friday, January 27, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of Mother Frances Byblow and Others Praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate St. Paul's Home.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of Donald Ralph Graham and Others Praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Agricultural and Community District of Newdale.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): introduced Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee ready to consider resolutions? Resolution No. . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: First resolution: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to establish a commission to study projects, problems and schemes relating in any way to water that may be referred to it, and providing, among other matters, the costs incurred in respect of the commission be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

Are you ready to speak?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, it is considered advisable to establish an advisory commission to have the power to consider matters that might be referred to it. The importance of water I think in Canada is fast coming into its own and the need for establishing priorities for the use of that water. One of the major items that needs to be considered is Lake Winnipeg and the licensing of water and it's felt that to have some authority of this kind in the form of a commission that can hold hearings and listen to the reasoning of all of the various interested groups and coming up with a policy that makes the most effective use of this natural resource of ours, would be almost a necessity. So I recommend the establishment of the commission to the House.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be able to give us somewhat more details at this time as to the composition of this commission and exactly what the terms of reference are going to be. Will it, in fact, be dealing with all of the water in the Province of Manitoba, all the questions of drainage, the requests that come from the many different parts of the province for additional drainage works, for watershed controls, for reservoirs, for damming, and so on. What will its relationship be with PFRA who have been in the past the Federal body concerned with these matters? How many members does the Minister expect the commission will have? Will it be a permanent commission or is this merely a study commission for a period of time? I think if the Minister could give us these details now, in committee, we'll be in a much better position to discuss the long-range programs of the government.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I didn't catch quite all that the Minister said in the introduction of the resolution. I'm somewhat intrigued by the way the resolution is set out in that "it is expedient to bring in a measure to establish a commission to study projects, problems and schemes relating in any way to water which may be referred to it". Do I take it, Mr. Minister,

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . from this that the question of pollution of water may be one of the problems referred to this commission? I trust that it is because there is no area to my knowledge insofar as water itself is concerned in the province, that needs a thorough investigation than that of the question of pollution of our water. Now maybe the Minister could simply say "No, it is not" and then I'll not need to go on further insofar as pollution is concerned. Is it or is it not? Could you just give me a simple answer to that because if it is not then I can cease talking on the pollution angle, but if it is, then I'd like to say a few words. I don't want to take the time of the Committee. . . .

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I came really prepared to debate the financial aspects of the bill, not the detail. I don't have a copy of the bill with me. My recollection is that it can study any aspect containing to water that is referred to it by the Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully suggest that apart from the other areas such as PFRA and drainage, the most important problem that we are going to be faced with and are being faced with in Manitoba at the present time, in my opinion, is the question of the ever-growing pollution of our waters. We know a couple of years or so ago of the difficulty that they had even with the operation of the Lockport Locks as the result of detergents and the effect on the Red River itself and the outflow. We know that some of our biologists have drawn to our attention that the fish population is decreasing in many areas due to the pollution of the water. We know that even in The Pas with Churchill Forests Industries, permission has been granted for the disposal of some of the by-products into the waters there. And this is going on. We know just -- as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the papers refer to a complaint of North Kildonan as the result of possible pollution going into the Red River to a greater degree from the North Winnipeg Sewage District. I'm informed that even Lake Winnipeg, for the first couple of miles at least at the southern end of Lake Winnipeg, the degree of pollution has taken effect that the fish population there is going down to a considerable degree.

So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister in this commission, will make sure that the commission will be able to review this whole situation. It is my understanding that there was consideration of a joint scheme between the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba to consider the whole matter of the availability of water, the pollution of our rivers and our streams, but according to the announcement in the press - and I'm not suggesting whether it was true or whether it was not - it suggests that the First Minister has rejected the participation of Manitoba into this field because of the reasons of economics, that Manitoba just cannot afford at the present time to go into such a scheme.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba can ill afford not to go into such a scheme. Water is fast becoming one of the more important commodities that we are facing problems in. As I understand it the engineer responsible for Metro insofar as its waterworks just the other day said there is the possibility in seven years even the supply of available water in the Greater Winnipeg area may become a problem. I'm wondering whether or not these are the types of problems in addition to the problems as those raised by the Leader of the Opposition of drainage and that these problems that I'm mentioning this morning; to me far more important than the others, will be the subject of review and consideration by the commission itself. I sincerely trust and hope so, Mr. Chairman, and when the bill does come in we will be able to ascertain to a greater degree the depth of this resolution.

And may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if this particular commission is not going to be charged with the duty of performing an investigation into the pollution of water, as I am suggesting at the present time, then I trust and hope that the government through some other body will assure the citizens of Manitoba that this grave problem is being looked into adequately and solutions proposed for the eradication of the pollutions in our waters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): The two resolutions appearing on the Order Paper that we are discussing this morning are very interesting, in my opinion, and I certainly have some questions in mind that I would like to have answered from the Minister if at all possible. First of all is this going to be a permanent commission or will this just be for the time being and that once they're appointed and served on a certain problem, that they might be, the board might be dissolved and we'd be without it. I think permanency should be there so that matters that do come up from time to time should be able to be referred to it.

Then, as already mentioned, that the Minister will have power to refer; will this be limited to the Minister only or will the courts have any right to refer?

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . .

Then what is going to be the relation of this commission to the Water Supply Board? Will this commission have power to recommend changes in rates, water rates, and also in case of any equalization schemes that might be considered for water rates, will this be within the scope of this commission? And I'd like to know just what scope this commission will have once its appointed. I think these are some things that I would like to know more about.

Further, I think it was mentioned that studies pending might be Lake Winnipeg. Are there others that the Minister knows at the present time that could likely be referred to the commission?

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister might indicate to me whether or not the establishment of this commission is going to prevent any action on the part of government in dealing with the problems of the Lake Winnipeg flooding area. I make this observation because I'm concerned that when we get bogged down into commissions that sometimes it takes an awful long time before they present a report and certainly I must point out that farmers in particular affected in the area as a result of the flooding of the last number of years can't afford to wait for an answer. So I hope that the Minister would be in a position to give me an answer on that question. I think it is very important.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give me an idea whether this particular commission could also look into the entire question of the effect of the Red River, Red and Assiniboine Rivers, on the erosion of the river banks in greater Winnipeg. This is a problem that's been with us for many many years, that seems to periodically come to the surface but no action is ever taken. The Rivers and Streams Authority which consists of the municipalities bordering on the rivers within the authority have agreed on a certain set back from the river. This is constantly being fought over between the municipalities, some agreeing with it, others not. Metropolitan government has attempted to establish a policy to recover river bank property for public use; there too it seems to bog down; they set aside an amount of money, one year they weren't sure what to do with it and the next year -- it seems to me this is certainly an area where the provincial government has to take the lead.

I'm very sorry that the former minister of agriculture is no longer in this house. Last spring during the height of the flood when he made one of his tours through the West Kildonan area to inspect the massive dyke that we had put up, he looked at it sorrowfully and said we're about 50 years too late in doing something about this. These homes have no business being here; this land should never have been built on and it's high time that the province did something about it. I'm sorry he's not here now so that I can have him take it over and discuss it with the government. But certainly the present method of allowing homes, buildings to be constructed, to have no clear demarkation of authority as between the rivers and streams authority and the various municipalities, the hassle that continually develops between metro and the municipalities should be cleared up. I'm wondering if this commission, because it says they will study projects relating in any way to water, and I hope that's a wide enough term, since the matter of river bank erosion is due to the flow of the waters, that this could also be studied by the commission and perhaps we might finally get a policy in greater Winnipeg that would be a guide line by which all municipalities may be able to live and which in the long run might resolve the problem because the flooding is with us, it's going to be with us -- I gather that the new floodway will not resolve the problem for low lying lands of which there are many in the greater Winnipeg area. So I wonder if the Minister could advise us whether this is the intention of this commission as well.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Minister does not need my assistance in explaining the terms of the resolution but I would certainly agree with him that the resolution itself makes it clear that this commission, that is to be established, has power if the matter is referred to it by the Minister or the government to study any and all of these problems, because it says "a commission to study projects, problems and schemes relating in any way to water." Well that seems to me could not be wider and I would agree with what the Minister has said that the plan is to refer to this commission any project, problem or scheme that seemed advisable to have studied. My point rather is that here we seem to be setting up one more board or body or commission, as its here called, that will undoubtedly be permanent, there's no question about this; this is not a commission that's set up to make one study or a series of studies and report and be disbanded.

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd). . . This is as I gather from the Minister's explanation an advisory committee within the department which will be charged with specific responsibility for the many many problems that arise with regard to water.

I agree with what has been said, generally, that there certainly are a lot of these problems and they keep changing as the times go on. I don't think this is the proper time to debate the matter at length but all we need to do is recall the fact that we have had recurring periods of high water and periods that are even more serious to the province of not enough water and I still maintain that with all the difficulties that are faced with the high water trouble that in general and in total they are not as serious to the province as the ones that arise in the times of extremely dry weather and low water. I have quoted, before in the House the fact that maybe it sounds a bit cynical, maybe it sounds a bit facetious, but there's a lot of common sense that arises out of the experience over the centuries in this and other countries that says that drainage work should be put in only in times of dry years and flood control work should be put in only in times of high water. Well, this is certainly not always followed and you have to be very careful of the different works that are instituted at one time to see that they don't create some special problems again later on. Because the Honourable Minister so far as I noticed mentioned only one particular matter, Lake Winnipeg, and the extremely high water that has been causing problems there recently, is it not a fact that we had a very careful investigation of that situation just a comparatively few years ago, approximately 8 or 9 I would think: I believe they reported since this government came into office. So far as that area is concerned, is it not a fact that the recommendations of that Commission are still valid, and were those recommendations largely put into effect? If I read the papers correctly during the summer and fall I saw that my honourable friend the Attorney-General was appointed as the representative of the cabinet in dealing with specific and emergency measures to deal with that problem. I wondered at the time why my honourable friend the Attorney-General was chosen rather than the Honourable the Minister of Highways, who I believe is the Minister presently charged with the well -- the fact that he's bringing in this legislation shows that he's the minister charged with this kind of thing. I have great confidence in the Honourable the Attorney-General in some matters but I didn't know this was one of his many specialties. I would have guessed that the Minister who sponsors this resolution would have been more competent to deal with that matter; or the Minister of Education who is personally concerned because of his constituency being there.

But the one point that I would ask the Minister to deal with is what has been done in the meantime. Perhaps he doesn't want to answer this until the Bill is before us, but to give him notice, what has been done with regard to implementing the recommendations of the Lake Winnipeg and Manitoba Board that was a special commission set up to deal with high water problems in that area and which reported, some years ago, to this government that prides itself on getting things dealt with quickly and efficiently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Resolution be adopted?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, if this sums up most of the questions, first of all I'd like to extend my appreciation to the Member for Lakeside I think - who answered pretty well most of the questions that were asked as for the scope of the Bill is concerned because it is intended that all of these matters concerning water can be if felt desirable referred to the commission.

He refers to my colleague the Attorney-General during the high water in Lake Winnipeg and I think I might publicly express my appreciation to the Attorney-General for looking after it because I happened to be absent at the time, I had a few difficulties and since that time I've been trying to lose some weight, I don't know whether anybody's noticed it or not, but I've had a wee bit of success since that time.

In talking about Lake Winnipeg Mr. Chairman, the item that I was really referring to was not the high water so much as the fact of the licencing of the levels at which Lake Winnipeg should be kept in relation to all of the various interests, the property surrounding the lake and the storage of water and so on for the Nelson River. This is going to be a very large project and there are many interests involved in the levels of Lake Winnipeg and something in which I believe all of those interests should very well be heard. There are other areas. I'm not going to attempt to go into the problem areas that will exist from time to time.

As I recollect, the Bill calls for five members. In answer to the Honourable Member for Rhineland I think that it can surely be said that it will likely be permanent, at least permanent until some such time as something else comes along to take its place at probably some distant time in the future. The activity of the members of the Board I would think would be

(MR. WEIR, cont'd) . . . . related to the speed with which projects are referred to them. It may well be that the Chairman would initially have to be a full-time person, I don't see the other members of the Board having anything like that significant amount of work in the original years at any rate.

As far as its relation to the Water Supply Board, there is no relation in the standpoint that the honourable friend mentions. The Water Supply Board make provision for a public appeal to the Public Utility Board as the final authority on the establishment of rates and there will be no change from that.

As far as the prevention of action around Lake Winnipeg for the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, I don't know that there's anything in the bill that would prevent action should that be the decision of the government.

I think Mr. Chairman, that that answers most of the questions that have been asked that might be considered relevant to and at this stage of the Bill.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his replies. I'm a little disturbed at one of the things he says. He tells us that the Chairman is going to be a full-time member and I'm under the impression that all the defeated candidates on that side have already been appointed to something and I don't know how he's going to fill his Board. He'll undoubtedly have to get some names from other sources on this occasion and I'll be happy to help him out if he finds himself in some difficulties insofar as . . .

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): I might suggest to my honourable friend he has more potential in that category than we have. We might be able to reason relieve him of his problem which is much greater than ours.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I appreciate that and I suppose if my honourable friend operates on the basis of take care of your friends first, I suggest to him that we could assist him and I think my colleague the Leader of the NDP also might be able to make some suggestions.

On the serious side, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that there probably will be a full-time Chairman and the Board will be permanent. I wonder if he could tell us now what the proposed budget will be for the Board; how many members he expects to have on it and I think -- well maybe we can wait for the Bill for the other details, if the Minister can give us that -- but I would like to know now on the financial side of it, which is one of the main reasons we bring these matters to committees exactly what the proposed expenditure is going to be; what the budget is intended; will this Commission have staff added to it as well or will it be simply the personnel on the Board and if there is staff will this be new staff or be present department staff.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I received the answer that I wanted -- the question specifically is will the problem of the flooded area be referred to the commission or is the government now considering action on the problem. I want to be sure where I stand here.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, after hearing the expressions of some of the other members I am just wondering whether this commission is set up as a buffer so the government can escape certain criticisms and also whether it's not going to be a matter of them dragging their feet. If that is the case I would certainly have serious reservations on this Commission.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I hope that the new commission will be a little more prompt in answering some of their correspondence than some of the other avenues that are set up by the government to take care of water problems within the various municipalities. Two or three of the letters that I have before me in respect to water and the problem that it causes to municipal men and indeed individual farmers, start off with, "I must apologize for the delay in answering your letter of 2 or 3 months ago". When there is a water problem it isn't solved by just delaying the answer.

I recall writing a letter to my honourable friend the former Minister of Agriculture in respect to Bill No. 108 that we set up last year and I wonder if there is some duplication here -- and my honourable friend certainly should be familiar with that. It had to do with an Act respecting the establishment of the Manitoba Agricultural Productivity Council, and I don't even know whether that was set up. But I thought that it was supposed to deal with most of the problems in agriculture generally and I simply asked the former Minister whether or not he would consider on that Board -- and I don't recall whether it was to be a 12 man board or not -- but would he consider representation from the Riding Mountain-White Mud River Water-Shed Committee? I felt that members that had worked so faithfully for at least a decade on the White Mud Watershed Committee would be most useful to that committee, and so I would suggest

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . .to my honourable friend that he might consider this when he's setting up this commission that perhaps he could select someone from the Riding Mountain-White Mud River Watershed to assist him in some of the problems of water generally, because it was, as my honourable friend knows, the first watershed authority in the Province of Manitoba. I wonder if there is some duplication with this new commission and the Manitoba Agricultural Productivity Council that was set up last year. And I also wonder, Mr. Chairman, what, if any, conflict there might be with the Watershed Conservation Districts Act and the Provincial Waterways Policy, because when I wrote to Mr. Hutton a year ago he said that he thought that most of the problems that I enumerated in my letter could be handled by: (a) The Watershed Conservation Districts Act; or (b) The Provincial Waterways Policy. So I wonder if my honourable friend can explain briefly the difference between these 3 or 4 different councils. And I wonder if my honourable friend might tell us too whether this will mean a new Minister. I suppose it will. I don't suppose my honourable friend will want to continue indefinitely as Minister of both the departments or perhaps he feels now that since he's got physically fit that he can handle both departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . we proceed any further if I might draw to the attention of the Committee Beauchesne Citation 250 on page 216 - (3) of 250. "The object of the resolution recommended by the Crown is to give the House first opportunity to discuss the advisability of making a certain expenditure. The details of the projected measure are not then disclosed and debate is confined to the resolution which should not be lengthy although care must be taken the terms used are sufficiently wide to cover the whole Bill which will be subsequently produced." I suggest to the Members of the Committee that there will be opportunity to discuss in detail when the Bill is brought before the House for second reading and so I just ask the members to confine their remarks as much as possible to the resolution itself. The Minister of Highways.

MR. WEIR: . . . Mr. Chairman, if I can try and answer a few of those questions. May I just say to the Member for Gladstone I appreciate his comments on my health and I think probably I'm in a position to handle another couple of departments as well as the two I've got if that were to prove itself necessary. There's always a few more hours in the day even if you do finish late in the day that you can always do something more.

There's no conflict as far as I can tell with the Agricultural Productivity Council. There are other things in water besides agriculture as we all know and you would have to ask my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, about the progress of the Agricultural Productivity Council.

The conflict with the other jurisdictions as far as water is concerned. I can see no reason for conflict. This is intended as an advisory board and may well advise on subjects that would come under the control of some other authority but would be in a position to assess the advantages and disadvantages of the various water aspects throughout the province.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland surprises me. He talks about a buffer and he talks about dragging our feet. It seems to me that sitting around listening to him for the last two or three weeks it's the one thing he's been asking us to do, is for goodness sake drag our feet. I can assure him that this is not the intention. The intention is to give a study and an opportunity for public discussion on these problems so that the knowledge of all of the people of Manitoba can be brought to bear on the subject of water in the Province of Manitoba.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead wants to know where he stands and I think probably he'll have to wait and see any forthcoming policy that may be announced; when that time comes it will happen.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was inquiring as to budget. There is no real specific budget; it will be within the area of the departmental estimates. I'll be glad to discuss it at that time. Really the out-of-pocket expenses of the Board and whatever there are for their actual costs is all that is anticipated at this particular time. No, the staff that would be used would be departmental staff at this stage of the game. No anticipated costs of that nature. At this stage of the game, at least, it's intended to be a very low cost operation although there's no doubt there will be costs attached to it. The speed with which things are referred to them will dictate very largely what those costs will have to be.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that answers the questions that I have.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, if there's one department that should spend more money I think it's the department that is in charge of water control and conservation. I've been after this for the number of years that I've been in the House. I think this is where we should spend

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . . a lot more money and move a lot more faster than we have in the present.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate that we shouldn't lengthen this debate beyond its intended scope and I hope to confine my remarks in such a way that I might impress the House as to the seriousness of the situation which I referred to, so that they don't make the decision of referring this problem to this Commission -- and that is a situation which I am sure my honourable friend knows is a very serious one, simply because people in the area in question are unable to meet their taxes for the last number of years; they haven't made payments on their land, on their equipment, their VLA payments are behind. As a matter of fact it has come to my attention that the VLA people have gone to the banks in the local area to try and borrow money or loan money -- borrow money I suppose the term is -- to have the VLA payments cleared up and it has come to my attention that the banks have refused so that the situation is rather serious for a great number of people in the area. So I caution the government very intensely that they don't further delay a decision on this particular problem because these people are simply bankrupt for all intents and purposes. I don't think they can afford to wait for a commission to make a study. They want answers now. They need answers now. They're in a desperate position. And if we don't get answers very soon I'm afraid that -- and I'm serious when I say this -- that we're going to have these people on the relief rolls of our municipality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . resolution adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is one question I asked the Minister which I didn't get an answer to. The number of commissioners that he expects to have on the Board.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I answered it once before. It's 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. Second resolution on the Order Paper. RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to establish a branch of the government to be known as "The Water Control and Conservation Branch" and to provide among other matters that all costs incurred in the administration of the Act be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

Are you ready to speak to the resolution?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the effect of the Bill mentioned in this resolution is to take those sections that are presently in the Agriculture and Conservation Act out and make a new Act with the same principles involved called The Water Control and Conservation Branch Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little confused as to the purpose or the need for this resolution because it seemed to me that we have had a Water Control and Conservation Branch all along. The estimates of last year carry such a branch under the Department of Agriculture and Conservation. I appreciate its been transferred to the Highways Branch but it doesn't seem to me that this calls for the setting up of another branch. Is it not normal when changes of responsibilities take place to merely make the shift? Some years ago the branch I think was then set up as a separate operation when it was taken away from Public Works which then combined Highways and Public Works. It was transferred to Agriculture and then I understand a separate branch was in fact set up. We opposed that move at the time on the basis that we thought the proper place for the Water Control Works was with the Department of Public Works because in many cases their work was combined -- particularly once you get in the outlying areas where you are proceeding with any kind of a public work you generally do get involved with some of the drainage problems. Well now its coming back to where it was originally in the Highways Branch; but is it necessary to bring in an Act setting up a branch when it already exists?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I kind of wonder if this is a method by which we may be establishing another Ministry. It does seem to me as I look at the estimates this year for the Department of Highways, it is clearly delineated in the estimates including water control and conservation in the Department of Highways and then there's a considerable section dealing with water control and conservation within the estimates of the Department of Highways itself so it would appear to me that we already have a branch of the Department of Highways charged with the responsibility of water control and conservation.

Now my question would be this being correct, and it's certainly spelled out that way in the estimates, is this measure in effect establishing a second separate department of the government to be known as Water Control and "Conversation", conversation with a --(Interjection) -- yes that's right I believe it will be, Mr. Molgat -- with a separate Minister -- or may I possibly suggest, Mr. Chairman, this is where the Minister Without Portfolio may come

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . into the picture and be allocated the responsibility of this to make it appear at least on the surface as though he may have something to do.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, to answer those questions, I think one of the reasons the name has to be changed is that with the loss of the former Minister of Agriculture the conversation was gone so that we probably had to make a bit of a change in that respect -- (Interjection)-- No, I have always referred to him as the Minister of "Conversation". It's something that he was exceptionally good at. He had other very good and strong qualities as well but conversation was certainly one of those things that he was quite apt at.

That's probably straying a bit from the resolution that's in front of, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.

This has been set up and taken out of the department. It formed a part of the Department of Agriculture as it exists now and there are certain sections that apply to both and it becomes a very difficult thing to follow through between the agricultural sections and the water control sections. The only answer that I could give to my honourable friend, I think, to attempt to satisfy him, that probably it isn't intended to be the establishment of a department is the simple reason that it's not called a department. I think all of the other departments of government are called departments and set up as such. This is specifically referred to as a branch and carries the same language with it that it had when it was associated with the Department of Agriculture except rather than associating it with the Highway Department where you might again become embroiled in the same sort of a thing if there was to be a change in administration between departments or something like that under the control of a different Minister; it's set up and the authority will be able to be transferred if that became necessary. There's a strong relationship, I believe, which the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned between Highways and Water Control and certainly at the present time I think warrants maybe some integration even of this type of service.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has just now mentioned the point that I was going to bring up, that is that the "branch" definitely indicates that it is a branch of a department, but I think for that reason the resolution should have said "a branch of the Department of 'So and So'" rather than just of the government, because I assume that the legislation that will be introduced will make it specific that it is a Branch of the Department of Highways. Is that correct? I would like to see this written right into the Act because I approve of the change that's now being made. I thought at the time it was a mistake to take it from the Department of Public Works, as it was then called, and place it under Agriculture and I think that the years have demonstrated that that was a mistake and now we have to unscramble it. So I would recommend that if the legislation does not already contain that provision, that it be specifically assigned to Highways, where I definitely think it belongs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and has directed me to report the same.

#### IN SESSION

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. WEIR introduced Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the establishment of The Manitoba Water Commission; and Bill No. 22, The Water Control and Conservation Branch Act.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct two questions to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Could he advise this House whether an Order-in-Council has passed giving the Commission of Inquiry into the Cost of Living the authority to proceed and defining its terms of reference? I understand this has been done in at least one of the other three provinces. If I remember correctly, the Honourable the Attorney-General did mention that Manitoba would have to pass a similar Order-in-Council. Has this been done?

MR. LYON: The answer to the question is, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Does that answer the Honourable Member for Rhineland's question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, And are the terms of reference of this commission made known or could they be made available to this House?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe when I made the announcement of the commission I read or paraphrased the terms of reference that were to be incorporated in the Order-in-



(MR. LYON, cont'd) . . . . Council. The terms of reference are common in each of the establishing Orders-in-Council of the three provinces. They're a matter of public record. If my honourable friend wishes to have a special copy of it, I can provide him with that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A further supplementary question, Sir. Did I hear the Honourable the Attorney-General correctly when he said they're common to all three? (Mr. Lyon nodded yes). Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. When can we expect your report of the inquiry into the Vegetable Marketing Commission?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that most of the public hearings that the Commission intended holding are finished with. I had some conversations with him recently. He gave me no indication as to when he would actually have a report in my office. I'm awaiting it just as anxiously as anybody else. (Thank you).

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Could he tell me how many commissioners are presently appointed to the Manitoba Telephone System Board and who they are?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, there are four presently holding office at the present time: the Chairman, Mr. Mills; Mr. Shewman, a Member of the Legislature; Mr. Wylie and Mr. Chipperfield.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, at the last session of the Legislature we increased the number of commissioners by a bill. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if he intends to fill the remaining vacancy and if so when.

MR. McLEAN: The matter is presently under consideration.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to make a very brief announcement indicating the importance of this day?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. DOERN: Last year the Honourable Thelma Forbes, Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs unveiled a bronze plaque commemorating the 50th anniversary of the granting of the franchise to the women of Manitoba. This was the Centennial project of the Manitoba Provincial Council of Women. That plaque is just down the hall where it was unveiled in November, I believe on the 25th. It's also an amazing coincidence that on January 27th, 1914, this was the day, some 53 years ago, that the suffragettes stormed the Legislature, led by Nellie McClung who was a noted authoress and teacher. They addressed the Premier but were unsuccessful in their attempt to get him to introduce the franchise for women. In fact, it was on the next night, which would be tomorrow night, that they packed the old Walker Theatre and presented a fantastic burlesque called "How the Vote was not Won" - and needless to say we all know who the Premier was - and he was very strongly opposed at that time to their right to vote. He said for instance, that good women shrank away from politics and that when women were given the right to vote in Denver, they voted "wet" when the men voted "dry". This was example of their irresponsibility. He said he was also old-fashioned and he was born before the days of the five o'clock teas and the tango dance and he said he was, in short, he was afraid that by adopting this that Club life, as he called it, which was common in the United States, would interfere with home life which he, I guess believed was more common in this area. But in short he said he was absolutely opposed to suffrage for women.

Nevertheless, after his defeat when the new administration came in, the Norris administration, they passed this measure and it was on the 27th of January, 1916 that third reading for this bill came into effect and I think on the 28th, which would be tomorrow, 1916, royal assent was given.

I might point out to the members that the only member who voted against this measure was the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose; but of course I might also point out for the benefit of the Leader of the Official Opposition, that he was a conservative and of course we weren't surprised. Well in view.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt this interesting historical disquisition, but if my honourable friend has some announcement to make, let him make it and take his seat. I don't think this is any part of the Orders of the Day.

MR. DOERN: I'm sorry, Mr. Premier, I was just concluding and my - the reason I made this announcement is very clear; it is in reference to the plaque that many of the members

(MR. DOERN, cont'd) . . . . are not yet aware which was placed there in November and which commemorates that occasion some 51 years today.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the objection of the Honourable the First Minister in this regard draw to the attention of the House that on numerous occasions members of constituencies draw matters to this House of interest to the House -- it might even be the home town curling team winning a bonspiel or a hockey team. I think this has been done in the past.

I regret very much my honourable friend's interjection.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Highways, can we expect any changes, legislative or otherwise, concerning water rates for various locals of the Water Supply Board.

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . Attorney-General, Has the Government of Manitoba authorized any wire tapping or tapping of telephones?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is affirmatively no, and if my honourable friend will have recourse to the Telephone Act he will find that that practice is illegal in the Province of Manitoba so far as I am aware by any or all persons.

MR. HANUSCHAK: MR. Speaker, I'd like to direct a second question to the Honourable the Attorney-General with reference to the Securities Act. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether he is considering bringing in any legislation amending two portions of the Act in particular, one dealing with the penalty provided therein -- I'm not sure whether its adequate or not; and secondly the matter of syndicates for stock purchases. Is the Honourable Minister considering a clarification of that section to avoid repetition of the type of interpretation that was applied to it by the president of the company who was recently convicted of violation of a Securities Act?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps as the Minister responsible for the Securities Act I should indicate that we have a proposal with respect to the Securities Act and related matters which will shortly be before the members.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the Attorney-General, to the one I previously asked, I appreciate his statement that it is illegal, I was aware of this. I wondered if there had been any complaints to him about wire tapping and has he taken any action on them.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, going sheerly on recollection, I can recall no complaint about it. I will check with the department however to ascertain whether or not such complaints have been made.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I lay on the table the Returns to an Order of the House No. 6 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to place on the table of the House the annual report of the Public Utilities Board for the period January 1st to December 31st, 1966, and to inform the members that the report is in the process of being printed and will be made available to all members just as quickly as they have been received from the printer.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, we've had a very complete debate on this motion and I do not propose at this time to repeat the arguments once again. The Minister indicated yesterday that he was prepared to accept my request, I would ask him if he could provide us with the answers as quickly as possible and particularly if we could have them before we reach the discussions of the Department of Industry and Commerce, or of Mines and Natural Resources because some of the factors involved here of course relate to both those departments and I think it would be extremely helpful to the House if the information were available prior to entering the discussion of those departments.

I regret I was absent when the Minister of Welfare spoke on this subject because I understand he had a contribution to make, the gist of which I gather was that members on this side of the House should not question anything that the government does, that we should sit here and simply accept at face value absolutely all the statements and that our job is to pat the government on the back at all times. Well let me assure the honourable member that that isn't my view of my responsibility and I don't propose to subscribe to his advice in the least. We have a very

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . . clear responsibility on this side and that is to take care of the interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba, to inquire into those matters that we think more information is needed, those areas where the government is not providing the information, and this is surely one of them, where there has been no clear indication until now. I'm hopeful that the information will be given. I have said all along that if the government had at the outset given the information the whole situation would have been much better for the government itself. I've stated this on a number of occasions. My honourable friend should know himself, representing the constituency that he does, that there is a good deal of concern in his own area about this right now. The First Minister told us that the thing was going to proceed; wait and see. The facts are that right across Manitoba right now there is concern on this and all that is needed to clear up that concern is for the government to come out with a clear cut statement. So, I would hope that we will get that statement very soon, certainly before we enter into the estimates of the departments concerned.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing:

1. Was the amount of \$171,018.36 shown on page 248 of the Public Accounts of the Province for the year ending March 31st, 1966 as being paid to Camp & Associates Ltd., Dalton K., Toronto, Ontario, paid to a corporation, firm or individual?
2. What is the name of the "corporation", firm or individual to whom the payment was made?
3. What services were rendered by said corporation, firm or individual for this payment?
4. To what Department or Departments were these services rendered?
5. Was the opportunity of performing these services open to other corporations, firms or individuals
  - (a) by public tender
  - (b) by competitive bidding
  - (c) or otherwise?
6. Were the services to be provided covered by a written agreement, or outlined in a call for tenders or similar manner? If so, a copy of said agreement, calls for tenders, etc.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 3. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I ask for leave on behalf of the Honourable Member for Burrows to have this matter stand again unless somebody else wishes to speak to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? Second reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may I have indulgence to allow this to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has leave. Motion that the house resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Are you ready for the question? --(Interjection)--

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker - I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker that I was not paying attention at the time. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General 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.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion 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 Arthur in the Chair.

MR. WATT: Education Grants (c) (1) pass.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, last night I was on my feet when the pressure of the clock prevented me from completing the comment I was making and I suspect I will make it in much less time than I would have yesterday had I not felt that concern. I was dealing with the point that our party has made time and again to the effect that the facilities of university education should be made available to all without regard to the ability to pay for same, and I wanted to answer in advance any suggestion that we are attempting to embroil the province, and indeed the university, in tremendous increases in cost to handle all

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . the increased students that would come as a result of that. I realize full well that in spite of our great desire to make advanced education available to all students, there must still be certain limitations based on the cost of it. I am therefore suggesting that a tremendous step forward would be if the same number of students were admitted to the university tomorrow as there are today, but that number should be invited to come only on the basis of the academic qualifications of the students and not on their economic resources which might prevent them otherwise from coming. That point I wanted to make last night. I appreciate the opportunity I have to make it first this morning.

..... continued on next page

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I think I should review some developments in consideration of these estimates which are of concern to this committee in understanding the estimates this year. . . . certainly were gratified with the breadth and depth of the examination of these estimates and generally surrounds our public school system in its financing and while each year shows heavier demands upon the resources for the support of the system, the range of services demanded in other areas and the costs of providing them and the nations need for educated and trained people is becoming so great that federal participation and financing those other areas has really been recognized as a necessity as we know. In the last few years the only questions at issue have been the selection of the fields of participation and the size of the federal contribution.

Now, these estimates show marked increases this year in support of the university and affiliated colleges, increased bursary money, but any change in the quantity of money provided from federal resources in the areas toward which support is directed or in the terms and conditions under which the support is given must be a matter of vital concern to all of us. And it is for this reason I would like to tell you of certain proposals made by the Federal Government to the provinces of Canada. And I'd like to deal with the federal support in the fields of university, technical and vocational training because this is all interlocked and we'd have to deal with the package in the way that I'll try to do them now.

It is the present practice in this fiscal year for the Government of Canada to appropriate a sum of money to be distributed directly to the universities and colleges to assist in their operation, and as we know this money has been distributed according to a formula which takes into account a number of factors such as the enrollment in the institution, the relative proportion of students at various levels in the university program and the relative number of students enrolled from outside the province in which the particular institution is located. And the money which is thus distributed in the current fiscal year to the universities and the colleges in Manitoba is \$5,090,000.00. These are the monies under the old federal grant formula. And federal support for technical-vocational education has been directed to the province under the terms, as we know, of the Technical-Vocational Training Agreement. This agreement came into effect in April of 1961 and will terminate at the end of March. It assured the provinces of federal support at rates which varied from one project to another for the operation of technical-vocational schools and other courses outside schools and in general more than 90 percent of the cost of training allowances for trainees -- living allowances I should say. It also provided that the Federal Government would reimburse the provinces for 75 percent of their expenditures on most capital costs, and ceilings were placed on the total federal contribution in the operation of vocational high schools and to the sharing of capital expenditures. Actually Manitoba's allotment for the support of vocational high schools came to around \$170,000 a year only. And it had been the hope of Manitoba in common or concert with other provinces that a new agreement or an extension of the existing Technical-Vocational Training Agreement would be negotiated before the present agreement terminated with much more realistic provision for sharing of operating costs of vocational high schools. We wanted more recognition in this area. In fact the Standing Committee of Ministers of Education had already presented a resolution, a unanimous resolution, to the Federal Government asking that its share of the cost of operating vocational high schools be increased to 50 percent. The hope of the provinces for such an extension of the agreement was fortified by the Federal Government's proposal for an increase in the rates of living allowances paid to trainees and an increase in the Federal Government's proportion of the allowances. This came into effect just last summer. I thought this was a very progressive step forward. It had been hoped that a federal-provincial conference might be convened early in the summer to consider some of the matters of mutual concern including the financing of universities and this meeting, as we know, was convened in Ottawa on October 23rd.

The Prime Minister at that time made proposals for changes in principle, not only in support of universities but in the support of vocational and technical education. These proposals were so radically different from the present procedures, both in principle and in effect, that they were received by the provincial premiers and their colleagues with reactions which ranged from indignation to bewilderment. Our immediate calculations seemed to indicate that Manitoba might have a net gain of about \$3 million under the new proposals. More accurate figures since that time coupled with the possibility of some modification of definitions may increase our net gain by several million dollars. However, no province has yet accepted the federal proposals and in general the provinces are dissatisfied with the amounts of money

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . involved and with some of the restrictive principles proposed. There is little satisfaction in the prospect of receiving more money, federal money, if the rate of escalation of costs far exceeds the rate of increase in assistance from the central government.

I would like to deal briefly with some of the proposals which we find unsatisfactory and unrealistic. It is proposed by the federal authorities that there be a category of education known as post-secondary education and that this category include all courses for which the admission requirement is junior matriculation or its equivalent and which are of at least one ordinary academic year in length. Generally this would appear to include university courses and courses in technology. Toward the cost of these enterprises the federal government says it will contribute 50 percent of operating expenses but by excluding many items of cost the resulting federal share is reduced to far less than 50 percent. Some costs which are inescapable but which cannot be shared include all forms of capital expenditure. It is perfectly clear that there cannot be a university without buildings and equipment and it is unreasonable to exclude their costs. Student aid is struck out, as are interest charges; furniture, equipment, cost of running residences, cafeterias and the cost of providing similar common services to students. It appears that such costs cannot be included in sharing in the coming year and -- the sharing in the coming year may total \$6,000,000 for the universities and colleges alone, that is the amount that cannot be included from the formula that we have been able to examine today. And we're told that after March 31st this year the Technical-Vocational Training Agreement will not be renewed; instead the Federal Government will pay the training costs of students who are categorized as adults.

To be considered an adult a person must be at least 12 months over the provincial school leaving age and have been out of school on the labour force for at least one year. About 30 percent of those now enrolled in vocational training and upgrading classes in Manitoba do not qualify under this definition and the province must carry the entire cost of their training. As I have already mentioned, the provision of training allowances has, at the urging of the Federal Government, become an integral part of our training system. The argument being that there is no point in having training services available if a person doesn't have the financial means to take advantage of the programs.

Under the new proposal those eligible for training allowances would include only students who have adult economic status. This means that they must be 12 months past school leaving age, have been out of school for at least 12 months and have been attached to the labour force for at least three years. We consider this three year rule, as it is called, to be extremely restrictive. The former rule required that a person had been out of school for one year. The federal proposal will however, permit a phasing out process under which those who would not qualify under the three year rule but who have commenced training before the end of March, 1967, would continue to receive training allowances until the end of their courses.

The province simply cannot afford to pay living allowances from its own resources and if the three year rule does go into effect many people in Manitoba who are suitable candidates for training and who have no income will not be able to receive the support necessary to enable them to take the training. About 50 percent of our trainees now qualified for living allowances will lose that qualification and the loss in support and opportunity will be tragic for many of them. We are particularly disturbed about this development because it was only a few months ago that we were induced by the Federal Government to expand the scale of living allowances, and when this was done, as representing the province in my capacity, I urged upon the manpower section that before going into this program it had to have security because people would be making a personal decision to quit jobs and come back into a program of upgrading and possibly on to trade or technology training, and before we initiated with these increased allowances which made it possible for so many to do so, we should assure them of its continuity and not pull the rug a short time later. This has happened.

The time limit within which projects must be given for capital sharing will be dropped -- some additional money made available for sharing on a 50 percent basis. I dealt with that earlier in the Session. We have the full allotment of our technical high school program -- for high school construction program and an extension of this on a 50 percent basis for \$11 million over our former commitment. This is the one thing that came out of that meeting.

However, we feel that the total amount of money involved in the federal offer combined with what we can manage from our own resources falls far short of what is required to provide the levels of post-secondary and vocational training necessary if our human resources are to be

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . properly developed. Many parts of the proposal lack clear definition and some parts like the three year rule are very retrogressive. We feel that there has been an inflexibility in negotiation which is not conducive to the making of a satisfactory agreement. We are therefore asking that a further meeting of ministers be convened. Until there is such a meeting we share with the other provinces the twin problems of an inability to make accurate estimates of the financial implications and a deep concern about our ability to carry out integrated programs in which we have been encouraged to enter but for which the financial support appears to be changed.

We can only hope that we'll be able to continue the development of good programs in expanding fields but this House and the people of Manitoba must take note of the possibility that some programs may have to be restricted because our total resources will not be great enough to support them on a large scale, while other programs will have to be dropped entirely. The former may include some kinds of vocational training. For example, the rehabilitation training. As you know, we've had it for years and it's been very effective as has basic upgrading and so on. And the upgrading of our Indian and Metis -- and incidentally we have the largest proportion of these people in Canada in our courses in adult education in basic upgrading and so on that are going on today. Certainly for the latter it must include those living allowances which now become an unshared provincial cost. It appears therefore that we will have gained in some fields - such as the extension of the building program for vocational high schools, and so on, but lost heavily in others, and the overall gain this time will fall far short of our needs.

In short, this meeting indicated that really three things came out of the meeting as a result at the end of our deliberations three matters were left unresolved. Basically: post-secondary education. What does it mean? The Ministers of Education spent an evening with the Minister of Finance trying to define post-secondary education. That's not resolved. Secondly: operating costs, and our officials are still negotiating what are operating costs? This has not been resolved. I've had no communication definitely whatsoever. We're fighting for what we think are legitimate costs as I've outlined. And the third thing is the three year rule, where they have altered their course of six months ago completely; where we six months ago started and joined with them in the offering of generous allowances for training and upgrading and got into this program, today we have over 1,500 people in 77 classes in 29 centres in the province, and generally unless, according to the new formula, these people have been out of school three years and in the labour force three years, they will not qualify for allowances. So you can see the problem there.

I would like to go on because this is vital to your understanding of this area and point out that these matters are still going on; our officials are still meeting; we still haven't resolved these problems and it made it very difficult for us, as I'm sure other provinces in Canada, to put proper estimates before you at this time as to what is involved. But we're fearful that this is not going to be the resource to us that we had anticipated.

I would like to deal with this more particularly with respect to the estimates before you because it may help to elucidate some of these areas further. Post-secondary education I would say - in other words, as they see it - is technology, two year technology programs at M.I.T. and university level, minus all these other costs. And what I may say to you now may elucidate you as how they came to their decisions to handle things in this way.

The development of the university itself in the community of institutions comprising our affiliated colleges has always seemed to me to be a fascinating story and it is certainly worthy in these days of more attention - in these days of change where the relationship between the university proper and its affiliates is accommodating itself to new stresses and pressures not anticipated even a few years ago, and I will deal a little later with some of these matters with respect to the Council of Higher Learning.

But highest amongst our concerns in the last few years has been the question of the ability of these institutions to continue the necessary rate of growth in a context of costs which always seems to escalate out of proportion to the increase in other educational costs. And there are a number of reasons for this escalation in our university field. They include, first, an almost explosive increase in the number of students who now seek university entrance level training; secondly, the necessity of the university and its affiliates to compete with one another and other institutions of a similar nature, that is, for staff, and this is reflected in rising salaries, this competitive spirit. Thirdly, the ability of staff during a period of shortage of highly trained people to demand facilities, opportunities, support and time for research and

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . the growing complexity of the physical plant required to carry on the manifold operations of a modern university.

No matter what the reasons may be, the fact, Mr. Chairman, is that the costs of operating our university level establishment are growing much faster than the ability of the province to find the huge sums of money that are now required. Manitoba, in common with other provinces, must therefore look to the Federal Government, with its much wider sources of revenue, for additional support. Our insistence that education be a top priority in Manitoba and Canada has been supported, of course, and backed up by a number of commissions and studies, and we've pressed the Federal Government to recognize that the investment it was making in our universities was pitifully small compared with their needs.

One of the main issues, as I indicated earlier, on the agenda of the federal-provincial meetings in Ottawa last October, was a proposal brought forward by the Federal Government for an increase in the volume of its university support together with the introduction of this new formula for determining that support. And I'd like to examine this proposal as we move on to a discussion of the estimates for the universities and colleges. As I indicated a few minutes ago, the formula in use now provides for the distribution of about \$5,090,000 amongst the university and the affiliated colleges and, as I indicated, takes into account the enrollments of full-time students, their distribution at various levels and the enrollment from outside the province.

Now under this post-secondary education category that's being established, a promise is made to pay the province a sum equal to 50 percent of the operating expenditures of post-secondary education. Of this 50 percent the Federal Government considers three-fifths as contributed to help the province cover the operating costs of universities and colleges and the remaining two-fifths or 20 percent is contributed toward capital costs for these institutions. This is how they came to the formula that appears across Canada, the Federal Government to pick up 50 percent of the post-secondary educational costs. And if you think we were bewildered, I'm still bewildered.

At least three questions occur to the people studying the proposals: What activities and services are included in secondary education? Secondly, how broad will be the definition of operating costs as we've outlined? What relationship will the new federal contribution bear to the actual 50 percent of the inescapable operating costs of these institutions? And will the amount of this contribution, plus the amounts which the province itself can afford to devote to post-secondary education, be enough to provide a competitive and pliable post-secondary establishment for Manitoba? The definitions to be applied to the elements of the proposal have not been established yet, but it appears likely that post-secondary education will include courses for which the admission standard is junior matriculation or its equivalent and which are at least one normal academic year in length. This would include most university courses and most courses in our technologies. It is also possible, it's possible, that Grade XII courses may become within the scope of the interpretation of this definition. This is how fuzzy we are at the moment but this is possible.

Similarly there's no firm definition yet, as I mentioned, as to what constitutes operating costs, but we are told that they will not include, as I indicated earlier, any part of capital. A minute ago they said 30-20; I think the 30 came from the Bladen Report who recommended 30 percent plus a \$5.00 per capita capital grants . . . . programs. They said we'll pay 50 percent of the costs under their formula. Now we come back to capital on furnishings, cafeteria, book stores, student aid, surplus products stores and so on. The exclusion of these costs from sharing in the budget at the University of Manitoba itself in the coming year would reduce the shareable part of the budget by \$6 million right off the top from what we know now. In other words, right off the top is 6 million. Our discussions with federal officials gives us some assurance that Grade XII will be included by the precise terms and conditions which will apply to its inclusion, but these terms and conditions are still not known.

In substance, it appears that we will receive much less than the 50 percent from the Federal Government with respect to university and colleges, and we're left with the task of finding the remaining 50 percent or of allowing operating costs plus the costs of all items excluded under the shareable portion plus the entire amount of capital, and we expect to be able to find the required money for the coming fiscal year as these estimates reflect, but it has already been pointed out that costs are escalating at a terrifying rate and the portion remaining for Manitoba to pay will increase very rapidly in the next few years. Unless the sharing proposals, including the rates of sharing and the definitions of what can be included, are



(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . modified, quite frankly we don't know where we will find the money to meet the demands of all our university level institutions.

In the fields of technology we see very little change in the amount and rate of sharing. Generally speaking, as I indicated, the sharing arrangement for technologies up to now has been on a 50-50 basis. Except for some new exclusions which may be brought into the arrangement we expect to continue under the new proposals with a 50-50 sharing arrangement. We therefore cannot see the prospect of finding any additional federal support for the technologies which we now conduct and which are bound to increase in number, enrollment and diversity, and we certainly know that this is going to occur as we are going ahead with the huge development, the Institute of Applied Arts and our other programs that are coming just into fruition at our other two trade schools.

We can look hopefully for one new form of federal support and that, as I indicated, the inclusion of Grade XII courses in the post-secondary part of the agreement, but on the other hand we are already committed by need and intention to the provision, as I say, of new and relatively costly programs in the secondary vocational field at the high school level. We will have to pay the cost of these new acquisitions to our public school system from our own resources with the exception, in other words, of some gain which we make under this agreement in the sharing of costs of Grade XII.

You're already aware that Brandon College will become a university on July 1st as a result of the recommendation of the Council of Higher Learning and the decision of the government. Other matters will have to be considered during the coming year, some of them having to do with the reorganization of the universities and colleges, and other recommendations undoubtedly having to do with the financing of these institutions.

Legislation may also be placed before you for the establishment for a University Grants Commission, and if such a commission is established we are most anxious that its work be not circumscribed by prior commitments having been made with the universities or colleges at this time in the change in the fiscal pattern.

Let me reiterate then that the grants shown in your estimates is an interim measure only to assure the colleges of adequate financial support during a year in which further reorganization can take place and a fuller realization gained of the impact of the final federal-provincial arrangements. For the future, much must depend on the hope for a better deal from Ottawa. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the sums of money which we propose to appropriate for institutions of higher learning will give them assurance that during the coming year they can maintain the standard of service they have been offering to the people of Manitoba.

I must, however, warn you that the difficulties we face will emerge in full perspective when we come to the appropriation for vocational education. I've already outlined to you how that dovetails with the university grant this year and I can talk more on the federal vocational aspects of it when we come to that appropriation.

What I've just said has been supported at the provincial level amongst the Ministers of Education who -- we've had no communication to my knowledge, or I've had no communication, neither have other Ministers I do not believe, because when we last wound up the meeting last fall our officials were to get together and look at the nuts and bolts and definitions of operating costs, the three-year role and so on, to spell out exactly what was involved in terms of program and dollars and cents, and I have had no confirmation of those discussions to date. My people have been fully involved and I just want to reiterate this, and I believe that the First Minister is following this matter up with a request to the Prime Minister of Canada to the effect that he wants these definitions looked at in a more enlightened way.

The Member for St. John's asked certain questions here and I would just like to review them as best I can. I do hope to cull out certain correspondence which I can indicate to him or try and get -- I haven't just been able to get it all together since yesterday although its list's on my file - and to table what possibly can be tabled, but the Council of Higher Learning has been most active and while I tabled the terms of reference a year ago I shall be happy to table them again, and the composition of the Council, and have asked my staff to get it out. The terms of reference in that Council, I would like to just say to him before it's tabled - or as soon as it's ready I'll table it - I should say to him in the interim that some of the points he mentioned in his address have been included in the terms of reference and are understood by the Council. The first term of reference, for example: "to direct its appropriate standing committee to study the needs of the Province for post-secondary education in their respective fields at the university and the affiliated colleges within the

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . next decade in terms of kind, quality and quantity, and to advise on these matters; to direct its appropriate standing committee to study (a) the capacity of the present institutions to provide for the needs referred to above," as were mentioned, "bearing in mind the importance of concentration in fields of special qualifications and avoiding unnecessary proliferation and duplication of courses in fields of limited enrollment and of high cost, and the problems of necessary expansion of existing institutions or the creation of new facilities, and to advise on these matters." And I will table all of the terms to make it clear.

When the honourable member says, "What is the thinking of Council?" well, the discussions with the chairman - and I have a list; I believe they've had eight meetings in the past year of the main council. They've listed their meetings with me or with council . . . . - and early in the deliberations of the Council I discussed with the chairman the early need to study the actual relationships between the existing institutions which is one of the precipitating things which brought them together originally. These relationships are really unique in Canada. Some are similar but nothing exactly like the situation was here. And we discussed early -- I discussed with the chairman -- we discussed the matter that these institutions are really functioning on a friendly discussion, easy -- of course in the early days when these colleges and universities were small, but he discussed with me how it's now becoming so highly complex owing to the increased size and financial and other problems, and the attempts of the council would be initially to rationalize these relationships. I might indicate that -- in other words as the affiliates and Brandon and the University have grown, the administrative difficulties crept in because you had affiliated college people sitting on the senate, on courses dealing with the University, Brandon College, and vice versa all around. So the attempts of the Council of Higher Learning have been to rationalize the administrative structure - say the academic structure - below the Board of Governors at the University and at the affiliates.

I received a communication early asking, "the Council of Higher Learning has recommended that Brandon College become a university on the basis that in the interim period its range of work be continued in the same areas and on the same levels as it is now operating and that financial support be maintained on the same general basis as at present awaiting changes which the Council shall recommend." Now under the terms of reference, after receiving a recommendation like this on Brandon recommending it be a university, from the Council, I circulated this to all the constituent colleges, received their confirmation, and then proceeded with the other steps which rationalized the board of the college, and now, on Order-in-Council being passed under the Universities Establishment Act, bringing this into being next July 1st.

Now the recommendations re Brandon were on geographical and sociological grounds, and the Council, in other words, found here's one thing we can do immediately; remove all the problems of this university or this college from the scene; and I can table the recommendation to me with respect to Brandon, an example of the letter I sent to each of the constituent colleges asking for their confirmation as provided in the terms of reference. I could point out to the -- as I said Brandon seemed simple -- one of the simplest things would be to give Brandon their independence on this basis. This was the main activity of the Council during the year.

I also discussed with the Chairman, who asked me, when the Member from St. John's said, "What is the thinking going on in the Council?" - the Chairman has discussed with me the place of United College in the scheme and the possibility of treating it separately because of geographical and other factors, and a study on relationships which he informed me the Council was carrying out between the University and the campus affiliated colleges - that is, St. Paul's and St. John's - and he said that he had received a committee report and he was about to study at the University with St. John's and St. Paul's, and then St. Boniface was to be next to be studied and to determine its place. He also informed me that the committees are studying the financial implications, as I requested them, of community and junior colleges, the need, place and function.

The Council conferred again with me briefly this fall when the government was having its deliberations with the Federal Government which it announced its change in support plans, and the Council needed some indication, they said, if possible of government plans or hopes in order to ensure that it was on the right track in its planning, whether these fiscal arrangements in Ottawa had any bearing on it, and we discussed this matter. We have conscientiously

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . not interfered but encouraged the Council to get on with its work as quickly as it could, and I am very heartened because all the members who are on this Council of Higher Learning are the people who are from day to day facing the problems and they are actively seeking the solutions. I can report to the Council that before the Session I spoke to the Chairman of the Board of the University and the Chairman of the Council of Higher Learning concerning the Duff-Berdahl Report and was advised by the Chairman that at this time I could only inform you that he has set up a sub-committee of academics and a sub-committee of the Board of Governors itself to look not only at the Board structure of the University but the very great need to rationalize the academic structure within the University itself, and this in turn, if you can understand, is tied in with the decisions re United College and the constituent colleges on campus. These sub-committees are, as I say, I think in the coming year, as I have indicated in my remarks earlier, may be coming to some decisions in this rationalization.

I think I've covered most of the points. Possibly there are some questions at this time.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear the Minister say that there is going to be a sub-committee of the Council for Higher Learning which will investigate the recommendation of the Duff-Berdahl Report, namely that - or did I not understand you?

MR. JOHNSON: The Board of Governors of the University discussed this with the Chairman of the Council of Higher Learning and informed him - and he told me I could say this - the University Board of Governors and the Council of Higher Learning, the Chairman of the Board is on the Council of Higher Learning - he's one of the members - he has set up, the Chairman of the Board of Governors has set up committees of academic and the board to look at the University board structure, to look at rationalization of the academic administrative structure, because I can report that one of the things that was found, for example, because of the topsy-turvy development of the administrative level, because of the various affiliates, Brandon and the university people, on the academic side, that it took two years to change one subject in one course in one of the affiliates.

MR. DOERN: Well I'm very happy to hear that because I think there is no doubt that there is considerable support for the representation of faculty and students on the governing body. For example, I have before me an article in the Winnipeg Tribune on January 18th and they point out that the Chairman of the University of Manitoba Board of Governors, Peter Currie, and the Chancellor, Mr. Justice Freedman, members of the Alumni Association, Faculty Association, and members of the Students' Union are all in favour of this move, and that in addition, it says here, it is well-known that the affiliated colleges are dissatisfied with University government as it exists at the moment. So this is an encouraging sign.

There's a couple of other areas I'd like to cover briefly and I'd like to ask the Minister one question or maybe I'll ask him a series which he can reply to. I'm concerned about the University's library. I've been told by friends of mine, both on the faculty and students and so on, that the library isn't very good, and of course a university library is a very expensive proposition; it costs millions and millions of dollars. Someone suggested to me that they had about a quarter of a million books and that to be really a top flight university library they'd need a million books or something. Well at \$5.00 apiece put on 750,000 books and you're up to \$4 million. So I'd like to ask the Minister there what he is doing specifically, what amount is budgeted for the library. Since we're running out of time perhaps he'd like to answer now and then I can save my comments for the next part of the debate. Oh sorry -- then I will continue. Excuse me.

A second point I'd like to ask the Minister is about university salaries - the salaries paid to professors and lecturers etc. I don't know exactly how they compare to other universities but I suspect that they are less. I think there's been improvements made but I'm wondering how competitive are the salaries paid by the University of Manitoba relative to western provinces in particular, and of course also eastern provinces, because we have lost in this province some of the top academic people and the first one that comes to mind of painful recall is Dr. W. L. Morton, our eminent historian who went down east. I don't think he was attracted by salary; I think there were other considerations which I don't care to bring up and which I'm not fully familiar with, but I think finances in terms of his department had a great deal to do with why he left. It wasn't his own salary. I don't think it was his own prestige either. We've lost many good men in the last few years and I know mainly the Arts professors; I can't speak too well for the other faculties; but another one would be Dr. Hiscox who left, and there have been others.

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)

So we need good salaries to retain our present staff and also of course to attract new staff. And here's where - again, I will only touch this lightly - the question of research comes in. This is probably under the Minister of Health - what kind of money does the Medical Faculty have, to do research? I have a friend in the United States who's studying at the Rockefeller Institute. He wants to come back to Manitoba; he's doing research down there; he's an absolutely top student; he's a specialist in internal medicine; he's reluctant to come to Winnipeg and reluctant to come to Manitoba because of the fantastic resources they have in New York. Now naturally we're not going to have their resources but I want to know what kind of resources are available for research in the Medical School because they need a lot of money if we're going to keep these people here, and their own salaries, their own salaries are not the only factor. These men want money to experiment, and unless we can provide them with it, we're losing them. This is the old "brain drain."

And two more points: the whole question again of what is now classically called tertiary education, which is beyond secondary. I'm not sure whether I understood the Minister's statement about community colleges - I think he referred to the Boundaries Commission and so on. We have a resolution on that and we're going to press very strongly for the establishment of community colleges in areas of the province where population can support them where they're feasible. This is the next step; it's an obvious step. Winnipeg is making a move in that direction. The Minister appears to be supporting that and I think this is something we must have in this province, particularly for people who are, say, general course graduates and technical graduates who want to go beyond high school, who want more education and who can't go to university under the present structure.

And a final point: what is the government's policy in regard to centralization and decentralization? I don't understand it. If they're suggesting, as they seem to be, that United is going to be independent and so on, why don't they put grants along those lines? They have here under Sections -- under Education Grants Section 2, under Part (c) University and Higher Learning, they give the University \$22 million, and that sounds generous and it probably is. They give Brandon around \$2 million and that sounds pretty good, but then they give all the affiliated colleges \$2 million. Now I want to know, is that an indication of your support for decentralization or for centralization, because it looks to me as if by those figures you're discouraging these universities from growing stronger? You seem to be stressing the campus, which I think is good, but by your grant structure alone you seem to be saying to these colleges, "We want you as part of the University of Manitoba. We don't want you to be independent." I'd like the Minister to explain that point. Is he encouraging some of these universities to become independent for decentralization or is he discouraging them? Because he certainly is giving the kind of grants which appear to be discouraging.

I'll just quote finally from an article that was in the paper on Thursday, January 19th, an article in the Tribune saying, "U of Winnipeg Seen by '68" and it says here: "The financial situation at United has been precarious for a number of years. In 1951 the Council of Higher Learning had provided \$300.00 for each student which was divided on the basis of population for each province, but by 1960 the grant had decreased to about \$150.00." And then it says, "If United College were independent the provincial government would be responsible for finances; it would end the College's financial worries," Dr. Bedford is quoted as saying. (He's an associate professor of English.) So I'd like to ask the Minister to answer those questions.

MR. JOHNSON: I just wanted to answer while we go along, to get on with this matter; why the differential. Simply because the University, of course, is going to have about 10,000 students next year. Brandon College's budget is being met for their costs this year. The affiliates - it's only a few years ago that they received any support whatsoever from government. In 1953 the whole budget of universities in Manitoba was \$906,000.00. - in 1954.

It's a few years ago that we started to assist the affiliates and it was largely -- that's why the Council of Higher Learning has its present composition. It was brought together, the instrument that brought together the affiliates and the University to rationalize their positions, and there's no implication that we're not going to give them support. As I've said in my earlier statement there's increased support to the affiliates this year, and we're waiting further deliberations of the Council in their discussions on the costs involved in what independence these people would have, how the colleges on campus will be dealt with. This is all coming, I think, very rapidly to a conclusion, but as I say it's also wrapped up between the University, the Board of Governors, and their attempts in working on this Council to

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . rationalize this whole area.

Now, with respect to the libraries, I believe that this is the budget of the University. This is their business in presenting a budget to the government. My recollection is that libraries account for about a million dollars a year of the University's budget. This is a rough estimate as I recall it. But this is, of course, the business of the University Board.

With respect to medical research; of course medical research is highly organized across Canada. The Minister of Health can deal with that probably better than I on up-to-the-minute reporting, but through the National Research Council major research projects are not duplicated from province to province. That Council oversees major research such as the chemotherapy research carried out by Dr. Israels here at the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, which is probably the finest kind of research of that type carried out in North America, and also the chromosome work at the Children's Hospital by Dr. Uchida, is it? This sort of thing. We have excellent pharmacology, pharmaceutical research, and the reason it developed, of course, was because of National Research grants centralizing research in one centre. A tremendous amount of research of this kind is going on. I think Manitoba has been quite competitive here, has some excellent programs, and each year the University in its University budget reflects increases in staff and what have you for the research they need to be carrying out. I might say basic medical research is carried out without a lot of money. Some of the greatest things have been done. It's people that create things, and of course they need money but you need the people too and I think we're quite competitive there. The University president advises me that on salaries, of course, this is the biggest component in the increase this year. In the University budget there's always salaries, and I believe the four western provinces are pretty well in concert at this time. They tend to be regional in that sense, and are quite competitive with average salaries most comparable. One will be up one year and down in the other, but the four of them are pretty well in concert.

He mentioned something about, was it adult education? Well, through your Foundation Program the government as of last year started to support adult day classes, as you know, within divisions. Evening classes have been active for many years and there's just been a great increase in this, not only in Winnipeg Division but across the province. In my area for the first time, I believe, in the last few years we have three or four adult evening classes; they're going on in the local high school. And at each of our technical centres, at Brandon, The Pas, Winnipeg and our Tec-Voc here, as I indicated earlier, I think we had a volume of over 3,800, or I believe that figure, or 3,500 people took night class training at our M.I.T. alone last year. Then, of course, we have correspondence courses for adults that are very popular and strangely still have quite a growing enrollment there, and again of course your University Extension Services which comes under the University of Manitoba. I think we're becoming -- there's an awful lot of adult education going on, and of course the most exciting being the basic upgrading program where we have over 1,500 people today in these various centres taking basic upgrading to a level III, II or I level where they can then go into trade training. I believe that answers the honourable gentleman's questions.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would thank the Honourable Minister and certainly express my appreciation for the statement that he made this morning. I think this is the information that I personally was looking for, and in the way he defined the programs and especially informing us on the post-secondary federal arrangements. While these have not been completed and the financial arrangements appear to be very much up in the air yet, I hope that these will be finalized before the Session ends and probably by that time he can give us some further information on this.

I was particularly interested in connection with the vocational training and the proposition that the government will have for us in the coming year in this connection, whether there will be any more new schools built and the location of these, and also to what extent does the Boundary Commission enter into this - will they still have the final say as to where these are located? Then also in connection with the Federal Government's program in this, we are given to understand that it's a phasing out, and will we be able to build all the schools that they need in this province under the plan where the Federal Government is contributing through capital expenditures? As he already mentioned, this probably comes under a different resolution under this department, and if he prefers to give me the information at that time I'm quite happy to wait this out. I had some questions but I was called out in between and maybe the answers had been given so I'm not going to ask him the particular questions I had in mind. I'll check up on Hansard for them.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I hadn't intended to participate a great deal in this debate but I've listened with great interest to the things that have been said with regard to the educational program, and one thing that I'm quite sure of, after listening to the Honourable the Minister of Education, is that he certainly doesn't feel that there should be any impediment nor should there be any discouragement towards people furthering their education and in particular taking post-graduate work. And that being the case, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether he couldn't get his head together with the Honourable the Minister of Labour and discuss the present Workmen's Compensation Bill which is before the House, which appears to indicate that an orphan child will be entitled to up to \$50.00 allowance for higher education up to the first degree.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm particularly sensitive on that point because this is discriminatory insofar as it affects the legal profession. I believe that every lawyer - and of course it's not the requirement - every lawyer should have a B.A. I think that it's a very maturing influence and it . . . . good lawyers, and that a person should not be discouraged from obtaining his B.A., from going in and then getting his LLB because of the present features of the Workmen's Compensation Act. It applies even more so, Mr. Chairman, to people in the profession that is very needed by this government, and that is social workers. The social worker of course is -- there's no such thing as a first degree. They have to go and get a B.A. before they can enter social work and I understand now they have to get an MSW and I think the way the Honourable the Minister's bill is now worded, that is, the Labour Bill, that they would be disentitled to the allowance after having achieved their B.A., and I hope the Minister of Education will be able to bend the arm of the Minister of Labour which I have been unable to do. You're in closer quarters with him and perhaps can have a more cogent influence on him in that regard.

One other point, Mr. Chairman. I don't like to see even a suggested inaccuracy go by unstated. I want to make it plain that I'm fully in agreement with the proposals and in particular the remarks made by my honourable colleague from Elmwood with regard to the restructuring of the Board of Governors and the investigations that have to be looked into with regard to further faculty and student representation. The inaccuracy I'm referring to is in the editorial which he quoted from the Winnipeg Tribune, and it's not really an untruth; it's a half truth. It says that members of the Alumni Association agree with this student representation. Well, it's probably true that many members of the Alumni Association do, but the editorial leaves the impression that the Alumni Association has taken a stand, and I know that my colleagues on the executive of the Alumni Association and on the board would feel that I did them a disservice if I let this stand without saying that they have not taken any position. I myself am in great sympathy with student representation and faculty representation, but there is a great deal of controversy on the Board of Directors itself, so I say that, Mr. Chairman, merely to enlighten the Minister that what he already knows to be the case is true, that you can't always get your accurate information out of editorials in the newspapers.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if I might ask some questions of the Minister with regard to the Council of Higher Learning? I believe he answered this question but I missed it if he did. Are we going to get a report of the Council here in the Legislature? And are we going to get copies of any recommendations that they have made to him so far?

MR. JOHNSON: I will be tabling the communication made to me with respect to Brandon College and a copy of the letter, as the terms of reference under the Council of Higher Learning indicates I must take that and send it to each of the constituent colleges for approval, and they approved it all, and we therefore implemented the recommendation. Since then the chairman has had, especially after the conference last October, he spoke to me concerning the work of the Council at this time, whether the matter there had any bearing on the work of the Council, and informed me at that time that Council activities were proceeding very well and that they were looking now at the status of United College and at the status of the constituent colleges on campus and then would direct their attentions to the St. Boniface College.

I also received a communication during the year, a letter which I hope to table, asking for the - I should have mentioned this; I overlooked it - the full interest from the School Land Grants Fund in the current year, to give some extra interim support to the affiliates, which we did, and I will be bringing legislation forward to validate that, if I may, and also then to cancel that Act and take the monies out of the Consolidated Revenue. These estimates are made up in that way. These communications I hope to table.

As I indicated, the other communication with the chairman was with respect to the

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . constituent colleges, the work of the Council and the position of United College. Concurrently I phoned, as I indicated in my early remarks, or I was in contact with and discussed with the Chairman of the Board of the University concerning the Duff-Berdahl Report. This all has an inter-relationship in that as you rationalize -- he wants to rationalize the activities of the academic section of the University. As you can see right now, for example, on senate of the University are members of the affiliates and previously Brandon was on there. It's a very complicated structure and it's been recommended to the government by both the Chairman of the Council of Higher Learning, the Chairman of the Board of Governors, that a University Grants Commission be established, or the necessary legislation be brought in at this current session, which will be brought before you to have this established as the Council brings in its further recommendations.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for his statement. I'd like to get back on some of the specific recommendations of the Council. Has the Minister received a specific recommendation from the Council that United College should be made an independent university?

MR. JOHNSON: I received a communication from the Council suggesting this but requesting a meeting with me, and I met with the Chairman in this regard and communicated to the Council that, as the terms of reference of the Council indicate, we would like the financial structure as to what he recommended, that the financial position be recommended and that the constituent colleges be dealt with simultaneously.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, did the Council of Higher Learning recommend that United College be set up as an independent university? Yes or no; could I simply have that?

MR. JOHNSON: I would say yes and no. Specifically, they suggested that this would be the next step that the Council were looking at to simplify things at their level, but that in connection with this they would like to recommend the position of the constituent colleges concurrently. So I have written back to the Council officially and said, "I received your communication in this regard; advise me of the financial implications with respect to United achieving its university status and also, at the same time, the structure and the pattern with respect to the constituent colleges on campus, St. Paul's and St. John's."

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to labour the point but I would like to have it reasonably clear, if I could, so that when I refer back to Hansard I will know exactly what was said. The status then I take it is this: that the Council of Higher Learning recommended that Brandon College be set up as an independent college or university. The Minister has accepted that and that is proceeding. The Council of Higher Learning has not recommended that United College be an independent university or independent status.

MR. JOHNSON: They recommended this; they recommended that United attain independent status but outlined certain conditions governing that which were inter-related to the constituent colleges on campus, if I can make that clear. It's not simple to explain. I therefore communicated back and said, "What are the financial implications of this move and the condition of the constituent colleges?" And they are now dealing with this matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if Brandon College could be granted independent status, with which I agree, what different financial implications are there granting independence to Brandon as compared to granting independence to United College? If when Brandon College received the recommendation and it was approved by the Minister, were the same financial implications . . . . ?

MR. JOHNSON: We were of course providing all the funds to Brandon. It was separate and distinct. All the resources -- we knew pretty well -- we had the financial picture on Brandon. It was completely known to us because we were providing all but, I believe, \$22,000 of their budget, so there was no problem in working out what the financial situation was with respect to that recommendation, none at all. But with respect to United, in connection with United's gaining status under certain conditions, namely that there be provision for the avoidance of duplication of post-graduate courses and that sort of thing, concurrently with that I felt, and the Chairman discussed with me the position of the constituent colleges and the desire to make a simultaneous recommendation in that regard at the time we could approve the United situation, but also they overlooked the fact that -- and I was in discussion with the Chairman, re the financial impact of United. Concurrently with this, both the Chairman of the Council of Higher Learning and the Chairman of the Board of Governors approached us concerning a University Grants Commission that these might be recommended simultaneously. In other words, that as we have more than one university we end up with, say, three, that we

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . would have a Grants Commission overseeing this, because you're no longer dealing with one entity, you'll be dealing with three separate entities. But this is all tied in with the full recommendation. I think this will unfold. We will bring forward, I hope this session, the University Grants Commission legislation that could be proclaimed and we're awaiting the report from the Council concerning the financial structure, and again in the middle of all this comes the Duff-Berdahl Report concerning board structures and the examination by the University of its board structure now and its academic structure provided they can make the satisfactory arrangements with the constituent colleges in whatever pattern they're going to fit in within the university setup in the future.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable colleague from Inkster suggested that the Minister of Education should bend the arm of the Minister of Labour, and of course this is a very dangerous possibility since he could in his enthusiasm dislocate it. Fortunately, however, the Minister of Labour is a chiropractor and he could undoubtedly cure himself. I would like to suggest that the Minister of Education get together with the Honourable Member for Rhineland because he gives me the impression that he's beginning to come around. He congratulated the Minister on certain aspects of his White Paper and I think the Minister should take a somewhat softer approach with him and shake his hand, and get together with him and encourage him to support the principle behind this Paper.

I have one question on this point. It's difficult to tell from the estimates how much money goes to salaries, and I just want to ask a general question to the Minister: Do I gather that you are giving (1) increased grants for salaries to the University of Manitoba; and (2) will this mean that the professors get a raise in pay?

MR. LYON: I move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Dufferin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm now leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.