



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 4, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to draw the attention of the members to the gallery where we have 60 students of Grade 9 standing from River Heights Junior High. These students are under the direction of Maryse Birolini. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Minister responsible for the Task Force.

We have 27 students of Grade 4 standing of Green Valley School. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

We also have 16 students of Grade 7 standing from Lake Region Junior High in North Dakota, under the direction of Mrs. Gloria Larson.

On behalf of all the members we welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, and on behalf of my colleague, the Honourable the Minister of Education, I wish to table the report of the Medical Manpower Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Minister of Health, I should like to ask the Minister of Health if he has had an opportunity to check as to the contention that there has been some change in daily routine and procedure in the Greater Winnipeg area hospitals with respect to the frequency of changing hospital linen?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition for having put the question to me again. I have had an opportunity to look into it. I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and members of the House that there is no foundation to reports of that nature, that their fears and the anxieties of any others in that respect that respect can be fully allayed, Sir. The hospital in question would not be identified by me or I think either by the Leader of the Opposition but it has been identified in public reports today and so I can report to the House, Sir, that I have held direct conversations with the administrator of that hospital, the Health Sciences Centre. I'm advised that a policy change was implemented in June, 1977 because, in the words of the administrator, "We were having cost problems even then." The administrator tells me that it's based on an experiment carried out in another hospital in urban Winnipeg which proved successful. The objective is to contain costs and maintain patient services in a responsible manner.

The hospital's directive, Sir, says that linen changes will take place Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. The Head Nurse in each case is to have the discretion to vary the schedule to accommodate specific requirements such as patients who are recovering from surgery or have other difficulties. It does not preclude additional changes even into a high number of changes during a 24-hour period for patients requiring it. But many patients, such as psychiatric and ambulatory cases are hardly ever in their beds — in the words of the administrator — and, as a consequence, the Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday changes in their cases are considered adequate but are monitored, again, by the Head Nurse in each case.

Sir, the hospital recently ran a questionnaire among its patients on services. To the question, "Are you satisfied with the linen services provided?" which was one of the questions on the questionnaire run in the last four weeks, there were 216 respondents; 207 of the 216 answered yes; 6 had no comment on that particular point; 3 said no, they were not satisfied. Of the 3 who were not satisfied, one complained because of a shortage of towels; a second one said that beds should be changed every day and a third one said that his or her wet sheet wasn't changed soon enough.

The cost for linen in 1977 at the Health Sciences Centre, Mr. Speaker, totalled \$1.78 millions. Linen usage per month at the Health Sciences Centre runs to 600,000 pounds through the central laundry and, in the words of the administrator, "Linen is a very costly item and there can be some

savings. We are looking at everything in normal budgetary procedures to keep the system on as businesslike a basis as possible."

Sir, if there are any further questions, I would be happy to entertain them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I do have some additional supplementary questions. The first would be to ask the Minister of Health if, in checking as to the accuracy of the contention or complaint that the hospital linen as a matter of regular routine is being changed on the frequency of only once a week unless obvious personal circumstances of any given one patient required a much higher frequency.

My question to the Minister is to ask him whether he can assure the House that as a matter, again, of regular operating procedure, that there has been no change in terms of the regular frequency by which hospital linen is changed. That is to say, if previous practice was once a day or once every two days, has it been changed to a somewhat more infrequent — every three or four days — basis. Can the Minister indicate if he has checked or if he will check to ensure that that is not what is happening?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well Sir, I can assure my honourable friend that there has been no change since June of 1977. I understood my honourable friend's question yesterday to relate to a restraint program, or relate to considerations relative to the current budgetary limitations placed on the hospital. The answer to my honourable friend's supplementary question is no. This change in policy was introduced last June. Prior to that I would assume, because this is reported to me as a change in policy, there must have been something different, and perhaps at that time linen was being, both top and bottom sheets on every bed in the hospital were being changed every day. But since last June, because as I say, the Administrator has said to me, "We were having cost problems", and our laundry costs were far in excess of what we felt they should be, we went to this system of Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday with the discretion of the head nurse on each ward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm not in a position to deny the fact that there may well have been ten months ago some change in terms of hospital operating procedure with respect to such procedures as change of hospital linen. Indeed there may well have been a cost problem when the hospital was kept to an increase in funding in the order of what? 5 or 6 percent, or 7 percent, which really makes it all the more valid, indeed, to ask the question as I did yesterday, whether the new level of increase allowable from 7 percent, let us say last year, down to 3 percent this year, is occasioning the kind of change that is being asked about. Clearly Sir, the question is, since it is a fact that the amount of incremental budget adjustment that is allowed the hospitals is something less than half of the the percentage increase last year. Does it not give rise to questions and issues such as what are the hospitals cutting back on, including the frequency of linen change.

Or, is the Minister of Health telling me that if there are cost problems? —(Interjection—

MR. CHERNIACK: Have you looked after the Archives Building yet? You know what that is.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the Minister saying that if there were cost problems last June when the hospital budget was allowed a 7 percent increase, or 8 percent, that there are no greater cost problems today when the increase is 3 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the questions he's asking are highly argumentative and probably are better handled in Debate rather than the Question Period. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll avoid argumentative questions even though they are matters of simple arithmetic, is 3 percent as great as 7 percent?

However, be that as it may be. I would like to ask the Minister if he has been able to ascertain whether there is a second metropolitan area hospital that has been engaged in some experimentation with respect to the regular routine of linen change, and if so is there a report indicating that one linen change every two or three days — personal circumstances aside — that as a matter of regular routine they are proceeding then to something less than one linen change every two days?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Sir, I would respectfully suggest that I have an opportunity to respond to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's first question too, as well as the one he has just put. In respect to that first one I would like to say that I believe I answered his question, that there has been no change in policy since June 1977. The policy went in in June 1977, I assure him I will continue to monitor it, I agreed with him yesterday, I believe, that I would not find a once-a-week linen change in a general sense acceptable. There may be some corners of some wards, perhaps with respect to

Thursday, May 4, 1978

ambulatory cases, where a less frequent change is justifiable, but as a general rule to any degree of generality I would not be satisfied with a once-a-week linen change or anything even approximating that, so I will continue to monitor it. But there has been no change, Sir, since June 1977.

In answer to his second question, yes, the Leader of the Opposition is correct, there is a second hospital in the urban area, although it was the first hospital, and because it implemented this kind of a program to bring its laundry costs under control through an internal audit that it imposed itself, and I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition knows the hospital I'm referring to which adopted its own form of internal audit which has proved as something of a rather remarkable guideline and example in the health organizations field in this area. Because of the success of that, the Health Sciences Centre turned to adoption of a similar kind of monitoring process on laundry usage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to Honourable Ministers that they don't answer questions until they are addressed to them. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Health with respect to a question I had posed earlier, a week ago and two weeks ago, as to whether he has been able to ascertain, upon checking with the district offices of Community Services Division of the Department of Health, as to whether there has been any receipt of complaint by those offices from the directors of patient care services of hospitals such as Concordia, for one, complaining that because of the withdrawal of certain social services support from the hospital that there has been some increase in difficulty in maintaining the same quality of patient care?. Has the Minister received such indication?

MR. SHERMAN: I have checked on that situation, Mr. Speaker, and I have received no such indication from any hospital or from any of our regional offices. I am continuing to check it so that I can give the Leader of the Opposition a definitive and all-encompassing answer; thus far I have received no such indication either from hospitals or from our departmental regional offices. In fact, I have been advised that there are sufficient social workers in the various social services programming components of the Directorate to supply the necessary liaison and social work for all hospitals concerned. But I would have to say to the Leader of the Opposition that it is a subject that obviously requires ongoing monitoring and review, and I will continue to maintain a watch on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health, relating to the change of linen in hospitals. Due to the fact that the Minister has indicated that the policy in June was to permit a discretion on the part of the head nurse which could change that practice from month to month, can the Minister find out when, within the June policy, the practice was changed at the hospital concerned so that linen is changed once a week, rather than more often as indicated by the policy? Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says the policy is not changed. I would like him to find out when the practice of certain administrators, who have a discretion given to them in June in accordance with that policy, have started changing sheets once a week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I could attempt to be within the limits of my intelligence, which is somewhat restricted, I don't think that I could be any more co-operative, any more informative than I have attempted to be. If the Member for Inkster is concerned about that kind of problem, he is a former Minister of the Crown with some standing in this community, he knows how to dial a telephone; he is perfectly capable of phoning the administrator of the Health Sciences Centre and asking that kind of question. I have told him that within the last four weeks a questionnaire has been responded to by 200 —(Interjection)— No, he doesn't care about questionnaires. Of course, he doesn't because he doesn't care about the factual actual truth of the matter. He is attempting to build an impression through suggestion that has attempted to create a concept in the minds of the general public, which is not true.

I don't have any control over the internal operations of the Health Sciences Centre and he knows that. I am assured by the administrator of the Health Sciences Centre that because of their interest and his interest in maintaining a properly run business operation; because he saw unjustifiable excesses in the laundering bills; because he saw unrealistic over-usage of the laundry facility that he implemented on the basis of an internal audit that had been tried successfully in another hospital in Winnipeg, a program and a policy last June which dictated this new approach. The new approach appears to be working. The new approach is being carefully monitored by that administration. The head nurses in each department have individual discretion. The patients have responded almost 97, 98, 99 percent in the affirmative when asked if laundry services are satisfactory.

Now, there is nothing more I can do to try to persuade the Member for Inkster that the case has

been examined and, in my opinion has been successfully resolved that there is no foundation to the imputations in the questions that have been raised about it.

If he wants any further information, he can debate it and discuss it with me on my Estimates, and he can walk out of this Chamber, dial the phone and talk to the administrator at the Health Sciences Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants me to do his job, then I can tell him that I'll be very happy to have him out of that seat and do his job.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister a supplementary question. Does the Minister indicate to me that as an MLA who has been advised by a patient in the hospital, who had a tailbone removed — not somebody who was in there for other than operative treatment — that she had the sheets changed once a week; that she asked about it and was told that it was the restraint program, does not the Minister think that we should put that to him in the Question Period?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has every right to be concerned about a situation — an alleged situation — of that kind being put to him, and has every right to ask the Minister of Health about it. I have attempted to respond to the question. I can't answer for every grievance, for every aggravation, for every bad mood, for every difficulty, for every emotional upset that every person in every hospital in this province is going through. There are days, I am sure, when the Honourable Member for Inkster says to himself, "I wish I'd never gone into politics. I wish I'd never joined the NDP." There are certainly days when we say that, Mr. Speaker.

Let's be reasonable. The Honourable Member for Inkster is a lawyer, he's a public servant, he's a distinguished former Minister of the Crown, he's the Crown Prince of his party, let us be reasonable. Can he not understand that people sometimes — if I may use a hospital analogy — get out of bed on the wrong side of the bed in the mornings? Maybe there are two or three people here, two or three people there, who are dissatisfied at particular circumstances, who may pass off the remark to a friend in a period or a mood of aggravation, "They don't ever change the sheets around this place." Maybe there was even one or two or ten, whose sheets were only changed once a week. That is the responsibility of the hospital administrator whom I have addressed on the subject, and he assures me that that is not permitted to happen; that is not the case. If it happened, it shouldn't have happened. — (Interjection)— No, it isn't right in the policy. — (Interjection)— But it isn't in the policy. It isn't in the policy. — (Interjection)— One has to expect, Sir . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'd like my honourable friend to apologize, my wife changes the linen and/ at least three times a week.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, if you're all finished, we'll proceed with the Orders of the Day.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: You have a supplementary question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable Minister not see that the very policy that he has read to us permits a discretion which didn't exist before and which could have changed last week; and if it happened in June, it's wrong — but the policy that he read would permit a change last week, which he says is unacceptable, because it gives the administrator the discretion to change sheets once a week, once every two weeks, and I ask the Honourable Minister to investigate a citizen complaint to me, that not only were the sheets changed once a week, but that one changeover of the sheets was by putting the part where the feet used to be to the head of the bed, and the part where the head used to be, to the foot of the bed.

Now if the Honourable Member thinks that that's a joke and if the honourable members think that that is a joke, then they have demonstrated that they, as a government are a joke.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that that is a joke. I want, on a point of privilege, to make the point for the record, that if the Member for Inkster was directing that admonition at me, that I was looking at him seriously, listening to him seriously and was not commenting, I do not think that that is a joke.

I think, however, that this whole situation is being exploited and being turned into something of a farce by members opposite. I have attempted to do what I could do in this instance. I will follow through even further. Thus far, Sir, I might say that nobody has named names or identified sources,

but if we do that on this side of the House we are called, by the Honourable Member for Inkster, cowards. We are called cowards if we raise situations and don't give him name, age, army senuer, place of birth, number of children and medical insurance card number. But, no, they can stand up and say that I know a patient who had her tailbone removed and who claimed one morning that her sheets hadn't been changed for a week. The House needs no more definition, no more precision than that, if it comes from the Honourable Member for Inkster. —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: You prove it then.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. I believe I have the floor. —(Interjection)— I believe I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to meet the Honourable Member for Inkster outside the Chamber. I don't think names in situations of this kind should necessarily be exposed publicly. —(Interjection)— But the Member for Inkster would not come to me and say that he knows of a particular situation. He just raises what may be an imaginary situation in the House.

Now let me say, Sir, that on his point about the policy change, that I couldn't disagree with him more than I do. The policy change permitted discretion by trained professionals.

Now, the Member for Inkster is saying to me, that head nurses, nurses in this province, graduate nurses serving in head nursing capacities in major hospitals in this province are not competent to make the decision —(Interjection)— to make the discretionary decision as to whether a patient needs three linen changes a day or three linen changes a week. That is what he is saying, Sir. —(Interjection)— You cannot have a policy like . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Health that this is not the time for a speech. You were asked to give the answer to a question and that's all you should do. —(Interjection)—

Now the Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister, first of all, said I didn't have the courage to give the names.

I offer to have this matter referred to Committee of Privileges and Elections, and I will subpoena the person who gave me that information.

The honourable member says that that is not the right way of doing it, which I agree with him that that is not the thing that should be done — (Interjection)— then we will not do it. But I offer here to the Honourable Minister, to have this matter referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, to subpoena the person.

I also say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a question of privilege to suggest that I suggested incompetence on the part of the nurses. No such thing. I suggest that the nurses are not being given the resources to enable them to exercise their competence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the same point of privilege?

MR. SCHREYER: No, I have a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Before your question, I find that the point of privilege raised by the Member for Inkster is, in fact, not a point of privilege and I would suggest that he deal with it with the Minister outside the Chamber.

MR. GEN: Well, he said that I should bring the names.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to try to focus the purpose of the question much more directly, may I ask the Minister of Health if he agrees that what is at issue here is not whether or not the hospital staff, the professional and semi-professional staff, have discretionary authority with respect to decisions of that kind. But rather, the question is whether the Minister will give assurance that this discretion which quite correctly the Minister indicates, and I agree, quite correctly this discretion lies with the staff immediately involved. Can the Minister give us an assurance therefore that such discretionary judgment and decision-making within the hospital will continue to take place unencumbered by any unrealistic restraints with respect to the budgeting and the funding that is available for such hospital basics as linen supply and linen laundry? That is the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will give my honourable friend that assurance this afternoon

and because those situations can change I will give him my undertaking to maintain as close a watch over it in the future as is possible.

MR. SCHREYER: My other question, Mr. Speaker, is to ask the Minister if he would wish to receive, either by way of tabling or by way of information directed to him, a letter which I have here from the Director of Patient Care Services at Concordia Hospital, indicating among other things that there is a gap in the quality of care for patients because of the discontinuation of social services at that hospital.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to receive it. It will be my first reception of any notification of that kind. When I say I will be happy to receive it I don't mean in the sense of satisfaction, I mean I'll be pleased to receive it from the Leader of the Opposition and I will act on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The sheet we were given yesterday by the Minister of Finance indicates a carry-over for 1978-79 of \$4.192 million and I would point out to him and ask him, on Page 1251 of Hansard he made the statement that the carry-over is \$5.134 million. I would ask the Minister to explain this difference of figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take that question as notice if I could.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. I wonder if he could outline comments that he apparently made yesterday or the day before outside this Chamber in which he affirmed his belief in a pay-as-you-go policy or deterrent fees and then made some other comments about doctors on salary, etc.?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly can't affirm it; I did not make it; whatever is reported in that respect is inaccurate; I reject it categorically; I repudiate it; I say it did not happen.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just as an aside, I say that this is a comment that was on the radio that the Minister can check into.

I would like to ask the Minister as well whether in view of his government's policies and his own policies, all the tightening up that is going on in our hospitals, I want to know whether this is in effect the results of government policies on austerity or restraint is an attempt to discredit Medicare by reducing the level of medical service in this province that will have the following results: the establishment of private hospitals; deterrent fees for everyone; and finally, doctors and nurses leaving our hospitals to work in other provinces under better conditions in better hospitals. Is this what the Minister is striving at?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the imputations in my honourable friend's question are not only unfair, they, I think, border on the scandalous in that they are intended and designed, as are many suggestions coming from the opposition these days, to spread false and misleading information and propaganda among the public, to mislead, to misdirect, to unfairly influence, and I put them in that same category and suggest to you, Sir, that they're not worthy of a response.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, may I just ask whether I am not in fact entitled to another supplementary question? If so, I would like to ask it. I would like to ask the Minister of Health if in view of his policies, if he does not agree that by grinding down the hospitals of this province, and making . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Questions of agreement are clearly out of order.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question flows from the reply given by the Minister of Health to the Member for Elmwood. In the Minister's reply he said among other things that there were many things coming from this side that were misleading with respect to health care services. I would like to ask the Minister of Health if this is not perhaps the ultimate example of a misleading answer. I've asked the Minister of Health on three previous occasions whether he could indicate and whether he

Thursday, May 4, 1978

would investigate the contention that patient care services in at least some of our Winnipeg hospitals were suffering because of the withdrawal of social service. The Minister said he wasn't aware; on a second occasion he said that he was checking but that nothing had been brought to his attention to suggest that, and I, Sir, have a letter here which is written by a Director of Patient Care and Financial Services. My question is to ask the Minister of Health if he does not agree that it is a misleading answer to say that he, upon investigation, has not been advised as to a problem with respect to quality of patient care when in fact directors of patient care have written to the district offices of Community Services of his department saying precisely that "the withdrawal of services of the social worker has greatly curtailed our care of patients in this area."

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that questions of agreement are not proper questions to ask at this time. The Honourable Member.

MR. SCHREYER: Then I would not ask the Minister if he agrees, but rather to put to the Minister, since he is the one that has made reference to misleading statements, I would ask him to indicate if his statement, and his previous answers and statements that he was not aware of any diminution or decrease in the quality of patient care services, is not misleading in the context of the fact that letters have been received by his department at the divisional level indicating just that, that there has been a down-turn in the quality of patient care services because of the withdrawal of social services?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the copy of the letter that the Leader of the Opposition has just directed to me, is a copy of a letter that refers to the departure of one person; it's directed to an area director within my department. I stand by my previous answer to the Leader of the Opposition that I have not been advised by area directors or regional directors in my department of difficulties in this field. If they arise, in their view, to the proportion or the quantity that are significant enough to make them feel that it's necessary to speak to the Health Services Commission or the Minister about the situation, I presume they will do that, I presume they will do that.

I am, of course, interested and concerned in the copy of the letter that the Leader of the Opposition has sent to me and has apparently had in his possession for some time. I reassure him that I will investigate it but I stand by my original statement that that kind of concern has not been communicated to me and I want to say, in response to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that all I can do is assure him, in honesty and sincerity, as two people who I would hope had some mutual respect for each other, that the response that I am getting from hospital boards and administrators, in the main, throughout the province, to the restraint program is a positive one, a creative one and a co-operative one. In many many instances, they have said to me that it can be done and it needs to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, maybe I should suggest to members of the House that we should perhaps all of us read Citation 171 of Beauchesne. I don't think I should take up time in the Question Period to read it all out to you, however, if you so desire, I can have copies made and submitted to all members of the Chamber.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my next question is again to the Minister of Health. I believe it is a conventional question and that is to ask the Minister of Health if this withdrawal of service that he refers to as being single and isolated, whether he would check to ascertain whether in fact the department has also decreased by three the number of family counsellors at the Nor'west Clinic; decreased by two the number of social workers out of the northwest office and also a social worker from the Mount Carmel Clinic for a total of five, a diminution of five family and social service support staff discontinued from their previous support for Winnipeg area health facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice. I would also say to the Leader of the Opposition that I will attempt certainly to have the whole package together for my Estimates when it can be examined in detail. I would also like to remind the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, that even his government aimed for a restraint target that set as its objective a 10 percent vacancy rate; a 90 percent filled job level in the community operations side of the Department of Health and Social Development, if not in the whole department. We are pursuing a similar vacancy rate objective. It was undertaken with the full concurrence of the various directorates through their directors and branch directors and they assured us, during the process in January, February and March, that the 10 percent vacancy rate could be achieved without diminution of quality of service, without diminution of necessary service and quality of service.

MR. SCHREYER: In light of the Minister's answer, I now have to ask him when he indicates that there will be a reduction in staff without a diminution in service, I would like to ask him if by that he means that there is no intention to restore the positions with respect to family counselling at the Nor'west Clinic and the social worker support service at Concordia Hospital. He can't have it both

ways.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he is asking for a statement of policy from government which clearly does not fall within the Question Period. Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm not asking for a policy indication; I'm asking very specifically whether the Minister, in light of his answer that there will be no diminution in service, whether that is to be taken to mean that there will be a restoration of these family counselling and social service positions. It's not a matter of policy. I'm asking whether it's the intention to restore positions since he says that there will be no diminution in service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, it's simply a repetition of the same question.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in this House it is the role of the Speaker to indicate when the next item of business arises. That includes, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection)— I still have the floor. That includes, Mr. Speaker, the use by the Speaker of his discretion as to when the time period for the asking of questions has expired and it may indeed have, but it's up to the Speaker to so declare, not a member of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. JORGENSEN: In case the Opposition House Leader missed it, the Speaker did call Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If I did call Orders of the Day once, I think I called it half a dozen times today and I once again call Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader. The Honourable . . .

MR. GREEN: There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that you did on several occasions indicate Orders of the Day but not at the expiration of the Question Period. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to review, I ask you to review Hansard tomorrow in that the Leader of the House rose immediately after a question was put by the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister was getting up to answer it and at that point, no call was made by you for Orders of the Day.

MR. JORGENSEN: Perhaps I should put the Point of Order in its perspective. Mr. Speaker did call Orders of the Day upon which the Leader of the Opposition rose on a phony point of order and then purporting to ask a question on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, if Orders of the Day have been called, I would like to move . . . If orders of the Day have been called, Sir, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Member for Inkster please state his point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I state my point of order on the basis that I merely want it understood, which I do not agree it was understood, that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . It is a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: A point of understanding is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for Inkster, please state your point of order.

Thursday, May 4, 1978

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to a point of order, if you are going to rule that I cannot use the word understanding, then I will appeal your ruling and say that in speaking to a point of order, I can use the word understanding. I merely wish, Mr. Speaker, to have it clearly established that the Leader of the House got up and said, "Assuming that the Speaker called for Orders of the Day", and this matter can very easily be resolved if the Speaker will get up and now indicate that he is calling for the Orders of the Day, and it's not being done by the Government House Leader. That is my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: In response to the Honourable Member for Inkster, I now call Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: I have a motion before me, it has been moved. . . The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: In order to appease the petulant Opposition House Leader, I will again put the motion.

MR. ENNS: But don't use me as the seconder.

MR. JORGENSEN: move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Education, and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for Public Works.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before I turn the Chair over to the Chairman, may I bring to the attention of the Honourable Members, the gallery on my left where we have the former Member for Churchill, Mr. Les Osland. We welcome you Mr. Osland.
720

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — PUBLIC WORKS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: We have a quorum. We are on Page 70 of the Book of Estimates, Item 2. Operation and Maintenance of Provincial Buildings and Grounds 2.(a)(1) Salaries \$273,500 — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, under (a)(1) there has been an increase of about \$21,000 in the salaries. Could this be explained in terms of what it is for?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: We are on item 2.(a)(1). The SMY situation remains unchanged at 13. That vote has an increase of \$20,800 from the 1977-78 request, which provides for the general salary increase and annual merit increment. On the Other Expenditures, there is a modest increase of \$6,800.00. The provision here provides for the increase in the cost of stationery, telephone, some travelling expenses — principally in the province. It provides technical staff and provides technical advice to the district maintenance supervisors.

MR. DOERN: So there were 13 SMYs last year and 13 this year, and no vacancies.

MR. ENNS: No vacancies.

MR. DOERN: Okay. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the section, Resolution 105, in which I believe our Energy Conservation Programs are contained, in this general area. I wanted to get some information here from We have the national headquarters of a citizen-type organization. We had a national Solar Energy Conference here in 1976 with 2,000 delegates; and although we don't have that much heat in Manitoba, we have a lot of sunshine — 2,300 hours a year about seven hours a day — so I would like to know from the Minister, what is going to happen now in terms of the Solar Energy Project? Can he tell me what he intends to do in terms of further expenditures, operations, expansion, etc? Could he indicate that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I might perhaps just open up the discussion in this area by reminding the

Thursday, May 4, 1978

Honourable Member for Elmwood, that last year when the then Minister of Public Works made a statement having to do with solar energy, it started raining that day, it didn't stop till October 11th, an impeccable source advises me. This Minister of Public Works coming from the land and witnessing the farmers just getting on to the land and getting what we all hope to be a good crop year into the ground, perhaps was subconsciously reminded of that situation and deferred from making any grand and eloquent statements in that regard.

However, this weekend — and a press release has emanated out of my office on this matter today, for publication, I guess tomorrow or the next day — and indicating as the member points out that for the first time the general public is being invited to vie the ar experimentation that is taking place on the rooftop of this building.

Those comments made by the member are well taken for very obvious reasons and the ones that he placed on the record. It has not been advisable to have or to generally invite the public to view the facilities, not because of any desire on the part of the department under his leadership, I'm sure, or certainly under my leadership, to prevent them from viewing that, simply because of the somewhat hazardous physical obstacles that are encountered in getting to the site, there's some concern on the part of those responsible that this be done.

But we don't anticipate any large numbers of people taking advantage of that offer, although by no means is it being restricted. But the guidelines that have been set down by the previous administration and carried on by this administration are very restrictive, you know, in terms of who can view the experimentation and really what this enables us to do for this weekend, is to relax them.

We do expect, principally, people who have a technical or an ongoing interest in the subject matter, to take advantage of it. Perhaps it's somewhat of a misnomer to indicate a general public invitation to viewing, although I want to make it very plain that no member of the public will be denied access to it on the weekend.

Mr. Chairman, the whole question of the experimentation up on the roof has undertaken no change as of yet. The future of the government's continued involvement in this program will hinge on the outcome of a review of this matter undertaken principally by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who, and it is sometimes forgotten, has also been charged with the responsibility of energy matters in the province, and is in the process of restructuring and setting up an Energy Council. There's a concern from myself and I think from some of the people in the Department of Public Works, while we were quite prepared and quite happy to continue carrying on the physical operations of that experiment, if in fact another division of government is charged with the responsibility of putting to use the data that is being collected and indeed developing a program that takes us one step further than what we're currently doing, then that responsibility rests with my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Finance.

I can tell the member simply this, that under the duress of time that we're all operating with the session being in place it is of course limiting his time to address himself to this matter, but that's the general direction. Nothing basically has changed and I think the Member for Elmwood would be the first one to suggest that the mere compilation of data, endless data, would hardly suffice or indeed justify the continuation of that program. It now needs to be taken a second step further into bringing in either those other communities of interest that are involved, whether at our universities and within the private sector, and indeed to be developing the broadest possible means of getting this information available and put into those hands, who in the final analysis intend to make use of it. Because in itself, what we're doing on the roof, and the member is quite aware of it, is simply compiling data as to the available amount of solar energy that can be collected with certain types of collectors, what prevailing weather conditions will provide X number of units of solar heat, etc., etc. There is no other practical feature of the work going on up on the solar experimentation project on the roof. It now needs to be taken that second step.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would remind the Minister that I believe the University of Manitoba is involved in the project and possibly other departments at the present time through Industry and Commerce, Biomass, etc. I believe there is other involvement and that the statistics and data that are available now is in fact being used over and above just the running of the machinery and the collection of data. I wanted to ask the Minister whether he himself has seen the project?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that I have.

MR. DOERN: Have not.

MR. ENNS: That I have, oh yes, oh yes.

MR. DOERN: You have. Fine. Could the Minister indicate whether he intends to complete the experiment. My impression is that if everything is operational and in good running order on the roof, that there was also a plan to develop sort of a public information room in the basement of the Legislature. The room has been allocated, there is some material there; perhaps a solar screen or two, some photographs, I believe there's maybe an audio-visual package or soundtrack down there. An original plan which was not completed was to have a room there so that the thousands upon thousands of tourists who come to this building — I don't know, up to 150,000, 200,000 a year — plus

Thursday, May 4, 1978

the citizens of Manitoba, plus school children in particular, and others interested, could go there and be informed as to what is involved in our experiment on the roof. The problem being that you cannot easily allow people to see the actual experiment because of the aforementioned difficulties, but I ask the Minister whether he has had an opportunity to examine that part of the solar demonstration project and whether he intends to complete it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on that very matter, a submission is being considered at this very time at Management Committee — it was placed there some time ago by the department — that will take advantage of the many thousands of visitors that will be touring the Legislative Building this year, and we would hope to include in Room 75-A an exhibition of the kind the member suggests, of solar technology illustrated by graphics, several types of actual collectors, an active schematic diagram of the solar demonstration and audio-visual commentaries. In other words, Mr. Chairman, principally the proposals that I suppose were initially perceived as being desirable partly, I suppose, because of the inaccessibility of the actual experiment from a physical point of view, that that be made, at least in a visual way, more accessible to more people. That is being contemplated and we hope to have that set up in Room 75-A in due course.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister plan any further experiments or involvements by the department in solar energy?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to refer to my earlier answer. I believe future initiatives quite properly ought to come from the announced Energy Council or energy group under the direction of the Minister of Finance. It would be not the role of the Department of Public Works to pioneer in this area; we would respond to requests from the department to assist or to carry out physical works, but I look forward to the Energy Council, when reconstituted and when it has set down future policy guidelines for its conduct to (a), essentially take over the future control and management of the project as well as any expansion or new or innovative ventures in this field. I think particularly the ones that we would like to stress, and I think the ones that we ought to stress, is to now get some of this experimental work that is being done by government into the hands of those people who eventually will find some practical end use for it, whether it is a small, enterprising manufacturer that is manufacturing solar panels here in Manitoba, whether it is greenhouse operators or farm operations that could make use of some of the data collected from the solar experiments. I would look to the Energy Council to move us into the second phase of this experimental work.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Minister that right now people are, in fact, being helped, who are commercial manufacturers' by this experiment. Their products are being bought. They were put into place and they are, in fact, being tested.

I wonder if the Minister could also, in passing, just mention if he is aware of any initiatives by his government in this field? For example, whether there is any plans in other departments that would either involve the Department of Public Works or not. For example, some of his colleagues in Ottawa, apparently suffering from poll fever, are now coming up with all sorts of new innovative ideas. Somebody named Stan Schellenberger — is he the one that was pushed out by your leader or is that someone else? That was Schumaker; this is Stan Schellenberger from Alberta. He is talking about tax breaks and all sorts of other developments, credits for solar energy in homes. Is the Minister aware of any other programs that his government might bring before us as a package?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in related although not in a specific way, the Minister of Finance and this government has of course already indicated in its budget approach, you know, an awareness of energy conservation and energy-saving matters, in the extension, for instance, of the sales tax removal to all insulating material, etc. But not to evade the question, that kind of question — and I've tried to say that several times now — I would look for those kind of initiatives to be taken by the Minister of Finance as the person charged with the responsibility of working with the Energy Council, or energy group here in Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: I would then ask the Minister whether he would now take the position that his government and himself have accepted the solar demonstration project and intend to continue and maintain it, and maybe even brag about it?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, like so many things, there is no question of acceptance; it's there and it's operating. There is a great deal of question as to whether or not full value for dollars has in fact been received. Certainly it is somewhat disturbing to me that after some significant time, and I'm trying to put a time frame to it but certainly a longer period than a year, very expensive equipment, control equipment, still wasn't operating when I visited the experiment and apparently has never been made operable. So, you know, if you are asking for a blanket endorsement as to whether the total dollars were wisely spent, I think it would lead into a fruitless debate. But in the main, there is no question that this government has no difficulty in accepting the solar experimentation that was initiated by the previous administration.

We believe, and perhaps would have been able to have brought about a similar compilation of data with considerably less money and considerably greater and immediate direct involvement of those people directly involved and, in fact, who are in the experimental business — the pioneering

end of the business — in this fledgling industry of developing the techniques and developing the hardware for the collection of solar energy.

c60-03 Mr. Chairman, I am not going to satisfy the honourable member that I will parade the solar experiment as one of the highlights of the previous administration. I will also not belabour the honourable member and the former Minister that it was one of the horror stories. There are just too many others that overshadowed that particular one.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I say, a better word would be a "bright spot" in the previous administration. But, I point out just in passing to the Minister that, you know, he talks about being an efficient operator and Tories are men who don't know the meaning of the word "waste" or "mismanagement", and everything will run smoother. As he said, they could have done it faster and better, and more economically. But I remind him that when you are Minister of Public Works you get a score of problems laid at your doorstep and, you know, since you have been Minister the electric doors haven't worked, the hot water hasn't worked, and all these other ridiculous things.

MR. ENNS: The coke machine doesn't work in the members' lounge.

MR. DOERN: That's right; I might remind you I lost 50 cents in the chocolate bar machine. These befall any Minister of Public Works, so I wish him well in that regard.

But I gather though that, as the Minister said, the administration has, in fact, accepted the experiment and intends to continue it. And I would hail that as a marked improvement, because it a considerable amount of was only, I think, a year ago when there as criticism coming out of the Conservative benches about the experiment and what I would regard as poor-mouthing. But I gather that we are past that and that the experiment is accepted and is going to proceed on course.

I would then like to ask the Minister about some of his other programs. This is the section under 105, operations and Maintenance, and so on, where a number of energy conservation programs were undertaken. I am interested in what will happen now to these programs. For instance, in 1974 we developed an energy conservation program in an attempt to minimize energy and to convert, where possible, renewable energy resources from, let's say, non-renewable.

Can the Minister, for starters, tell me what is happening to the program of energy conservation in existing buildings, to make them more efficient in terms of the use of energy and the conservation of energy? Is that program being carried on? Do you have the dollars for it and the direction to continue it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have no summary with me at this time. I would take the question as notice. The staff is involved in the monitoring of some of the changes that were made in this respect, and particularly some of the major buildings that we're operating. I am given to understand, with reasonable success. We have had suggestions made to us that we should employ or take on outside private sources to help us with these matters. This has not been done, principally because we feel that within the work that's being done by the department reasonable progress is being made. I'll have to ask the staff to perhaps provide me with an update or a summary of the actual types of savings in energy consumption that have been effected as a result of the work that staff has been doing in this regard.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister would be here today and tomorrow, and then will be away for two weeks. So I would ask him whether he could either by tonight or tomorrow morning, provide us with an update as to what's happening in terms of energy conservation, electric heat, awareness campaigns, encouraging staff to turn thermostats down and so on, and so on. If he would provide us with that, I would leave that particular point.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two unrelated questions. Well, there both very straightforward, I think.

The first one is, to inform the Minister who has been on the job for six months, and he may have already had the experience which I had several times when I was Minister of Finance, of being approached by several firms with a suggestion that the government would be well advised to do one and/or both of the following: One, sell some of its buildings to him on a long term lease, and he would then be able to finance it and take away some of the debt loan, debt weight of the province. Two, which he was more confident that he could sell, was the idea that he would take over management of the building in terms of servicing the building, caretaking staff, etc.

His selling point was that he was not bound by the Civil Service negotiations, and could get the work done, he said, as well, but certainly unquestionably cheaper than the government was paying, recognizing the government's employment standards with the MGEA.

I wonder if the Honourable Minister can give us any assurances in regard to his attitude to this kind of a proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I've received in the short period of time that I've been Minister, proposals that I'm sure every other Minister of Public Works or Finance has received from individual builders or

Thursday, May 4, 1978

building managers, particularly somebody that has viewed some of the empty spaces within the proximity of the building and then offers to perhaps. . . wants to build a parking facility, as for example, and with the idea of having government as tenant. We have certainly the same approaches being made to us as to any other governments where major developments are occurring in terms of new and prime office space. The normal call is made to solicit government business. I might say in this regard, that it's certainly no hang up on my part. I think the fact that perhaps in some instances we have allowed — and this goes back over a number of years, back to the sixties, perhaps beyond — a spreading out of government buildings or Crown corporations or using of government buildings — I'm referring specifically, for instance, whether it's the Hydro Building up on Taylor Avenue, the B Telephone Building down on Portage Avenue. Other jurisdictions in other cities have sometimes used this as a more effective means of developing the core and the downtown section of cities. I'm making specific reference to Edmonton, who have as a result been able to build the kind of attractive downtown areas, squares, link-up areas.

We don't have any position, we have made no commitments certainly to fundamentally alter the manner and way in which we use space. Interesting alternatives are made known to any new Minister of Public Works. The experimentation or the change that in fact is taking place in British Columbia, I believe, which I am not totally aware of, and only know of superficially, where, I believe, they have gone the route of setting up a Crown agency that took over all the government buildings, and this Crown agency is now the manager of the government space and leases it back to the government client departments. I don't imagine that that would change matters a great deal particularly in the sense that the Member for St. Johns is asking the question, insofar as that one would expect a Crown agency to operate not all that much differently than the government operating the buildings.

I can only assure the Honourable Member for St. Johns that there would have to be substantial advantages shown to this government and to this Minister for any reason to in any fundamental way change the practice and the manner and way in which lease space, or government owned space is handled by this department. In total, we have a considerable amount of space at this time. There is some contraction taking place, some consolidation will take place hopefully, that will bring about two benefits, hopefully better administration and more convenient administration.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate the extensive answer. It's not quite what I was talking about, but it's important to hear that in any event.

I'll be more specific, to give an example. The government owns buildings in the vicinity of this building on Osborne Street that are occupied by government offices. I'm not referring to new and potential space, I'm referring to the existing space presently owned and presently occupied by government. The specific proposal that I had related to one of those buildings, that the government should sell that building at a fair price to this private operator, a reputable and responsible firm, to sell the building to this person and take back a long-term lease. The argument there being just a simple one. Well, I can get my financing anywhere and it won't in fact be a burden on your assets and liabilities page. So that's one question. I don't believe that that could be contemplated as being feasible, however, I wanted reassurance on that.

The other one could be the same building and need not be — it could be the Norquay, it could be this building — and that is to take over the responsibility for maintenance. I don't mean just painting but I mean caretaking cleaning services. The argument there was straightforward and honest. We can do it cheaper because for one thing we don't pay as much, we don't give as good fringe benefits, and thirdly, we can drive our staff harder and get away with it because we're not unionized. I mean these are blunt reasons given, and I think that I'd like a reassurance that that's not being contemplated.

MR. ENNS: The Member for St. Johns wasn't here at the opening statement. I dealt briefly and touched briefly on that subject matter, indicating to the members of the committee that we have a reasonably good mixed approach in this area. We find ourselves in situations where the contracting out of certain facilities in certain buildings lends itself very well. In other instances, it's not at all applicable, particularly in many kinds of places where firstly the kind of services that are being required or asked for by the department, or client group departments, aren't available. I don't foresee any fundamental change in the department other than that I've asked the department to review the situations where a certain circumstance allows and permits — indeed encourages — for contracting out, that that be considered.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought I'd get a quicker answer than that but one that would settle my anxiety which it did not do. Could the Honourable Minister please elaborate on what he means by the kind of contracting out that he thinks might be desirable and which they are now attempting to investigate?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, firstly let me make it very clear that settling the Honourable Member for St. Johns' anxiety is not my first responsibility at this committee, but . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: It's not suggested that it is; it's just a question of time.

Thursday, May 4, 1978

MR. ENNS: . . . but it often, — if you want as a matter of principle from this Minister in the way I would approach it — is the situation that the department finds itself from time to time in individual locations that perhaps call for a temporary situation and when I mean temporary, it could very well be for a 12-month or 18-month period. I would view, rather than immediately add to departmental staff, to see whether or not suitable services for security, surveillance, for a cleaning service or caretaking service could not be sought in that manner. Where we have the kind of services that, and the quality of service, that client departments demand and have a right to expect, we would prefer that that would be done with in-house staff.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Honourable Minister clarify for me the working agreement — I guess you can call it that — with the MGEA in relation to the employment by government of contracted out services that would be in substitution for work that is normally done by employees of the government.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, I think I should perhaps ask the Honourable Member for St. Johns, or perhaps more appropriately the former Minister of Public Works who was responsible for the department when the work, or some of the work, for instance in the Norquay Building was contracted out in much the same manner that I'm suggesting. What I'm suggesting — and I'm not playing games with the Honourable Member for St. Johns — is that we find ourselves facing literally 101 different situations. In many places that the department has the responsibility for the maintenance of a building, there simply is no other alternative, nor is one desirable, other than the utilization of departmental staff in some kinds of services. Some particular kinds of security services where we ask, for instance the security services in this building have a dual nature. They have a nature that goes far and beyond the normal security services that we ask for from Metropolitan Security, Barnes, Centennial or any other of these security firms that offer their services for normal compound type security services. The security services of this building are asked to act as courteous building guides, and a great portion of their duties is involved in accommodating the tourists that come through this building, including our own school children, so under those circumstances, there is no contemplation and no problem.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, my concern is very clear. I would not like to see this government undercutting its own employees, contractual employees under the Civil Service Act, by hiring help through a contracting service which will result in people being paid less for the same work than they are being paid as employees of government. That's clearly my concern. If I'm told that there are occasions when, say, I imagine there could be a short term lease where you have to look after your own place, where it doesn't pay to go out into a place like Rock Lake and force people to move there and work at a government building that it might be better to employ temporary contractual services. But what I'm concerned about is just that, reassure — just that simple — that we are not contracting out in order to get a cheaper job done than we could get done under our present agreement with the MGEA.

MR. ENNS: I can give the member that assurance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I said I had two. I really had three. Will you let me sneak in one, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we will.

MR. CHERNIACK: All right. The one I'm sneaking in is, could the Minister tell me if the basement door is still locked at 5:30 being the only exit from the basement floor of this building?

MR. ENNS: I can tell the honourable member this, that that concern was communicated to staff and I'm now awaiting the answer.

MR. CHERNIACK: I see. Well, I was too although I haven't been there for the last week or so, so I . . .

MR. ENNS: The concern is noted again officially to the Honourable Member for St. Johns and I will accept the question seriously because, of course, it's made in a serious way and I also acknowledge the fact that there is a kind of an added, somewhat new concern about that because of the arrangement that has just been made in the last little while that houses 23 honourable gentlemen in the basement who, by nature of their work, are there on hours when the rest of the building is principally vacated and where they often are the only ones in the first floor of the building and I recognize that that could be a concern. The Deputy Minister is acknowledging the concern.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's fine. I just add, I think there's a security concern on behalf of the Department of Finance as well.

All right, Mr. Chairman, the other question. We've now been given a list of Capital Authority carry-overs by the Department of Finance which would simplify the question that I want to put to the Honourable Minister and that is that the indication is that in Public Works, the carry-over authority for

Thursday, May 4, 1978

1978-79 is \$5,742,400.00. It is my impression from this list that this item of \$5,742,400 is not shown in the Estimates but is expected to be paid out in this fiscal year. I'm asking for confirmation and a breakdown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had, just for your information, agreed the other day, or I had suggested to committee that we discuss the financial aspects under 6., the next page. The Minister says he believes he has the answer for you at hand.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we're in the same ballpark in terms of figures. My figures for outstanding capital in Public Works are \$5,742,000, in that area. I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, of that total, \$941,000 are in submissions before the Management Committee of Cabinet at this time, and the remaining \$4,800,000 has been committed to being spent this year. It is outstanding but it has been committed to being spent this year.

MR. CHERNIACK: Outstanding means it hasn't been spent, but it has been committed; is that a correct interpretation of the wording?

MR. ENNS: Committed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes. Is it on a number of projects, or is it any one or two or three major ones?

MR. ENNS: Spread over a number of accounts, which we can probably find a list for the member in due course.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, if it's put on the record, then I don't need it right now. If in due course it could be put on the record, I would appreciate it.

MR. ENNS: That's fine.

MR. CHERNIACK: And therefore it is clear that the intentions of the department are to spend the figures shown, the grand total shown, of \$53 million, plus the \$5,742,000 which is not shown on the

MR. ENNS: With this reservation: I am never so overly confident that every submission that I make to Management Committee will necessarily gain approval. The amount of that \$5 million that has gained approval or is committed is \$4,801,000.00. But I also indicate to the committee that the balance of that \$5,700,000, the last submission of \$941,000 is also before the Management Committee for approval at this particular time. If that approval is gained, then the assumption is correct that the total amount of \$5,742,000 will be spent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify my understanding. The items shown in the Printed Estimates of close to \$54 million are items that have been approved — have gone through the Management Committee process and have been approved by Cabinet — for the Estimates. My impression is that it has been approved, but for any major program that is in there but still has to be developed, it probably still has to go back to Management or Treasury Board to be approved again. So I am taking it, at this stage, that this is what the department, with the approval of Cabinet, has agreed to project as the work expected to be done and money spent in this year, but that Cabinet and Management Committee and the department, itself, may change its mind. That's my impression of how it goes, year by year. And again, I am satisfied now that the Minister has answered my questions.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the member, just while I have got him in a satisfying mood, wouldn't consider the fact that — this is the list of the projects that he is asking for — multiple, multiple lists — obviously many things, and that I don't think is the information that the honourable member requires.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if they could be categorized into buildings and equipment. Any summarized way, Mr. Chairman, so it can boil down to five or six lines would be quite satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Any further questions from the Member for St. Johns?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. James, Elmwood, and then St. Vital.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, changing the subject back to what the former Minister of Public Works was discussing with regard to the different programs converting over to the use of renewable energy sources rather than non-renewable energy sources, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise us of the present status of the electric cars? Because I believe that was part of the program that the former Public Works Minister had embarked on. I just wondered what the present status is of that particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might point out to the Member for St. James that we have a Section 3.(b) Central Provincial Garage. You are asking it from an energy point of view rather than from a car point of view, I hope.

MR. MINAKER: That is what I am doing, Mr. Chairman. I presumed that you would give me the same latitude as you gave the former Minister of Public Works on this subject, and also in fact that you would let the Honourable Member for St. Johns have such latitude and go over to Item 6.(b) at this time. Under this subject, I thought possibly that you wouldn't object to my questions relating to energy.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, let's agree that we will come back to the rules and go through the Estimates line-by-line, as we had just about agreed. But I believe the Honourable Member for St. James has a right to ask for that latitude, seeing as how we have gone around the table once.

Now, the question of electric cars, of course, is not all that bright. Let me make it very clear, you know, I have no quarrel with the idea or the concept of a government being pioneering in a new and innovative way. It certainly is the appropriate role for government to do this from time to time. But, you know, I question whether or not nine cars had to be purchased only to find out they are lemons, and whether one car wouldn't have sufficed to have demonstrated that.

I must say a very loose arrangement with the supplier was entered into by the previous Minister, to the extent that we still haven't got the proper equipment and converters to properly charge these cars. This led to the situation where the former First Minister, on taking one of the cars home one week-end, never made it across the Disraeli Freeway — perhaps because the cord wasn't long enough, I don't know. But he had to come back, in any event.

But the sad state of the matter is that the cars, you know, at considerable expense to the public purse, have essentially taken up valuable parking space for the last year. We have now, in an effort to derive some gainful benefit to the taxpayers who paid for these cars, sent three to the University of Manitoba, one additional one to the Red River Community College. These cars haven't been disposed of or sold; they are there for the instructors and the classes' use for experimental purposes. So hopefully our future engineers and electricians, and what have you, future automobile makers can have the use of these cars to experiment with at the University and at Red River College. That still leaves me with three that I am trying to find a home for.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, from the Minister's answer I presume then that this particular experiment has been discontinued as far as looking at using a renewable energy source as a form of motivation then.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we have just never been able to overcome the technical difficulties of the manner and way in which these units can be properly recharged. Aside from adding up the initial and total and capital costs of this experiment, you know, the time and space that these these units have taken up was beginning to mount up. Again, I simply say that it just boggles my imagination why a small fleet of them was purchased. I would not be critical of the former Minister of the government if he had been satisfied to purchase one, and I can remember it so clearly, the pictures, the former Minister's picture in the paper along with that of the First Minister on the steps of the Legislative Building, the government fleet was going electric. They had solved the energy problem here in Manitoba. And I would have to report that we haven't solved them with the use of those electric cars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, could I ask if the fact that detailed records are being kept of the solar energy unit on the roof of the building and have been kept since its inception, could the Honourable Minister advise if we have kept any detailed records of the performance of these vehicles in terms of energy conversion costs and maintenance costs and also hours of operation?

MR. ENNS: Yes, I'm told that they are available.

MR. MINAKER: My next question is, Mr. Chairman, is the information that is being gathered on the solar energy source at the roof, public information that's being made available to people?

MR. ENNS: I don't know whether it's public information as such but certainly available to interested parties, to the University of Manitoba and to any other private . . . through the Energy Council, yes.

MR. MINAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that basis then, I don't think I'd be out of order to ask if it would not require a lot of cost? I would myself be very interested in seeing the details of the records on the cars, but if it's going to take a lot of man hours to put it together, no. If it has been kept, I'd be interested in seeing it.

MR. ENNS: We can undertake to provide the member with that information.

MR. MINAKER: The last question is, would the Honourable Minister at this time, or his staff, have in

their possession the capital costs of the vehicle fleet, and also what the operating cost was last year to maintain them and operate them?

MR. ENNS: You're referring to the electric vehicles?

MR. MINAKER: Yes.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that cost can also be made available to the member at the same time that we give him the other data.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is obviously considered a topic of some amusement by the Conservatives. This is obviously a standard gag and I think demonstrates the considerable ignorance of what is going on in the world and what is going on in terms of the possible limitations of gas and oil, and what is going on in electric car developments around the world. You know, when the airplane was first developed, I don't know whether the Wright brothers — whether it was 1911 — I don't recall the exact date, but it was the early part of this century the airplane was developed. And in the early days people did not get on airplanes and say, "Take me to Los Angeles in three or four hours," or they didn't say, "Let's get on this plane and let's go to Paris and back," because it took decades and millions and millions of hours of time and millions and millions of dollars to develop this. The same would apply, I suppose, to the development of American rockets, of all the space experiments and technology. When the Americans started they didn't have the capacity to equal the Russians, and then they poured billions and billions and billions of dollars into this, and eventually they came up with a man on the moon. I don't know what good that was; I don't know whether that did us any good. I think quite frankly it was a waste of money, and certainly whatever was spent in Houston and at Cape Kennedy in terms of spin-offs, I think was a waste of money, just like the Vietnam war.

Now, the American government is spending and has a bill through Congress — and I direct this to the Member for St. James as well, I draw it to his attention as a man of science, which I do not claim to be, but he is — the American government passed through Congress a bill for some \$150 million to develop electric cars, and they are going to purchase, I think, about right now, 2,500 vehicles — something like 50 vehicles from 50 suppliers — and run them in the post offices and in what they call, I think, HEW, in their Environmental Department — they are overseeing the experiment — and the people that we bought cars from, who are a small operation in a suburb of Cleveland, once again they are getting contracts from the American government, they are going into other developments in this area. For example, when we bought the cars from them, it was a couple of years ago, they were using Renault bodies, and that's really all they were using, they were not really Renault cars other than they were the body of the car, and then they used the series of electric gear to tie up some 16-odd batteries and to drive the motor, etc., etc., etc. Early stages of development. These people are now expanding, they are now using American Motor bodies, and they are using their technology, etc., etc. When we bought these cars, we bought them on the basis of an experiment. Nobody thought that these cars were the equal of the gas engine; I never thought that; the Premier never thought that; nobody in the Department of Public Works thought that. We knew that these cars, according to the manufacturer, would have a range of about 30 to 60 miles depending on how fast you drove them. We knew that in winter there would be a loss in efficiency because of the rather nasty climate that we live in compared to more southerly, warm climes and so on and so on, so we found out that these cars had some defects. It didn't surprise me; I was only surprised in that some of the defects were worse than I anticipated.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would permit me to interject because I really don't think the item deserves any great, lengthy debate. But my question to the honourable member right now is, and I would be less critical of the electric cars, if he would have bought seven different types of cars, but he bought seven cars that were identical, that he now tells us they knew in advance would only operate 30 to 60 miles, wouldn't operate in the wintertime . . .

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have the floor so I think I'll continue my comments. If I could continue my comments . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . so from the experimental point of view all the member is doing is compounding his difficulties.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the Minister interrupted me, because I would point out to him that in Manitoba there are several other manufacturers or makes that are in existence, for example, we bought an electric truck from Boyertown, Pennsylvania . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the Member for Elmwood carries on, it is now 4:30 and in accordance with Rule 19 (2), I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m. unless — and this is the big "if" — Private Members' Hour only goes for a matter of

Thursday, May 4, 1978

minutes, so I might remind all members that they might be called back to the Committee and we will resume shortly and proceed until 5:30, if Private Members' Hour falters.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the Honourable Members to Page 27 under the Department of Education, Resolution 45, Clause 5. Community Colleges Division (a)(1) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that yesterday the Honourable Minister in response to a question regarding the housing needs for students at Red River Community College, had indicated that he is considering a number of alternatives with a view to resolving the matter of housing. Would the Honourable Minister indicate the types of alternatives that he is considering in order to resolve the housing problem of the Red River Community College students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Burrows, some of the alternatives that have been looked at are, of course, looking at the Federal Housing Authority. They have been approached and, I believe, information just received recently is there's been some change in policy there that may in fact, have some bearing on this matter of student housing. I've also approached the Minister in charge of Housing for the provincial government as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5. (a)(1)—pass;(2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b)(1)—pass; (2)—pass;— The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, would the Honourable Minister please explain this particular item, what is contained within it. I'm referring to 5.(b) Programs, if that is the item we're on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, this is under the heading of Programs, perhaps better known to the Member for Burrows as Planning and Evaluation. This is the directorate that operates as part of the division responsible to the Director of Programming, via the Director of Programming to the Associate Deputy Minister. It has overall responsibility for the planning and evaluation of programs operated by the community colleges in Manitoba and, specifically, it is responsible for the assessment and submission for approval, coordination, evaluation, and continuing development of existing courses at the colleges.

It also manages the federal training improvement projects, sometimes called TIP and this fund provides financial support for innovative development or experimental projects related to Canada Employment and Immigration Commission training programs. And, of course, the directorate also represents the division on a number of advisory committees and similar groups.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Minister could elaborate a bit more on his explanation because as he had indicated, the responsibility of this particular branch is to do planning and evaluation and I have a distinct recollection, Mr. Chairman, that when we dealt with Resolution 42 entitled "Research", that it was indicated by the Minister at that time that with the amalgamation of the two former departments, Education and Continuing Education and Manpower, with a view to creating a more efficiently operating department, that the planning and research functions of the two previous departments were combined into one. When we dealt with research under the previous resolution, namely 42, that branch was doing research work as described therein which includes planning for the entire spectrum of the education program, extending from Kindergarten into the Post Secondary field. And now, the Honourable Minister just indicated to us that he has another research branch under community colleges which strikes me, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any further explanation, as somewhat of a duplication of services.

The Honourable Minister also went on to indicate that this branch administers the TIP Program, Training Improvement Program, but, Mr. Chairman, I think you will note that there is a separate line for Training Improvement Program, namely, (g) under 5 which we'll come to after dealing with the individual community colleges or not long thereafter. And it includes a salary item of \$96,000.00. So, I'm still somewhat at a loss to know the distinction between the two, in view of the fact that they are shown separately, but the Minister had indicated that under (b) Programs, comes the management and administration of the Training Improvement Program. So it's two questions, Mr. Chairman, that I'm posing to the Minister.

One, if he would explain the structure of the research arm within his department in view of the fact that he had indicated some time ago that under R 42 research for the whole department was combined into one branch, and then here planning and evaluation surfaces again, and also the relationship to Training Improvement Program in view of the fact that under 5.(g) Training Improvement Program

we are also given a salary item, which appears that it stands on its own and operates on its own, quite separate and apart from the item that we are presently dealing with.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, once again to the Honourable Member for Burrows, I really am surprised that he is not aware of what is involved in the programming and development area. This is operational planning and operational development of programs, which I suppose if you want to expand that whole sphere of research you might include it in there. I suppose some people include almost anything in research. However, this is not in the terms that I commonly see research, under the same heading.

Now, when it comes to the hard data that this particular branch might require in this planning and evaluation, that hard data would come from the Research Branch, and they certainly would be working in harmony with that branch under those circumstances. But what we are talking about here is program planning and the evaluation of those programs, probably in the broader educational sense.

On the other point, Mr. Chairman, once again I'm a bit surprised because I realize the Honourable Member for Burrows, no more than some six months ago was Minister of this particular area and had been for some time, I am sure he realizes that the TIP Program is completely federally funded and, as a result, has to appear under a separate item here if the federal people are prepared to carry through with their funding. And that is one of the reasons, and the main reason, that it appears here as a separate entity.

The salaries, as he realizes, go to cover contract personnel in that branch and depend on the number of projects, and so on, that are being carried forth under that particular heading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I am equally surprised that the Minister is surprised, because with the amalgamation of the two departments and with the change in the Estimates format which in many areas really bear very little resemblance, if any, to the former structure and hence the questions to give the Honourable Minister an opportunity to indicate to the people of Manitoba how the department is structured and how it operates. In my sense, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister would rather not have the public know how his department operates. So if that is the case and he wants to keep it a secret, well, let him say so.

MR. COSENS: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. It's just that I do believe that this particular category appeared last year in the Estimates and I fail to understand the concern that the Member for Burrows is mentioning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, we had approved Salaries which shows \$23,000 and a few hundred dollars increase, but I note that there is an increase in Salaries on the one hand but a decrease of Expenditures on the other. Could the Honourable Minister explain that, because one would normally think that if there is an increased salary expenditure that there would be a proportionate other expenditure increase but here it is the reverse.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, hardly a significant decrease — I believe some \$13,000.00. It merely represents the direction that that department is taking. It feels that it can accomplish the goals and programs that it has for this year within this type of expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, further to the same question and answer, I am wondering whether, in looking at this, because it isn't just in this particular instance that there is a decrease in expenditures but there are some others following. I want to know from the Minister whether this means one of two things. Does it mean that certain supplies, and so on, were purchased in the fiscal year 1977-78 so that the 1978-79 could be reduced accordingly because they had used last year's funds in order to purchase ahead? In other words, to increase the amounts spent in 1977-78 and to decrease the amount to be spent in 1978-79. Or is it that certain items which might be of a Capital nature are not shown, are dropped because it is going to be spent through Capital, formerly voted Capital Supply?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Seven Oaks, I think if there is a small reduction in expenditures here there are a number of reasons. In fact, a whole variety of reasons that may range from perhaps over-budgeting last year or perhaps the fact that the particular division feels that they can practice further economies and achieve the same results. Or in fact it may mean that some of the projects that were undertaken the previous year have been completed and the projects that they have facing them in the year ahead will not require the same amount of expenditure. It doesn't represent, Mr. Chairman, any drop in the amount of work or in the amount of undertaking of the department, at all.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again I apologize because in a sense I am straddling more than one item here, not just (b). But the Minister says it does not reflect a change in programming and certainly Salaries indicate an increase. But Other Expenditures has nothing to do with Salaries on people on staff, it is the expenditures other than actual salaries. And it is a decrease and to suggest that somehow these just flow logically and that they can perform as well with these less expenditures, I am curious to know the nature of this drop. I am curious to know what was dropped, even though it is a very small amount in this item (b) that we are dealing with — it is between \$33,000 and \$20,000.00. In dollars it's very small, it's only \$13,000.00. But going down, as I say, to the others it adds up to a considerable number of dollars in total.

And so the Minister says, "Well, I can assure the House that the programs are going on and they are not, in any way, going to be . . . there is no diminution at all." And this simply reflects the fact that they can somehow do it with less expenditures than in the past. I would be curious to know the nature of the expenditures last year and what changes have taken place this year in (b), (c), (d) and (e) Items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks made reference to Item (b); we are on Item (c).

MR. MILLER: I apologize. On Items (c), (d) and (e), and if you don't want to mention (d) and (e) until we get to it, just Item (c).

MR. COSENS: Yes, under this item, Mr. Chairman, I understand that in the left-hand column we have included the general salary increase last year, which certainly would account for some increase on the left side in relation to that on this year's appropriations. I also understand that the equipment budget has been included in these expenditures that that purchasing and renewal of equipment has been included on the left side and this year it appears in Capital in Item No. 8.

MR. MILLER: Okay, Mr. Chairman, exactly. Therefore what appears on the left-hand side includes the capital, or as the Minister put it, equipment replacement, that sort of — I forget the term, the technical term used — but it's the equipment replacement, tools, etc., etc., that have to be replaced from year to year — they are included in the left-hand side because of the combined Capital and Current and that the Minister says the Capital portion is actually in Item No. 8 and that will appear there under \$4.6 million.

Now I want to ask the Minister whether, in addition to that, is there any amount of money in this appropriation of the 1978-79 carry-over of \$1,573,000 which the Minister of Finance indicated in the table he circulated yesterday, is there anything in addition on the right-hand side because in the summary distributed yesterday by the Minister of Finance, he indicated that \$1,573,000 would be spent — and I don't know whether it's Community Colleges or where it is, but certainly part of it has to be here — and whether that amount has not been shown in the right-hand column, therefore, reducing the right-hand column to that extent.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in attempting to come to grips with the dilemma of the Member for Seven Oaks, I can inform him that some \$48,800 has been carried through on the equipment purchases as he, I know, understands that some equipment is not delivered on time and, as a result, this has been carried through. Of course, I would also mention that the equipment for this year — \$1 million — is not shown in the \$24 million in the right-hand column.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like clarification. \$48,800 is included in the figure of \$2,707,000 that we have there or is it included in No. 8? The \$48,800 referred to, is that amount for equipment included in the \$2,707,000 or is that amount included in the No. 8 item, we'll find out later on in the \$4.6 million?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the particular \$48,800 I referred to is included in those moneys that the Minister of Finance, I believe, pointed out yesterday as being flow-through money.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there's two figures we're dealing with here: \$48,800 and \$1 million. I'd like to identify exactly how they're being treated. I gather now, from what the Minister is saying, that the \$48,800 is not in the printed figure here, the \$48,800 is not in the printed figure of \$2,707,000.00. Is the \$1 million in the printed figure of \$2,707,000.00?

MR. COSENS: No, that figure does not appear in these printed Estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: So that \$1 million and \$48,800 does not appear in these printed Estimates?

MR. COSENS: The \$1 million, Mr. Chairman, that will be used by the Community Colleges for equipment replacement and purchase appears under Appropriation No. 8. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets. The \$48,800 does not appear anywhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We're on 45.(c)(2) is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 45.(c)(1) Salaries.

MR. JENKINS: No, I want to speak on (c)(2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Minister indicate the projected enrollment or the anticipated enrollment for the 1978-79 fiscal year for Red River Community College as compared with that for the fiscal year just ended. I believe that Community Colleges, as a rule, in comparing that type of data, they do it on a number of student days, I believe, as opposed to the total number of students because simply indicating total number of students doesn't really mean all that much if you lump together the part-time students with the full-time, evening and so forth. Also their courses are varying lengths so in some meaningful fashion, if you would give us that comparative analysis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I know the Member for Burrows appreciates the significance of the fact that the number of students at any given time at the community colleges fluctuates depending on the length of the courses, so that at any given time to take an estimate would not really give you a true figure. I can give you those figures and then the gross training days which I think is the figure that he's referring to which is probably a better representation of the output of the community college. They list, for 1977-78, some 22,846 students and for 1978-79, a projection of 26,105. Now, if we translate that into gross training days, in 1977-78, some 1,261,114 and in 1978-79, and increase — not a huge increase — but gross training days of 1,297,747.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just a little bit confused here with the Other Expenditures from the item that appears in last year's Estimates as passed. I believe last year it was \$4,949,000 and this year's Estimate, on the left-hand side of the page, show only for this Other Expenditure item \$3,053,200.00. This also appears in (d)(2), (e)(2) and I'm not going to speak on those at this time but I just want to know, was there an under-expenditure of the voted Estimates because we find a discrepancy, a difference of \$1,896,700 between what was voted last year, and I imagine that the left-hand side of the page of this year's Estimates shows what was actually expended in Other Expenditures. Where has this money been transferred to in the department?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Logan, I appreciate his question, I can understand his problem in trying to understand or reconcile these particular figures. The DPW, Department of Public Works, allocation to the Community Colleges appears in those figures that he refers to as some \$4 million, I think it is, 949, I believe that's the figure. The Department of Public Works Capital has been taken out of these particular figures. It doesn't appear in this year's and has been taken out of the figures on the left-hand side of the sheet as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, then would it be fair to say that the \$1,896,700 would show as an expenditure last year under the Department of Public Works? I realize that we're overlapping and that's the problem that you have with your new methods of presenting the Estimates. But would it be fair to say that that money that is shown here — that \$1,896,000, and the same thing for the succeeding ones — that these would show up now under the Department of Public Works, the Estimates there, as a Capital? Is that correct?

MR. COSENS: Yes.

MR. JENKINS: And also carrying on, that answers that question, there is a considerable cutback in the Other Expenditures at Red River Community College this year, roughly around \$300,000 I believe, or maybe in excess of that. And with the increased enrollment that seems to be going on at the Red River Community College, both in the day and the evening program, can the Minister explain why there is this cutback in the expenditures, given the fact that goods, services and supplies and the inflation that we are living under today, is there a cutback in the Other Expenditures? There must be, because otherwise, given the fact even if we stayed at even money, we wouldn't be having as many other supplies, are there any staff man years of contract or term employees in this Other Expenditure that have been reduced or done away with? Is this the reason why there is a cutback in the expenditures from what was expended last year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Logan, these reductions, I suppose, reflect an increase in efficiency, more students per teacher in the classrooms, general efficiency

measures that the colleges have been undertaking in their operation — not just this year; in all fairness I understand this has been going on for some time. They have been looking very closely at their operation, and each year have been able to really make rather significant reductions in their operating costs because of this type of efficiency. I think they are certainly to receive tribute for that type of efficiency. I'd suggest that they run a very tight ship and those responsible are to be complimented for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: The Honourable Minister didn't answer my question. Are there any staff man years of staff within this Other Expenditures, or is it strictly for goods and services?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, not in the item under Expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I'd like to ask one more question, and I don't know if this is the right item, but it's dealing with Red River Community College, the college itself, and I realize that part of it is an application that they made to CMHC for facilities. Where in the Estimates could we discuss that item?

MR. COSENS: I suppose with the Minister of Housing with the Provincial Government, although as I've mentioned to the Member for Burrows, that application — you're speaking of the application to the Federal Government, I believe, at this time — they have made tentative proposals to the Federal Government and I am not aware of any particular answers that they have received at this time.

MR. JENKINS: Well, it's my understanding that they have also made some application to the Provincial Government for some input into this. The proper place would be under the Minister of Housing. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to pursue that a little further because the Minister of Education, according to a letter I have from the Students Association at Red River, are in the process of seeking assistance from, or approval from, the Minister of Education. It says: "Regarding the approval of the building of a student residence on our campus." I wonder what role the Minister has played in that. What role he intends to play in that, or what role the province is playing in that application?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the honourable member's question. The Student Organization at Red River Community College has been looking at residence accommodation for some time. In their approach to me and to the Provincial Government through me — and I mention this is our first meeting on this topic — they were looking for a guarantee for the moneys that they would borrow, through one or the other of the different housing authorities and for tentative approval from the government for them to explore this particular topic.

I might report that I certainly am in sympathy with that type of initiative that they have been showing and I understand it's been carrying on for some time — perhaps for years.

The matter of the guarantee from the provincial government, of course, has not come before Cabinet because they have not as yet had a concrete proposal accepted or really go beyond the consideration stage, either at the federal level or at the provincial level.

Now, their first approach has been to the Federal Housing authority and also at the same time, it's been passed on to the Manitoba Housing authority.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan had to leave for another meeting and he asked me if I would pursue this a little further.

I wonder which parts then, of the letter that I suppose all MLAs receive from the Students Council, they were asking for a number of things from the province and I wonder if he could indicate which of these things the province has agreed to do and which things the province has not agreed to do and which things the province is still considering.

1. Was a letter from the province indicating its support and backing.
2. The province must state its intention or desire for student housing and establish a priority list.
3. The province must agree to covering any cost over that amount approved and funded by CMHC.
4. The CMHC loan would be an absolute maximum.
5. If the project is on campus and there is no land factor than can be applied as the Housing Corporation's contribution.

Now maybe that's not very well worded. Maybe the Minister can explain that regardless of the wording of those five points raised in their letter.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can explain to the honourable member the fact that the housing proposal at this point is still just that. The government, — in fact until the proposal becomes solidified and the Student Association is able to get something a bit more concrete from either level of government, federal or provincial, regarding the co-operative housing residence that they have planned — will not be considering the guarantee and the financial aspect until that time.

We're awaiting — perhaps you might describe it — as more solidification of the situation; in fact a positive reply from either CMHC or the provincial housing authority.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to ask the Minister then, in view of his colleagues' dislike for public housing, senior citizens' housing, co-operative housing, etc., I wonder what position he is taking as the Minister. Is he in support? Is he encouraging the students to pursue this matter? Or is he being honest with them and saying, "Look, this new government really isn't interested in this kind of project and forget it, you're not getting any support from the Department of Education." I wonder what approach he's taking to that matter.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I have been encouraging them to pursue the matter and get the facts and the figures, so that I can place them before my colleagues for careful consideration.

MR. McBRYDE: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, then, if the Minister has done any ground work with his colleagues to prepare them to accept this kind of proposal, because it doesn't seem that they are prepared at this time to accept this kind of proposal.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to speculate about who will accept what at this point until I have concrete figures and information to place before people for their consideration.

As I mentioned, at this point I've been asking the student representatives to gather this information, to get a concrete proposal that I can then place before Cabinet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister indicate whether whatever costs may be incurred in connection with the conduct of — I believe it's called The Open House — Red River Community College Open House, which usually occurs sometime in March or April — (Interjection)— That's right, it was about a week ago. Whether the costs related to that would appear under this item, that is Other Expenditures or whether they're shown elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand that those costs would appear under that particular item. I might mention that I had the pleasure of attending that particular Open House, and I would certainly recommend it to all members, the type of work, the type of displays and the community relations aspect of this type of Open House is something that I commend the colleges for. I understand it's practised by all colleges in the province and I think it's a miraculous and very very beneficial bit of public relations.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt about it and I'm very pleased that the Honourable Minister is continuing that practice and is providing funding to enable that practice to be continued.

But I have one question in my mind, Mr. Chairman. I believe that over the years the participants in Open House — and particularly those who may have been assigned the duty to escort people around the various exhibits and so forth — and they wore identifying insignia of some kind, it may have been hats or whatever else, and usually that was done in what I believe are the college colours which are green and gold. This year I am advised, that they were found to be wearing hats with ribbons, red, white and blue, which happen to be the colours of a political party; and one which happens to be the government party. I'm wondering if one can attach any significance to the change in the colours of the insignia worn by some of the participants in the Open House exercise.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for Burrows is injecting a certain bit of humour into the debate. But by the same token, I can assure him that my guide had a ribbon that was green and gold on his particular hat.

The hats, I understood, may have been borrowed from some other organization, some fraternal group, something of that nature and perhaps under the gold and the green, there may have been some other colours. At the time, perhaps if someone had thought of the red, white and blue colours it might have been a rather novel innovation, but I find a great deal of pride existing in the students at the college in their own school colours and I know they're proud to wear them. I was pleased to see that that's the colours they were using on that occasion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, there was some question about the Other Expenditure, but I'm still not clear. I wonder if I could get the Minister to explain in a little bit more detail what the Other

Expenditures are and which Other Expenditures have been cut to bring about this reduction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Well, I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, how specific the information is that the member requires. If he wants specific information then it's going to take us some time to gather that information for him, because we're talking about all of the expenditures of a large educational institution. And when you're talking about some \$3 million, or close to \$3 million, and you're talking about a cut of something in the area of \$300,000, then the amount of lessening of purchasing in one area, or the economies that may be accomplished in another will be quite small but if he requires that information, if it is possible to get it, I can certainly ask the officials responsible for that particular college to endeavour — I don't know if we're asking something that's impossible or not, or if in fact the information would be that revealing but I suppose they can go through the different items, so many packages of paper and so many drafting pencils and this sort of thing, so many gross of this, so many gross of that and come up with a figure, if this is what he's after.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, I'm going to have to ask the Honourable Minister for that because we've been through an experience now for the last number of months under this administration where there is talk about efficiencies and cutting fat and running more efficient programs when, in fact, what they've done is cut services and cut programs. I would like to know what services and what programs have been cut in this amount. I would like the Minister to bring forward that kind of detail, if he could bring forward that kind of detail as to just what has been cut and what services the community college will now not be providing or the students will be doing without as a result of the program cuts of this government.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can allay the fears of the honourable member by mentioning to him — I don't believe he was present at the time that the Member for Seven Oaks and myself were going through some reconciliation here of these figures — but added into those Other Expenditures in the three community colleges is \$1 million in equipment expenditure that does not show here but which shows on the left-hand column. The equipment expenditure has been included in those expenditures, so in fact the comparison, once you include that particular figure into the three colleges, I would suggest becomes rather minimal.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll still have to ask the Honourable Minister for this type of information because, the colleges being faced with a cutback in funds available for them to operate have undertaken various measures and the community college at The Pas, for example, has undertaken a measure of contracting out of services. Now, was that kind of cutback necessary at Red River Community College or how did they cut services so they avoided contracting out? Maybe The Pas Keewatin Community College could learn from the experience at Red River that they didn't have to go to contracting out of services in order to bring themselves under the government cutbacks.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest once again to the honourable member that if he adds in the \$1 million in equipment purchasing into the expenditure figures for the community colleges that in fact the discrepancy will be minimal if it exists at all.

MR. McBRYDE: I am, I will have to admit, a little bit lost and confused because I understood the way the book is set up here that what's provided on this year's expenditure side is matched, as much as possible, on last year's expenditure side. Then if you look at that you'll see that there's an increase in salaries — which is a natural thing that takes place every year — but then there is a pretty drastic reduction in relationship in Other Expenditures and this is why I'd like to know what other expenditures have been cut. What exactly are they? This is the information I would like to get from the Minister because each community college, faced with these cutbacks of the present government, has to cut back certain services. I would like to know which ones Red River have cut back in.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will reiterate once again that in fact the fears that the member is suggesting that, if he adds in the \$1 million into the expenditures for those three colleges, in fact will not represent any significant cutback if any cutback at all, so he is talking about something, I would suggest to him, that does not exist.

MR. McBRYDE: Then is the Minister saying that what I should do on this side in trying to understand the budget of this department, the expenditures of this department, is take this \$1 million figure for equipment, etc. and add it into the right-hand column but not into the left-hand column of last year? I mean, moneys were expended on equipment last year too and unless you took that \$1 million and added it into one side which would show then quite an increase in expenditures, and there was no such expenditures last year, then we still have a reduction and I don't think you can explain away a reduction quite that easily.

MR. COSENS: Well, I will let the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, judge how easy it is. I should point out to him that last year there was some \$459,700 spent on equipment as opposed to \$1 million this year. If that's a reduction I would like him to explain that to me because the figures for equipment,

as I've mentioned, are \$459.7 — I said .7 I now find in checking the figures it's .9 — this year it's \$1 million. Certainly that is not a cut, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I would suggest it's certainly a very sizeable increase and reflects the confidence of this government in the type of work that they're doing in the colleges, and also I think it reflects the fact that the equipment replacements over the last few years, Mr. Chairman, have not been adequate and the problem that the colleges have been faced with has been that their equipment has started to become outdated. When the graduates who train on that equipment go out into the world, in some cases, they have experienced some difficulty in adjusting to new equipment. The employers — and I think the honourable member is aware that we have advisory councils of people in the industrial field and people in the field who will be employing the graduates who advise the colleges on the courses and the equipment that they use in these — courses these employers and potential employers have been concerned that, in fact, we are training people on outdated equipment and equipment that does not train them to meet the type of challenge or the type of equipment they'll meet out in that real world, out in the world of industry where there has been some updating of equipment to keep up with the production demands that industry certainly faces.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the measures that the Minister has been able to have taken to upgrade equipment but I don't think it answers the question I was asking and maybe he could get his officials to take a moment and give me some general idea of the specific item we're talking about — No. 45.(c)(2) Other Expenditures for Red River Community College. Is this a cut in the toilet paper of the institution; is this a cut in the secretarial services; is this a cut in the amount of video tape that's available since they inherited some from the Focus program I guess? Exactly where are the cuts coming and are those cuts this year possible because of expenditures in past years? I wonder if the Minister could get a summary of some of that detail which I'm sure he has in the book in front of him and he is now aware exactly what they are.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'll certainly be glad to supply that information to the member, however, I would suggest that we are not talking about a cutback in that total expenditure appropriation at all if he adds in the portion of that \$1 million in equipment that would be going to Red River Community College. However, he's asked for information and I would be pleased and I feel obligated to provide it to him: 1977-78, Advertising and Exhibits—\$23.7; 1978-79, \$23.1 — there's a slight reduction. Building Maintenance Supplies: 1977-78, \$31.6; 1978-79, \$31.6. Household Supplies: 1977-78, \$53.1 and in 1978-79, \$53.1. Medical and Safety Requirements: 1977-78, \$3.7; in 1978-79, \$3.7. Utilities: 1977-78, \$5.3; in 1978-79, \$5.3. Automobile: 1977-78, \$38.4 — and here's a reduction, Mr. Chairman, 1978-79, \$38.0, some \$400 there. Travel: 1977-78, \$30.3 and in 1978-79, \$30.3. Transportation: 1977-78, \$11.9 and in 1978-79, \$11.8. Books: in 1977-78 — and I'm not sure what type of books we're talking about here, Mr. Chairman, but I could get that information — \$50.7 and here's one on the other side of the ledger, 1978-79, \$51.4 — a slight increase there.

In Course Consumables — and these are materials and so on, foods, etc. that are used up in the process of the learning/teaching process — in 1977-78 some \$1,119,000, I believe that's the correct figure, .2, and in 1978-79, a reduction here, \$1,089,300.00. Freight: 1977-78, \$15,000 and in 1978-79, \$14.8. Clothing: 1977-78, \$17.8 and in 1978-79, \$16.6. Subsistence: \$445.5 and in 1978-79, \$444.0. Miscellaneous: \$17.3 in 1977-78 and in 1978-79, \$16.0. Audiovisual Audio-visual: in 1977-78, \$85,000 and the same amount in 1978-79. Membership fees: \$2,000 in 1977-78, the same amount in 1978-79. Periodicals: in 1977-78, \$17.1; the same amount in 1978-79. Office Furniture: in 1977-78, \$19.3 and here is a reduction, Mr. Chairman, although there may be some other explanation for it, I see no sum of money opposite that appropriation in 1978-79. That may be a non-recurring item or by the same token it may be something they practice every two years rather than annually. I wouldn't know; I'd have to check into that item. Office Equipment: in 1977-78, some \$16.7 and in 1978-79, \$7.5 — a reduction there. Classroom Furniture: 1977-78, some \$22.1 and in 1978-79, \$19.5. Equipment Purchases: in 1977-78, \$295.5 and the item that appears here is \$21.2. Equipment Rentals: in 1977-78, \$68.8 and in 1978-79, \$69.8. Building Renovations and Maintenance: 1977-78, some \$1,000 and the same amount in 1978-79.

The totals that occur here, Mr. Chairman, for 1977-78, some \$3,053,200 and in 1978-79, some \$2,707,600.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I believe that the Honourable Member for Roblin does want to enter into debate. I have one brief question then I am sure that all of us would be most happy to hear the contribution of the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I yield to the former Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Honourable Minister, in giving us the comparative figures, did make reference to equipment purchases for the fiscal year just ended and then for this current fiscal year and he included the figure for the current fiscal year within the total of \$2,707,000.00. I was of the impression, if I understood the Honourable Minister correctly, that equipment purchases for the current fiscal year for the Estimates that we now are considering, is not included in Other Expenditures as shown here, with specific reference to Red River Community College under (c)(2), but under 8.(a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the point raised by the Member for Burrows, this particular equipment, I am informed, is non-capital equipment, what might be classed as smaller equipment, I suppose maybe smaller items in the audio-visual area, this sort of thing that does not come under the category as capital equipment.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, would the Honourable Minister please explain that point, because a few moments ago he took great pride in the present government investing funds in equipment which had according to him become obsolete over the years and so forth to keep pace with the changes in technology and so forth, hence the million dollars. But if my memory serves me correctly, and I did not record the figures as he was reading them, but I do recall a very significant reduction in that equipment figure that he had given us from last year to this year.

MR. COSENS: Well, once again, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Burrows, I have to point out that the \$1 million, that part of that \$1 million that would be included in the Red River Community College budget, does not appear in this particular Estimate item. It appears in No. 8; however, last year that equipment item appeared on the left-hand side of the Estimate book — at least, this year it appears there for the 1977-78 — and of course, \$295.5 thousand is a long way from the type of equipment purchasing that would be done by the college.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps some of these points will unravel themselves as we move along, but I know that the Honourable Member for Roblin is very, very anxious to get into the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three questions I'd like to put on the Order Paper and before the Minister that's now heading the Department of Education. I recall discussions in the 1966-67-68-69 area, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, that were dealing with matters that are before us today — colleges, universities, municipalities, towns, villages — to recognize there's only one tax dollar. And there were meetings held in those days, up until 1969, to recognize to the jurisdictions that are wringing this dollar out, this one tax dollar, that there's only one dollar, and there has to be debate and liaison and discussion as to how these administrations are going to deal with that dollar. And to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, I can't recall a discussion ever being held with municipalities, school divisions, local citizens regarding the tax dollars, regarding this matter or others; in fact, I can suspect and offer to the Honourable Minister that the former government even went so far as to set up this Parkland Community Development type of improvement, which is highly political. The local school division didn't have any input into it whatsoever; neither did the local town or village; neither did the local citizens. The only input, as I can gather, over those years — and it was only a pilot project — was from the government of the day. So I would just ask, very briefly, to the Minister, if he is, under this item, prepared now to go back to Square One and deal with the local school divisions, with the municipalities, divisions, and the citizens, and go back — there's only one tax dollar, and there should be discussions before we declare our budgets and decide where we are going to, or how we are going to spend that one tax dollar.

I know members opposite are going to be very uptight about that matter because they don't believe in that system; they believe in the state system, the state's supreme and the municipalities and the school divisions and the local jurisdiction or the local citizens — unless they're political — they shouldn't have any input or in fact even attack the principles and the thrust of that government, because government is supreme. So I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would, when he rises to his feet, tell me that we're going to go back to Square One and have some communication with the municipalities, the school divisions, the towns and villages and the people, as we try and share this one tax dollar among the community colleges, the universities, the school divisions and all those children in this province that want and deserve a good education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. MCBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more questions for the Minister. I might just comment on the Member for Roblin's contribution to the discussion in that he seems to have some belief in his mind that the government which he is now a part of is willing to involve people in decision-making and discussions, and I think that the evidence so far is that nothing could be further from the truth. I think the Task Force Report is a good example of that kind of situation which basically recommends a more centralized and controlled system with less involvement from citizens outside.

But Mr. Speaker, the questions I wanted to further direct to the Minister, I wonder if the Minister could explain — and I think it would be helpful to all Manitobans — how he's going to hold his utility bill this year at exactly the same level as his utility bill was last year? Because I'm sure that many people would like to know the secret of his ability to be able to do that at Red River Community

College.

I would also like to ask him about the services provided at the Ccollege, maintenance service, cafeteria service, if there is any — the type of services that could in fact be contracted out, if any of those services are contracted out at Red River, and if they have examined the feasibility of contracting out any of those services at Red River?.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I could inform the member at this time that the cafeteria service at Red River is not contracted out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm anxiously waiting to hear the Minister's response to the contribution to the Estimates debate by a colleague of his from his backbench, the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for that particular oversight; I always appreciate the contribution of the Member for Roblin; he's a gentleman of course of long standing in this House and I know that he always has the concerns and education of his constituents at heart, and his contribution is appreciated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like some greater clarification. The Minister indicated that in Other Expenditures the reason for this year's, the print for 1977-78 being different than the print of the 1977-78 book itself was because of the transfer to Public Works of \$2.926 million, approximately, and that therefore from that I gather certain amounts that were voted under Community Colleges were now in fact being transferred to Public Works, they will therefore appear in the Public Works Estimates and not here. Is this a change in the delivery, apart from how you're going to account for it, and how you will be charging for it, does this imply a change in who is going to be doing this kind of work? Does it mean that Public Works is now going to be doing something they didn't do before? Or is it just simply an accounting procedure? In other words, whereas before it was charged against the Community College, Public Works would do it and be paid, and the Community College would pay Public Works. Now, is that procedure not going to hold true? In other words, Public Works will do what it does and there won't be a charge on the Community College.? So that in fact the drop as we see it in Expenditures reflects the fact that Public Works is now going to be doing the work it did before, but instead of collecting for it, it simply will be a charge on Public Works. Is that right? Thank you.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Seven Oaks is quite right; I would just add that there is an addition in there — or I suppose, subtraction, depending on how you want to look at it — additional funds that were added to last year's vote for wage awards of some 737. So you get a reconciliation of 2.168 — .6. One . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am sure the Honourable Minister is aware of the fact that over the years all the community colleges, and certainly not excluding Red River Community College, had fairly extensive off-campus education programs, as it were, in various communities throughout, within reach of Winnipeg, the Interlake, and to the east and south of the city, as well as in at least a couple of centres — and we'll come to Parklands under. . . and we'll have a thorough discussion because, well at that time I'm sure the Honourable Member for Roblin would also have a further contribution to make. But getting back to Red River Community College, could the Honourable Minister indicate his plans with respect to the off-campus education program in other parts of Winnipeg and outside the city of Winnipeg, whether there are any changes, any expansion or cutback?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, let me assure the Member for Burrows that I anticipate no cutback in this area and I would hope that we would be able to expand in that area according to the demand of the people in the particular areas, the student population demand that of course determines at any time, I suppose, the courses that are offered in different parts of the province. It has been quite extensive; I was just looking at a list I have here of the different parts of the province that have been covered geographically by these courses, it's quite impressive, and to my knowledge there is no intention to cut back on that particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings in accordance with Rule 19, Section 2, for Private Members' Hour, and will return at the call of the Chair.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to draw the members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 24 students of Grade 10 standing from Edinburgh School of North Dakota, under the direction of Mr. John Myrdal. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, An Act to Amend The Liquor Control Act. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand it, but I would certainly be very anxious to hear other members who wish to speak on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, Bill No. 6, the Freedom of Information Act. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading, Public Bills. Bill No. 8, An Act to Amend the Portage la Prairie Charter. The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debate on Second Reading, Private Bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. James, Bill No. 10, an Act respecting the Royal Trust Company and Royal Trust Corporation of Canada. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker, please.

PRIVATE BILLS — SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 13 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE COOPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY OF MANITOBA LIMITED

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE presented Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I received a memo as of March 31st, from the Credit Union Central of Manitoba, asking me to make the presentation of this bill. They enclosed a draft copy ta da, ta da, and so, Mr. Speaker, I come here and suggest to the members of the House that since the days of the original Act to Incorporate the Co-op Credit Society of Manitoba, and I think it was given Royal Assent in 1950, the Credit Union movement has grown — as most members I think, in fact, all members know — in enormous bounds across this province.

The original bill, Mr. Speaker, of those days the capital of the company was listed at some \$500,000 divided into shares at a par of \$5.00 each. Under the new bill that's before us today, Mr. Speaker, the company is requesting a capital of \$100 million, divided into 20 million shares at \$5.00 each of par value.

Mr. Speaker, under the old Act the membership was confined to Credit Union Societies, Associations or societies or corporations; under the Companies' Act — I think it was Part VII, if my memory serves me right, of the Companies' Act.

Under the proposed bill that's before us at this time these members as mentioned under that jurisdiction shall now be registered under the Co-operatives Act, which is a bill that's come before this House and has been duly passed.

Mr. Speaker, the making of investments as was provided under the original Act, was legislated as I said earlier under Part VI of the Companies' Act of 1946. Under the new bill that's before us at this time, and is ready for debate, this provision will be covered again under the Co-operatives Act.

The other provisions under the bill that's before us, Mr. Speaker, under the old Act the auditors, if not appointed at the Annual General Meeting, could be appointed by the Director of Co-op Services. Under the new Act, instead of that Director, Mr. Chairman, the Registrar appointed under the Co-operatives Act will assume the role formerly assigned to the Director of Co-op Services.

The balance of the bill, Mr. Speaker, as I read it and as it has been presented to me by the CCSM, brings the co-operatives, or the co-operative companies under The Co-operatives Act rather than under the old Part VII of the Companies' Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have checked the bill out with most jurisdictions and most credit unions and recommend the bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 16 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE
ST. JOHN'S RAVENSCOURT SCHOOL**

MR. GEORGE MINAKER presented Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate St. John's Ravenscourt School, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My explanation will be very brief. First to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I am not a graduate of St. John's Ravenscourt, I am of St. James Collegiate.

I was asked to present the bill on behalf of St. John's Ravenscourt. It primarily, Mr. Speaker, is a housekeeping bill. It, as you may or may not be aware, St. John's Ravenscourt now operates under a co-educational system and many of the items in the old Act do not presently apply.

Without breaking the rules in Second Reading I won't go to any particular item in the bill — but to explain what some of the housekeeping changes in the Act would be, they no longer have a Headmaster, they have a Principal, so that it's amendments like this.

It also deals with the Alumni Association in its interpretation of what makes up the Alumni Association. The amendments deal with the appointments of board members and qualification of the board members as well as filling of vacancies on the board.

It also deals with filling vacancies and length of service, and primarily deals with the operation of the board itself, in the school.

I hope that the members of the Legislature will support the bill so that the school will be able to operate under an up-to-date incorporated bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to really put a question to the member that he can reply to in his comments. I don't know if this is true or not, but years ago it was said that the following was the fighting song of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Is the member speaking or is he asking a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes, I'm making a statement, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask the member, being an old northender, went to Strathcona School, Faraday and Isaac Newton . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: St. John's comes from the north end.

MR. DOERN: Yes, but they were rivals of Isaac Newton. I just wanted to know if this is true, because this is what we were told was the fighting song of St. John's Ravenscourt. If it is, maybe the member could mention whether this is still adhered to and still repeated and sung by the boys in the school, as follows:

Peaches and cream, peaches and cream,
We're the boys from the Ravenscourt team.
We're not rough, we're not tough,
But, boy, are we determined.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, if I might answer the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

DECORUM OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's been brought to my attention that there is a member in this Chamber who is not wearing a tie. Would that member please look after that matter as quickly as possible?

Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I see the honourable member has a tie in his pocket.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, there has been a decision made in this House. It was made by a former Speaker of this Legislature, the Member for Burrows, and I think that that statement by the former Speaker was distributed to all members of the Chamber, I believe it was yesterday. And the Honourable Member for Rupertsland knows full well that he is not allowed to sit in this Chamber without a tie, and yet he has disregarded an order that you have just given him, to remove himself from this Chamber unless he is properly dressed.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member please look after the affairs.

ORDERS FOR RETURN — DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return, on the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews has 20 minutes.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was explaining his Order for Return, in his demand that the government produce information and background papers, he mentioned that he was tired of being called a Communist, a Marxist, a Socialist, someone of this type. He suggested that maybe someone, such as myself, a backbencher, had done this in the past or would do it in the future, and he was tired of it. I want to assure him . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that he remove himself from the Chamber until he is properly dressed.

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you. I wanted to assure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that although he's not here today, that I do not plan ever to call him a Marxist or a Socialist, or even a Social Democrat, because I think most of those people — all the people who subscribe to those particular philosophies — like they have a basic code, a basic set of principles they subscribe to. I don't think the Member for St. Boniface has that. I don't think the political experience and having read some of his speeches in the past, having listened to what he said yesterday, I don't think he subscribes to any definite set of principles.

To be exact, I would describe his principles as infinitely flexible.

A MEMBER: He's bigger than you.

MR. DOMINO: He's bigger than me, that's right. However, what did the Member for St. Boniface, what is he asking the government to produce? Well, if you look at the Order for Return you would see that he's asking for all reports of review teams submitted to the Task Force on Government Organization and Economy. All special study group reports submitted to the Task Force. All supporting documentation submitted to the Task Force.

I would suggest that the material he's asking for was gathered and produced by a combination of public and private consultants. And that the reports of the review team and the special study groups were supplied as advice to the Minister without Portfolio, responsible for the Task Force.

The role of the review teams and the study teams and the study groups, they were similar to the role performed by any group of civil servants or any group of outside consultants, hired by the government who are asked to supply information to any member or to any Minister of the Crown.

It is a long-standing tradition, British parliamentary democracy, that a Minister has the right to ask for and to receive information in confidence, whether it be from private consultants or from members of the Civil Service. And there's a good reason for this, because we are very concerned that when a civil servant supplies information to a Minister of the Crown, his main concern is the validity of the information, that he's not going to be worried about the political ramifications, or not worried about his job down the road. The Civil Service supplies the information in confidence to one of those

gentlemen or the lady who sits in front of me, they then take that information and combine it with other information available to them from other sources, and they make a political decision. They are held responsible by the electorate for that political decision. That's the way our democracy works.

If we establish the precedent of tabling this sort of material, civil servants will become reluctant to give you an honest opinion, to give you honest answers. You'll soon find that they'll put nothing on paper because they'll be frightened that the paper will some day be tabled in this House and they'll be held responsible. Most civil servants — and I would say that we all in this House agree on that — most public servants in this province do a good job, and they try to be as non-partisan as possible because they're concerned about the Civil Service and its professional ethics.

Now, in 1971 — I don't have a large body of knowledge to rely on. I've only been in this House now for a matter of a few months. So I have read back, I've tried to find other instances in Hansard, when this same sort of discussion occurred. When other people asked for information of a similar nature and a government refused the Order for Return, what happened? I found in 1971 that the former Member for Souris-Killarney requested information of a very similar nature. The material was refused by the then government, and I think rightly so, and I think that during that debate there was a lengthy discussion. At the end of that debate the Member for St. Boniface got up and there was a great deal of discussion about just what I've mentioned.

MR. CHERNIACK: What was the subject and the vote?

MR. DOMINO: The Member for St. Boniface, I think he basically agreed in summary, when he got up he said: "I'm ready to accept the years of tradition." This was just after some of the other members from the government side had made an argument very similar to the one I just proposed.

But during the last election campaign one of the main platform planks of the Progressive Conservative Party, and in my constituency the main platform plank, the one that I ran on the most — I reviewed all of my literature very carefully last night to make sure of this — involved first that we would try to make our government more efficient and the second follows from the first; we would cut waste wherever it was possible to cut out waste or duplication in government services. And the third point in that platform plank was that we would try wherever possible not to reduce services to people, and we suggested it was possible to cut costs, waste and duplication without cutting services.

The Task Force was appointed right after the election campaign and it was a major initiative, it was the first step towards fulfilling that commitment we made during the election campaign. And what was the Task Force asked to do? It was asked in the terms of reference that were published, it was asked to evaluate programs and departments of government. It was asked to recommend procedures to eliminate duplication. It was asked to recommend methods of making ongoing programs more efficient and it was asked to recommend ways of improving the financial accountability of the government.

In general, it was asked to investigate, to gather information and to give advice to the government, not to make government policy, but to give advice to the government on how some of these objectives could be met.

I think just as an aside we asked those five men to do an awful big job, because there are approximately, if you count Hydro and Telephones, approximately 30,000 civil servants in this province, and the government of Manitoba, if you count those large Crown corporations, spends almost \$2 billion a year. It is a big job to review quickly such a huge organization and to find waste and duplication. I think they did an excellent job and I believe that government initiatives in the interest of efficiency are important. I think if you could take it out of the partisan, which is impossible I realize, but if you could take it out of that context that many members opposite would agree too. Because if you look back, you see that when money is spent foolishly by a government — I won't submit to any questions, Mr. Chairman, I only have 20 minutes and I would like to get across my message. The member will have his opportunity when I sit down.

I think that every dollar that is spent foolishly on duplication or waste in any way — I suggest having a civil servant working at 50 percent capacity is waste. I think every dollar that is spent wastefully there can't be used for programs that I think are valuable, programs like more hospitals, more home care, better schools, better education system, better roads, more help for our senior citizens. I think all of those things are very important and necessary.

Now I think this country, North Americans have got used to a very rapid industrial growth, a very rapid growth in our productivity, and we were living off our ability to exploit the Third World countries to get raw resources cheaply. It fed our economy, it made us rich. Well then 1973 came along and those people who had the oil finally smartened up, and since then other groups of raw resource producers have formed cartels, bauxite and other types of raw materials, and they are fighting back too. We are never again going to be in a position where we can build a strong expanding economy by exploiting the Third World countries. It is going to be harder and harder. And I think it is right, it is only fair.

So we have got to look at a situation now in our society when we are going to have to learn to do with small increases in our productivity and small increases in our overall wealth.

When we had a rapid increase in our economic growth, the solution to social problems which were agreed were social problems by all members of all parties — generally all parties did this, was to take some new growth revenue, to lump it together, form it into a program, and throw it at the problem. Sometime it worked, sometime it didn't work. Very often, because it is only human nature that we are not always right, very often the program designed wouldn't work. It was ill-conceived.

Conservatives also conceived programs like that, that didn't work, and I agree, not only New Democrats. It didn't work or it missed the real problem and only worked at 50 percent capacity, but because of the political reality in our society is such that it is hard to dismantle any program, because it always helps at least a few and they form a very vocal group demanding some help, and they are generally more and more highly paid vocal well-organized civil servants, whose jobs are at stake and who don't like being transferred or maybe having to go seek a job somewhere else. So there is a political group that fights back and it is hard. Very few politicians in the past had the nerve and the guts to stand up and say, "Okay, it is politically not very sexy, but I am going to go ahead and shut down this program so I can redeploy this money." We could afford that sort of a loose and easy approach when we had a rapidly expanding tax base. We don't have it now. Now we got to make those tough decisions and I suggest if the New Democrats were in power, or at least I hope if they were in power, that they would take the same approach. They might do things a little differently, but they too would seek to shut down wasteful programs that weren't working and to redeploy the money in a better way. That is what the Task Force's role was to do, and in that sense I congratulate the government for setting the Task Force up and I congratulate the Task Force for attempting to fulfill its mandate.

Let's take a quick look at where this information that the Member for St. Boniface is asking, came from. Members opposite like to pretend it was Conrad Riley and three of his friends who produced the Task Force. It is not so. Information came from six different distinct areas.

One, it came from civil servants. We invited civil servants to propose briefs, and they did. Over 500 came in, some of them seven or eight pages long. That information for sure cannot be released, for sure it cannot be released. The Minister in charge of the Task Force has assured me that it is the case. I believe him. If you don't, stand up in the House, you can challenge his honesty. I think he is a man of integrity.

Secondly, the material came from a small central staff of civil servants and some private consultants, basically accountants, public and private, who sat down together. Their job was to assist in developing an overview for the Task Force. Their job was to gather information from other jurisdictions, from the United States, from Australia — who has just gone through a very similar process — from the Federal Government, who undertook a similar process. They also gathered information on Manitoba and Canada's overall economy, so they could be integrated in the Task Force. They also monitored the government's Restraint Program, because that had an ongoing effect on the Task Force and its recommendations, because things were changing, things were not static after October 21st.

The third source of information were the five members of the Task Force themselves. They met with people working within the government; they met with the Provincial Auditor and his staff; they met with the Civil Service Commission; they met with the Deputy Ministers; the Assistant Deputy Ministers; they met with some staff at middle management; and some staff at the delivery level of government; they met with city and town councils; they met with school boards; Indian bands; community leaders; they met with a wide broad spectrum of Manitobans and talked face-to-face with them.

The fourth area was the Management Committee Secretariat, which also provided some information; the Program Auditors, Management Committee, their general job is normally is to provide a monitoring evaluation for the ongoing programs of government. They supplied facts. To be exact, it was suggested to me that all the material supplied would fill half of a good-sized room, in printed form, if you were to try and dig it all up and put it in one place.

Fifth, staff was seconded from the government departments as necessary. They were brought in to represent the departments and to give detailed answers to the Task Force staff, when necessary.

Six, and this is where all the publicity and all the anger and venom of the Opposition is being poured out on. There were the eight review teams, special review study groups. They were composed of people from both the private and the public sector. They were selected for their administrative experience and for their knowledge in specific areas. The review teams' role was no different from any one of the other five groups that I have just mentioned. Their role was to advise the Task Force and they acted in the role of consultants. The only difference here is that the government in the past eight years is used to paying a big salary to consultants. These people work for nothing. They also went out and met with civil servants and interviewed people. For instance, the Social Development Review Team held over 90 meetings with civil servants. —(Interjection)— All of the facts that I mention here have already been published and made public in speeches given by the Minister responsible for the Task Force. The review teams prepared information and they presented reports, advice, like everybody else.

Now once the five members of the Task Force, reduced to four right before the report was written, when Bill Jackson resigned, once they received all the information from these six areas, they got together and they prepared and combined their ideas and they wrote reports, which were then published and tabled in this House — the Task Force.

Finally, after all of this, the government takes a look at the Task Force reports and makes decisions. The Task Force reports are simply recommendations, simply advice.

I don't think that is fair and honest, and I think it would be a danger to the Civil Service. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five minutes left.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you . . . and the impartiality of the Civil Service and the Civil Service's ability

to give frank and honest advice to the government if we table this sort of material.

Now I think it is important in summary to note that the methods used in gathering the information that went into the Task Force were very similar to those used by any government departments when coming to a decision.

Secondly, the procedure for gathering information was no different than the procedure used in interdepartmental reports.

Third, as the members know, interdepartmental reports normally are not tabled in this House by tradition. A Minister by tradition has the right to ask for information and advice on a confidential basis, and it is out of the ordinary for a Minister to table this sort of material.

As I mentioned earlier, as a freshman member of this House I do not have a large bank of personal experience to call on. To be exact I would suggest the Member for St. Boniface has a very large bank. He has been here a long time. So I read back the Hansards to see what happened in previous debates and I found that when matters like this came up, these documents were not tabled. They were not tabled by the Progressive Conservative Government of Duff Roblin; they were not tabled by the ND Government of Ed Schreyer. And it was for a good reason.

I looked back at the debates and here I am quoting from May 4th, 1977. This is when the Member for Souris-Killarney wanted to have several reports and studies and private consultants on government departments, which he asked for, and the government refused. It was debated. Here is what the Member for Inkster said about that: "I am suggesting to you that there is no previous administration that has done this; that no previous administration has made available an entire staff and their reports to a Legislative Committee or to the House to be dealt with first-hand." That is what he said. I think he agrees completely with me — the Member for Inkster. Following that statement, the Member for St. Boniface got up and said, "I am ready to accept those years of tradition, I think it is a good system." Let's look a little further. April 30th, 1971, question by the Member for River Heights saying, "Can the Member for Inkster inform the House whether it will be the policy of the government to file interdepartmental requests when they are requested in this House?"

The Member for Rossmere gets up and says, "Mr. Speaker, the question of interdepartmental reports or other documents and whether or not they will be tabled, I would like to answer as follows: "That it is discretionary with the government of the day to decide whether or not they will be tabled in the House; if they feel that it is not in the best interests of the province, they have the right to refuse to table it." Again August 29th, 1969, this is the Member for Rossmere saying, "In the end this administration like the previous one has to exercise judgment as to what material will be tabled and it is just a question of who was right and who was wrong in the exercise of judgment. I would suggest to you that the Member for River Heights in charge of the Task Force was using his judgment and it is proper."

He is right. The Task Force doesn't make decisions, the Task Force simply offers advice. I was elected along with the rest of us in this House to make decisions and I am not about to give that position up to the members opposite, or to screaming crowds outside, or to any Task Force. The government makes decisions, the Task Force simply offers advice like anyone else. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to have this item raised in the House, because it gives the Minister responsible for the Task Force something to do, because he really hasn't had anything to do in this Legislature. He has been avoiding the Legislature. Yet, he's tabled very quickly a report before the legislature which has profound implications, possibly, on the Estimates process that we're presently reviewing. But at least now given that the Member for St. Boniface has raised some points it has given the Member for River Heights the opportunity to have a valid reason for participating in his government's activities and participating in legislative activities. I see that he takes the point so seriously, that in discussing this I note his absence today which is not unusual.

I'd like to comment briefly on the accuracy of the Member for St. Matthews. If you recall, I tried to ask him a question. He kept saying that there were five people on the Task Force. There were only four. Their names are the Honourable Sidney Spivak, Conrad Riley, William Jackson, but William Jackson resigned and Gordon Holland. Does that count up to five?

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Transcona was not listening to what I said. I said originally the Task Force was five. I distinctly mentioned it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, that is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: There weren't five originally, there were just four, and one resigned. Maybe you know something. Was there a secret member of the Task Force that we don't know about? Was that Jim Burns, I don't know? Maybe it was the Member for St. Matthews, or the Lone Ranger. The point at issue here is that we have a report that has been brought forward by a Minister. It is a ministerial report. He is the Chairman of the report. He is the Member of this Legislature to whom we ask questions regarding the substance of the report, and this is put forward supposedly as a technical document, because it has all these businessmen involved in the development of this technical

document, and it assumes that these fine people actually did some analysis. That they actually did some analysis. That's the impression that they're trying to create, but the report doesn't have any analysis in it. The report is the work of a bunch of people sitting over a coffee, or at the Manitoba Club, and we would like to know where is the substantiation for reports like this. And that's a fair question to ask, and it's been asked, "Where is the background documentation, where is it?" And, it's not forthcoming because you see this report not only is it technically bad, not only is it technically bad, but it is incorrect in many respects, and the point then is whether the Minister deliberately tried to mislead us, or whether in fact, staff misled him and he reported it on to us. And given the past performance of this government, I would think that the Minister deliberately and in a calculated manner, I will prove it, attempted to mislead us and I'll give you the specifics.

I'll give you the specifics. On Page 24 of Volume 1, there are the statements here — the Member for Pembina is digging in. There are the statements here that in total the combined deficit for 1977-78 was \$225.1 million. That's the statement made by the Minister irresponsible for the task farce, that's the Minister's statement as of March 31, 1978, and documentation by the First Minister which he tabled in this House shows that that statement as of March 31st, 1978 was a deliberate lie. Or a falsehood, I'd say a falsehood. I wouldn't go so far as to say that they would lie, they've got bad memories, bad memories, amnesia. The amnesia of the First Minister has now hit the Minister irresponsible for the task farce.

Now what's ? the real deficit Take a look on Page 24, is it \$225 million, because that's what this report says. They're now saying it's \$181 million, but we're not sure because the final account isn't in. What they are saying here is that it was \$225 million and that's been shown to be incorrect, and the Minister surely has a responsibility to come forward and explain to us why he made that statement as of March 31st, 1978. This has nothing to do with whether in fact he interpreted the question correctly, or incorrectly, whether it's to do with Revenue Canada or anything, it has to do with this blanket statement here that the deficit was \$225.1 million, and that's wrong.

I would like to see whether, in fact, the Department of Finance officials actually said that the deficit was \$225 million, because those officials by that time knew that that wasn't the deficit. And I recall precisely that in the month of March, the Member for Inkster asked the Minister responsible for the task farce, if in fact Department of Finance officials were being forced to provide documentation to back up the political propaganda of the Conservative government, and the Minister responsible got up and said well, we're relying on the technical advice, they are not being co-opted, they're not being forced to provide any type of misleading figures. Well, take a look at Page 24. That's a misleading figure of a very large magnitude. Very large magnitude. No proof, so it's up to the Minister responsible, if this report is to have any credibility, to come forward with the documentation, but of course, his colleagues have already confessed to the sin. And the Minister responsible for the Task Force is trying to act as if the sin wasn't committed. It's a deliberate distortion. It's a very valid point. If you don't think that a distortion of 50 or 60 million is a valid point, then how are you ever going to talk about efficient government. What's 40 or 50 million bucks?

Page 26 is the next point. It says that preliminary calculations indicate that the 1978-79 current and capital expenditures could exceed revenues by an amount in the area of \$400 million. I would like the Minister responsible for the Task Force to provide the documentation for that figure. My colleague, the Member for St. Vital has asked every Minister putting forward his Estimates to provide the documentation, and they refused because they can't do it. There is no documentation. This is a flight of fantasy, and it was not produced by the Department of Finance officials, it's a piece of propaganda by the Minister Responsible for the Task Force. And let him put it forward, let him put it forward, because the Minister of Finance has already said that this is probably an guesstimate. His figure of \$300 million may be a guesstimate. These guys are very good at guesstimates. We want facts. They're a government now. There is the notion of accountability. Accountability is a very important concept in government and Ministers are accountable for their statements in the House to members and to the public, and these people run and hide, and I see the Minister, unfortunately he's hiding right now. He's either in the Barbados or in his basement hiding. It's too bad, I challenge him to provide the documentation, I challenge him, and let's see whether he will or not. It has nothing to do with whether in fact these are interdepartmental reports or not. There are some very glaring inaccuracies in this report.

Let's go on a bit further, because it's rather interesting what type of statement they were trying to put across in this piece of propaganda. We go on to Page 27. They're trying to say that if we had this big deficit, we'd have to triple, triple the provincial personal income tax rate. Now, I would like to know who put that forward, because I don't think that any Department of Finance official who had any integrity, would put forward a deliberate distortion like that. That would have to come from the Minister, or it would have to come from the other Co-chairman, but no Department of Finance official would put forward a distortion like that. Or, they say that if we didn't have a tripling of income tax, we would have an increase in the sales tax of at least 10 points to 15 percent. That also is a deliberate distortion, and it's wrong, and I would like to know which Finance official put that forward, because no Finance official put that forward. And, unfortunately, the Minister responsible for the task farce hides behind the skirts of the integrity of the Department of Finance officials, and that's very unfair to them, because they didn't put forward numbers like that. They wouldn't put forward numbers like that, but what we have is a person saying, "I've taken those numbers and here they are. I don't want to provide background documentation." There's an onus on him to provide the background documentation, because those are distortions, they're completely incorrect, so there's a very strong onus —(Interjection)— That's right, three inaccuracies, Page 24, 26 and 27, and I'm glad he came.

Glad he has something to do finally. Imagine being a Minister responsible for nothing. Being the Minister of irrelevance. It's a sad, sad state of affairs for a former leader of the Conservative party to be put in limbo and to have to be forced in his craving for public attention, to deliberately take, I think possibly the honest work of civil servants, and change them. That's right. Where do we get a tripling of the income tax rate on Page 27. We don't get it. You show me the documentation where any Finance official said that we would have a tripling of the income tax rate. You show me the documentation which indicates we would have a \$400 million deficit in 1978, show it to me. Give me all the documentation. Fine, I appreciate getting the documentation, and I want also. . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, so the record will show, that information was supplied by the very officials who, in fact, supplied the information to the previous government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister has no point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Do I get an extra minute for that, for the completely irresponsible interjection of the Minister who is irresponsible for the task farce? I challenge him to provide that documentation. We've asked every time. You haven't been in on Estimates, but we have and the Member for St. Vital has asked every Minister to provide the documentation. Provide the documentation, and it's interesting that it's not been provided. And, you can't provide it.

And also, getting back to the \$225 million deficit, where is your documentation for that because the Minister of Finance has already said that was inaccurate, and the First Minister has already provided documentation which shows that that was inaccurate. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that as of March 31, 1978, what he was saying in this report was deceiving, it was deceiving in the mildest form. It was calculated deception, and I ask him and I challenge him to provide the documentation which I don't think he can provide.

I see also that on May 3rd in the Tribune the Minister of Finance said that he conceded Tuesday evening that he could not substantiate his claim concerning the possibility of a \$300 million increase in spending. He can't do it, he can't do it, he's the Minister of Finance, but somehow the genius, the Minister responsible for the task farce, does it. Can provide the documentation and then runs and hides. He's got ample opportunity to provide the documentation, and he's not done it. He's not done it at all, so why shouldn't we ask for the documentation. Why shouldn't we ask for the documentation that might produce a distortion. Prove it. He's got a very good opportunity. And I've asked him, we've challenged him, and he can't do it. — (Interjection)— Oh no, he will be hiding, he will continue to hide. It's in the same place as the Member for Roblin's Hydro bill I'm told. Another person of integrity who would never never ever say something that he could not back up. Nothing that he could not back up. That's right and I'm quite happy that the Member for Roblin is participating in the debate in his normal style — from the seat of his pants. He may, in fact, get a sliver; he may, in fact, get a sliver.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. PARASIUK: I've watched the clock fairly closely and I don't know if it's just five minutes but I obviously have to concur with the Speaker's definition of time.

We have some other recommendations of the Task Force that should be documented, Page 154, 155. It's a very important recommendation that has been put forward by the Minister responsible for the Task Force which means that he endorses it, it is his recommendation, he believes it, he believes it to be true, therefore, we ask him to prove why he would recommend on those pages that the Manitoba government not borrow in the foreign capital markets. But we find that just a couple of weeks ago, the Manitoba Government did, the First Minister got up and said, "We have borrowed \$57 million," and they were pleased. And the Finance Minister came back after this extended trip in Switzerland and said, in fact, that he was pleased. Well, why do we have that recommendation on Page 154 and 155?

I would think that this recommendation would have been put forward by the chairman of the review team, who would be Bob Jones who is president of Investors Syndicate, who conceivably may be an analyst of some worth to the other side, so he probably put that recommendation forward. The Minister responsible for the Task Force accepted it. Did he tell the Minister of Finance, "Don't go to Switzerland and borrow the money." I don't think he did that at all. Because the Minister of Finance would have asked him, "Where's your documentation; why do you tell me that? Did you dream this recommendation up over a cup of coffee or do you have any justification for it because if you have some justification for it, I'll listen to you." But they didn't listen to him, they didn't listen to him, so obviously it has no justification.

So it's a valid question for us to ask: Why do you make those silly types of recommendations then that your own people won't even listen to? This is a very important, major recommendation. — (Interjection)— Well, that's right. My colleague says that this document has outlived its political usefulness; that's true.

But there is the whole point about accountability in a Legislature. We want the background documents; we want to determine the validity. That's a normal, normal thing for a Legislature to ask for. We want to hold the author, and the author of this report — basically the authors are two people: One elected and one not elected. One not elected. When the Member for St. Matthews wants to talk about democracy and democratic traditions, let him remember that that government, that group on the other side ran for election, got elected and turned over the task of governing to a group of non-

elected businessmen who weren't even part of the government administration.

Then we had a whole confusing set of circumstances where there were a whole bunch of cuts and the Minister said, "We didn't do it; the Task Force did it." Well, how could a Task Force that is not elected, that can't — as the Member for St. Matthews says — make decisions, how come Ministers of repute who have in fact been Ministers before, who have been long-standing members of the House, how could a Minister of Health say, "I didn't cut the people at the Portage Home; it was the Task Force that cut the people at the Portage Home." Well who was making decisions then? The Minister? The Legislature? Or the Task Force? So I think the Member for St. Matthews should do a bit more arithmetic and do a bit more counting when he starts talking about accuracy.

Now, I think it's quite important that we do get the other co-chairman because I don't even know whether in fact the Minister responsible for the task farce has read the entire report, whether in fact he wrote it. Maybe it was the co-chairman; maybe it was this reputable businessman from Dominion Tanners who in fact wrote the Task Force Report and I would prefer having the other co-chairman here before a Legislative Committee answering questions, Mr. Speaker, for a very simple reason. I'd rather hear from Edgar Bergen. I don't want to talk and hear from Charlie McCarthy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member that just took his seat gives us a classic example of the type of people that they have sitting on the benches over there. Who in his wildest imagination unless he had a wooden head would talk about Charlie McCarthy except the member that just sat with their Mickey Mouse arithmetic, their NDP philosophy. I just can't understand that a man that just rose and sat in his chair would stand and rant and rave around this Chamber for days — and other members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who know very well that if they want to deal with matters of this Task Force, the Minister is sitting right there and one day you will have the right and the privilege to deal with his salary and if you don't like the Task Force Report, you can vote against his salary. Now who is kidding who in this Chamber?

I suggest to you new members, go back and read the Rule Book. You will have your day, you will have your time to debate that Task Force Report completely, if it takes you until next Christmas, but don't stand up here day after day telling us that we're denying you the right to deal with the matters in that report. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that somebody send the Member for Transcona a rule book because he's never been here before.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Transcona on a point of order.

MR. PARASIUK: The Member for Roblin is saying that I am not following the rules, that I have not followed the rules in my past speech. I would like an interpretation from the Speaker as to whether in fact I followed the rules in my speech just now regarding this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: That is no point of order. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you are going to have a very difficult time with the Member for Transcona. I thought he was a knowledgeable man but when he raised the Charlie McCarthy thing, Mr. Speaker, you may have to send him a special Rule Book because of the allegations and the charges he has made in this House and the way he's conducting himself. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that maybe you should put in some other terminology because a man that's coming out of Planning and Priorities and one of the Big Wheels in this government, I daresay the highest civil servant of the Schreyer government is standing up in this House and trying to tell us that have been here all these years and worried about this Task Force Report, he's the one that's got the skeletons in his closet. I suggest when the day that that Minister's salary comes up for debate in this House, my friend, you will get those horror stories in complete, documented, paper by paper, and you were the author — or if you weren't you were part and parcel of that whole horror story that we inherited. So let the Member for Transcona go back home and have some sleepless nights because you're going to have your day, my friend, you'll have your day in this court when that Minister's salary comes up before this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised, I'm surprised you let this debate go on day after day after day. It's mumble-jumble; it's junk. They can deal with the Task Force Report when that Minister's salary comes up before the House but don't leave the allegation on the record of this province that we're not going to stand up and defend everything we've done.

Let me just very skilfully on this Resolution — I would like very much to get the study or the background papers or the documentation of this new Schreyer Task Force Report, the one where the former First Minister of this province has the guts and the courage to stand up and tell the people of this province that there are people starving in Portage la Prairie. God bless his soul, that former First Minister. No political party, no citizen of this province, whether they're NDP, Liberal, Conservative or Social Credit will ever deny any senior citizen in this province a meal or three meals a day or five meals a day and, Mr. Speaker, put that in the record for members opposite especially. I'm surprised that the former First Minister of this province would stoop to that gutter level and debate in this Chamber the lowest debate that I've heard in my years here. I've got more. But the former First Minister of this province . . . I'd like to see that task force report, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member that he stick to the subject matter of the debate. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to see that task force report from members opposite which was planned, very skilfully documented, phrased with the television cameras out here every day. They are phoned ahead of time, everybody knows who's orchestrating what. Let's talk about the bed costs. Very skilfull. —(Interjection)— The bed costs for the senior citizens. I've approved it three or four times in my time here but all of a sudden the other day it's a gut issue, a big issue, and here's the former premier of this province standing up in his seat and pleading against us when he knows darn well that they over there passed it three times before but here he is — and I'd like to see the study, how you arrived at that on your task force report.

But the cruncher was today. Could I have a glass of water, Mr. Sergeant-at-Arms? The one I liked — and I'd like to see where they got this out of their task force report about the beds. I love this. The former First Minister of this province yesterday had to stoop to the level of questioning the quality of the bed sheets of people in hospital. Now can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, in your wild . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member once more that he stick to the subject matter of the debate which is dealing with the report of the Task Force. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm still dealing with the NDP task force and I haven't got to the Regina Manifesto. I haven't got to the Guidelines for the Seventies. I can go on for hours. I'm still trying to get from those members opposite some of their documentation or reports of how the former Premier . . .

Now, would you ever imagine, members, that a former Premier would get himself down so low in the House one day that he would ask about the sheets in a hospital. Now that shows what kind of trouble members opposite are in. It's a shambles over there. They still think they are government. When you, as members opposite, have to deal with matters of sheets on a person's bed in this hospital, and then you don't trust . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair. The House will resume at 8 o'clock with the Committee Chairman in the Chair.