

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 14 April, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Matter of Privilege of the House;

WHEREAS the former Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Dean Martin Wedepohl, has acknowledged the existence of a legal opinion prepared for Manitoba Hydro; and the former Chairman has said the Deputy Premier was aware of the legal opinion;

WHEREAS the legal opinion is that the Tritschler Commission did not act within its Terms of Reference, nor within the Rules of Natural Justice, it has been alleged that the Deputy Premier resorted to threats against the Hydro Board regarding possible action upon the legal opinion;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources be instructed to enquire into:

- (a) Legal advice to Manitoba Hydro regarding the Tritschler Commission;
- (b) Breach of the Commission of its Terms of Reference and/or the Rules of Natural Justice;
- (c) The Minister's knowledge and actions regarding Manitoba Hydro's position vis-a-vis the Commission; and
- (d) All other matters arising from the legal opinion and allegations made regarding this affair.

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

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In quickly reviewing the proposed motion it would appear at first glance, Mr. Speaker, that this is the same motion that was before the House yesterday which was ruled out of order. (Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting to compare the wording from yesterday's motion with the one just moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is repetitive and should be ruled out of order; that it is again a substantive motion and if in fact you deem not to rule it out of order on the basis that it is not repetitive, but which I submit it is repetitive; but again secondly, that as substantive motion it requires notice in the regular manner, Mr. Speaker, and on those grounds should be ruled out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the reason the motion was ruled out was because we

had a procedural disagreement. It wasn't mentioned that it was a matter of privilege. The matter of privilege takes precedence and has to be debated. What is the content of the matter of privilege may have to have 48 hours notice but that is aside from the point that a matter of privilege may be debated. A substantive motion has been introduced in respect to the matter of privilege and I think we are proceeding correctly today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on the point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, again on the point of order I submit to you that a question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity. In Beauchesne it states that even a gap of a few days may invalidate the claim for precedence in the House. This could have been raised yesterday; it wasn't raised; it wasn't raised at the first possible opportunity and on those further grounds, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre on the point of order.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the case that I made yesterday. If people will recall it was my position that the Leader of the Opposition had mentioned that he was amending his motion on a matter of privilege and I still believe that Hansard will substantiate that was the case.

The Government House Leader now is trying to use the case that because he didn't raise it yesterday he has lost the opportunity to present that motion. The Leader of the Opposition stood in his place and said, I rise on a matter of privilege. I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how he can be debating points of order when a matter of privilege takes precedent over points of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. For the information of the House I did receive an unedited transcript of the proceedings yesterday and I will read from the opening statements. "The Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker", then the Speaker recognized the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and this is the transcript:

"Mr. Speaker, whereas the former Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Dean Martin Wedepohl has acknowledged the authenticity of the legal opinion prepared by Manitoba Hydro, presented to the House on April 10 by the Honourable Member for St. Vital". I find no mention made of the Leader of the Opposition rising on a point of privilege at that time.

The Speaker is bound by the Rules of the Assembly and if the member had wanted to raise it as a matter of privilege, it should have been raised at the earliest possible time, which would have been yesterday. The member did not raise it as a matter of privilege at that time; he raised it as a resolution therefore I would have to rule that it is out of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: You have the records of the transcript there. You will recall that yesterday I

clearly indicated to the House that if the preface on a matter of privilege was not included in my remarks, they had been omitted as a result of inadvertence. So, Mr. Speaker, it was very clear on the record yesterday that the matter was being raised as a matter of privilege.

The Government House Leader — and I do not criticize him for this — seized upon the opportunity to attempt to have the matter ruled out of order on the basis that the preface was not included, but on the record yesterday it's very clearly placed, Mr. Speaker, and it will be included in your transcript, I'm sure. If you don't have that part of the transcript then I'd suggest you take this under advisement, that reference to a matter of privilege was not included solely because of inadvertence.

So, Mr. Speaker, there was every effort made yesterday to raise this matter as an item of privilege of the House and in any event, we are attempting to raise it again this morning, Tuesday, at a very early circumstance after the Friday divulging of information to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member in raising the matter now, has not raised it at the earliest possible time. The other point, and it's one I think that we should consider, is that the member has stood in his place on a matter of privilege and put forward a substantive motion. It is the purpose of the Chair to find out if a prima facie case can be made for a motion of privilege. I find no attempt has been made to establish a prima facie case and I would have to rule it out of order.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I would believe that if we are going to have the establishment of a prima facie case in respect to privilege; in respect to privilege a motion has to be debated to point out and prove whether there is a prima facie case or not and if this hasn't taken place then it means in the future, Mr. Speaker, we will have to make a motion that may be three pages or four pages long in order to prove that there is a prima facie case before we get a chance to debate it. I think that is not the procedures of this House and I would suggest, Sir, that you reconsider and take this matter under advisement before we make a decision which this House may regret.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable members of the Chamber, Citation 84 (1) of Beauchesne, "Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in making such precedence".

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Due to the fact that we have not had an opportunity in this House to present our case that there is a prima facie case in respect to the matter of privilege, I have to challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour of the motion please say Yea. Those opposed please say Nay. In my opinion the Yeas have it.

MR. FOX: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follow:

YEAS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman.

NAYS

Messrs. Adam, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Schroeder, Uruski, Walding, Ms. Westbury.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 29, Nays 21.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Ruling of the Chair sustained.

Presenting Petitions . . .

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Matter of Privilege. My matter of privilege has to do with statements that have been made by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, misstatements by the same, statements by the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro and the Deputy Premier of this province and having to do also with a document from which I read in this House on Friday which you ruled as being not tableable, Mr. Speaker. My matter of privilege arises following matters that have happened in this House, although it's not my intention to reflect upon the Speaker's Ruling.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a good deal of comment made in the past few weeks having to do with a written legal opinion given to the Board of Directors of Manitoba Hydro with allegations that it has been written by their legal counsel of the day, Mr. Steward Martin. The existence of this document has not been ascertained although the debate has centered around it and upon the question of whether it has been received by the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. The question as to whether this document exists, or by whom it has been seen, has been blocked on a number of occasions by the government. We have asked the Minister involved to take certain steps to enable Mr. Martin to appear before the committee, in fact, before two committees to make his explanation and explain the document or the missing document and to give us the background of the particular case.

Mr. Speaker, the response that we received from the Minister was that in the event that Mr. Martin should apply to the Hydro Board that Hydro would in fact discuss the matter. There was no indication given there that they would be prepared to release

Mr. Martin from this solicitor-client relationship to enable him to give his information and the facts that he knows to his knowledge. Mr. Speaker, there would appear to have been a change in that position as far as the Minister was concerned as of yesterday when he gave me at least to understand that he would be prepared to permit or to endorse such an action on the part of the Board of Manitoba Hydro, and also to refer to statements made by the Minister on a television program, "24 Hours" last evening, of which I have a transcript. The Minister was being interviewed and he does make reference there to a report; he makes reference also to a discussion paper and he makes reference to a document which he says that he has not read.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the syntax of the statements made by the Minister is somewhat unclear and could be a little bit confusing. There was a question asked of the Minister at the beginning of the program whether in fact he had received the legal advice that was offered. The Minister replied and I quote "Was I given this advice?" And the answer is simply "No".

Mr. Speaker, that is not quite the information that has surfaced so far in this whole affair. I believe that we have established that the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro had taken the concerns of the board, as communicated to them by their Chief Counsel, and had gone over to the see the Minister and spoken to him in this regard. The Minister further goes on to say on that same program and I'm quoting again from the transcript: "I was advised by Manitoba Hydro at the time, by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro at that time, that they had a report from their lawyer, whether it was verbal or written — I presume it was a written report or kind of a discussion paper that outlined a number of grievances he had with regard to the commission". A further quotation, "It was a report to me". Now, Mr. Speaker, you will note that in the context of the Minister's remarks it is not clear whether the report to the Minister was the report that has been referred to on several occasions as being the legal opinion that was given by Mr. Martin to the Board or, in fact, whether it was simply a report from the Chairman of Hydro to the Minister. That is one thing that is unclear to us, Mr. Speaker, would appear to be misleading to the House and, in fact, to the general population who happened to be watching the program last evening.

The Minister goes on to say: "No, if the report was this one that is now knocking around — and there's a good chance that this one is not the legitimate report — we don't really, no one really knows and I quite frankly have not read it". Mr. Speaker, if the Minister there is referring to the paper that I sent over to him during the question period yesterday I find that absolutely astounding, Mr. Speaker. It would appear from the Minister's comments here that what he is referring to is the paper that I released to the press last Friday; that I quoted from extensively during my grievance last Friday, and of which I sent a copy to the Minister yesterday afternoon.

The Minister, after a week of this issue, more than simmering it's been boiling, Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that he has not read it. Mr. Speaker, I have to question the political intelligence of the Honourable Minister who says that a document like this that has given rise to front page headlines in the

paper for the last week; that has been the subject of extensive news coverage; and that has been of considerable interest to the news media, Mr. Speaker, the Minister himself says that he has not read this. Mr. Speaker, I find that incredible that he has not done so but we must take the word of the Minister. He tells us that he has not read this particular paper which makes us wonder, Mr. Speaker, of the political intelligence of the Minister, on his part and on the part of the First Minister on his part, in allowing this matter to continue in the way it has and for permitting the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro, on his part, to continue in the way that he has.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about this matter. I should make one further quote from the Minister's remarks last night. Mr. Speaker, the Minister said, "Now we had a recommendation in the House this afternoon that I agreed with". Mr. Speaker, I don't have the Hansard in front of me nor the draft of it so I'm not quite clear just what the recommendation was in the House of yesterday afternoon. But the Minister apparently agrees with it and for that we are rather pleased.

The Minister goes on to say and I quote again, "I said I will be quite happy to submit to the Hydro Board the Hansard copy of today's recommendation". We are making progress, Mr. Speaker. I quote again, "that Hydro initiate some sort of discussion with the legal firm to see what this is all about". Mr. Speaker, the Minister it seems would like to know what this is all about. Mr. Speaker, that opinion is shared by the members on this side of the House. We also would like to know what all this is about and I suspect there are a number of backbenchers on that side of the House who also would like to know what this is all about. I know that members of the media are exceedingly anxious, Mr. Speaker, to know what this is about and there are a million Manitobans out there who also want to know what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister goes on to say, "But I am going to tell you that I wouldn't be surprised that in the long run that this turns out to be half-hoax. Mr. Speaker, I find that remark somewhat surprising. Mr. Speaker, I have an idea what a hoax is but I have no idea whatever what a half-hoax is. But perhaps that is what it's all about, Mr. Speaker, and that this is a half-hoax that has somehow been dredged up by the opposition to embarrass the government. Mr. Speaker, it is intended to embarrass the government certainly and to show the incompetence and the ineptness of the Minister involved. We also want to know what this is all about.

In order to comply with the rules, Mr. Speaker, and not to waste the time of the House in order to find out what this is about, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that the Public Utilities Committee be summoned immediately into meeting to look into this whole affair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order really with respect to this claim for privilege, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out two matters. One, in Votes and Proceedings of Thursday, April 9, 1981,

Mr. Speaker, this matter was in substance dealt with and voted on by this House and I suggest therefore that this matter is repetitive and should not be dealt with again at this Session.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the member has not concluded with a motion as he should on such a matter.

Mr. Speaker, thirdly, I want to refer you to a previous ruling by Mr. Speaker Fox in the 1972 Journals, Pages 73 and 74, that learned Speaker, in which, Mr. Speaker, he said that, "It will be seen thus that parliamentary privilege is concerned with the special rights of members not in their capacity as Ministers, or as party leaders, or whips, or parliamentary secretaries, but strictly in their capacity as members. Allegations of misjudgment, or mismanagement, or maladministration on the part of a Minister in the performance of his ministerial duties, does not come within the purview of parliamentary privilege".

Mr. Speaker, to quote from the Member for St. Vital who referred to the allegation of incompetence and ineptness on the part of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, I think the situation fits in perfectly with the ruling of Mr. Speaker Fox, and clearly is not a matter of privileges and does not conform with the conditions necessary to establish a claim for privilege and should be immediately ruled out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on the point of order.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the ruling that the Honourable House Leader of the Government read in, I think that just buttresses the case of the Member for St. Vital that he does have a matter of privilege. The question is that this House is being prevented from doing its work because it's not getting correct and total and sufficient information. The ruling that was made previously by the Speaker was correct, that ineptitude doesn't count; but it does count in respect to privilege when the House is being prevented from having the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I thank all honourable members for their advice and contributions. I will take the matter under advisement.

Presenting Petitions . . .

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Ste. Rose on a point of privilege.

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker. During the time that the bells were ringing for the division, calling of the vote, two members of the Opposition were sitting on this side in our seats, and we received two messages that were delivered to us by the Page, which was handed to the Page by the lady that takes care of that messenger office. The message came to us on the little pink slips that we use for telephone calls, Mr. Speaker, they are signed, "Request a short meeting in the Members' Lounge. NFU". In other words, Mr. Speaker, these messages were intended

to give us the impression that the National Farmers' Union, who are today in the building wanting to lobby each individual member; they wanted to leave the impression that we were to go out to the Members' Lounge to meet with the NFU.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the NFU did not send these messages in. Mr. Speaker, we have contacted members of the National Farmers' Union out there to determine whether they had sent these messages. Mr. Speaker, we believe that these messages came from the Conservative caucus in an effort to get the last two remaining Members of the Opposition out of the House.

That government resorts to trickery, they have demonstrated that. The Leader of this Province . . .

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

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs on the point of order.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I too got a message delivered in to me, and it's asking that: "Susan Proven, National Farmers' Union Director, requests a short interview with you. Subject: Crow Rate. Thank you". It just came to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please, order please. The Chair can only entertain one point of privilege at a time. The Chair cannot be responsible for the messages that come into this Chamber, nor should the Chair accept that responsibility. I believe that the honourable members, should they wish not to communicate with people, that is the choice of their own, and it is not a privilege of the House, nor is it a matter that should be taking up the time of the House. I would have to rule his point of privilege out of order.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that in view of the fact that the Speaker and the Sergeant-at-Arms are responsible for the Pages and the duties that they have, that those services and duties that they have been gone over again so that they are not tricked into doing work that is not their part of the service for this Assembly.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege, I did not receive an invitation to meet with a member of the Farmers' Union.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, rising on a point of order. I believe it is a Rule of the House that when a member rises on a matter of privilege that the matter of privilege should be accompanied by a Motion that the House can deal with. The Member for Ste. Rose had not, at the time that you rose, presented a motion that could be dealt with by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The honourable members cannot reflect on a ruling that the Chair has already made.

Presenting Petitions. . . .

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it was not my intention to reflect on the ruling of the Speaker, I am only asking, on behalf of my colleague, that he be given the opportunity to complete his remarks and put forward any resolution that he might have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Chair has already ruled on that point that was raised. Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have distributed by the Clerk a copy of the 27th Annual Progress Report of the Faculty of Agriculture of the University of Manitoba.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 27 students of Grade 11 standing from the Neepawa Area Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Wayne Hollier. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro. Can the Minister advise whether or not he has communicated already to Hydro his announcement yesterday that he was giving endorsement to a unilateral action on the part of Hydro to release Steward Martin from solicitor-client privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that I would be willing to send a copy of the legislative Hansard to Manitoba Hydro.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would be curious to know from the Minister as he hasn't shown much desire to be expeditious in this matter, as to whether he has done so already and if not, when does he intend to?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll be quite willing to do it immediately it's available; it's still not available.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister. Rather than the Minister beating around the bush, can't he communicate to Hydro his statement of yesterday so that we can expect some reasonably early response from Manitoba Hydro?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there's certainly no attempt in any way to provide any time lag in it. The undertaking yesterday was that I would provide a copy of the discussion yesterday and the joint request to Hydro to give consideration to ask him for the information. I could indicate to the member before he gets himself any further cranked up that the chairman and the general manager, as far as I know, were in Edmonton both yesterday and today working on matters which are important to Hydro.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise whether or not he will support the convening of a committee of this Legislature so that the matters pertaining to the allegations that have been raised by members of the Opposition as well as by former members of the Manitoba Hydro Board can be dealt with so that we can get to the truth of this matter as quickly and as soon as is possible and clear away the clouds which unfortunately have been generated by the actions of the government in their attempts to constantly and persistently stonewall and cover up this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that this government, unlike its predecessor, is as anxious to be open and above board on any matters, —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, on any legitimate matters that are raised in the House.

This House, Mr. Speaker, has been treated to a barrage of triple hearsay, unsigned letters and the like over the last two or three days on a kind of a trumped-up issue that my honourable friend thinks is the biggest thing that's happened to him in his life as the Leader of the Opposition.

I can only say if my honourable friends have any evidence that is worthwhile, signed under oath, that is —(Interjection)— the Member for St. Johns talks about under oath and smiles in his own catlike way at that. I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that this House in accordance with your ruling should not be acting on the basis of unsigned letters or things of that sort. Now if my honourable friends can document anything of substance with respect to this issue of fabrications that they've put forward so far then the House I'm sure would be prepared to give it another look. But on the basis of the non-evidence that has appeared thus far my honourable friends are really wasting their time and the time of this House.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further by way of supplementary to the First Minister. If the First

Minister is indeed that enthusiastic about escaping from triple hearsay and unsigned letters, then why will the First Minister not concur with the request of the Opposition today to convene a committee so that we can subpoena witnesses and hear evidence from witnesses under oath — under oath, Mr. Chairman, under oath — in order that we can obtain the truth of this matter rather than indeed doing as the First Minister has just made comment on, depending upon hearsay or unsigned documents, let's call the witnesses. Let's call the witnesses under oath.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that my honourable friend had taken training in the law. I was only under the impression, I must say, Mr. Speaker. The impression is fast fading from our knowledge in the House of his actions recently. and this is the case with respect to any matter of substance. If my honourable friends opposite at any time have some proof upon which this House as a House should move to act on the basis of sworn evidence and so on of a nature that is substantive, then I'm sure the House will act that way. In the meantime the House would be acting I suggest, very irresponsibly; to react to the kind of triple hearsay; to react to the kind of non-evidence that my honourable friends are trumping up in order that they can avail themselves of some sort of a fishing expedition that they want to undertake in order to blacken the record of the Tritschler Commission, which laid the indictment against that party for all time in the history of this province, for the maladministration that they committed on Manitoba Hydro over the period from 1969 to 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SYDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister to whom the Manitoba Hydro Board reports, which I hope would perhaps simplify the procedure. Would the Minister to whom Hydro reports, obtain the the permission of Hydro — and I rather expect that he is able to do that — to telephone Mr. Steward Martin and ask Mr. Martin whether the document which my friend the Member for St. Vital attempted to table, does in fact represent a fabrication, as is now alleged by the First Minister, or whether he in fact read that document to the Hydro Board? If he did then the Minister will know it and I think he would be as curious as the rest of us to know it; and if he didn't, he will come back to the House and tell the House that, I've spoken to Mr. Martin and he told me that is not his document. Would the Minister, with a simple phone call, ask Mr. Martin whether — Mr. Speaker, I have reason to believe that it is Mr. Martin's document — I would ask the Minister whether he is not curious to find out and he is empowered to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this matter was discussed as recently as yesterday in the House on the same matter and the recommended course of action was discussed and I think agreed upon and that was that the —(Interjections)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition can't seem to decide just what it wants

on this. They, first of all, want to prove that somehow the Minister moved in and overpowered Hydro with regard to its decision on legal matters. The Minister has taken the position that was not the case. They are saying, well, regardless of all that, now you must move back in again and make sure you do this. What I've said and what the House agreed upon yesterday is that the client, who was Manitoba Hydro and not the Government of Manitoba, the client who was Manitoba Hydro, always has been, who made the appointments of all the lawyers, engaged them, released them, whatever the case may be, should carry on and do that. That, Mr. Speaker, I think is important to pursue and I think it's important that it be pursued along the lines it was decided yesterday.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's a supplementary question and it's directed to the First Minister. Can the First Minister tell me whether the special appointment to Mr. Steward Martin, in writing, made by the Premier of the Province of Manitoba appointing Steward Martin as Special Counsel to the government with respect to Hydro matters was ever revoked by the First Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question for my honourable friend but I would think the answer is 'no'. I do know that the Counsel in question was used extensively by the former Premier of this province, Premier Schreyer and by the former NDP government of this province, on various matters and then the gentleman in question was apparently retained by Manitoba Hydro, when Mr. Bateman was the Chairman, to represent their interest before the Tritschler Commission. I have no recollection of revocation of the appointment but I can certainly ask to see if that were done. My knowledge, Mr. Speaker, would not extend to the point that the appointment was in fact made by the Premier; I don't even know that for a fact. If my honourable friend says it's a fact I would have to take him at his word.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the First Minister that is certainly my recollection and if I'm wrong I will withdraw it. But, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the British Parliamentary Rule is that the King is dead, long live the King and the appointments are made and that governments do not end their appointments by virtue of changes in government, is it not then a fact that if that appointment was not revoked, that Steward Martin, while he was acting for Manitoba Hydro and in the same capacity as he acted previously, was also acting as Special Counsel to the government of the Province of Manitoba and, as such, the Government of Manitoba — and, by the way, I believe they can do it in either event. The Minister says the procedure has already been agreed to; I never heard of any agreements in this House over the last couple of days but I ask, Mr. Speaker, to simplify matters, would the First Minister who, if I'm right, can ask his own counsel a question and if it's Hydro then Hydro will give the Minister the permission to ask the

question, would he simply pick up the telephone, ask Mr. Martin whether in fact that document is something that he read to the Hydro Board and then tell the House whether it is or isn't?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe I understand now what my honourable friend for Inkster is getting at. If he is referring to the appointment that was made by our predecessors, I presume by Premier Schreyer, of the counsel in question to be counsel for the Manitoba Government on the Northern Flood Arrangement, that's the only one that I'm aware of, and I can tell my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that when this government came into office, to the best of my knowledge and recollection, the services of that particular counsel were never utilized again by the Government of Manitoba. I think that subsequently my impression is that Manitoba Hydro, of its own volition, appointed the same counsel to act for it with respect to the Tritschler Commission. I wouldn't suggest for a moment that there was any continuity between the appointments because in our time Mr. Martin was not appointed by us, nor was he continued in his position as counsel on the Northern Flood Committee arrangement with which my honourable friend for Inkster is familiar.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. I wonder if the Minister would advise the House of the expiry date of Manitoba Hydro's agreement to supply electrical power to the International Nickel Company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there has been one that just expired the first half of its term at the end of March of this year. The second half of the term has now been entered into and that agreement, whether that has been yet signed or not, I can take the question as notice if that is part of the question.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, in taking the question as notice, I wonder if the Minister would also supply us with the new rate structure and the duration of the agreement and also a copy of the existing rate structure when he is supplying the other information, please.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll supply that if it's available; if in fact the agreement has been entered into and that information is available I will supply it.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. I'd like to ask the Minister whether he has read the document I sent over to him yesterday afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, no, I haven't had a chance to read the document at this point in time, no.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the same Minister if he can tell us what steps he intends to take to determine the authenticity of this document?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the member I took it home last night at supertime with the full intention of examining it and I decided instead to watch the "Gong Show", so I didn't have a chance to get through it. But if the "Gong Show" is not on tonight, Mr. Speaker, I'll make another attempt.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is to the Honourable First Minister. In view of the monumental insensibility of the Honourable Deputy Premier will the First Minister replace him with another Minister who has a little more political sense of what is important to Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is clearly no because the Minister has certainly demonstrated, as I indicated yesterday and on previous occasions, the kind of integrity which, while I realize it's all too rare on that side of the House is appreciated on this side of the House. I want to say to my honourable friend that if he is so concerned as a member of this House about the authenticity of documents which he sees fit to distribute in the House let him determine the authenticity otherwise don't distribute it.

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Is the firm of Woods Gordon still engaged in seeking out prospective purchasers for ManFor in addition to the three that were named in today's newspaper story?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, they're still retained by the government with regard to ManFor matters, yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Has the Minister an offer to purchase from Technopulp which purportedly was received by the government about three years ago?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there's none under active consideration. Perhaps the member should ask his question again. Has the government received?

MR. HANUSCHAK: The question is does the Minister have an offer to purchase ManFor from Technopulp?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there may have been one received at one time or another but I think it was during the period of the former government. I'm not in a position to redirect the question but I think there was an offer to purchase if I have heard noises correctly by the former government.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I was not asking the Minister about any documents that may have been in possession of a previous government. My question to the Minister is: Does the Minister have an offer to purchase from Technopulp?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, not that I am aware of but I will take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like to direct a question to the Minister who reports for the House for Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited. I'd like to ask the Minister whether or not Noranda Mines Limited, MacMillan Bloedel Limited or Repap Enterprises have been negotiating with the Province of Manitoba for the partial or outright purchase of Manitoba Forest Industries and whether or not any serious negotiations with these firms or any other firms are currently under way?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, to answer the latter part of the question first. Yes, there are negotiations under way. These three firms named have been involved in discussion with the Manitoba government. Options with them have not been closed off. I cannot give the House any further information at this time other than what I said at the committee meeting, that all of the examination that is under way we expect will be wound up by probably mid-1981 but they are still actively being pursued and discussed and there's really no further information I can give at this time.

MR. McBRYDE: I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether these negotiations are for the partial purchase or whether they're only for the outright purchase. Are they solely for the outright purchase of ManFor by these companies; and secondly, would the Minister indicate whether or not the \$75,000 Woods Gordon Report on the ManFor complex has yet been shared by the Minister with the Board of Directors of Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited and the senior management of that company?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, to repeat, I really can't provide the member with any further information. The report referred to was discussed at the committee I think by the Member for The Pas who was at the committee and raised the same questions when the ManFor group appeared. I indicated at that time that all the reports and papers and other things that were involved in this examination were used by the government people in their discussions and negotiations with other prospective companies that may have an interest. As a result none of the documentation received any circulation other than in the government itself.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House why the Woods Gordon Report on the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited was not shared or not shown to the Board of Directors for ManFor nor with the senior

management. Why hasn't this taken place; for what reasons? I would also ask the Minister whether or not he would be willing to table in the House the Terms of Reference for the Woods Gordon study.

MR. CRAIK: Again, Mr. Speaker, the latter part of the question can appropriately be dealt with by Order for Return if the member wants to pursue that approach. But again, to repeat what I said in the committee stage, the sharing of reports is a question that came up at the time and internal reports that are being used for, if you like, negotiating purposes are kept confidential during that period. Since the government has been carrying on the negotiations directly that's the reason.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister's statements yesterday that the Crow rate issue was dead, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister now is in a position to or has indicated that he is repudiating his earlier government position that no longer will their position be that the Crow benefit be paid to all farmers and that the Crow rate should remain and any benefits that accrue to the farmers should come from the railways who got the major benefits in terms of this agreement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to review the comments that I made yesterday indicating that the Crow rate issue was dead or in what context I stated them in. Mr. Speaker, I would imagine I was referring to the fact that the Federal Government who truly have the responsibility for the national transportation policies and any changes that may have to take place, Mr. Speaker, to get on with the job of moving the grain for the farmers of Western Canada, we have not seen a position come forward from the Federal Government so that we truly can assess what their objectives are.

MR. URUSKI: Can the Minister confirm that the present Manitoba government's position, and I quote from a July 6, '79 press release, "that the Crow benefit would be paid directly to western farmers in relation to the amount of agricultural products shipped, the federal subsidy would be equivalent to the shortfall between the revenue derived from hauling grain at the statutory rate and the cost of hauling at the compensatory rate". Mr. Speaker, with the inducement for utilization of the most effective and efficient mode of transport vested with the producer himself, can the Minister confirm that has been the position of the Provincial Government and whether he is prepared to move away from it; rather than take the railways off the hook, and place it on the Federal Government as he has, to agree at least in part with the request of the Federal Minister of the Wheat Board that there should be an inquiry into the affairs of the CPR in this country, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I guess we have to let the public know as well as members opposite, since

that press release went out in July of 1979, following actions that were taken by the Premier of this Province to get on with the job of moving the grain out of Western Canada, but it's time that we should reassess some of the positions that were taken. If those actions hadn't been taken, we would have been still sitting with grain piled up around our ears and a lack of ability to meet the payments that farmers have to meet with the high cost of production today.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be also put on the record that the Province of Saskatchewan, as I've been made aware, that I think they have probably reassessed their position because they, in fact, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, they as well as the Canadian Wheat Board, which is operated by the farmers of Western Canada, they, Mr. Speaker, have broken the statutory rate by buying hopper cars and providing equipment to the system. We no longer have a statutory rate left in Western Canada to protect the interests of the farmers.

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

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at least it appears that the Minister is now indicating that the farmers of Western Canada have been blackmailed by the railways over all these years, and forced Western Canadian governments to buy hopper cars, Mr. Speaker. At least he recognizes that.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that compensatory rates which the Minister supports will reduce farmers incomes in Manitoba by a sum of approximately \$80 million, how does the Minister expect those farmers to make up that income when net incomes for Manitoba farmers are projected at roughly \$279 million for this coming year, Mr. Speaker. How does he expect farmers to make up that additional cost to them if the Crow rate is gone, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the member again is off and running on a path that is very much consistent with the New Democratic party position and the Farmers Union position, which I indicated yesterday and I indicated to the Farmers Union today, it's a head-in-the-sand position, but in fact if you carry that philosophy through that you want to nationalize the transportation system — (Interjection)— Yes, they want to nationalize the transportation system, and they want to nationalize the farms, Mr. Speaker, that produce those grains.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Order please, order please. We can only have one person speaking at a time.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a question.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the fact that my colleague has just read a news bulletin that was issued back in 1979, and in view of the fact that the government now is trying to hide where its position is in regard to the statutory Crow rate and, in addition to that, they have a Mr. Forbes going out throughout the province telling people that they do not have a position, could he advise why? What has made them

change their position over the past year, that they now do not have a position according to Mr. Forbes who is their representative on Transportation?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, there's no problem. We don't have to hide our position. Our position has basically been and will remain, that the benefits of the statutory rate being retained for the farmers of Western Canada. Mr. Speaker, that is the position of the Government of Manitoba, unlike the position of the members opposite who take the position within the farm community of asking them if they would like to pay more money to move their grain. As I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, no, farmers don't want to pay more money to move their grain. It's a natural answer; who would want to pay more money.

But the other alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to have the grain sit in the bins, to break the statutory rate as they have already done by buying hopper cars through the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, that's already happened, and they're trying to hold onto an old political issue that, as I said yesterday, is dead and I believe it still is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a supplementary.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that recent surveys, both in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, have discovered that approximately 80 to 90 percent of the farmers — farmers, not organizations but farmers — are in support of retention of the Crow rate, is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to support the resolution that I have in the House at the present time that does call for the retention of the Crow rate?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the member, if he was in the House yesterday when his resolution was being debated, would have heard me. I indicated that I wouldn't support it. He brings up the survey that was done in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, he brings up the survey that was done in Manitoba. You know, it's very easy, it's like surveying the people of Canada asking if they want to pay 18 cents more for each gallon of gasoline. The answer is no, and they'll vote a government out that asks that question. But if they don't ask them the question, and say, well, we don't have an energy policy, and the price will go up at whatever and the people vote them in, now what is the price of gasoline, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My final supplementary is, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible to identify public aid to the amount of \$10.34 billion to CP Limited over the years, identifiable, and much more that we can't put a handle on; in view of the fact that CP Limited lists their assets at \$11 billion, in fact the taxpayer of this country have paid the entire shot for CPR, would the Minister agree that it would be in the best interests of Canada that CP Limited be nationalized?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in any way, shape or form that the CPR should have the protection of any public government. I do not believe

they should be allowed to take advantage of the people of this country. Mr. Speaker, I guess we would have to point the finger, if that is the proper expression to use, that because we've had a Federal Government that haven't been able to make the railroads live up to their obligation, then I would suggest that several months ago, when we had the government of Joe Clark, if the members opposite would have seen fit to support that government we'd have had a government in place like the Minister of Transport at that time, Don Mazankowski, who did a tremendous job of getting on with the job of moving grain in this country.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable First Minister. On Thursday, April 2, he undertook to look into and respond to my enquiry about an Order for Return which was accepted by the Minister of Agriculture on May 16, 1979, some 23 months ago, and an Order for Return accepted by the government by someone — I guess by the Honourable First Minister — on a request of the Member for Fort Rouge which was accepted on April 8, 1980, just over a year ago, whether he is now in a position to report to us as to the progress and when one can expect these Orders to be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we will have them tabled as soon as they are ready.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would be prepared to indicate to us the difficulties that are being faced by the Minister of Agriculture in the filing of what I understand would have to be a rather both routine and short list and what difficulties he is having in preparing an Order for Return which has been waiting for over a year. What are the problems that the Minister has discovered?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to look at the detail of what my honourable friend is enquiring about.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable First Minister gave that kind of an undertaking on April 2, and in view of the fact that apparently he has not looked into the problem of the delays involved and the reasons for the delays, may I ask the Honourable Minister whether he is indeed sincere in attempting to respond to Orders for Return that are Orders of this House made over a year ago and whether he is prepared to undertake that this will be done before the session ends?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question as to the sincerity of the government, the answer is yes. I find it rather ironic that the Member for St. Johns, of all people, has the temerity to stand up in this House and some of us can remember the terribly lax record

of that government responding to, when they were a government, and God forbid that they ever would be again, when they were charged with Orders of the House and never filed Returns. When we came into office, Mr. Speaker, we had to clean up, as I recall, Orders for Return that were left over from one, two years back. So, Mr. Speaker, yes, we're sincere in trying to get it out and our record thus far has been very very much better than the record of our predecessors and will continue to be.

MR. CHERNIACK: I rise on a matter of privilege and I will be pleased to file a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a matter of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought it would take three questions to have the Honourable First Minister reveal his true nature as he has just done. Mr. Speaker, on that point I wish to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of privilege that this House unanimously accepted that there shall be Orders for Return. The First Minister can wiggle and weasel and twist his way around but he can't get out of the fact that his Minister of Agriculture accepted an Order of this House on May 16, 1979 dealing with Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation land sales details and this Minister has not produced the Order for Return and his First Minister is sitting back and trying to find some other precedent to excuse him for this negligence and lax. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an affront to the House itself which has given an Order and which the Minister is now saying, well, I don't have to do it, pointing at other precedents.

Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that there was a time during all the time that the First Minister was the Minister of the Crown in the Sixties, and that continued well into the Seventies, when there was no requirement to file an Order for Return after the end of a session. The rules were changed that did not permit the government to get off the hook in regard to filing Orders for Return and in the fact that the rules were changed it was obviously agreed that there would be an honest effort made. I asked the Minister more than once, I've asked the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, and I can give chapter and verse on the occasions and always there was an undertaking to investigate. The First Minister specifically on April 2 on Pages 2342-3 of Hansard undertook to look into the matter. That was on April 2 and today he undertook to look into the matter. Mr. Speaker, it is an affront to this House to make that undertaking and then to give a snide reply in his typical form and manner and yet one to avoid giving an honest reply to the problems that this government is having in responding to Orders for Return which they accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Johns was not accompanied by a substantive motion and therefore I would have to rule it was not a point of order.

The time for question period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in consultation with the Opposition House Leader, with the Member for Fort Rouge and I think it is the Acting Deputy Leader of the Progressive party, I believe there is unanimous agreement on Thursday of this week to the House sitting from 10 to 12 o'clock noon and then 2 o'clock to 5:30 and not sitting in the evening.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Education; and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Municipal Affairs.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): Call the Committee to order. We're starting Municipal Affairs. I call in the Minister for his opening statement.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to introduce to the Estimates for the Department of Municipal Affairs for 1981-82.

In the past year it has been my privilege to represent this department in its relationships with 202 local governments throughout the province. As Minister of Municipal Affairs I've visited a number of municipalities where Centennial celebrations were being held. In areas such as the Villages of Treherne, Glenboro, Crystal City, Pilot Mount; the Rural Municipalities of Tache, South Cypress, Louise and St. Andrews, I've joined with municipal representatives in paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of local government. This opportunity to join with municipalities in their tribute to public spirited citizens who served their communities has been a very rewarding experience for me.

My department has recently concluded a series of seven two-day seminars on local government held for newly elected councillors at Gimli during late January and early February. Some 268 councillors attended representing municipalities throughout the province — 21 towns, 58 rural municipalities, 18 villages, 4 cities and 11 local government districts. The opportunity to interact with these newly elected councillors has proven to be a worthwhile experience for members of my department and, judging from the response, for the councillors in attendance. All branches of the department participated in the sessions. I should indicate that a number of municipalities were represented in addition by people who had served on council during the past three years.

I would like to publicly acknowledge the contribution made by municipal councillors throughout this province. The tradition of public service in local government is one which attracts people of various callings, occupations, backgrounds,

and ages — in one instance a man who begins his third career by serving his municipality at the age of 71. I am certain all members will join me in acknowledging the contribution made by municipal people throughout the years.

My departmental Estimates do not include any funds involving Urban Affairs. Those items will be covered by my colleague, the Honourable Gerry Mercier, Minister responsible for Urban Affairs.

I should also remind members that funding for the Assessment Review Committee is not located in the Department of Municipal Affairs. The Assessment Review Committee has compiled its second interim report and that report has been filed for members of the House.

The provincial land use policies were established in final form in November of 1980. The policies are designed to guide municipalities and planning districts in the preparation of plans and to establish guidelines for subdivision proposals in the light of provincial land use policies. During 1980 some 1385 subdivision applications were received, with 1246 receiving approval.

There are now 13 planning districts throughout the province involving some 43 municipalities. There are 11 other municipalities where formation of planning districts is being considered. Grants totalling \$89,200 were paid to planning districts in 1980.

In order to improve service in the planning field the Municipal Planning Branch has now further decentralized. The Stonewall Office opened in October with six people. The Morden Office with five people opened in December and the Portage Office with five people opened in December as well.

Location of District Offices in the areas served is now completed, a process which was commenced some years ago. The bulk of our operation is now located outside Winnipeg with some specialist staff being available from Winnipeg to assist where required in various districts.

New planning districts formed in 1980 were: The Eastern Interlake Planning District, The Nor-Mac Planning District, The Killarney-Turtle Mountain Planning District and the South Riding Mountain Planning District. As well, the Rural Municipality of Rosser was added to the existing South Interlake Planning District.

In November the Department of Municipal Affairs distributed the first of its municipal newsletters called "Municipal Informat". The second edition has recently been mailed and we are extremely gratified by the response received from municipal people throughout Manitoba. By covering a wide range of subjects of interest to the elected municipal people we hope to strengthen the communication links which we have traditionally maintained with municipal councils throughout the province.

The overall Estimates for the Department of Municipal Affairs have increased by \$1,580,600, in brief. The breakdown of a branch-by-branch basis will be following.

Mr. Chairman, those are my opening remarks and I have copies of these remarks if anyone is so interested. I see that copies of the municipal format which I have referred to, copies of those are also available for anyone that might wish to peruse same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his opening remarks with respect to his

department. I must say that in listening to his remarks, although we didn't have his statement until a little later on during his speech, I would like to take this opportunity and share with him our congratulations to the local governments who are celebrating their Centennial celebrations this coming year. I would hope that although the longstanding practice of special emphasis in Centennial celebrations and grants that are made available to the local groups, that some measure of at least looking at what inflation has done to funds that are received by local government, that it may be time that the province look at some revision of its contribution to local government in terms of recognition of their Centennial celebrations and may, in fact, wish to in terms of some special projects that municipalities might be undertaking that some various alternatives be provided in terms of assistance and recognition during those celebrations.

Mr. Chairman, as well we recognize and the Minister has indicated the seminars for newly-elected councillors. In view of the elections now falling on the same time every three years, Mr. Chairman, it certainly is worthwhile that councillors and newly-elected councillors are availing themselves to the seminars that are being held. It's certainly a credit to people seeking public office in local municipalities that they are sincerely dedicated and wish to learn the ins and outs and the workings of local government and their responsibilities which I'm sure these seminars attempt to clarify and enlighten the councillors who have been elected.

As well, to those citizens who have sought elective office in the municipalities, certainly it is a credit to the interest that is shown by the citizens of the province. Although many areas from time to time have showed in terms of voter turnout there could have been much more participation by citizens. Indeed, the interest shown by people seeking elective office has been encouraging in many municipalities. I know in our own area there have been contested elections which makes the democratic process worthwhile and makes people much more accountable to the electorate.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister commented as well on the government's land-use policies. I would hope and we wonder whether or not there have been any changes in procedure with respect to the handling of applications in terms of subdivisions and how the approval process is operating. Just by the mere statistics that the Minister has quoted to us does not give the entire picture of what is happening, Mr. Chairman, and I will elaborate.

For example in the Interlake region, the Department of Agriculture had a resource agronomist who recently retired after a number of years of valuable service to the department and his position has not been filled, it may be now, but as of several weeks ago — and this has been for some time now that it's been known that he's retiring — the role has not been filled. We wonder on this side as to how important this Minister and this government places on their land-use policies in light of some of the controversies that have erupted from time to time in terms of subdivisions that have been approved or not approved.

Again the Minister knows of some of the matters in the Interlake area where either some advice or

misadvice was given and the advice given by the resource people was not heeded, Mr. Chairman. I say this to the Minister that I would hope that government officials, Ministers, do accept their responsibility, that there may be from time to time a difference of opinion between the expert advice that is given to the politicians in terms of making decisions and that should be noted, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister who is ultimately responsible be prepared to stand on his own two feet and make the decision one way or the other.

But, Mr. Chairman, we've evidenced in this Legislature by your colleague, the Minister of Agriculture who tends to sidestep the issues of how his department relates to the planning process in his co-operation or lack of co-operation in the land-use process certainly leads one to wonder as to this government's and your position with respect to the land-use policies and how they are being administered and whether staff is allowed the freedom and the expert advice that they are hired for; and that they are allowed to give that expert advice; and based on that expert advice the government and the Minister then does make the decision. He may not like the expert advice and I grant that from time to time he will look at applications or look at the advice that is given to him and he will say to himself, notwithstanding the advice that is given to me, I believe that it is still in the interests of the people of this province that this subdivision or this transaction go through. I respect that process fully.

But what I don't respect, Mr. Chairman, is Ministers subtly hamstringing their staff and indicating that, or at least through a means of either not filling positions or just telling staff to cool it, the general message goes down and the freedom of the staff to give opinions is thwarted, Mr. Chairman. That I don't go along with. I believe that staff are there in terms of their advice and it is really a decision that the Minister and his colleagues should stand up and make those decisions whether they like the opinions or not, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to the decentralization of the department, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the government has moved along with the decentralization that was in motion a number of years back and likely didn't move as quickly as some of us would have liked, but that those plans that were commenced a number of years ago with respect to the Planning Branch have gone ahead. I'd like to find out from the Minister whether the whole area of decentralization with respect to service to the municipalities, how that is now balancing off with respect to local subdivisions and with respect to technical information or information of a wider nature that municipalities might need, how is that being co-ordinated between the regional offices and the municipalities and what input there is at a central level for advice to municipalities?

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that there have been a number of planning districts coming on stream and I would ask the Minister to comment as to what he sees for this coming year as to municipalities, whether there are new planning districts being formed. Speaking of planning districts, Mr. Chairman, the Minister will recall in this fall's elections and in an area of the province where there

has been a substantial pressure building up and has been from residents who wished to have, if one could put it, no controls whatsoever, no strings attached to land-use planning — and I'm sure the Minister knows of the area I speak of, directly to the south south-west of where we sit today, Mr. Chairman, the area of Morden, Stanley, in that area — where councillors were elected primarily if the media reports were accurate, to thwart any planning, any logistical planning whatsoever they skinned, if one could use it — at least I believe I recall, I maybe mistaken — but the skinned land-use planning to Communism, Mr. Chairman. That was some of the statements that were brought out in the newspaper.

I asked the Minister what kind of dealings and what kind of relationship is there between the government and local government in that area where services that were provided to that planning district now, and maybe that attitude has changed and the Minister will correct me, was no longer desired because of the individuals that were elected and their position with respect to planning. I think it would be rather difficult for the government and the Planning Branch to advise local government officials, elected representatives, who were totally opposed to any planning or at least maybe to the electorate, maybe they have settled down in terms of their viewing of the planning process, I'd like to hear the Minister's views as to how the relationships between his department and those local governments are proceeding.

So, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Assessment Review Committee, I would hope that although the Minister has indicated that the budgets for the funding of the Assessment Review Committee do fall under the Minister of Finance. I am assuming that the Minister is not attempting to limit any discussion on the workings of that committee, that we will be able to discuss some of the workings and what further has to be done in terms of this committee and how it is proceeding under the Minister's Department of Assessment, Mr. Chairman, in terms of detail. I hope that he is not intending to allow or disallow any discussion in this area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) — the Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the Minister would answer some of the questions raised. Is he going to at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't get a signal from the Honourable Minister that anything was decided. I just want to clear that we're on 1.(b).

The Honourable Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: I have some comments to make but if you want to add something further at this time, I can wait.

MR. SCHROEDER: In general, I'm not planning on making any kind of a lengthy opening statement. The one area of shared concern that I have is how the entire Planning Branch is operating. I recall back several years, in fact 1977, meeting up with some real estate agents who were very happy about the fact that the then Leader of the Opposition was running around saying that he was going to do away

with that whole nonsense. Of course, fortunately he changed his mind about that, among many other things and that hasn't completely occurred. In some areas it hasn't occurred at all in that we have now moved onward with many planning districts and we are quite happy to hear about them.

We did discuss this whole issue for some considerable period of time last year. We still have some of the concerns that we had last year when Mr. Uruski raised the concern of a residential subdivision going up smack-dab in the middle of an agricultural area and it was obviously contrary to the proposed policies that were in effect then and certainly it was contrary to the purported policies that are now in effect. When I read the land-use policies, it is pretty clear that policy number one is that areas should be preserved for a full range of agricultural activity where agriculture is in the dominant position, etc.

Now we understand that sometimes these applications come in and sometimes all you hear is one side of the story. Last year we did ask several times and make some suggestions about the department coming along with a policy which would in some way notify the neighbours of the fact that there is this subdivision application coming in.

Just recently in my capacity as a lawyer, I had an individual come to me and ask me to write a letter to his local municipality and to the local office of the Planning Branch, to notify them that he would like to have notice of any application for subdivision. He was planning on setting up an agricultural operation on a piece of land and he felt that he was entitled to notice. When he discovered that he wasn't going to receive any notice he asked me to write a letter to his local councillors and Reeve and to the local Municipal Planning Branch office to ask them to somehow red circle that general area and if some application per chance came in he wanted notification. In fact I talked to some of the councillors involved and they thought it wasn't a bad idea and they hoped that in some way future councillors would be able to notify this individual. But it's not only one individual, it should be other farmers. If you happen to be within a half a mile or so of some individual who is planning on setting up a couple of two or three acre lots or something and you were sort of, in the back of your mind, thinking about a hog operation or a livestock operation and if that subdivision application is approved without your even having had the opportunity to be heard, then later on when you see those basements going in you're going to be upset.

Now, the Minister indicated last year that there is some difficulty in terms of notification and of course it's not that easy to notify everybody but as he, I'm sure, is aware, the Land Title's Office does have a record of the addresses of people, the Municipal Offices have addresses. I'm not suggesting that we should have legislation which requires hand delivered Sheriff's service on every neighbor but if you have some form of written notice to the latest available address of the neighbors or if that is too expensive you could at least have a couple of billboards hammered up within a mile or so of the proposed site as you do in the city. If you have a zoning change applied for in the City of Winnipeg you see the area placarded with some notice that somebody wants to get into a non-conforming use or there is

some change in spot zoning being applied for, or whatever, so that neighbors have some ideas to what's going on. Surely they should have the right to be heard and it seems to me that is one area that I haven't seen any indication from the Minister or the department yet that they have chosen to move on it.

It is an area that I grant you is not something that a whole bunch of people are extremely excited about. They only become excited after the fact, they only become excited after something has happened that they didn't want to have happen and that doesn't mean that they should have had the right to stop it. What it does mean is that they should have had the right to be heard and that to me is a pretty crucial fundamental issue that I would hope the Minister will look at.

In his opening remarks he indicated that there were more than 1300 applications for subdivision received and close to 1300 were approved. I'm just wondering how many lots that wound up making; how that compares to previous years in terms of applications and approvals; where those applications and approvals came from, and not specific municipalities but just general areas of the province; how many of these lots are recreational or were considered to be recreational lots as opposed to residential? It seems to me that in the last couple of years with the increases in the price of gasoline that there has been a decided slowdown in the move from the city out onto these little lots 10, 15 or 20 miles out and the Member for Emerson says it's picking up again. It may well be that it will pick up, we will see, but I'm just wondering whether the Minister sees any long-term trend slowing it down.

As well the Member for St. George has commented on the problems of the Morden, Stanley, Thompson, Winkler, planning district. I, as well, am kind of curious as to the outcome and as to whether planners sent there ever come back and just how they are making out down there?

The Minister has also indicated that there have been offices opened in a number of centres and I'm just wondering whether he could give us, he may have provided us somewhere in the material, and I'm just wondering whether he could tell us what the total staff is in that branch and approximately where abouts they are now involved. I'll just leave it there for now.

MR. GOURLAY: First of all I'd like to thank the members opposite for their comments with respect to the areas in Municipal Affairs. You have asked a number of questions, I'll hope that I can try and remember most of them here. With respect to the changes in the subdivision approvals, this has been transferred out of the Municipal Planning to the Provincial Planning so that the role of the Municipal Planners is one of advisory capacity. They continue to fulfil this role with the municipal people continuously so that they don't have to subsequently put on another hat and reject subdivision applications that they have maybe taken the municipality through a course to having it approved and then turning it down for some pertinent reason. So the Municipal Planners fulfil a role of advice to the municipalities and the rejections are withdrawn from their role and placed in the Provincial Planning Branch. So there is a bit of a change there and I think that it has worked out very well.

With respect to the administration of the land use policies with the various departments, some concern was expressed that the Ministers had indicated to staff to cool it so that the staff perhaps reacted and this could happen. We try to see that the administration of the land use policies are administered in an equitable fashion and we hope the administration of the policies that have been approved by, and recommended, by municipalities throughout the province, will be administered as equitably as humanly possible. But I don't deny that there are situations where the human element may be affected by the leeway that there may be within their jurisdiction. With respect to the number of planning districts, we have not had any new planning districts organized since we went through Estimates last July, some nine months ago. I think there's good reason for that because we have gone through municipal elections last November and I think there was some reluctance on the many of the areas that are interested in forming planning districts. There have been a number of changes of municipal people and there are a number of areas that were interested and are still interested in forming new districts. I would anticipate in the year ahead or months ahead that there will be additional planning districts formed.

The situation with respect to the Morden-Winkler-Stanley planning area, I would say there have been some major concerns expressed by some of the communities involved in that planning district. I think it became an election issue in that area and I was somewhat concerned myself as Minister as to what might be happening in that area because the province and the Department of Municipal Affairs have spent quite a bit of effort, money and time in that planning district and it was doing a reasonably effective job in planning. Some of the people took exception to that. I think since the municipal elections have been held, they realize that maybe all their concerns were not fully explained to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I move that Committee rise for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 51 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education, Resolution No. 55, 6. Universities Grants Commission, Item (a) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one of the matters that I wanted to discuss with the Minister is the perennial problem which has been exacerbated in the last three years and that is employment for university graduates in the Province of Manitoba. There has been over the years a general brain drain of highly skilled people first and foremost in the category of ages 25 to 45. This has been noted for many decades, particularly in the post-war period. I recall in particular it was a major feature of the TED Report, the Targets for Economic Development, which was a product of the Roblin administration. It's something that has been a problem faced by all governments in Manitoba in at least the past 35 years and possibly prior to that.

Now what concerns me is that we are spending a substantial amount of money on our universities. The government probably has spent less than it should have in the first few years in office. They made substantial reductions and cutbacks in their so-called period of restraint and then more recently are trying to play catch-up and I think that what has happened in effect is that their economic policies and their economic development combined with their restraint programs have in effect driven people out of the province to find employment elsewhere.

I want to relate to the Minister a conversation that I had only a month or so ago with a young student, a young woman, who teaches figure skating to my daughter. I asked her what she thought of the job market. I first of all asked her what she was going to do on graduation. If I recall correctly, I think she was a Commerce grad. I asked her whether she had a job, in particular, and she said that she did have a job. I asked her with what company and I think she said somebody like Imperial Oil or Shell or whatever. I asked her where the job was and she said it was in Edmonton. Then I asked her how the rest of the graduates were doing in her year and she said that those who had decided to leave the province had found employment, but those who had wanted to remain in Manitoba were unemployed.

Now, you know, the Minister will have to take my word for it; I don't have a document signed or unsigned, I only have my memory to go on, but I can produce the witness if the Minister so desires. Now this struck me as a very sharp dichotomy. I'm sure that this is not an accurate reflection of all graduates at the university level in all faculties, but it really struck me as a pretty sad commentary on what is happening in the province and what has been the result of some of the programs and policies of the Progressive Conservative Party. This young woman who took a course, her observation is if you want to find a job you have to leave the province, that was really the net result, the net effect, of her particular comments.

So there has been debate about this. I notice one of the interesting comments made by Dr. Campbell was that a lot of the graduates were really going home. I think that was an interesting comment and Dr. Campbell, I think, is a very fine gentleman who heads the University of Manitoba and no one can question his integrity or his ability. I think he's done an excellent job; he also has a bit of a flair or a feel for public relations which wasn't found in his predecessor but was found in Dr. Saunderson before him. The comment sounds reasonable enough; namely, that many of the students, or some of the students who are leaving Manitoba aren't from Manitoba in the first place or weren't resident in the Province of Manitoba and they're simply going back home.

Mr. Chairman, I say one of the reasons they are going back home is because they can't find work here anyway. If the job market is to the west and to the east, anywhere else but in Manitoba, then of course the people who come from somewhere else will go back home. Not only will they go back home but they will take several Manitobans with them and this is the problem that we're facing.

I believe that the brain drain has been accelerated and that we're having students leaving, that we're

having qualified trained people leaving to the booming markets of the west and to the traditional place of central Canada. It's no longer Montreal. I have only heard of one friend of mine leaving for Montreal in the last year or two. He was offered a job at a substantially higher salary than he had because the trend is coming out of Montreal, which is a whole story in itself but a rather sad story I think of what is happening to that great metropolitan city. But people from Winnipeg are going to Toronto, going to Calgary, going to Edmonton and going to Vancouver by the thousands and some, too, are going to Calgary and Edmonton.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister cautioned me that I should be easy. You know, I will throw at him a resource person, my colleague from Brandon East and the Minister must keep in mind that I'm also talking in general terms, I'm not saying only students, I'm saying Manitobans and among them hundreds and hundreds of students and I know that when I talk to people I'm not meeting people in Winnipeg who have just rolled in from points west but I am keeping track of friends of mine who are leaving the province to find employment and find opportunities. Now the Minister himself is not responsible for employment but he is part of team and he is part of a government which can at least effect in global terms the picture, the job picture, the employment picture and the out-migration picture.

So I'm simply saying to the Minister that I would be very interested to hear the comment that he would have on observations made that the opportunities for graduates from our university are not good. We were talking yesterday about community college graduates. It is my impression that the average graduate of a community college will have a better opportunity of finding employment in Manitoba than the average graduate of the university.

It wasn't that long ago where a university certificate or diploma was almost a guarantee of employment and I recall myself, when I graduated some 22 years ago that I had a good prospect of about five jobs including working for the Federal Government in Ottawa as a junior administrative officer and I remember thinking hard about that one, Mr. Chairman. I discovered that I didn't want to disappear as an anonymous person in the great bureaucratic machine down east, that I would rather stay —(Interjection)— A pity. Well, I don't want this House to lose the Member for Lakeside, although I'm torn, as I've said between those two fine gentlemen in the front bench as to which one I'm going to support at that nomination meeting that's coming up pretty soon. I'm not sure which one I'm supporting or which one I will say that I'm supporting in an attempt to scuttle that particular person and help the one I really want to support. In your case I'm supporting your opponent, Mr. Domino, who is clearly the best candidate for the New Democratic party to knock off. So he is our best bet. (Interjection)— .

Mr. Chairman, I simply say to the Minister that there is a debate that's going on in the editorial pages of the Free Press about whether or not there is a student exodus, those are the words being used; or whether some of them are just going home or whether some of them are just going away for a little while to see what is happening outside in the big bad

world, in the booming economies of the west. Some people are being dissuaded from moving because of the booming economy and I could cite examples of people who intend to leave the province but cannot see themselves being able to afford decent accommodation. A person wants to get a good job in Vancouver and then pay a quarter of a million for a mediocre house, that is a problem and, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention that I really had to sort of laugh, I saw a program on the real estate boom and how inflation benefits certain sectors of the economy and it showed a real estate man in Toronto who was making a killing by selling homes and he was living in what I would regard as a rehabilitated dump, it was an old house in downtown Toronto and the fellow on the program asked him how much his house was worth. He said 600; 600 was what he said, which was \$600,000.00. You could buy that house in Winnipeg for \$30,000 to \$60,000 and then renovate it for say \$10,000 or \$20,000 more but it was laughable that that house was worth \$600,000.00. It wasn't a mansion; it was a dump that had been fixed up.

So I would like to ask the Minister for an opening comment; what his observation is in terms of the job market? If some 85 percent, if I recall our debate yesterday, was it 88 percent of community college graduates, according to the department's Annual Report were able to find employment within a year. That's the figure given on Page 40 and 88.5 percent were working in Manitoba. I ask the Minister what statistics he has in regard to university students as to what percentage of graduates are employed a year after graduation and what percentage are working in Manitoba?

I'll make one more comment. I went to the graduation of the home economics or human ecology students this year and there were so many references made, I mean here was a group of people graduating, predominantly women, but there were perhaps one or two men in the class, I don't know, and they were graduating and one would assume that all the speeches would be about here we go into the world and we are going to apply and we're going to build the economy and build the province and build the nation and fly around the earth in that space shuttle and all that sort of stuff. A note of optimism is what one would have expected. All that optimism or there are some short letters, two letters with periods that stand for it sometimes and that is normal, people going out into the world. But I must have heard 10 to 20 times that night from the head table, people saying, including the dean, that he knew that unemployment was a real possibility and he hoped that a year from now they weren't sitting on his doorstep trying to say to him, how come we took your course, now we graduated and we can't find jobs. You must have something to do with it because you encouraged us to take this course and now we are unemployed. There were repeated references, repeated references, to the difficulty of finding a job in Manitoba, and at one point I think the dean even said, "even in two years from now, don't camp on my doorstep". So it was a rather bleak picture, often said in jest but obviously on the minds of everyone, "Will we be able to find a job in the field of our chosen endeavor?"

So I ask the Minister for a comment and in particular I'd like to see him pull out from his

resources some figures to correlate to what figures he has produced for the community college graduates.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment on a number of things that the Member for Elmwood has mentioned. First of all I think it is only appropriate he has made some reference to Dr. Ralph Campbell, President of the University of Manitoba, and I think it's only appropriate at this time, Mr. Chairman, to mention that Dr. Campbell will be retiring from his position as president of the University of Manitoba and will be replaced by Dr. Naimark and I think it is only fitting and proper to acknowledge the tremendous contribution that Dr. Campbell has made to this province and to the university specifically while he has been here.

While I'm on that topic, Mr. Chairman, I think it's equally appropriate to acknowledge another university president, a gentleman who has served in that position for a considerable number of years, Dr. Harry Duckworth of the University of Winnipeg, who also will be retiring who will be replaced by Dr. Farquhar, from the Saskatchewan system, and certainly Dr. Harry Duckworth as being a very fine gentleman and a fine scholar in every sense of the word and his contribution to the University of Winnipeg and again to the Province of Manitoba, has been of great value and both men will certainly, I hope, enjoy a very fine retirement and knowing that Manitobans appreciate the contribution they have made.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood is a bit upset by what he would term, "the brain drain from Manitoba". I believe he exaggerates the situation to a considerable extent. I believe that it has historically been true that Manitobans have gone to other parts of Canada, in fact to other parts of the world upon graduation from our universities and that is still the case, that we do lose a number to other provinces and to other countries and it's probably in part, Mr. Chairman, a test to the fine quality of graduates that come out of our university system. Certainly the faculties of so many different disciplines in our university are well regarded around the world and their graduates are in demand, often over the graduates from a number of other universities in this country and in fact in North America and I think it again in part attests to the excellence of the work that is done, not only in teaching but also in research in our university system.

But getting down to specifics, Mr. Chairman, I would refer the Member for Elmwood to the job market reality for post-secondary graduate study that was completed by the Department of Statistics Canada, a survey of 1976 "College and University Graduates", and I believe that study would certainly be of interest to him and the information that it contains. I would caution that a newspaper article based on that particular study did distort the picture and did in fact produce some incorrect statements. The title of the article or the headline itself was misleading when it said, "university graduates quit province", which I suggest really wasn't supported in part by what was contained in the report and perhaps I could just refer to that briefly. It said Manitoba loses a greater percentage of its university graduates than any other province in English Canada

except Nova Scotia, and that is incorrect, Mr. Chairman, and let me refer the honourable members to the table showing the migration of the university graduates and this was as of 1978. It showed that in first rank was Ontario with 92.9 percent of their graduates who remained in the province of their graduation at the time of the survey and again I repeat that was in 1978. Newfoundland had 92.4, British Columbia with 91.5 was in third place, Alberta was in fourth place with 89.8 and in fifth place we find Manitoba with 84.1, and following Manitoba with higher percentage of their graduates moving out of the province we have Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. So the newspaper article in itself was misleading, Mr. Chairman, in the statement that we lost more than everyone else but Nova Scotia is not supported by the facts.

As far as the net loss of graduates, we lose some 8.6 percent, net loss, Mr. Chairman, and I was just roughly trying to compute what that would represent. In numbers of graduates we have something like 5,000 graduates a year in the province and if we're looking at 8.6 percent then we are looking at something in the neighborhood of 400 and some graduates net, who leave the province. Now I have not compared this on a yearly basis but out of 5,000, 400 leaving for any number of reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest is perhaps not reason for tremendous concern. We have a net loss in that regard, we have have a net gain of 6.3 percent in the area of the community college graduates; but perhaps more pertinent to the topic were some of the other statements in this survey of the 1976 graduates that was carried out in 1978 where they compared Manitoba university graduates to Canada as a whole and they made these observations, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of this comparison, that Manitoba graduates were doing as well in the labour force as graduates from other provinces in terms of participation rate and employment rate. They also found that Manitoba graduates were more likely to have jobs related to their field of study than graduates in other parts of Canada. They also found that Manitoba graduates were less likely to be underemployed. They found Manitoba graduates as satisfied with their jobs as any graduates in Canada. They found that they were earning salaries comparable to graduates in Canada as a whole. They found that they were less likely to regret their choice of field of study. They also found that they were more likely to be planning further post-secondary education in the next two years.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's a rather flattering comparison when we look at the picture across this country and find that our graduates on this survey conducted by Statistics Canada compared so favourably and in some cases in a superior position to graduates from other universities in this country. —(Interjection)— The survey, Mr. Chairman, was conducted in 1978 and has been released a number of months ago and has been, of course, available to honourable members. —(Interjection)— 1976 graduates, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the situation has not changed dramatically since that particular survey has been released.

So the brain drain, as the honourable member refers to it, has existed historically in this province,

will continue to exist and I would share his concern if in fact undue numbers of our graduates were leaving and going to other parts of the world. But we don't have a fence around this province and we never have had and I hope we never do have. But certainly because of the quality of our graduates, the quality of the teaching and research that's carried on at our universities, I repeat, they are in demand. We will always have that problem, if the honourable member sees it as a problem, of some of our graduates being snapped up by companies, by industry, by people in other parts of the world because of that recognition.

So, Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not share the gloom and doom picture of the Member for Elmwood in this regard at all.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we're talking here about a matter of degree and I know that it's going to be some time before we see a situation in Manitoba where there are no graduates leaving in the sense of, as a perfect balance between graduates leaving and people coming and jobs here and jobs out there. We're talking about a matter of degree. It's my impression that with the out-migration figures that have been witnessed in this province that there are a large number of skilled people leaving the province every year and among them are hundreds of students. The figures are certainly supportive of what I am saying.

So the Minister is saying there's an 8.6 percent loss. I would be curious as to how that compares over the last four years. The Minister was sort of talking about '78 or '76. I'm interested in '77, '78, '79 and '80. Perhaps he can give us some figures there.

The problem is this, Mr. Chairman, I think there was the old saying about all roads lead to Rome. But in the Lyon administration the saying is all roads lead from Manitoba. We have highways that are going east and west and north and south but the traffic tends to be out of the province — too much of an imbalance as compared to those who are coming here to find employment opportunities.

I want to ask the Minister about this point. My impression is that in certain faculties it is extremely difficult for students to find employment in Manitoba. I want to give the Minister three or four examples and perhaps he could come up with some figures. Architecture and Engineering — we have been hearing for the last number of years about the fact that practically none of the graduates from Architecture or from Engineering can find employment in this province. I certainly know that better than most people. The construction industry is down, it's sagging. Architectural firms have been closing, winding it up. Some keep going by opening offices somewhere else and commuting. I know people who do almost no business in Manitoba and they earn their bread and butter outside the province but they commute because they want to live here — that's doing it the hard way but I'm thankful that they are around. So when we hear figures like none of the graduates found jobs in Manitoba, or out of 30 or 40 graduates, two or three or four or five stayed and the rest went elsewhere, that certainly is discouraging and depressing news.

I mentioned to the Minister the Faculty of Human Ecology and there again I don't know what the figures are but it sure didn't sound very encouraging for students. I, like the Minister, was an Arts

graduate and there's always a problem with being an Arts graduate. I think it's, in my judgment, just about the best course you can take for grounding but you cannot then go out and say I'm a B.A., can I have a job. You then may have to take something else or do something else or take a training program because you are a generalist. I think that is the best thing to be in life, a generalist, because if there are flaws with being too broadminded, Mr. Chairman, there are problems with being too narrow a specialist and not being able to see beyond your own area of expertise.

So I say what about for Arts graduates and what about for graduates of Education, which the Minister and I and others in this House have served our time and worked in. I'm sure that if one looks at those particular figures that one cannot be optimistic about the job market.

Now maybe there are some faculties, maybe Commerce or maybe Business Administration has very high numbers of graduates being snapped up. I hope that is so. But I'm sure that councillors today in our high schools are often saying to people, look if you take a B.A. you're going to wind up being unemployed. Or if you want to be a . . . My friend from Fort Rouge agrees. If you want to take a degree in Education there's a big surplus of teachers so there's a problem there. I don't know what the solution is. I believe the solution is general in the sense of the economy must get fired up — that is in effect the solution.

According to Mike Doyle of the Free Press, he writes in his article and he's quoted by Dr. Campbell. He says the days of education for education's sake are over as far as students are concerned. He says education policymakers should orient programs more than ever to the job market.

Mr. Chairman, that's a 15-hour debate. I'm not sure exactly where I stand on that particular issue as to whether the university should be geared directly to the job market or more to the job market or should say forget the job market, we're here to develop generalists and educated people and civilized people and you'll have to worry about employment later on.

I'm simply saying to the Minister at this point and time, surely in Architecture and Engineering the future in Manitoba is bleak under his administration and under his record in office, namely his government's record. There has been little opportunity whatsoever in this province; in Human Ecology the same thing; in Arts, I'm sure the same thing. I know in Education that if one wants a job you have to normally go 400 or 500 miles north of Winnipeg to find employment. So could the Minister comment on those problem areas?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, certainly there has been no follow-up study to the Statistics Canada Survey on Job Opportunities for Graduates that was completed in 1978, but I'm informed that our University Grants Commission will be completing a follow-up study this year on graduates and I would have that information for him at that time when that is completed.

We have, as the member knows, completed a study on community college graduates more recently than the Statistics Canada survey and that also supports the Statistics Canada survey in fact, and shows that what was reported in the '78 survey certainly was applicable in '79. I suggest to the

honourable member there has been no dramatic change.

Now in the area of job opportunities as to faculty, I don't have that particular breakdown, Mr. Chairman, and I have to rely to a certain extent on rather subjective information as the honourable member has with his human ecology experience and I think that's always dangerous. But I find in talking to people in their final year of Engineering that they have received several job offers in most cases — that they're not experiencing a problem in that particular faculty at all in finding jobs. I haven't that type of information for Architecture so I can't give it to the honourable member nor does the University Grants Commission have that type of information.

In the Arts field of course, if the member is speaking of the Bachelor of Arts field, and I believe he was, and not in the Fine Arts where we have one of the finest schools in Canada, but in the Bachelor of Arts field the honourable knows, Mr. Chairman, that the Bachelor of Arts has never been intended as a one-way ticket to a job. I don't think anyone entering into the Arts program has ever believed that on completion there would be people knocking on their door prepared to employ them. It is certainly not an employment-oriented faculty. It is, as the honourable member has mentioned, an area where a student receives an excellent basis, an excellent grounding, to go on into other areas whether it be law, whether it be teaching —(Interjection)— Yes, they could even go into politics I suppose, and absolutely necessary in that regard. We certainly require lawyers, we require social workers, teachers and others that certainly benefit from that basic training or basic education that they received during their years in the Bachelor of Arts program.

So I cannot really give him any indication as to the employment picture there nor would he really expect it quite seriously. I think he'd be facetious if he says to me, Mr. Chairman, how are Arts graduates doing. They have never done very well as far as finding jobs, but they certainly do very well in that they consider their Arts training as the basis for carrying on in law, social work, teaching.

In the area of Education, Mr. Chairman, once again, we are not overly producing graduates in that field but we have a problem that is faced by several fields in the professions, and that is that in many cases graduates do not want to go beyond the Perimeter Highway, for any number of reasons. As a result we sometimes face that odd situation where we have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie report of committee, be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

Tuesday, 14 April, 1981

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I had an indication that there might be a disposition to call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition Whip was going to just take a moment to consult with one or two of his colleagues outside the House. If we could just wait a second until he returns.

Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that there is a disposition to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.