

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, September 9, 1969

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I had adjourned this for my leader, the Honourable First Minister. In his absence I would ask that this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to speak they may do so.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two comments on the proposed legislation which I hope are at least relatively pertinent. Like other members on this side of the Chamber, I am concerned with the elimination in the legislation of a section that appeared in the original Act drafted by the earlier administration and would like to register my strong appeal for reinstatement of the deleted section in the legislation in its final form. I realize that on one level I run the risk of perhaps being called to order by either yourself, Sir, or by the House Leader of the government, from the point of view of speaking with specific reference to sections of the legislation. However, there is a principle involved here, and I think other members of the House have been given some leeway in their consideration of this particular legislation.

I'm referring specifically to Section 18 (e) - subsection (e) of Section 18 which concerns itself with restriction on the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman himself, and, as I say, a number of members of the Chamber in speaking to this legislation have already assessed at some length the relative merits of the deletion of that particular section, and as a consequence I feel I'm within my rights, Sir, and certainly in order in addressing myself to that section too, at least in part of the remarks that I want to make because there is a principle involved. I think we've conceded that in earlier discussion of this legislation. There is of course no subsection (e) to Section 18 of the Bill that's before us, Bill 25. The only place where subsection (e) existed as far as this House is concerned was in Section 18 of the original bill which corresponds to the Section 18 of the new bill, Bill 25 in every other way, in every other capacity except for the omission or the deletion of that particular section.

That section, Sir, if I may just refresh the minds and memories of members of the Chamber, points out that nothing in the Act authorizes the Ombudsman to investigate any decision, recommendation, act or omission of any person acting as a solicitor or counsel for the Crown in relation to any action or proceedings to which the Crown is a party or in which the Crown has an interest or in relation to any claim against or by or on behalf of the Crown. In other words, the deleted section, when it was incorporated in the earlier proposed legislation and as it exists in legislation already in effect in Alberta and as some other members have pointed out in New Zealand and other parts of the world, was designed to make sure that the Crown's litigant enjoyed some protection in the statutes and that his decisions were not subject to the assessment and purview and dissection of an officer who perhaps, Sir, might have no legal training or qualifications whatever. There are countless hypothetical examples that could be cited. No doubt all members of the Chamber can conceive for themselves situations where in a solicitor for the Crown may have laid himself open to some illogical and irrational recourse by persons who feel that they have a grievance as a consequence of action taken by that representative of the Crown, and I don't think it's necessary to describe or conceive or construct any number of hypothetical examples which I'm sure come easily to mind.

My purpose in speaking to the legislation at this point is simply to re-emphasize what some of my colleagues have already suggested in the House and place myself on record as being fully in accord with the position taken by my colleagues which supports the measure that was incorporated in the earlier legislation and which by its existence guaranteed that the litigant for the Crown did enjoy protection under the statute and was not open to just any and every kind of recourse on the part of any person feeling himself aggrieved.

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews in speaking to the legislation earlier in the week suggested that the deletion of that particular section of the legislation was logical and reasonable on the grounds that if a counsel, as he put it, gave advice to the Crown which really hurt someone and if it was not an error in judgment but an act of malice or irresponsibility or anything relating to that, that this is the only case in which such counsel would come within the purview of the Ombudsman.

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . .

Well I challenge the logic of that argument, Mr. Speaker, on the grounds that one presumably would not be able to tell whether it was an error in judgment or an act of malice or irresponsibility or anything relating to that, to use the member's words, unless a complaint were lodged and an investigation were carried out. It seems to me patently impossible to assume on the surface in any situation where a solicitor for the Crown is involved in the capacity in which we are discussing, impossible to assume on the surface that an error in judgment or an act of malice or an act of irresponsibility has been involved. The only manner in which the question would ever come up would be that which would result from a complaint on the part of the party feeling himself aggrieved, and then an investigation would have to be carried out to determine whether it was an error in judgment or an act of malice or any one of these other omissions or oversights or errors, and by that time, even if it were merely an error in judgment and not an act of malice, the damage would already have been done as far as the credibility and as far as the professional integrity and statutory protection of the Ombudsman is concerned. And I submit that by definition the investigation prejudices, the investigation that would be necessary to arrive at this conclusion referred to in the honourable member's remarks, by that definition the Ombudsman is already prejudged in his professional capability and in his professional integrity.

I see this as a serious shortcoming and oversight in the legislation sufficient certainly to discourage many members of the legal profession from taking on assignments where they act as litigants for the Crown. And I beg your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and that of other members of the Chamber, but it seems to me as I think back on what I was saying that I used the term "ombudsman" rather than litigant for the Crown or Crown representative or Crown solicitor in the last point that I was trying to make. The position of the Crown solicitor would be prejudged, I suggest, and would be prejudged if this investigation were carried out.

So I suggest that that aspect of the legislation has a very unhealthy and discouraging element to it which would tend to I think arouse the suspicions, if not the outright cynicism of members of the legal profession who are concerning themselves with taking on specific assignments in which they function as official representatives of and litigants for the Crown in legal actions.

The other point to which members on both sides of the Chamber have addressed themselves with fundamental disagreement is that on the aspect of the legislation covered by the suggestion of my colleague the Member for River Heights, that the first two cases, or certainly among the first two cases to be handled by the Ombudsman should be those involving Damascus Steel and Family Friendly Farms.

Once again I refer to the position taken by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in his remarks yesterday in which he suggested that these are precisely the kind of difficulties and situations in which the Ombudsman should not be concerned because they are political. And if I may refer again to his remarks on the record in Hansard, he said, Sir, that "a basic requirement for the Ombudsman must be non-involvement in political controversies. If he were used to embarrass the government or the opposition it would drastically impair his credibility and his effectiveness."

Well, I think that in terms of the general abstract objectives of his thinking contained in those remarks I would have to agree, but I submit that where such cases as these involving Damascus Steel and Family Friendly Farms occur, Sir, that there is no danger of the credibility or the effectiveness of the Ombudsman being impaired. Quite the contrary, I suggest that his value and his credibility would be sharply underscored and emphasized and reinforced in just situations as these, because it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is precisely in those situations where someone perhaps has been the victim of a political development of some sort or a development in which there are political undertones and overtones and influences over which he has no control, it's precisely in those situations where the Ombudsman, I suggest, would have his most telling and his most compelling effect and benefit for the complainant.

In my limited acquaintanceship with the situation in the Province of Alberta, I think it's been demonstrated that a substantial percentage of the cases coming before him are cases in which people feel that they have a grievance arising out of a decision that although perhaps not overtly political in the sense that it was made or taken in a Legislative Chamber, is a situation that has come about as a consequence of the political life and political events in the community in which he lives, and it's precisely in these cases where there seems to be no ready recourse through the familiar legal procedures known to the average person, it is precisely in those

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.).... cases where the Ombudsman becomes a most effective public servant. So on that point, too, I challenge the position advanced by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews and subscribe to the suggestion made from this side of the House earlier, Sir, that such cases as these involving Damascus Steel and Family Friendly Farms really provide the kind of problem, the kind of difficulty and the kind of private crisis which calls out, cries out for the attention of an officer such as that envisioned in the office of Ombudsman.

There a number of other aspects to the legislation which I dare not examine on the floor at the moment, Mr. Speaker, because were I to do that, I would contravene the rules of debate at this stage because they do have specific reference to and specific reality only for individual sections of the legislation itself, and so I shall have to wait for a later stage to address myself. Some of them have already been mentioned by earlier speakers such as the -- one area in particular is the area of recompense, of compensation, financial remuneration, the importance of establishing that figure and answering that question to our satisfaction and the satisfaction of all sides of the House I think before any appointment takes place.

Another is the urgent importance I submit, Sir, of having consultation and agreement, or at least hoped for agreement among all sides of the House on the selection of the officer for the role of Ombudsman rather than just having the appointment announced as a *fait accompli*. Another is the section of the legislation having to do with the challenge that may be lodged against the Ombudsman and the numerical requirements in the House for removing him from office. These, however, I think can be, as I say, dealt with at a later stage in our study of the proposed legislation.

But I think the first two points, the urgent necessity for protecting the Crown's litigant through a section like old subsection (e) of Section 18 of the old Act, and the compelling necessity for all parties to appreciate really the rationale for the Ombudsman and the fact that it is very often going to be because of problems arising out of political conditions and situations that the office itself is necessary. These I submit, Sir, are cases that can and must be made in this Chamber at this stage in the legislation, and I commend to the government an urgent request to re-examine the legislation in both those areas and remedy what I see, Sir, as two serious oversights.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the motion stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan? (Agreed.)

The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on Bill No. 12 which is the Consumer Protection Act at this time. It is quite a lengthy bill and takes, in my opinion, a lot of time to do homework on it because it goes into so much detail, and if you really want to understand the full grasp of it you have to concentrate quite well, and therefore I want to thank honourable members for letting the matter stand before so that I would have a little more time to peruse the bill as such.

First of all, I feel that the bill puts the onus on the credit **grantor very strongly and** possibly too much. This has been my concern ever since we started on the whole matter of consumer protection. Probably we did not have sufficient consumer protection before, but I think now the pendulum is swinging the other way and we might just be going overboard a bit in providing too much protection and that as a result costs of credit will be going up because of the protection that we are building around the consumer. The credit grantor will have to take these things into consideration and as a result the costs of credit are bound to rise because the cost of this protection will have to be taken into account, and as we know, this is always passed on back to the consumer and in the final end he has to pay for it regardless of how we put it.

Before I make my other remarks, I would have a question of the Honourable Minister, even if he would interrupt me in my speech tonight, on the interpretation of money lender. It says: "Money lender means a person who carries on the business of money lending or advertises himself or holds himself out in any way as carrying on that business but does not include a registered pawnbroker as such." Am I to understand that we are strictly dealing with persons and not with corporations of any type under this bill? -- (Interjection) -- It doesn't refer to any other Act under that section and the definition, because if it includes corporations or other financial organizations - and I assume now it does from what the Minister says - then there are various matters that crop up that I feel we will have to take a very close look at, and probably some of the financial organizations will appear before Law Amendments to state their case and

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . that we can have a discussion on some of the matters.

For instance the matter of insurance charges, we find that in the case of credit unions that they have a blanket policy with insurance companies whereby all loans are covered, and in those terms the cost of that coverage is borne by the organization and is not charged directly to the borrower. And in this case, just what is the interpretation of the Act? Will there have to be anything shown for insurance on the bill? Because it would then mean that we would have to have a breakdown on each of the loans that are outstanding and it would require quite a bit of work in figuring out these amounts. I certainly would like to hear from the Minister on the interpretation of that particular section. It also involves the people who are disabled, because under the present way the insurance is carried on all people are covered, but we find later on when it comes to collections, those that are disabled and do not qualify, they certainly are not insured, and at the time of giving the loan we would not be able to ascertain whether that person was disabled or not and whether this charge should be made against him or not. So there are grey areas here which certainly need some clarification.

I think the same holds true for registration fees. These are also borne by the corporations and are not charged back individually to the borrower. Would this be a requirement under this Act as it now reads? We know that property mortgages are not included under the Act so this would primarily concern chattel mortgages, and here again we have in our movement what is called a chattel lien non-filing insurance whereby chattel mortgages are not registered, and in this way there is no fee from the Land Titles Office but rather a fee from the insurance company with which this type of insurance is being carried on. While there is a set rate per instrument that is being charged, I think it also has a varied scale, that after a certain number the costs go down and therefore it is not a straight charge. So that there are these various matters that I feel will have to be looked at as far as the mechanics are concerned.

Then there's another thing. The Minister is probably aware that today certain financial organizations are writing paper at a higher rate of interest than what they actually charge. The reason for doing so is that, especially under the Credit Unions Act, you can only increase interest rates on any new paper that is written, on any new notes that are being made. If you increase interest rates it does not apply on existing loans and therefore certain credit unions have made it a practice now to write the paper at a higher rate and then forgive interest charges later on. In this way they will gradually build up to where the bulk, other loans outstanding. If they increase the interest rate it would then apply to a major portion of their loans outstanding. And just how would you work out this matter of interest that is being forgiven in the calculations?

I'm also interested in the sections dealing with acceleration of payments. Under certain portions of the Act this is not being permitted, yet under other sections where you're dealing with default, once a loan comes in to default this is being allowed. I think probably some of these questions can be answered when we deal with it in Committee of the Whole if these things are not being brought forward in Law Amendments.

I'm also interested to see the matter of advertising come into play and also the prepayment of loans in that there is a maximum charge that can be levied in the amount of \$10.00 in cases where you have a prepayment that is being made. I am wondering whether this is sufficient with some of the larger loans if they've only run for a very short period of time. Perhaps in some cases it would be quite all right, and while a maximum has been set for the Act under which it applies, I think it's something like 7,500 if I'm correct - well from 50 to 75 hundred. So no doubt we will be hearing from some of the financial organizations on this matter - at least I think so.

The matter of discharges comes into play in that those people requesting discharges can have them, but it's rather confusing in that section because the last part of that particular section puts a question mark behind it. Apparently if you hand back the papers that would suffice as a discharge. But I always feel that if you have chattel mortgages made that these should go through the proper channels of having a discharge so that it's cleared up.

Another matter is the matter of seizure of goods, and here again we know that before you make a seizure things have really come to a bad point in most cases I would say. But on seizures made, the time period given for the person to redeem his chattels is 20 days, and I'm just wondering whether we are not cutting it just a little short with 20 days. Perhaps the period should be extended a little longer. This too I might propose an amendment on my own if necessary at committee stage. I certainly would like to hear from others on it though before

(MR. FROESE cont'd) taking that particular action.

Some of the other matters have already been referred to by other members of this House, especially the 25 percent owing on a certain chattel or goods. The lender then has to have leave of the court in order to take possession and I'm not so sure whether this is the best thing in all cases; how the courts would react. There are certain qualifications listed together with it in the Act, but the practical end of it I'm not so sure whether this will work out too well, Especially if you have people who are out to be obnoxious, some of the lenders might have a hard time collecting under this section if they're not bound to have their goods repossessed if there's only a small portion owing.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are a good number of other points that I could raise. Having gone through most parts of the bill, I do want to take time and look into a few others more thoroughly before we deal with the bill in committee. But on the whole I think the bill is not too bad. I think it's probably good legislation, but my greatest concern is just the onus that we're placing on the credit grantor, and my concern is that we're probably going a little too far and going overboard, and this might harm certain people rather than benefit them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I will be closing debate on this bill if there's nobody else who wishes to speak. Before making a few comments of my own and trying to answer a few of the questions asked by the honourable members of this House, may I first of all thank the Premier of Manitoba for appointing me Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I will do everything in my power to acquire all the knowledge needed of me to honour this challenge. I would equally like to extend hearty thanks to all of my constituents in Springfield. Because of the electors of Springfield I am today able to look forward actively to the enactment of Bill 12, the Consumer Protection Act, which will consolidate the provisions of the Time Sales Agreement of Manitoba enacted in 1962 and amended in 1963 . . .

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Is the Minister asking a question or is he making a statement of policy?

MR. TOUPIN: I'm closing debate, Mr. Speaker. . . enacted in 1962 and amended in 1963, and the Consumer Credit Act of Manitoba enacted in 1965 and again amended in 1966, and this was to regulate disclosures of borrowing of costs; prepayment privileges; forfeitures; assignment of credit sales contracts; door-to-door sales and relative matters of direct concern to the consumer. The proposed legislation will provide for the establishment of a consumer bureau as an agency of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to investigate complaints of breach of consumer legislation and to provide information and related educational assistance and services to consumers.

I also wish, Mr. Speaker, to thank all past ministers of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who have worked at the different drafts intended for Bill 12, and equally all of the other members of this House who have given a lot of their time to ensure that the contents of this bill will not only protect consumers but equally the businesses. I for one believe that my colleague Saul Cherniack, the Minister of Finance, has done much to see this bill go through with second reading. I was especially happy to hear my colleague the Minister of Finance give a brief history of Bill 12 dating from 1962.

And equally hearty thanks to all civil servants - we mustn't forget the civil servants who laboured this proposed legislation.

I wish to thank all members who have spoken on this bill and I will now try to answer or to comment at least on a few of the questions, knowing that not all questions will be answered today; this will be done more effectively by experts in the committee stage.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia made a comment that I appreciated. He mentioned that the bill is timely and long overdue and that businesses will gain from this type of bill.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital asked the question whether any changes had been made by this administration concerning Bill 12. The only one that was made during this administration was Section (4), Subsection (2)(m). 1. The requirement to disclose the rate of interest charged on default payments has been changed. 2. Disclosure of the total additional charges excluding court costs. This is adopted from the Alberta Credit and Loan Agreement Act.

The Honourable Member from Fort Garry mentioned that this bill was a critical and

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) crucial piece of legislation and that there has been at least 15 hearings with the past administration. He equally made mention of his disfavour of the bill and that the good sound businessmen had nothing to fear from this legislation, and that the bill, that is Bill 12, was long overdue. I appreciate his comments with regard to say, more dialogue and closer examination in Law Amendments. We should do everything to help the buyer beware and equally have the seller take care.

The question of costs of administration of this legislation will depend on the investigation that will have to be done by the Consumer Bureau. This equally was a question from the Honourable Member of Fort Garry. We do not intend on having more personnel than needed and I fully agree that not all the troubles of the consumer will be over by the enactment of this bill. We must begin and follow through with good, sound information to the public and equally introduce **preventative** measures. This is very important.

Another question posed was, who is going to be on the Bureau. We intend as a start to have a director, an assistant director, and at least one or possibly two investigators, plus a clerical staff. We do have an amount of approximately \$32,000 in the estimates for 1969-'70 for provision of a staff for the Consumer Bureau.

One member of this House mentioned that the four days cooling off period was a very progressive move. I fully agree. The Honourable Member from Ste. Rose mentioned the section dealing with direct sellers and that some are doing improper things and do need control. He indicates doubt on the section that mentions 75 percent payments and the need for a court order for the balance of the 25 percent due. He suggested a remittance of merchandise for the balance due. This will surely be dealt with in committee. But may I make a statement on this at this time. This section is called Section 49 (1) which provides that where a balance owing on time sales agreement is less than 25 percent of the cash price the seller may not repossess a property without leave of the court. There is also a similar provision under Section 57 (1) in relation to the chattel mortgages. The reason underlying this provision is that generally speaking where the buyer has regularly and faithfully paid 75 percent of the price it may well be that he is not a deliberate defaulter but has experienced some financial difficulty which caused the default. In such circumstances, it might well be unreasonable to expect the purchaser to obtain a lawyer with the cost involved and in any event would probably have no legally acceptable answers for his default.

Under the proposed provision where the total balance has been reduced to 25 percent, the seller would obtain leave of the court to repossess normally on notice to the defaulting purchaser and the court would decide after hearing all the circumstances, and say on a fair basis, the matter of the right of repossession under the circumstances. And equally we mention here that no repossession after two-thirds paid except by leave of a judge. Where, for example, a buyer under a contract has paid two-thirds or more of the purchase price of the goods as fixed by the contract, any provision in the contract or in any security agreement thereto under which a seller may retake possession or resell the goods upon default in payment by the buyer, is not enforceable except by leave of a judge of a county court or a district court, and the power of the judge would be upon an application for leave under Subsection (1), the judge may in his discretion grant or refuse leave or grant leave upon such terms and conditions as he deems advisable.

On his final remarks, that is again on the remarks of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, was that this bill deserves approval of the House, and all I have to say to this is "Hear, hear".

The Honourable Member from Rhineland made quite a few interesting comments, posed some questions that I will not try to answer this evening, that will definitely be dealt with in committee; and he's mentioned one himself that he'll probably bring an amendment to. He closed off by saying that the bill was not too bad, maybe even good legislation. I wish to thank you for your attention.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Before we move to committee, I wish to correct an error which was committed in dealing with the previous bill. The previous bill can no longer remain in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan because his comments are tantamount to his speech and it's recorded as such in the Votes and Proceedings.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe you're correct, Mr. Speaker, so I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs that the debate be adjourned. That would be proper.

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

MR. SPEAKER: That takes care of that. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103, 1(a). The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I spoke last night on some section of the Minister's portfolio. Tonight I would like to confine myself to the educational aspect of this most important of all departments in our provincial government. As we know, many of us have received the preliminary report of the Boundaries Commission. It affects each and every one of us to various degrees in their own particular constituencies, and tonight at this present time the Pelly Trail School Division which comprises roughly one-half of my constituency is meeting and they are presently discussing some of the implications that are arising from this report. In contact with the members of that board just a few minutes ago, they are not prepared at this stage to voice an opinion other than to express concern regarding the implication inherent in the proposals of the Boundaries Commission.

Probably in my constituency the changes that are proposed by the Boundaries Commission are more extensive than they are in any other single constituency in this province. In effect what the Boundaries Commission is saying is that the Pelly Trail School Division and the Bird-tail River School Division which had a common east-west boundary before should now be amalgamated and a new boundary drawn on a north-south line. I am not prepared nor have I had sufficient time to study in any length the implications but I am sure that the implications will be such as to concern many people in my constituency. Not only does it affect the trading areas, the normal routes and affiliations and disaffiliations between villages and towns, but the building programs that have been in effect and are proposed for these divisions no doubt will have considerable changes as a result of these proposals. Mind you, we realize that these are only proposals, it's going to take some time, maybe more time than what we would care to presume at this particular moment, to resolve these difficulties; nor do I think that these difficulties can be resolved entirely to the satisfaction of everyone, but we have to take into consideration the majority and also very much so at this particular time, we have to consider dollars and cents. Everyone I think is a little reluctant to discuss education in other than academic terms, but it has to be discussed, not only in academic terms but also in dollars and cents.

But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, the division posed a question to me, and they asked me if I could convey to the Minister one of the serious problems that faces them. And it's a problem that we as human beings have created. In an effort to better one segment of our society we have created a barrier to another segment. And here I'm talking about the Shellmouth Dam. In creating a lake roughly 40 to 50 miles long by the Shellmouth Dam there's a very narrow stretch of land in the Province of Manitoba anywhere from two miles wide or a mile wide down to five or six or eight miles wide which is theoretically in the Province of Manitoba, and because of the geographical boundary that we have now built up by the Shellmouth Dam, it has a natural barrier towards trade; but not only trade, but also towards the educational program of the Province of Manitoba.

The Pelly Trail School Division would humbly ask the Minister if it is possible to work out a reciprocal trade or a reciprocal educational agreement with the Province of Saskatchewan whereby these students, or those students that wish to, could receive their education in the Province of Saskatchewan at the expense of the Province of Manitoba. We're not too sure, they aren't too sure of what type of negotiation would have to be carried out, but they feel that the discussions should be carried out between government and not between divisions. So, Mr. Minister, I humbly request that you consider this problem that faces the Pelly Trail School Division.

There was great concern last winter and a rush program was instituted by the Department of Transportation to build a road to service this area. The road has been pretty well built. Last winter they had considerable problem on it and I believe flagmen had to be on the job 24

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . hours a day on a particular segment of that road because they had engineering difficulties there; they felt it was unsafe to allow vehicles to cross that particular segment. And in light of this concern, while I realize that that particular area is not within my constituency, it does concern the Pelly Trail School Division and as most of the Pelly Trail School Division is within my constituency, I raise this at this time for the consideration of the Minister.

I could go on to some length on the curriculum, Mr. Chairman, but there is another field which does concern me, and some of that concern was expressed by the Minister of Transportation the other day when he was dealing with a clearing program for the Indians on the Lynn Lake road. Now we have our native people and we have our Metis in this province and I am quite concerned about some of the educational programs for this forgotten segment of our society. Now it's not just enough to have a regular classroom program because many of these people, while they are underprivileged, the constant harassment of our daily life has demoralized the people and there appears to be not only a lack of living conditions which are conducive to a good study atmosphere, but there seems to be a lack of concern on the part of the parents on how their children react to the educational program. It's very difficult for a child of 8, 9 or 10 to carry on the school program that we have today with the homework that's inherent if they don't get the co-operation of the parents. In my particular area we have tried various programs to induce parent co-operation. We have invited the parents to parent-teacher meetings; we have even gone out and provided transportation and asked them if they would come, offering them free transportation to meetings to meet their teachers; and unfortunately I cannot say that such a program has been a total success.

So I'm concerned about the educational program that we have today and the benefits that this segment of our society derives from such a program. There are many possible solutions. Whether an adult educational program for the parents could be made to work, whether the results would show in the studies of the children I'm not too sure, but I would like to see the Department of Education move forward in this field because we have many children of Metis descent whom I feel are not deriving the full benefit of the educational opportunities that are facing them today. And if they're not deriving the full benefits then this in turn means that we are not deriving a maximum return for the dollars that we invest, and on that basis I feel that we should express concern and do everything that we as individuals, as legislators, as groups, can possibly do to make sure that maximum benefit is derived from our educational program.

With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will let someone else carry on.

. . . . continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103, 1 (a)-- The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): First of all I would like to congratulate the Minister on his appointment. I'm very pleased to see an individual with municipal experience realizing some of the impact that the cost of education, or the investment of education bears at the local level of government.

But also I am in general agreement with the comments of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose, and I suggest that I support his views, not because he's a resident of St. Vital but because I believe there is merit in his suggestion that the cost of secondary education at the university level has to some degree set up an export of brains from the Province of Manitoba to other areas of Canada and to the U.S. south of the border. Now I'm sure that we cannot enter into any reciprocal arrangement with the United States, but because of the fact that brains or brain power, technical knowledge is beneficial to Canada as a whole, I am in complete agreement with the honourable member when he suggests that additional monies should be forthcoming from the federal treasury insofar as the university education is concerned.

The Honourable Minister, it has been brought to his attention the six proposals of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees has been brought forward. I'd be extremely interested in hearing the views of the Minister inasmuch as this group represents what I feel to be the real grass roots in the field of education. They are elected; they are responsible to the local people.

Now the academics of education itself, many very valid comments have been made from this side of the House and from the government side, and inasmuch as these comments have been made I'm sure that the Minister will take these into consideration and under advisement.

I'd like to deal very briefly with the financial aspect of education as it affects local levels of government. Now the Minister is I'm sure aware that insofar as the Foundation Program is concerned it covers the capital costs of construction, the maintenance of buildings and teachers grants - teachers grants up to a point. Now may I cite that the grant structure as it is at the moment with respect to teachers' salaries, in the lower levels of salary to some degree is quite adequate, but as the qualifications of teachers themselves increase, in the case where a teacher probably is being paid a salary of \$9,700 per annum, only about 75 percent of this cost is borne by the foundation levy, the Foundation Grant.

Now I'd like to cite as an example some of the specific effects in certain areas. Now I suggest this because the Minister of Social Services and Welfare on the announcement with respect to the medicare costs has indicated that these are going to be reduced. But there is one other aspect of taxation that does affect property owners. It affects property owners who are in the position, not by their own choice, of being on fixed incomes or low incomes, and I am suggesting to the Minister that in many many cases it is a tremendous hardship. This ogre of the cost of education, or investment as the case may be, is presenting a real problem at this level, and I'm sure the Minister is aware of this. In specifics, I cite as an example 1969 based on 70 percent Foundation Grant where the general levy is in this particular case \$643,000, or a decrease from the previous year of \$90,000.00. But the crux of the matter, the crux of the problem is that in the special levy this increase has gone from \$845,000 to \$1.1 million, an increase of \$300,000, or a net increase of \$200,000.00, and in relationship or in terms of mill rates it represents about 60 percent. I would suggest at least the minimum of 60 percent of the total mill rate, certainly in the metropolitan area. The decrease in this particular case for the general levy is 2.5, but an increase in the special of 5 mills.

There is one other item that I sincerely hope and respectfully request that the Minister give serious consideration to as it applies to teacher grants. It's my understanding that the pupil-teacher ratio varies, depending on the level of study, anywhere from 28 to 1 to 21 to 1. Now here again 30 teachers, which represents about 10 percent of the total number of teachers, are not covered by this grant, are not covered by this grant at all, and as such represents a direct cost or tax to the local property owner of in excess of \$200,000.00. Now the special levy as stated of 1.1 million, of this, in excess of 80 percent is directly attributable to teachers salaries.

Now one other point that has been brought to the attention of this Assembly, I believe by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, has to do with the budgets of local levels of government. Now it was suggested by the Minister - and I appreciate his remarks because I'm sure he's very conversant with the problem as it exists in certain areas - but I believe

(MR. HARDY cont'd.) the suggested reply was to the effect that other areas of local levels, whether it be fire, police or public works, local councils are in much the same position. With this I agree; they are; but they are controllable to a much greater degree by the councils themselves than are the cost of school boards. And here again may I point out to the Minister that in many many cases the numbers involved represent perhaps one-third or less in comparison with the numbers of teachers on staff. I don't necessarily agree that this is not a good thing, I think it is, it's essential as a matter of fact in order that local levels of government are in a position to bring down their budgets.

Now the effect of this on local levels, even with an increase in the Foundation Grant - which has been suggested by resolution of this House that they be increased up to the point where perhaps they would represent 100 percent and this is fine - but I think the projected figures over the next two or three years would indicate that this increase is only going to keep pace with the projected increased costs. And my point in suggesting this is that in order that education becomes realistic to the local level of government that certain controls have to be established, and I am suggesting, respectfully suggesting, Sir, that you give very serious consideration to the establishment of certain controls inasmuch as they do represent proposals made by MAST and also some of the comments that were contained in the White Paper as presented by the former Minister of Education.

I think my main point in making these comments is to draw to the attention of the Minister the impact that the cost of education has on the local level of government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's really much I can say that I haven't said yesterday. The Member for Birtle-Russell posed the problem of the Pelly Trail School Division, and I can tell him that I will look into it, and if he can see me outside the Chamber we can discuss it so I can get more information from him, and if there's any way that the department can assist in helping these people resolve the problem, I can assure him we'll do what we can.

With regard to the remarks by the Member for St. Vital, I can well appreciate his comments, having sat on this side and having said the same things in the past. We're on the same wave length. I'm aware that something should be done and hopefully I can perhaps come up with a partial solution in the months ahead. I can only assure him that we can't just let the matter stand as is and there's no intention on my part to ignore the matter. Beyond that, at this stage naturally I can't make any comments at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, during the course of our discussions here we haven't had any questions or discussion or indication from the government regarding any wide-ranging policy or changes in policy they may have with respect to education, and one of the areas in particular that has been up for discussion in Canada and in Manitoba as well has been the area of encouraging bilingualism in accordance with the aims and objectives and desires of the Federal Government. I know that the First Minister, who's not in the Chamber at the moment, but at earlier occasions has stated his support of the Bill C-120 federal bill, which is a little more commonly known as the Languages Bill, and its various ramifications as it affects the provinces and as it affects the federal service and so on. I think it would have been of value, and perhaps the Minister can elaborate on this and reflect some of his thinking or whether or not the government has adopted any specific policies along these lines. The Minister may or may not have had a chance to examine the proposals made by the Secretary of State Mr. Pelletier, I think in about June of this year, when he made proposals that the Federal Government was going to support financially the encouragement of teaching in the French language in the provincial school systems.

I should indicate that I think about November of 1968 last year that we had written to the Minister or the Secretary of State at that time making a proposal to him and asking him if they would give consideration to financial support to the schools which would operate in the French milieu, that is for complete teaching in the French language in the various areas, with the prime objective being that these schools would be available in at least the larger school divisions so that people of non-French, people other than the French language ability themselves could avail themselves of it, particularly at the lower grades, and we could get a firmer footing on the way towards encouraging the French language.

Now I think this is one of the first times I've seen the Member for St. Boniface make

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) himself almost completely absent during the discussion of the education estimates. At any time I sat on the opposite side of the House he was very attentive all through education estimates debate and as a matter of fact took a very vigorous part, particularly as it pertained to language instruction and aid to parochial schools or to separate schools. I was hoping that between the Minister of Education, the First Minister who has had considerable dealing with this at the federal level, has stated it as a provincial policy, and the Member for St. Boniface who has always had a consuming and outspoken interest in this topic, that the government, between these three people, particularly the Minister of Education, might indicate whether they are going to embark on a program which tends to support the federal position on propagation of a bilingual country, avail themselves of the federal money which is purported to be available in furthering education in the French language in Manitoba and if in fact they are contemplating any legislation which would change the 50 percent content rule that the provincial government now has. So if the Minister could cast any light on this I'm sure it would be of considerable interest to all of those in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in this regard I want to say to the Member for Riel that if he wrote or he contacted the Federal Government last June there has been no answer, because as far as I know there's been no word from the Federal Government on what they propose to do. We have not heard from them regarding any details. If there's federal money available I haven't heard of it and I suspect that no clear-cut policy has come forth from Ottawa at all. When they do of course we'll look into the matter. I can assure the honourable member that members on this side of the House are interested in seeing to it that the spirit of Bill C-120 is adhered to and is lived in Manitoba and we will do whatever we can in that direction. We are of course waiting for the Federal Government to announce its policies and its programs in somewhat more concrete form than they have announced to date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution . . .

MR. CRAIK: I would point out to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, that there was never an answer received that I can recall of either, but the policy that was brought out, the public policy that was stated by the Secretary of State in June of '69 was essentially pretty well the same as the suggestion that had been made to them in late 1968 by the Minister of Education office. But what I would think is of more interest, and I would prevail upon the First Minister to I think elaborate - you on his behalf or he if he can during these estimates - elaborate on his thoughts in respect to bilingual teaching or teaching of the French language, as it is really an aspect which is more important, I think, in practical fact than all the other contents of Bill C-120, and certainly has greater long term implication. I am sure that he must have had this in mind when he stated the policy, his policy, in June of this year with his support of Bill C-120, and I think that he must surely have this in mind and it would be appreciated on this side of the House at least if he could elaborate some on it.

MR. MILLER: Well, the Honourable Member from Riel must realize that what one has in mind is something one keeps in his mind until one is prepared to bring in policies and programs; so long as we don't know what the Federal Government's proposals are in a concrete way, they're simply just ideas that we have which we can't translate into programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'd like to ask the Minister if there are any changes contemplated in the present shared services plan with respect to parochial and private schools. There has been some talk in the province that there may be a change, so could the Minister tell us?

MR. MILLER: There is no change contemplated at the present time. That matter hasn't even been discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103 --

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, just briefly, I would like to ask the Minister to tell us where he stands with respect to the school trustees' request for changes. I believe there were about five points. One was the time limit on a negotiation with teachers, the other one was to establish larger regional bargaining units, and the fact that principals should be recognized as part of the administration and not included as on the side of the teachers when it comes to bargaining. -- (Interjection) -- Is this speaker on? And then there was recommendation by the trustees that calls for the prohibition of black listing and lockouts during salary negotiations. Did the Minister hear my first three.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Perhaps we could have an answer on what his thinking is with respect to these requests by the school trustees.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did answer that yesterday, but for the benefit of the honourable member who may have not been in the House, I'll repeat what I said yesterday. I'm aware of the mass proposals, they've been kicking around I think since August 1968. As the Member for Ste. Rose pointed out yesterday, they're not new. I hope to meet with trustees and teachers and superintendents and parents, etcetera throughout Manitoba when I get out of this session, and I hope we can resolve the problems which the trustees pose and the teachers pose in a manner which is agreeable to all parties concerned.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Minister's salary . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: . . . he just indicated that they had nothing in store for us in connection with the shared services program. I would appeal to the Minister that they do give consideration to this matter of extending the services under that program. Unless we get aid to private

MR. MILLER: May I interrupt for a moment? Mr. Chairman, are we still on the salary or have we gone beyond that?

MR. FROESE: Sure we are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . to point (c) of . . .

MR. MILLER: To point (c). Well, I wonder whether the Member for Rhineland is speaking on point (c) or he's speaking on another item. -- (Interjection) --

MR. FROESE: . . . because I had more than one item that I was going to dwell on. First of all on the shared services program I think we should extend the program. We know of the difficulty that the private schools have today and that they are deserving of financial support and they're not getting it. If they capitulate, and we have examples of this, what happens? If they can no longer afford to stay in business, then the whole cost has to be borne by the government, and sure enough, we're better off to provide them with some support so that they can remain in business. And secondly too, I think they're performing a very valuable service to the children that they educate and we should see to it that proper support is given to them. We have a number of these schools in the city. We have some in rural Manitoba and the results of the grades show that these schools are not lagging behind; in fact I think they're grading as well as any other of our public schools and some of the teachers teaching in these schools are excellent teachers and certainly they should not be treated as second-class in this province. If the government is not prepared to proceed with any additional help at this time I do hope that these matters are taken into consideration when we meet at the next session.

I note from the government Boundaries Commission report that has been sent out, apparently the government is not prepared to discuss it in detail. By the next session this report will be several months old and probably some decisions will have been made by the government in connection with policy on it by the next session. -- (Interjection) -- I certainly would like to review some of the matters that are stated in the report, but if the Minister says that it will still be open at that time for consideration by the members of this House and that policy will not have been formed on the report by that time by the government, then we will have time. However, I notice from the report that the composite high schools are just placed in the larger centres, except along the northern edge we find that Swan River and Dauphin, Portage, then there's one slated for the Fort Labosse area, but the whole of southern Manitoba is left out. I'm not sure whether this is quite fair. By the time that we meet next I will certainly have some remarks to make on this matter, that's for sure.

I find that the divisions of Hanover and Morris, they are in the category where they're supposed to, or at least will be entitled to one, and I don't know for what reason why they should be privileged compared to some of the other southern divisions as they're outlined under the report; because the people in southern Manitoba have been making a request of the government repeatedly for both technical-vocational and composite schools in their area. I do hope that when these divisions will be making representation that policy will not have been finalized to the point that it will be useless of them to come forward; that with the assurance of the Minister now that that will not be the case I certainly will tell our people back home so and that they will hear from us in the not too distant future on this matter.

These were two of the matters. I had one other one and I will deal with that one a little later on in the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103 (1)(c) -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Minister's salary, I would like to ask some questions. -- (Interjections) -- Oh no, no, no, we're still on the Minister's salary. He would like to be off the salary; but we're still on it, Mr. Chairman.

I have some questions to ask the Minister regarding the new plan which we just received yesterday. I recognize that he has not had time to go into all matters, but there are some particular points that are of concern to me on which I know questions will be asked. I would hope that the Minister will soon be in a position to answer these questions of people in the province. I'm referring particularly to the area in which I am concerned and that is the two proposed divisions of Dauphin-Ochre and Minnedosa-Neepawa. In the case of Dauphin-Ochre the recommendations of the commission involves some substantial increases in size of the areas, as do in most. But there is one particular point, Mr. Chairman, which will concern some people in this division - that apparently a decision has already been made by the government - admittedly not this government but by the previous government - regarding the type of school which will be established there even before the report of the commission was committed. Because if you go to Page 12 of this report you will see that insofar as the Dauphin-Ochre School Division after listing there what the population is and what can be accomplished, goes on to say, "a composite high school to be built within the division has already been approved".

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is putting the people in this school division in an unfair position. The report had not been produced and yet a decision has been made on what type of a school is going to be established. Now it doesn't seem to me that this is a proper course of action. Now we have questioned many times in previous sessions exactly what was the situation insofar as decisions as to the type of schools. You will recall I am sure, Mr. Chairman, the very interesting debates we had with the then Member for Dauphin constituency as to exactly who was going to make decisions as to what schools would be built and where they were going to be built; and my colleague the Member for Gladstone constituency had voluminous notes and clippings in his files regarding this subject. Well, we now find that a decision has been made - a composite school to be built within the division has already been approved. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether in fact this is going to be the position of this government, and whether the people who now find themselves added to the Dauphin-Ochre School Division are faced with this decision by government before a report had been prepared.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I'm curious as to what is going to be the provision for people within the so-called Special School Divisions. I find that insofar as the sections on the map listed as Special School Divisions, in what we might call north-central Manitoba, three-quarters, a little more in fact, of the whole area of the so-called Special School Division comes within my constituency and quite obviously the question that I will be confronted with by these people is exactly what are the provisions proposed for special school divisions. Are there to be schools locally; are the students to be transported elsewhere; are there to be residential schools in other parts of the province or what provision is to be made? A very large area is included here; includes almost all of the Local Government District of Alonsa and a good portion of the Rural Municipality of Lawrence. There will obviously be some concerned people here, wanting to know what is to happen to their children. I'd like if the Minister can give us an answer now to what the proposals are, or if not to ensure that clarification will come soon so that these people will not be left in doubt.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, a number of members kept referring to the Boundary Commission provisional report. I would simply say to them it is a provisional report; it wasn't tabled by me, it was required that the Boundary Commission after it came to this point in its studies would issue this report. It's being made available I'm told throughout Manitoba to schools trustees, municipal councils and other interested parties. The next step is not action by this government, but rather a series of meetings which have to be held throughout the province at which all these questions can be asked of the Boundary Commission. These will be public meetings I gather, announced well in advance so that the people involved and the MLAs if they happen to be around can certainly be present, and I think should be present. Insofar as action on this particular report, there can be no action until a final report with final recommendations come to the government; and no final recommendations will be made by the Boundary Commission until such time as the public has had an opportunity to study these recommendations, and has had an opportunity to be heard at public meetings throughout the province.

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

I would like to say this to the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. He asked a question about composite schools, and I can tell him that approval has been already granted. They're on their way as far as I know. The school at Selkirk; the school on the east side of the river in Metropolitan Winnipeg and a school at Dauphin - those are three fait accompli, as far as I'm concerned, schools. A school I believe has been approved, I'm told in Swan River "in principle." I don't know what in principle really means, I'm not sure how far it's gone, but that in principle has been approved. In the metro west area there's been approval in principle, and an Order-in-Council had already gone through by the time I got into the picture. So that is the report on the composite schools as I know them at the present time.

To come back to the report, with regard to any of the recommendations in the provisional drafts, I haven't frankly gone through them because they're provisional, and since I know I don't have to deal with them at this session or in the immediate future, I'm simply waiting, as the other members will have to wait, until we learn more of the reaction from people in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . oh, I'm sorry. Has the honourable member

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, following on this particular point. The Minister says decision has been made on a number. Well in reading through this I find that the only school division which there is a statement by the commission that a decision had been made, is the Dauphin-Ochre. And the problem, Mr. Chairman, is that according to the recommendation and the map, the Dauphin-Ochre School Division is to have one composite high school. Nothing is included there for any academic high schools; nothing included for any vocational high schools - simply one composite high school, presumably to be located in Dauphin. Are we then faced, are the people in this school division - and there are large additions here from other parts who were previously in other school divisions - are they then faced with an accomplished fact that before the report - even a provisional report of the Boundaries Commission was produced, before this provisional report was in the hands of members of this House in the hands of the government, before any decision could be made as to the size and the composition of that school division, that the final decision had been made on the establishment of one school, and one school only in that division?

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat what I've said. The school for Dauphin had been approved. The other question - there was a school in metro east but of course that isn't covered at all in there. As you notice on the cover it's all the rest of Manitoba, not including Metropolitan Winnipeg, so perhaps that's why it's not mentioned there.

I can't really reply to his question with any degree of knowledge except to report what I have been told - that the location of the school at Dauphin, or the fact that there will be a school at Dauphin - a composite school. How this will affect the other schools there I'm - I don't imagine it will have too much effect because there are high schools now, academic high schools in Dauphin. The composite school of course includes academic courses as well - that's the idea of a composite school.

The composite school at Dauphin - the people in the school division needed a school and they had the students; they had the school enrolment required and I believe the idea was that since they could support such a school insofar as enrolment is concerned, the decision was that a composite school could be demonstrated to be justifiable and action was taken in that regard.

That's the only information I can give to the member at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: I fully recognize that the present minister is not responsible for the decision - he couldn't have been - it was made beforehand. But I wonder if it's fair to the people who were told that an analysis would be made of boundaries, that before anything was done they would be consulted, who now find themselves in this boundary with one school intended - and if you look at the structure it now says that Dauphin-Ochre will have a Grade 10 to 12 enrolment in '68 of 1,034, and a decline projected to 891 by 1976. If you turn then to the qualifications recommended for schools, the composite high school recommends an enrolment of 750 students. Now if you're going to have 750 students in one composite high school, and it's projected by 1976, 891, it doesn't leave any students for any other kind of high school - and presumably none other is projected.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is not fair to the people in this area. If the decision was that they were to be told by government you will attend such and such a school and you have no say about it, then that's one thing. But if they were told "you will be consulted," and yet they are faced now with a decision, Mr. Chairman, I submit that that is totally unfair. I don't

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . blame the Minister for it, it's not his fault, but the previous government were in complete and total error, and were absolutely unfair in their dealings in this matter proceeding in this way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the only way you could get a fair look at this is to know what the numbers were based on previous boundaries. I don't think the enrolment numbers that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is suggesting here are based on the proposed boundaries. I don't think that you really know what the previous decision was based on until you look at the numbers on the old boundaries.

But I think you should maybe consider that the Dauphin school doesn't stand or fall on the basis of new boundaries. The numbers enrolled in the school were adequate enough based on the old boundaries. These proposal boundaries presumably are to provide a better time distance factor for the school; whether they do or don't I don't suppose we know by glancing at them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, in my remarks last night I was trying to draw to the attention of the Minister, and unfortunately he hasn't got the map before him as the provisional plan. But I think he will see quite clear the problem of Camperville that I drew to his attention last night. It's more than evident now because it has been moved, it looks to me like some 25 or maybe 30 miles farther south. They have the Pine River area and others also included now in the school division of The Pas. So I humbly submit to him that when he goes to Camperville to deal with those people there, to take a copy of it. It's quite plain here that they're prepared now to - and whether they've been in there and held hearings with those people I'm not prepared to say; there may be, and Indian people and that. They've extended the boundary farther south but that's not going to solve the problem in the meetings that I've held with them there so I hope he would . . . It is quite clear now that the problem would be more irritated than it stands at the present time, if it was to be extended farther south as proposed in this plan.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): . . . position to indicate to this House the location of the approved composite high school east of the Red River?

MR. MILLER: . . . couldn't tell you exactly where it is east of the river. I can find out and let the member know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Is the honourable member speaking?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to me when exactly the decision was made to approve a composite high school in Dauphin?

MR. MILLER: I'd have to look up and get that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103 passed. Resolution 104 2(a) -- passed --(b)(1) -- passed --

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when we're dealing with resolution 2(b)(1) - Student Aid and Miscellaneous, I wonder if the Minister could explain to us -- he had told us previously that he is only introducing the estimates of the previous government, but I find here that item No. 2 (b) (1) has been increased by \$75,000.00. Could the Minister please explain the reason for this?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'll gladly explain that when we come to supplementary estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104. 2 (b) (1)--passed; (2)--passed; (c) . . .

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. HARDY: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to reveal to this House the number of students that are attending university in the province of Manitoba from outside Canada, and the cost?

MR. MILLER: These are just questions that I can take as notice. Really I haven't got this information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: While he's looking it up would he also include Brandon and University of Winnipeg?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: While he's going to get that information, maybe he could give us the

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . information as to the allotment to each of the universities, how much is allocated to each of the universities. Probably he has that figure now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104 passed. Resolution 105. 3 (a) (1)--passed; (2)--passed; 3(b)(1)--passed; 2--passed. Resolution 105 . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on 105, have there not been some changes made by the government insofar as teacher training and grants?

MR. MILLER: Yes, there has been some changes. These appear in supplementary estimates. When we get the supplementary estimates I'll certainly explain them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 105 passed. Resolution 106. 4 (a)(b)(c)(d)--passed. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the Manitoba School for the Deaf, I wonder if the Minister could inform this House, or take an opportunity to dig out some information on the Manitoba School for the Deaf, and the program that we have involved there - whether there are other provinces sending students to this school? If so, from what provinces? Whether other provinces are contributing anything towards the management of this school, and other pertinent information dealing with it?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge there are no students from other provinces enrolled at the Manitoba School for Deaf and therefore no other provinces contributing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 106 passed. Resolution 107. 5 . . . The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could provide some information. He probably doesn't have it there, but could he provide information on the total amortization payments for the total province now that the province is carrying the capital lending, or borrowing for the school divisions as a lump sum. I notice that for one school division one of the local newspapers has indicated 16 percent of the total budget as being amortization capital retirement costs. Could he determine, see if he can determine if the figures apply for the total province?

MR. MILLER: I could try to get that information for the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could we have a breakdown of this figure of \$6.2 million. It says land, construction, alterations, renovations, and furnishings and so on. But is this at one major point, or is this grant towards all the different divisions?

MR. MILLER: I can't give the member a breakdown but I can assure him that this isn't at one school at all, this is throughout Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . the Minister does not have the estimate book showing what this covers? I do not believe it was given at the previous session, and I wondered if it was available what it did cover?

MR. MILLER: I'm sure it was available at the last session but I can try to get the information and pass it on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when we're dealing with buildings and other projects I feel that it's most important that some concern should be expressed at this time, not because of the expenditure of the sums that are in this particular estimate, but I think we should express concern now over the possible expenditures in the future as a result of the proposals that are proposed by the Boundaries Commission in their interim brief.

I don't know if it affects other constituencies to the same degree as it does my particular constituency, but in my particular constituency there are two divisions involved and both of these divisions are working hard, and I congratulate them for working very hard, towards building a better educational system than what they have at the present time. There are plans, I know some of them have been approved, construction is under way. There are some that construction has not started on as yet, and if the implementations of the proposals of the Boundaries Commission are implemented, then it might alter completely the educational program, because there will be two entirely new divisions, and the existing school structures that would then be within the new divisions might be more than adequate for the needs of that division. So I would just wonder if it might not be advisable - and I say this advisedly - to take a look at all present proposed school building programs in the light of some of the proposals, and maybe we should just look carefully before we proceed in undue haste if such proposals as are being announced or proposed would be put in effect, what would then be the benefit to

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) be derived from the programs that are presently under way or being proposed. I say this in all sincerity without any malice or questioning the integrity of the existing school divisions in any way, because I'm sure they're working in the interests of the present school divisions that are in existence now; but I feel that we should maybe take a look at the construction program as it exists now and try and fit it in to the program that could possibly be in existence if these implementations were put forward. With the tremendous cost that we now face in education and building - and building is a large factor in this - I think that we should be proceeding very carefully and looking closely at the immediate programs that are on the drawing boards of the architects at this present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on the item before us I certainly would like to have a breakdown at some time of this total figure. Then, too, I would like to hear from the Minister as to the number of applications that have been approved by the Public School Finance Board in connection with building projects, also the number rejected and the number pending, of the total amount that will be placed at their disposal. Is the figure 6.2 million as in our estimates, is that the total amount or how much will be allocated to them at their disposal under capital. I think we should have a clearer picture as to what our Public School Finance Board is doing. I haven't got their report before me at the moment. I have one in my possession though. It doesn't provide too much detail in my opinion. In fact I would like to see them come before a committee; I think we should have a Standing Committee on Education in this House which could call the Finance Board before a hearing and to find out from them personally as to the whole program that is placed under their jurisdiction. I think this is something that we as members should have a right to examine and I think we should provide the means whereby this could be done; I think a Standing Committee should be appointed by this House so that this could be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . 107. (5)--passed, Resolution 107 passed . . .

MR. FROESE: . . . some answer to -- just standing there approving \$6.2 million and not even getting any answer, I'm not satisfied with that.

MR. MILLER: What about last Session?

MR. FROESE: I didn't have the chance at the last session because I was there the first day and I did speak on the estimates at that time, I questioned them in some parts, but when I came back the next time they were passed, within a day. I think we have a new administration and we should be able to hear from them. Certainly just because we have another government, a new administration does not mean that we should not be able to get the answers to our questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I advised the member earlier and perhaps he didn't hear me that I would get the information for him; when I got it I would give it to him; I cannot give it to him right now. I thought he understood that.

MR. FROESE: I thank the Honourable Minister for that assurance. I didn't have that assurance before.

MR. MILLER: Well read Hansard tomorrow, you'll see I said it.

MR. FROESE: You made it to him . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6(b)(1)--passed; (2)--pass; (c)(1)--pass; (2)--passed; (d)(1)--passed . . . The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Resolution 108 (6)(d), Archives and Historical Research -- I'd be interested in finding out from the Minister just what is involved in the \$46,000 program. We haven't come down to sub-item (3) but it is the only one of the three items that's constant between the fiscal year which ended March 31, 1969 and the projection for the year ending March 31, 1970. The other two sub-items (1) and (2), Salaries and Other Expenditures, both reflect a moderate increase and the question that occurs to me, or one of the questions that occur to me, Mr. Chairman, is the involvement from the point of view of the government where Historical Research is concerned. Does this contemplate or embrace a centennial program or is this a continuing kind of program that is upgraded each year, that expands somewhat upon itself each year and that therefore involves an increase in expenditure? Or is it something that is directed specifically to the Manitoba Centennial observances in 1970 and therefore involves an increase in expenditure at the present time but doesn't necessarily reflect a continuing expansion of this nature?

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

Could the Minister acquaint the committee with the program that is involved under the heading "Archives and Historical Research," with specific reference and particular attention to the historical research item?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I can try to get the information for the honourable member.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering -- I spoke last night on this particular aspect of the estimates . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this might be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10 o'clock and the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.