

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 5, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed I should like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 80 students of Grade 9 standing, attending Windsor Park Collegiate. These students are on a music Exchange Program from North Vancouver. They are under the direction of Mr. Christianson, and Windsor Park Collegiate is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

At the same time I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the loge on my right where we have Mr. John A. Bagnariol, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington.

Speaker Bagnariol has been in Manitoba addressing an Executive Information System Seminar dealing with Effective Government Management of Information Systems.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, my first question is really in the nature of a point of order. It has to do with the distribution by you, Sir, of photocopy of Citation 171, which has to do with the form and manner in which questions should be put.

My point of order, Sir, is that the Chair, and you as the present incumbent, have a reputation, historical, and in your case recent but already well established, for impartiality.

By distributing Citation 171, which has to do with questions only, implies that it is only this side of the House that is erring in the way in which they put the questions.

Citation 181, Sir, had you attached it, then you would have maintained your reputation for fairness and impartiality because Citation 181 indicates how questions are to be answered.

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

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I find it amusing that the Leader of the Opposition should choose to rise on this point of order. He may or may not recall that almost every year in the past eight years that same citation has been distributed to members of the House and I never noted that he took exception at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it's a beautiful morning upon which to start this note. I believe that the Honourable the Government House Leader is quite correct, which merely demonstrates that he was not on his toes in those days.

While pursuing this further, Mr. Speaker, may I then now direct a question to the First Minister and to ask the First Minister if either he or his colleague, the Minister of Finance, have had opportunity to make direct representations to the Federal Ministry of Finance to raise objection with respect to the rather special deal — sales tax deal — with the Province of Quebec and, if so, can he indicate if any reply has been evoked?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am not in a position to answer my honourable friend's query today, but I will take it as notice for my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and see what facts he has been able to ascertain through his departmental officials.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the absence of the Minister of Finance my next question would be directed to the Minister of Mines and Resources and it arises from one of the annual reports of the Canadian Development Corporation to the effect that some \$45 million has been invested by the Canadian Development Corporation in gas leases in Louisiana. I should like to ask the Minister of Resources if he would take under advisement the possibility of making representations to the Government or Canada and/or the Canadian Development Corporation with

Friday, May 5, 1978

the view in mind of persuading them to put their money into the potentials in Canada, for natural gas exploration and development, including low pressure fields — some of which may well exist in the Virden-Scallion area of this province, and other places.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any communication with the province at this time in that regard but I would trust the organization in question would have some knowledge and have some competence in the field as to where their money might best be expended.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Honourable Minister has said that he will take this under notice, but in light of the other part of his reply, I would like to ask him if he accepts with equanimity the prospect of continuation of investment by the CD C in energy resources in such places as Louisiana, or wherever else?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have not taken it upon myself to make a judgment as to the operations of the Canadian Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health if in light of the concern that has been expressed, one copy or example of which I have conveyed to him, with respect to problems arising as a result of the withdrawal of certain support service to district hospitals by Community Services Division of the Department of Health, if the Minister will undertake to explore the possibility of the restoration as much as possible of these support services to district hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition. I would ask him if he would repeat the question.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was simply to ask the Minister of Health if, in light of the fact that there has been some expression of concern by those responsible for patient care services in district hospitals, concern that because of the withdrawal of certain support services by the Community Services Division of the Department of Health to the district hospitals, will the Minister undertake to explore the possibility of restoring at least some of the support services that had been extended to district hospitals by the Community Services Division of that department?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to explore the Leader of the Opposition's question and the foundation for the question. If, in fact, there is that concern, which has not been expressed to me, which has not been directed to my office or to me personally, then I will undertake an examination of it. First of all, I will examine the validity of the Leader of the Opposition's question.

MR. SCHREYER: Well a supplementary, it is not as though the question is theoretical, Mr. Speaker. I have conveyed to the Minister, if I haven't yet I'm prepared to do so now, letters from some of the administrators of district hospitals indicating concern, or expressing concern at the discontinuation of social services support at one or another hospital. My question is to the Minister, in light of the fact that X-number of family counsellors, X-number of social service support workers have been discontinued in employment at certain of the Community Services Division offices, can the Minister indicate in the light of this expression of concern, whether he will explore the possibility of restoration of at least some of these positions and services.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, could I perhaps suggest this to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I will certainly explore and examine the situation to which he alludes and if I discover that that is an area of concern, that it is an area that is producing hardship or cutback in quality of patient services, then I would be prepared to discuss with him his basic suggestion, that is a re-examination with a view to restoration. But I think, Sir, that it would be irresponsible to assure him that I will explore restoration until it becomes apparent in reasonable terms that quality and standards of patient care and services have really deteriorated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: In light of the Ministers undertaking that he would be prepared to consider such restoration, or partial restoration of positions and service, if he can be satisfied that those positions of direct involvement are concerned, I would like to ask him if he does not consider the opinion of the Executive Director of Patient Care at Concordia, the Director of Financial Services at Concordia, where they do specifically express such concern at the withdrawal of social service support as being sufficient grounds for commencing this investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Sir, I suppose I would. But, I happen to know the Administrator of the Concordia Hospital quite well — I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition does too — I happen to talk to the Administrator of the Concordia Hospital quite frequently, and that message, that concern, has not been expressed to me. I don't know what else I can say than what I've said in this House in the past few days and weeks, Mr. Speaker. I'm monitoring the situation, I'm staying in touch with these personnel. They are not conveying that kind of concern to me. They may be conveying it to others, and I will check that point. If they're conveying it to others, then there obviously must be some concern there, but it has not been conveyed to me, and I'm in discussion with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it may well be. I take the Honourable Minister's word for it, that he has not had any expression of concern directed to him personally, but he has been asked several weeks ago whether this could be checked via the route of the Department. Now I have here Sir, and I'm quite prepared to forward it to the Minister, letters by both the Executive Director of Patient Care and the Director of Financial Services, in which in one sentence they express concern about the curtailment of care for patients as the result of the withdrawal of service of social workers attached to the hospital. Will the Minister take these letters as being at least a partial indication of concern?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will take those letters from the Honourable Member who is the MLA for the constituency in which that hospital is located, and with whom that hospital would no doubt be in some contact, as a serious matter and I will look into the situation.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: My question is to the Honourable, the Minister of Health. Have all the hospitals in Manitoba been placed on a global budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I believe so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: If this is the case, then do they have the freedom to actually work on a global budget, or is there any interference from the Minister?

MR. SHERMAN: They have the freedom, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the Attorney-General. I'm sure the Attorney-General has received many inquiries pertaining to the recent decision by Judge Baryluk dismissing charges arising out of the breathalyzer on the basis that the breathalyzer machines were not of the proper type. Would the Attorney-General advise us this morning as to whether or not his department intends to appeal the decision by Judge Baryluk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that decision is currently under review and a decision has not yet been arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. I have a letter here from the Progressive Conservative Victory Club, it's addressed to Wilson Parasiuk, Planning Secretary of Cabinet, Manitoba Government, Legislative Building, Winnipeg. Now given that this letter was sent to me as a civil servant to an office here in the Legislative Building, I would like to ask the Minister if she authorized the Conservative Party to solicit funds from Manitoba civil servants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: If she is not answering then I assume the silence is consent. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if she would contact the Conservative party immediately to instruct it to cease soliciting funds . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There's a point of order. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: Notwithstanding my honourable friend's experience in government, he still is incapable of understanding a simple rule even when it's placed in front of him. That question, Sir, is out of order because it does not relate to any Ministerial responsibility.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the civil servants of the Manitoba government are having funds solicited from them by the Conservative party and their integrity as independent civil servants is being threatened by this type of letter, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do have the right to ask this question of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

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

MR. PARASIUK: I would repeat the question that I was making when I was interrupted by the House Leader. Will the Minister contact the Conservative party immediately to instruct it to cease soliciting funds from civil servants employed by the Government of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary. Will the Minister immediately write to the heads of Civil Service departments instructing them to disregard these letters from the Conservative party, and will she ask her Ministers, her colleague Ministers who are responsible for Crown corporations and agencies to do the same to the heads of Crown corporations and agencies, and will she issue a formal statement through Information Services so that all civil servants who are receiving letters like this will be informed that they should disregard them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: Again, Sir, on the point of order, I draw to your attention the Citation that you just distributed to the House and I invite you to look at subsection D(d).

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Health about a situation which I assume he is monitoring. Does he have any information on Manitoba nurses being recruited or raided by U.S. teams?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister confirm that new and inexperienced nursing staff is being given precedence over experienced professional nurses in Manitoba hospitals due to the government enforced restraint program?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Is the Minister concerned about the negative effects of the low or no salary increases for nurses, the poor working conditions and the lower standards of patient care in the hospitals of Manitoba?

MR. SHERMAN: I am concerned about negative effects, Mr. Speaker, but those aren't the negative effects that concern me. It's the negative effects of the imputations in the kinds of questions that are sowing misimpressions and misleading information among the public, such as the questions just directed towards me by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister inform the House as to who will replace Mr. Victor Rabinovitch as director of the Workplace Safety and Health Division as Mr. Rabinovitch's resignation as director becomes effective today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the position hasn't been filled as yet.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary then. Can the Minister confirm that instructions have been transmitted to safety and health officers to cease the issuance of improvement orders and stop-work orders until such a time as a new director is appointed?

MRS. PRICE: No, it hasn't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then. Can the Minister then indicate who has been designated to hear appeals against such improvement orders as called for in the Workplace Safety and Health Act under Section 38, clause 1, making it a responsibility of the director?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, any decisions that have to be made in the absence of a director will be taken care of very adequately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour, can the Minister of Labour indicate if the government has moved as yet to appoint a successor to succeed Professor Woods who headed up for a period of 14 years our Manitoba Joint Labour-Management Industrial Relations Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter a couple of weeks ago to the vice-chairman of that committee and asked him to call a meeting of it and that is where it stands right now.

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

MR. JAMES D. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health confirm that it has been the practice the Rehab. Centre of the Health Sciences Centre since the beginning of this year that bed sheets are changed once a week on a Wednesday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to investigate to confirm this suggestion? Would he also be prepared to check his sources of information to be certain that they are in a position to have the full knowledge of the situation?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to check it again. I think the answer that I gave at the opening of Question Period before Orders of the Day yesterday supplies the answers to this type of question but I'm prepared to give that answer again and I'm prepared to check the situation again.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister reconsider calling the Committee on Privileges and Elections to listen to a constituent of mine who is prepared to testify under oath that when he was in that section this year that his sheets were changed once a week on a Wednesday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Labour inform the House when the freeze or moratorium on minimum wages shall be lifted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear the question.

MR. FOX: Can the Minister of Labour inform the House when the freeze on minimum wages will be lifted, how soon?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, it's under constant review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister and welcome him back to the House after his recent illness. I address my question to him as the Minister in charge of Federal-Provincial relations and ask him if he would take as notice to find out if it is the policy now for visitors from the United Kingdom, coming to visit relatives in Canada, to have a letter of invitation from the person in Canada? If I might just elaborate a bit, Mr. Speaker, my wife received a letter today from my sister-in-law in the United Kingdom who is coming here in September for a visit. On the form she received, and I will quote from the letter and I'll actually give the Minister a copy of the letter after, on the forms received it says, "Visitors to Canada should have a letter of invitation of staying with relatives." I wish the Honourable the First Minister would look into that with his federal counterpart and see if that's part of Federal policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that it is not, as the honourable member appreciates, a matter which falls within the jurisdiction of this Legislature, I would be happy to make inquiries if he'd be good enough to supply me with the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance responsible for the Manitoba Energy Council. Can the Minister advise the House whether the Manitoba Energy Council and its secretariat are continuing to monitor sources of supply of natural gas, particularly future sources of supply for the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question would be yes and in particular the work of the Polar Gas group is getting underway and I expect that fairly shortly there will be more information available with regard to the work of this committee.

MR. EVANS: Last week I directed a question to the First Minister which he took as notice on the Minister of Finance's behalf regarding the question of possible increased exports of natural gas to the United States. I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to answer this question. The Independent Petroleum Association of Canada is now in the process of urging the Federal Government and the Alberta government to permit increased exportation of natural gas to the United States. In view of the need to assure adequate future supplies — and I'm not talking about 20 or 30 years from now, I'm talking about five, six years from now — adequate future supplies of natural gas for the Province of Manitoba, would the Minister undertake to contact his counterpart in Ottawa and also the National Energy Board indicating opposition to this particular move which I believe is now getting the support of the Premier of Alberta. This is a very serious matter.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the matter of future supplies of natural gas is exceedingly important and that is one of the reasons we have attempted to establish a closer watch on the policies that are being adopted in the west with regard to natural gas supplies. I think the member will realize as well that the ingredients that go into these decisions are somewhat more complicated than a straight sale in many cases and if, in fact, there are guarantees of resupply through the Alcan Pipeline back into the Canadian supply network as a result of early shipment of supplies from Canada and then a return at a later date with the construction of the Alcan line, this of course will change the judgment that might be made with regard to the sale of natural gas supplies from Canada at the earlier date. But the nub of it all is that Energy Board hearings is the place where these sorts of contributions are made by the other provinces. We are, at the current time, just completing a very strong statement to the National Energy Board with regard to the oil pipelining in Canada.

It would appear now that the decision being made, or likely to be made by the National Energy Board with result to supplying oil to the further Eastern provinces in Canada is, in fact, going to cause an increase in the pipeline price of the oil in Manitoba which, of course, we are extremely strongly opposed to and we consider to be extremely unfair but that appears to be what is happening at the present time on oil pricing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed any further, may I suggest that if a member has a question that requires a long answer it might be better if that answer be given in writing, rather than take up a long protracted period of the Question Period in the answer. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On that point or order, I appreciate your comment. I just might add that I have put at least two written questions on the Order Paper; I think one is at least seven or eight weeks ago and I still haven't had a reply. I know we have been admonished many times by the Government House Leader to put in written questions, and I believe I have been the only member to do so and I thus far have not received a reply.

But as a supplement to my question, very specifically my understanding is that the Independent Petroleum Association is talking about supplies of additional exports to the United States not tied to any strings, with no consideration of refurbishing those supplies with gas from the United States back to Canada, or what have you. So it's a straight case of pressuring the Federal Government at this time. So therefore, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Can the member indicate what type of question it is he wants to ask.

MR. EVANS: Would the Minister undertake now to advise the Federal Minister of Energy and the National Energy Board of Manitoba's opposition to any increase in Canada's exports to the United

States at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think that question is a repetition of the previous question the member had asked. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: On the point or order, I listened to the Minister's answer very carefully, and he did not answer that specific part of my question, and he went on to another matter, including oil pipelines, which I did not ask.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I indicate to the honourable member that he has a perfect right to ask a question; he has not got the right to expect an answer. The Minister may answer, if he so desires.

Before we proceed, may I draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have 84 students of Grade 9 standing from Crescent View School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Furdievick. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance, I believe, lends itself to a short answer. And that is to ask the Minister of Finance if the Province of Manitoba has made representations to the National Energy Board, or is prepared to do so, to draw a distinction between any incremental sales of natural gas from Canada as between those that have conditions in it for return or swap — some few years down the road — and those that do not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of one question in isolation from the other. It's not possible to take an isolated position without looking at the other parts of the equation that may enter into the picture, such as the National Energy Board's position, and with regard to the likely timing of the Alcan line, or the fact the National Energy Board's hearings with regard to the Polar Gas line. They all enter into the picture.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we may find ourselves in the position, with regard to the Polar Gas pipeline, that the Polar Gas pipeline can in no way be justified without very substantial exports to the United States. Now, if you are going to take a position with regard to a singular isolated decision on one area of export from Canada, but attempt to divorce it from a decision with regard to the likes of the Polar Gas pipeline, you are going to find yourself in a box that you can't get out of. So it's not going to be that easy to isolate these various decisions, Mr. Speaker. All I can advise the members is that we are in close contact with the matters that are going forward. The one that is of greatest concern to us at the moment is the decision regarding the oil pipelining and the direct implications for Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Would the Minister confirm to the House that I have now given him particulars of a woman who was in the hospital from the 12th day of April until the 19th, had her sheets changed once on the 14th and had the same sheets for the dates from the 14th to the 19th — six days inclusive — had her sheets changed from head to foot on the 17th when she complained. I have given him the name, the hospital and also, Mr. Speaker, the fact that she made a complaint on her evaluation to the hospital. Would the Minister confirm that I have given him this information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the Member for Inkster has conveyed that situation to me, in the manner in which he has just presented it to the House. That's the only thing I can confirm. I certainly do not confirm or agree to some of the contentions in his remarks, but he certainly has conveyed those remarks to me outside the Chamber yesterday.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reply to a question that was asked me by the Honourable the Member for Churchill earlier this month, when the honourable member asked me whether I could confirm that the Lynn Lake Community Counselling and Resource Centre has been forced to close its doors due to a lack of funding.

Sir, the answer to the question is that funding has been terminated for the Lynn Lake Community Counselling and Resource Centre by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, effective March 31st, 1978. But it is not correct to conclude that the centre has been forced to close its doors due to a lack of funding. The agreement, according to my information and I am prepared to go into this in detail outside the Chamber with the honourable member because it's rather a lengthy explanation, the agreement was reached in concurrence and with the co-operation of personnel who had been at that centre themselves. But I would like to go into fuller detail with the member, outside the Chamber, Sir.

Friday, May 5, 1978

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to follow up with a question to the Minister of Labour dealing with the minimum wage. I wonder if she could indicate to this House what factors she is reviewing constantly, that she indicated, in view of the fact that the intervening period before increases and between increases in the minimum wage and the cost-of-living increase. How far is the Minister prepared to let that area go before she is prepared to announce an increase in the minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of Cabinet policy and I will not be discussing it any further with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Since I asked the Attorney-General on March 29th, in connection with the Koteles break-in and he has indicated since that an inquiry is underway as to whether or not a full-scale probe should be undertaken, and since I have not received any further information as to the results of same, could the Attorney-General inform the House as to how much longer it will take for his department and the RCMP to provide him with information pertaining to same?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Next Monday morning, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to that same area, in view of the fact that the Attorney-General of Alberta has indicated that RCMP involvement in various alleged break-ins, the McDonald Commission, the Laycraft Inquiry, will be a subject of discussion at the forthcoming Attorneys-General Conference in Edmonton, the end of June, could the Attorney-General advise the House as to whether he is in the process of preparing a brief to that conference on behalf of the Province of Manitoba? The Conference of Attorneys-General in Edmonton, the end of June?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the agenda for the Attorneys-General Conference has not yet been finally settled but the McDonald Commission is on the preliminary agenda, and we are in the process of monitoring the involvement of the RCMP force in Manitoba with the McDonald Commission and we will be in a position to make known the position of the Province of Manitoba at the Conference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister of Health for the answer to my question and will look forward to discussing it further with him. My question now is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate who was Acting Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Division in the absence of a permanent Director?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Cam Younger is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Was the appointment of Mr. Obie Baizley to the Chairmanship of the Manitoba Labour Relations Board discussed with the Manitoba Federation of Labour?

MRS. PRICE: It's Doctor Baizley, Mr. Speaker. No, it wasn't discussed with the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

MR. DOERN: Will the Minister of Labour consult with organized labour on any appointments of vital concern and interest to them?

MRS. PRICE: If any of them have any concerns, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they know where to find me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. EVANS: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, in his capacity as Chairman of the Manitoba Energy Council. Would he have his staff look into the matter of exportation of Alberta, not Northern but Alberta gas, an increase that may be taking place in the near future? Would he have his staff look into this and apprise himself of this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the staff of the Energy Council are aware and keep abreast of the different moves. I want to repeat to him that the export of Alberta natural gas cannot be taken out of context with negotiations that are also going on with regard to the potential for a Polar Gas pipeline and the implication that it has with regard to export of natural gas. They will be considered jointly and when there's a government policy to be announced that serves best, No. 1, the interests of Manitoba, then that policy will be announced.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, my question relates to a problem that does not relate to Polar Gas. This is an immediate problem of increased exportation of southern Alberta gas to the United States. Would the Minister be prepared to propose an increase in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Member for Brandon that repetitive questions are not in the best interests of the Question Period.

While I'm on my feet, may I introduce to all members of the Legislature, 40 pupils from Teulon Collegiate. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: I want to be sure that I have permission from the opposition today. Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 4 and then No. 9?

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 4 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 4, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill dealing with the amendments to the Highway Traffic Act, there are two aspects that I would like to deal with at this point. First, of course, Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm the views expressed by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, in connection with the necessity for this bill. It would seem to me that the bill is principally based upon developing greater administrative efficiency insofar as the police forces are in the Province of Manitoba. That objective may be very well admirable, it may be quite admirable, as long as it does not impinge upon certain basic rights that are reasonable to be safeguarded. Mr. Speaker, in the bill that we have before you, there is the very fundamental and important objective of removing from the highways all those motorists that in fact may be a danger to other motorists on the highways because of the degree of alcohol which they have consumed. That is the principle of the bill, a principle that certainly we support, and it was the principle by which the former government introduced the legislation in the House last June.

On the other hand, I do not feel that the bill should be impinged upon for administrative efficiency when in fact I feel that important right may be compromised, and that is, the changing of the wording to remove the opportunity for a motorist to request a test some time during that 12-hour period, a breathalyzer test, so that person is in a position to establish that they, that he or she, is in fact in a position that they can operate a vehicle safely on the highway and receive the return of the license within that 12-hour period. There will, I do believe, be many instances of inconvenience if that right is not safeguarded. The travelling salesman, for instance, that may in fact find that he will be without his driver's permit for the full 12-hour period that could establish his ability to operate without question shorter than the 12-hour period. Or the truck driver, who also finds himself in that same position.

So that I do not see why, for purposes of efficiency only, we would want to remove that opportunity for a driver, driving for purposes of commerce, for the purposes of one's own livelihood, to have the opportunity to obtain the return of their driver's permit earlier than the 12-hour period if they can successfully pass the breathalyzer test. I believe that is a right that the Attorney-General should consider safeguarding in the legislation; he should not strip away that basic right, that basic safeguard, for bureaucratic efficiency, and that in fact is, Mr. Speaker, what is occurring at the

present time.

Now if the Attorney-General is not prepared to make that change in the legislation, then I feel the Attorney-General should take a careful look at whether or not the 12-hour period is necessary; whether or not a 6-hour period for removal of the driver's permit would not be sufficient.

I recall and I would urge the Attorney-General to ensure that we have before us, medical testimony, when this bill is dealt with at committee level.

My recollection is that medical information was to the effect that six hours would be as good as 12 hours in achieving the objectives of the legislation. If, in fact, that is so, then, Mr. Speaker, that would be an alternative to the earlier, possibly an alternative to the earlier suggestion that I made in respect to one's inconvenience caused by not being able to demand a test within that 12-hour period. If the delay period was only for a 6-hour period then the practical problem would not be so great.

So I would request the Attorney-General to ensure that before the committee there is medical testimony, so that we can question medical authority as to whether or not a 6-hour period would be as valid as a 12-hour period.

I recall when the bill was first introduced, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure you recall it so well last year when you were performing the role of justice critic of the then government, that the bill was introduced with a 24-hour period in it. I point out to the Attorney-General the flexibility that occurred at the committee level and the result that we amended the bill in committee, to reduce the number of hours from 24 to 12 as a result of discussion in the committee — and I believe you, Sir, participated in that discussion. So that I would say to the Attorney-General, if he is not prepared to reconsider the first point made, that serious consideration be given in committee to whether or not we need remove the driver's permit for the entire 12-hour period, whether six hours would not satisfactorily achieve the same objective.

That is I believe, Mr. Speaker, the only area of a basic concern that the opposition has in connection with this bill. I do believe that that concern can be dealt with in committee, while we retain the worthy objective of the legislation.

So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would not be prepared — unless there are others who wish to speak on this bill — to hold up further passage of this bill in second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, it appears that there is certainly agreement in principle with the bill and it is the detail of the bill that I, and members opposite, are concerned with. I would expect that in committee all of these matters can be dealt with much better and that the suggestions made by the Member for Selkirk can be dealt with in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader. —(Interjection)— Oh, you're quite right.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Call Bill No. 9, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 9 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MORTGAGE BROKERS AND MORTGAGE DEALERS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have considered this bill and in view of the amendments that are contained in it, we believe it would be best dealt with in the committee when it's passed in second reading, therefore, we are prepared to let it go.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes.

BILL NO. 14 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE INCOME TAX ACT (MANITOBA)

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day I just had about five minutes to make a few brief comments and I don't intend on debating a too lengthy period of time. However, there were a few items that I wanted to make and contribute to the debate on the passing of this bill.

Really, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated the other day, the basic differences between the two

governments are in this bill. The former government believed, as I indicated before, that the government should be the big business, the government should be the big employer and the government should be the big brother.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we obviously don't believe in that and in last year's election, went to the people of Manitoba and said, "That if you vote for us and we become the government, we will reduce the personal income tax. We'll reduce the small business tax," and really this is what's in this bill; and the people answered and said, "Fine, we want that," answered to the tune of 49 percent voting for us.

And Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that the Honourable Member for St. Johns — I don't think in his particular part of the debate — indicated how he was going to vote on this bill. I think it's quite clear how the Honourable Member for Inkster will vote on this bill because he let it be known in one of the committees the other night what he was interested in seeing a government that he would be part of do in regard to inheritance tax and in other taxes. So that I expect that the Honourable Member for Inkster will be voting against this particular bill.

But I ask, Mr. Speaker, how can they, as representatives of the people of Manitoba in the ridings that they represent, vote against a sales tax reduction? I would also ask, Mr. Speaker, how they, as representatives of their people in their ridings, can vote against a personal income tax reduction? And great to-do was made about the fact that people in the — as they called them — the middle-class area would be better off than people in lower income areas. Well, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the major contributors to our tax that we do collect in income tax are the blue collar workers, or the middle-class workers, the plumbers, the carpenters, the electricians, the civil servants, these people that they have in their particular constituencies that they represent, that are going to benefit from this particular income tax reduction. So I cannot understand why, as representatives of their constituency, that they would want to vote against this bill and it may well be that they won't vote against it and will pass it.

A MEMBER: No, they'll vote against it.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest the other day when the Honourable Member — oh, my apologies to the gentleman, I guess it's City Centre — made comments about the fact that an agreement with the doctors was settled at some 7 percent. My apologies, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, but when he made comments about the doctors fees being settled in the area of 7 percent, well I'm sure the Honourable Member is quite aware of the fact that he wasn't truly relating the amount of moneys that the doctors were going to be receiving. Because, out of those particular fees the doctors are paid, they also pay their secretaries, they also pay their nurses, they also pay their stenographers out of those particular fees, light bills, and he knows very well that the 7 percent is really to cover the increased costs of running the doctors' offices and so on. The only source of funds the doctors have to pay for the operations of these facilities are from the fees that they collect for their services. So it really is an unfair comparison.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of the income tax reduction, as we indicated earlier, was to encourage the people to stay in our province, encourage the people to stay rather than leave our province for where the income tax levels are more attractive, or had been more attractive prior to reductions, rather than see the brain drain of the carpenters and the technicians and the engineers and so forth, who have liberty to travel between boundaries of provinces under the present federal and provincial legislation. Mr. Speaker, I would think that this former government, the opposition, cannot understand that type of philosophy, because they have always believed that they are the big spenders, they are the big employers, they are the big business people. I think it was answered very clearly at the last election, that the people of Manitoba wanted the government to get out of business, to spend less money.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support a bill that will see small business tax be reduced, which will hopefully attract small business and maintain small business in our province, because the greatest creators of jobs in the province is the small business community. And, it's hoped that through this effort they will continue to be major employers in the province as well as expand and be able to compete with the competitiveness of outside the province companies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment and relating it to the bill before us that the Honourable Member for St. Johns indicated with these tax reductions that we were going to create a bigger deficit than what actually has been predicted in our Estimates. Well, I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that he was the Finance Minister and part of the government, he is fully aware that when a government sets its Estimates and passes them at the start of the fiscal year, it's very difficult to move and spend all that money. If think if he checks back into the past history of his government, the past four years history of his government, that when they had an approval of "X" number of dollars to spend, say \$1.6 billion or \$1.5 billion that at the actual cut-off date at the end of the year, the money had not all been spend. In fact, history shows that it could go as high as 4 ½ percent to 2 ½ percent when you compare this, and really if you apply a 2 percent figure to what we're looking at, \$1.6 billion combined budget that we have this year, you're looking at \$33 million that will not be spent because of the lapse factor. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that \$33 million will cancel out the \$30 million that he's trying to add to create this deficit. And he knows his administrators and the people that have told us this, he knows that it was the same administrators that had this experience with his government, have predicted this. Yet, he will not accept that fact. And, he knows very well that there will not be the kind of over-expenditures that he's talking about because of that lapse factor, if he fully understands what the cash flow type of approach that is being taken in this budget is. Because if one applies 2

Friday, May 5, 1978

percent . . . Then, Mr. Speaker, if he doesn't believe that, and I ask him sincerely, does he really believe that this government will be able to, or will know how to spend money more than they did? Does he really believe that we are much better at spending money than their government was? And, their government had 4 ½ percent lapse one year, and they had 2 ½ percent in other years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can't really accept the Honourable Member for St. Johns suggestion that the \$30 million carry-over will end up as an additional \$30 million deficit, because it will not. And, I will remind him that we will find out when we deal with the actual financial position of the province in our quarterly statements. That's when the fact will come out on who is correct. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I would love to answer a question after I'm finished. Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in supporting the bill that's before us. I feel that we are completing or at least starting to complete some of our objectives that we put forward to the people in the last election. We have confidence in the people of Manitoba. We have confidence in the business community of Manitoba that these initiatives will turn the economy around and get things starting to go again in Manitoba, and that there will be investment continue in Manitoba and grow in the private sector where the major employers are presently situated, rather than the other approach that the former government had which was to get more and more of this involvement into the hands of the government. More and more involvement in the control of the cash flow of the province which in opposition we never agreed with, and this government do not agree with. So, I hope the opposition will consider again what the objective of this particular bill is, and will have the guts to support it. Thank you very much.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member indicated he would be prepared to consider a question. I would ask him whether he wishes to leave the impression that the Conservative government of the day went through a budget process, reviewing all expenditures and ended up with a figure which they do not expect to spend and, therefore, that they expect to have a lower expenditure in this fiscal year than is shown in the Estimates that are now before Committee of Supply?

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

MR. MINAKER: Well no, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the honourable member raised that question, because that is why the proposed way of estimating is put forward to the Legislature at this time, because in past what was happening, was that the capital carry-over was carried over from year to year and at times when we dealt with the Estimates in this House, we weren't dealing with the capital that was going to be spent in that year because it had been carried over from two years prior. And, because of that combination of capital and operating that you could have when you totalled the carry-over of capital and the capital approved for the year, and you carried it through from year to year, you weren't able to spend all that money, and that's why, exactly why this particular type of accounting is being put forward and why the auditor recommended it, so that we will know exactly what is being dealt with on a year by year basis. And, if you look at the past history of adding carry-over capital, capital approved for the year, and the expenditure that was approved by the Legislature, when you applied all that to be spent for that year, it wasn't spent and would vary anywhere from close to 5 percent in lapse down to 2 ½ and that's what I was meaning by that statement.

MR. CHERNIACK: Only if the member will permit a supplementary. Setting aside capital and current discussions, is the honourable member leaving us, does he intend to leave us with the impression that the Estimate sheets that we are now dealing with in Committee of Supply for the current fiscal years shows an expenditure item which the government does not expect to spend and that indeed the government expects to spend less because of whatever reason they feel that there will not be a complete expenditure of the expected amount?

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, not at all because it depends on the definition of spending. If the definition of spending is sending a contract out, yes, we will spend everything that's in there that's supposed to be spent and in the carry-over but if you look at the cash flow, then if the Accounts Payable is not in at that time or they haven't completed the work, you can issue a contract two months before the end of the year for a million job, then in fact the order has been placed but will not be accountable for until the following year because the bill hasn't come in or the progress billing hasn't come in because the definition is at the year end, what isn't either in Accounts Payable or work not completed on that particular contract, it's cut off. So this is why I'm saying that in the old method, there was this 4 percent lapse or this 2.5 percent lapse. So what you are comparing when you say there's going to be a deficit of additional \$30 million is to the old system and the old system, when you added all those items together, showed that you were never able to push all that money through in one year, it wasn't practical.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my comments with respect to this bill and in doing so. Mr.

Speaker, I particularly want to deal with some of the matters that have been raised by my friend, the Member for St. James. The Member for St. James is of the opinion that there is fear in the hearts of any legislator to vote for a reduction in taxes and that anybody who does that is destined to political failure. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I've been in politics for 16 years with relative success; I have never gone to my constituents on the basis that I would reduce their taxes. I have said that I would try to make taxes apply more on those who have the ability to pay and less on those who do not have the ability to pay. I've never called for a reduction in taxation by virtue of reduced public services.

With regard to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I would have no difficulty voting against it on the basis that it doesn't represent a reduction in taxation; it represents a part of a comprehensive budgetary program on the part of the Conservative government which will do economic harm to this province. If one takes the income tax in isolation and says that I'm going to charge my clients or my constituents \$13.00 a year more in income tax by voting against this bill, I tell my honourable friend that I am going to cost them a lot more by voting for this bill. Although it is possible, and has been done, for a group of legislators to get up and say, "Yes, we're going to vote for the income tax reduction as an isolated item but we object to it in the context of what it is doing," — which is a legitimate position and I'm not going to argue against it — I would have no difficulty voting against this bill on the basis of the fact that I know it is a comprehensive program. I'll deal with the reasons, Mr. Speaker, as to why it is possible to vote against a taxation measure which ostensibly reduces taxes.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I made a speech in this House in 1967 dealing with the very same question that the honourable member is raising and I showed him that we could reduce taxes far more than what the Conservative administration is suggesting. We could, Mr. Speaker, eliminate the educational services to the people of this province and eliminate \$352 million in taxes. That's \$350 for every man, woman and child in this province. \$350 million means that we could wipe out the sales tax entirely. Add to that all of the revenues — I hope that the Member for St. Johns will correct me if I'm wrong — but I believe that we could wipe out the sales tax if we saved \$350 million on education because the sales tax is about \$200 million — 5 x 40 is \$200 million — and we could also wipe out either the corporate or the personal income tax. We could say to the people of the Province of Manitoba, "User pay," and user pay means — and I'm going to be conservative — that for my family it would mean \$1,000 a child per year, that I would pay only for the primary and secondary education, elementary and secondary education. I have five children; 12 years is \$12,000 per child and I'm being conservative, times five children is \$60,000.00. You know, I'm being very very low on what it would cost to educate those children. I'm sure it would be \$1,500 a year. But that's what I would say to the people of the province, that if we are going to eliminate this tax, which in sales tax and income tax costs you a certain amount, and we're going to let you educate your children and that will cost you for a family of five a minimum of \$60,000.00. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I don't know about my honourable friend, but if I voted that way, I'd be chucked out of office so fast you wouldn't be able to take a fast speed picture of it, because the people in my constituency understand very well the benefits of society getting together, pooling their collective resources and doing things ourselves collectively as a matter of social responsibility which we could never accomplish individually.

Mr. Speaker, we could eliminate another \$300 million if we eliminated the health services, if we eliminated the hospital and the medical. I can tell my honourable friend that if he came in here with a bill saying that we will wipe out sales tax, wipe out income tax and eliminate these services, that I would proudly stand up and vote against that bill and I would go to the people in my constituency and I would go to the people in his constituency and we would get him defeated on the basis of voting for such a tax measure. So let's not look at the percentage increase — but I will do that in a few moments — as being what this bill is legislated. This bill is legislating a taxation and budgetary policy which I am opposed to and which I believe a majority of the people of this province are opposed to and when the members talk about that 49 percent, I believe that it isn't 49 percent anymore. You know, if it would make them feel any better and if they would guarantee me the opportunity of doing so — and this is probably a vacant boast and they will say, "Well, in my constituency anybody could get elected." — I'm willing to test that 49 percent right now. I will resign on the understanding that the First Minister will call an election and I will go to Inkster constituency on the basis of how I have just voted and let us see whether the 49 percent that you are talking about for the Conservative Party exists. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it would happen in my constituency and it would happen in St. Matthews and it would happen in Osborne and it would happen in many of the fringe constituencies. Let the First Minister call an election to test that 49 percent, Mr. Chairman. Right now, let's test that 49 percent. Because you talk about it, the members talk about it as if it was written in stone.

Mr. Speaker, when we were in office, Mr. Speaker, elected by the people of this province with 43 percent, I heard for eight years how we'd had no mandate, that we were a minority government, coming out of the mouths of the Conservatives. That's all I heard. At that time the electoral mandate didn't mean anything. Now, suddenly, it means much more than it meant over the past eight years. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that one thing that Conservatives really know but don't care to admit is that the electorate, once having spoken, is not thereafter mute and that we are continually . . . And one thing that the Member for St. Matthews apparently doesn't know is that in this House and on the hustings, we are continually fighting the election. Not the last election, the next election. If there is any problem in that connection, Mr. Speaker, that people think that when I ask a question I remember someone said on the other side that that is a political question, I know of no question that is not a political question and every single question that I ask, I ask on the hope that it will make our side politically stronger and the other side politically weaker and every speech that I make in this House is

Friday, May 5, 1978

based on the fact that I hope that it will commend itself to the people of the Province of Manitoba and that it will bring discredit upon the opposition, the opposition meaning those opposed to me, the government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the basis —(Interjection)— I don't know, I have never considered "politician" to be a dirty word, never. I consider it to be one of the highest callings that anybody could be involved in. So those people who speak about "cheap political tricks" really do not understand politics because politics is not a trick, it is not a con game as was said by the Leader of the Liberal Party that politics is a con game, but too many people do fall into the trap of thinking that being elected is somehow putting something over and then doing the opposite. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in the continual test of whether that has been done.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to get to the specifics of the tax legislation in a moment. I do want to deal with the Member for St. James' — and I'm going to try to be as kind as I can while being as accurate as I can — the Member for St. James' Archie Bunkerism with respect to matters intellectual. Well, Mr. Chairman, I told a story in the House last year which is probably regarded by people of all philosophical persuasions, of all philosophical persuasions, to be one of the greatest short stories ever written. It was written by Count Tolstoi. It is a story not about Socialism; it is a story about human greed which is recognized as one of the problems of mankind —(Interjection)— No.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask the member . . .

MR. GREEN: It relates to what I am talking about. It relates to this human greed of the income tax, yes. And Mr. Speaker, I didn't interrupt when the honourable member was talking about it. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that on a bill a member has 40 minutes, and can relate almost anything to the subject matter of the bill with the smallest degree of ingenuity. If you're going to make me do that, I'll do it but we've only got 40 minutes and at the end of 40 minutes I'm going to have to stop anyway so why don't we just let it continue?

The honourable member attributed my philosophy as saying that a human being doesn't need anything more than six feet of land. The reason that the story was told, Mr. Speaker, was we were discussing the amount of land that a man needs and at that time I thought that it was an appropriate story — not a Socialist story — to talk about human greed as being one of the devastating problems that people have and that no matter what class you are, no matter what stage you are in, that human greed is something that will kill you. That is what Tolstoi said. He said that the man who walked around the six feet, who walked around and tried to get as much as he can, found out that by trying to do that he had killed himself. As an intellectual, Mr. Speaker, can the honourable member not regard that story as to its inherent value rather than trying to attribute to me the suggestion that six feet of land is the amount of land that a man needs. What I was talking about is human greed.

I want to tell the honourable member that I really didn't intend to deal with this matter. I show you a magazine. This magazine I can't read. It's a trade magazine that my friend, the Member for St. Johns, may be able to read. It's in Japanese. It's a magazine that was published in Japan and there is a story in it written by a great capitalist, one of the leading capitalists of Japan. His name is Misawa. He builds in Japan — at that time 50,000 homes a year. He wrote a story in this trade magazine, Mr. Speaker, which essentially deals with his relationship with one Sidney Green, Minister in charge of Natural Resources and Environment. This was written a year ago and they sent me a translation; I don't even know if it's correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he relate his story to income tax.

MR. GREEN: Yes, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: Very good.

MR. GREEN: I certainly will, Mr. Speaker. I am relating this story to the question of the philosophy of the capitalism and individual achievement, and the story that Tolstoi wrote of much land does a man need, as it relates to this income tax, which is essentially intended to show people in the business community that they are going to be a great substantial consideration on the part of this government, to the exclusion of others. That's what it's doing. That's the basis of this bill. This bill is not going to save businessmen money. And I will deal with the amount of money that we're talking about, in a few moments.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is what Mr. Misawa said about this particular story. "In 1973 when Mr. Green visited Japan I recall that Mr. Green told me a story, "How Much Land Does A Man Need" which I understand he took from one of the stories of — Torstley is what they have here, and it was Tolstoi — "while we were on route to Misawa Homes Training Centre in Shizuoka." By the way, I want the honourable member to know that this magazine was written after we got out of Misawa — after we got out. After we were merely there as a . . .

He expanded the story further by concluding "that anything belonging to nature should not be dominated by a certain people, thus land should, in principle, be available to all human beings and should not be dominated by one or a few.

"Mr. Green is not tall, not in comparison with my height" — Mr. Misawa is a very short man — "and his philosophy is so sophisticated that I have learned a lot from him." Now, Mr. Speaker, that's a little bit of immodesty which I am driven to by the reading of the story.

But I am trying to indicate to my honourable friend that recognizing the intellectual validity of a great piece of literature is not the exclusive domain of socialists; that somebody could recognize that and be of an entirely different philosophy; and that the story has meaning and that if he would read it, that I am sure that he would find that there is some meaning in it for him and for Conservatives of all walks of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member talks about how this reduction in income tax is going to do a great deal for the small business community. Now, let's look at what it actually does. The amount of money that a business that is netting \$87,000 — and this is net, that a business after taxes got \$87,000 — after wages and everything got \$87,000, will now get \$89,000.00. Has anybody in Manitoba ever heard of a business leaving Manitoba or in any way being discouraged with Manitoba because its profit moved from \$89,000 to \$87,000, that at the end of the year it showed net — this is before taxes — \$87,000 instead of \$89,000.00?

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's go to the other comparison. Let's take a smaller business, one that had a net of \$4,350.00. It will now have a net of \$4,450 — \$1,000 more. Has anybody heard — (Interjection) — Oh, \$40,000 — \$43,500; it will have \$44,500.00. Has anybody heard of a small businessman complaining that his profit went down from \$44,500 to \$43,500, and therefore he was considering altering his program.

Mr. Speaker, that is so remote as to be ridiculous. In the law business, a law firm that made one year \$87,000 and the next year \$89,000 figures it made approximately the same each year. That its profit was roughly the same each year.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members say that we have to do this in order to be competitive with other provinces. Well, I hope we don't competitive with other provinces, because the business in Ontario that saves \$1,000 on \$44,500 is paying two cents extra in sales tax from five to seven and if they have got 14 employees, Mr. Speaker, if they have got 14 employees under Ontario law, they have to pay 14 times 500, approximately, which is \$7,000 in health insurance premiums, \$5,000 in health insurance premiums, plus the wages. And I say that that is a package of wages, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there is a law in Ontario that you have to add to a worker's wages if there are over 14 people \$7,000 — you have to add to their wages. And I believe it is wages. But how does that make one competitive, if one looks at the two situations and says in Manitoba we're going from 13 to 11 to save them \$1,000.00. When we go down the line, Mr. Speaker, to real small business, which after wages . . . And when you are talking about real small business you are talking about businesses which after wages to the entrepreneur if they make \$20,000 that's a good business. — (Interjection) — Well, if they make \$20,000, how much are you saving that firm? \$500 at most; has anybody heard of such a firm leaving Manitoba because it made \$19,500 instead of \$20,000.00? — (Interjection) — Pardon?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you I have been involved with businesses. I have never heard it; I have never heard it from any businessman that he was thinking of . . . — (Interjection) — or heard it from them — none of them know anything about business.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin always talked about nobody on this side ever having had to have a payroll. Mr. Speaker, if you talked about small businessmen as between the two sides of the House, we double the number of small businessmen that they have. The Member for St. Boniface had a small business — a mortuary. The Member for Seven Oaks had a small business. He had a sheet metal business. The Member for St. Johns had a small business. I had a small business. Howard Pawley had a small business. The former Member for Dauphin had a small business.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of operating small business and knowing the problems of small business, that the credibility of members on this side of the House surpasses members on that side of the House — surpasses, Mr. Speaker. But let's not take credibility as the issue. Let's look at it on its objective facts. Which small businessman gave up his business because his profit dropped from \$20,000, after taxes and after wages — wages to himself included — because his profits went down from \$20,000 to \$19,500.00.

I say, Mr. Speaker, without any difficulty at all, no such case can be found in the annals of business history. No such case. So what does this do, Mr. Speaker? This is not a relief measure. This is a symbolic measure. This is a measure which says to the business community that we really can't give you anything, because there is no real elbow room. And you know that's kind of a contradictory thing. The Minister of Finance comes in here and tells us that he is starving; that his hands are tied; that he can't operate; that he is facing a disastrous financial situation and then gives up \$20 million in income tax, \$8 million in estate tax — roughly \$28 million. And it's symbolic, Mr. Speaker, because it doesn't do anything for the small businessman but it says to the small businessman that you are now in government, and we are going to look after you, as a business government. It is a declaration of dependency, which I have so often referred to in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the worst part of this declaration of dependency is, what does it mean? What is a small business? As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, a person who has invested \$20,000 and makes \$50,000 in the first year, is engaged in big business. He is engaged in big business. The person who invests \$1 million and makes \$100,000 has made far less money than that first businessman — far less money. And that's something that the mining companies in this province understand when they said that our incremental tax makes much more sense than the Ontario incremental tax. Because we relate the profits of a business to the investment of that business. Not this — a person who makes \$20,000 and invests \$1,000 is engaged in small business. It seems to me he is engaged in very big

Friday, May 5, 1978

business. He has made 2,000 percent on his money the first year.

The Minister doesn't take that into account because he is engaged in something that we all get involved in from time to time, regrettably, and I will not even be able to exclude our own group from that position, in essential populism which really doesn't have any rationale behind it. Essential populism which doesn't have any rationale behind it because it's not based on any business principle that one can find.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Honourable Minister is engaged in trying to create this myth, this image, that this government is going to be better for business; that a reduction in taxes does more for economic activity than worthwhile desirable necessary public investment and expenditures; that it is better — and I have used this example before but I will use it again — that it is better and more profitable for society to have someone working in a massage parlour than it is to have them working in a hospital. Because one is in the private sector and one is in the public sector.

Mr. Speaker, that's coming home. The Honourable Minister said that he is going to reduce . . . The Honourable Minister and his party said that the way in which they are going to accomplish reductions in taxes while maintaining services is to eliminate the fat. Eliminate the fat Mr. Speaker, and they referred to Flyer Coach Industries, Saunders Aircraft. Where, in the budgetary figures of 1977, do you find moneys on operations for those companies? And if you say, well, it's lost and it's in capital, well if you compare the capital with what we are paying for for your administration's failures, it's far more than what we are paying for Flyer and Saunders.

But in any event, those things are there. You can't reduce fat on the basis of repayment of debt. You have to reduce it in operations. And when they came into power, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't find the fat. Not finding the fat, Mr. Speaker, they created a new definition of fat. If you will look at the definition of fat — here I have here the Conservative Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary and if you will look under fat . . . Here, where is fat? Fat under this new dictionary. Fat means, Mr. Speaker, meals — reduce to two meals a day. Sheets — reduce to replacing sheets one time per week. — (Interjection)— Yes, and head to toe instead of toe to head. And the elimination of health inspectors.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know this is the Conservative definition of fat, because they haven't found any fat in that budget. Mr. Speaker, so we are now seeing a Conservative administration that says it's hamstringing reducing taxes. Reducing taxes on the basis that it's going to stimulate the economy. . . I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of money that will be saved by cutting hospitals to 2.9 percent and changing sheets once a week, and give it to a businessman so that he will have \$45,000 instead of \$44,000, will not improve the economy of this province. Because it is much more likely that that nurse who is not working now, or the public health inspector who is not working now, or the amount of money that was being spent in the public sector for useful things, would be spent by the people making it in this province. Whereas there is every opportunity — as a matter of fact, the probability that the businessman who earns an additional thousand dollars will spend that in additional holiday — test that by yourself, test that by yourself. When I earned \$35,000 a year, is that when I started going overseas and making trips and spending money, which I could never spend before?

Mr. Speaker, that is the case almost universally, that the person who is working in the hospital is spending their money in the province of Manitoba, and the businessman whom you give an extra thousand dollars in profits is almost certain to use — (Interjection)— Well, where do I find the people with the suntans in February, other than myself, Mr. Speaker? Other than myself? I find them amongst my business friends, and I don't fault them, I don't fault them at all. I have never had anything remotely negative to say about a person who has earned enough money to take a good holiday and to go overseas, or to go to Europe, or to go south. I regret, I regret that that circumstance and the luck of the draw as to who has it available to them is created by an unjust structure of society, but I certainly would not blame the people — I do not blame them at all. — (Interjection)— Well, certain people do, you know, I hear certain people over on your side referring to the "working stiff" who works at Canada Packers for 50 years, has been there because he doesn't have the intelligence to do anything else. I hear people on that side of the House saying that, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that man is making a sound contribution to society and is a very hard-working person. That's right. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not fault either of these people; what I do is fault society for passing this type of legislation which is designed to create and maintain class differences.

You know, the First Minister and the Minister of Highways both said something which I find incomprehensible, and that's why it's so difficult to put yourself into somebody else's subjectivity — the First Minister said that the main difference between your people and our people, the Conservatives and the New Democrats, is you believe in peace and tranquillity and non-confrontation in society, and we believe in confrontation and creating difficulties. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, there is some truth in that, but what does it reflect? The man who is sitting in a position on top of the world over a group of people who are sitting underneath him, he wants tranquillity; he wants no problems; he wants no agitation. And really, what you are saying is that the economic status quo as it presently exists is a reflection of the Divine Providence, it should always be — and anybody who challenges it is envious and is seeking to stir up difficulties in society.

Well, Mr. Speaker, is there no understanding on the part of the other side of the House that a person who is born in poverty, who feels that he has had all kinds of avenues closed to him, who is living on the lowest rung on the economic ladder, who, in his mind — and I will support his thinking — feels that that is not because of some defect on the part of himself, but rather results from some type of organization in society which has created, which has put him in that position? Is there any understanding on the part of members on the other side of the House, that that person would be in

favour of change and would not want things to stay as they are, whilst my friend and friends who have been born with silver spoons in their mouths, who will continue to profit immeasurably — if the situation doesn't change — should say, "We like things as they are. We're satisfied; why can't everybody be?" And that's the attitude, that's the attitude of the First Minister of this province, and that's the attitude of the Minister of Highways, that somehow we are evil people because we are willing to engage in an attempt to upset the economic status quo so that the benefits of the wealth that is produced in the society are shared more equitably amongst the people. And that not only becomes a wrong concept, Mr. Speaker, that becomes an evil and pernicious concept in the eyes of the First Minister because it leads to trouble. And Mr. Speaker, it has led to trouble as long as history has been written. The feudal lords said the same thing, "Why can't the serfs be happy like we are? Why are they trying to create trouble? Don't they know that peace and tranquillity is better for them than creating trouble?"

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: The same thing, Mr. Speaker, was true of the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain, between the 1850s and the 1900s when working people decided that they would take the same steps that industrialists had been taking, and that is, trying to combine together for the purpose of improving their economic bargaining position, and what did the industrialists say? "Why can't these people be happy and contented and peaceful, as we are? Why can't they be? Don't they know that peace is better than difficulty?" And Mr. Speaker, the same thing is being said by the First Minister: If the people in the Manitoba Club are not running around with signs, if they are not agitating to try to upset things, why shouldn't you, the working people, and the people at the lowest end of the economic ladder, why shouldn't you be happy and contented, as we are?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it just doesn't work that way. There has been and will be, I'm afraid, for time immemorial, a continual struggle, if you want to call it, the First Minister will say I'm talking about class war — you know, you can use whatever euphemism you like, or non-euphemism — what you are going to see, not only in 1978 but in 2078 is a continual conflict between those who have much of the material goods and power in society, and those who have less of the material goods and power in society, and generally speaking the people who have much will call for peace and tranquillity and the people who have little will call for change. And if the honourable members think that that is a phenomenon which indicates that the people who have little are engaged in an evil design, it merely reflects the shallow Archie Bunker-ism lack of knowledge which is reflected by the Member for St. James when he takes a Tolstoy story and talks about it as if it represents a pernicious philosophy, that nobody should have anything, which is the way in which he dealt with the story.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to say what this bill is. This bill is not relief to taxpayers. The amount of relief that it grants to the \$10,000 earner — I think my friend, the Member for Seven Oaks — \$13.00 a year, a dollar a year, will be taken away from him in the park fees that he'll have to pay if he goes several times — (Interjection) — It'll take away the transit fees four times, four times! A person who rides the transit bus twice a day will be paying about \$52 a year by this bill, Mr. Speaker. So when we're talking about who is increasing taxes, this bill is the increase in taxes to the people of the Province of Manitoba. The poor family that has to send a child to university and has to get that money will find this increase wiped out ten times by the mere imposition of the tuition fee. And there are numerous other examples and we will be collecting them as to what's going to happen to the \$11.00 a year that you people think that you can bribe the majority of the people of the province as being a tax reduction; it is not a tax reduction; it is a tax increase because it goes along, Mr. Speaker, part and parcel, with an economic program which is designed to put the people that it ostensibly says are going to save, in a position where they will be paying more money out of their own pockets in one form of user tax or another. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I at least want to let it be known that this bill is not tax relief; for the poor it is a pittance — with regard to income tax it applies to nobody who is below the income tax paying level, and that could well be 33 percent of the population of this province. With regard to the people who pay a very small portion of taxes, and then we may be getting — I would make a guess, Mr. Speaker, which is a hazardous thing to do . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll finish with one sentence. I'll make a guess, which is a hazardous thing to do, that over 50 percent of the people of this province will not save \$50 a year by this bill and they will pay much more if their family uses the transit bus.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General . . .

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. Only with leave of the House can a member ask a question. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, it relates to the Tolstoy story. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Inkster would advise if he believes that individuals should have a Torrens title to land and should be able to pass it on to their children?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in the context of things as they are, I would say, certainly, certainly. If you are asking me whether the most desirable procedure on earth is that people should have a Torrens title, then I have to tell my honourable friend that if I said I believed in that, I would be dispossessing the majority of the people of this province from ever having private ownership of land. Because, does not the honourable member know that the fewer number of people who have Torrens titles, which is the way in which things move, particularly in the rural areas, the greater the number who will never have anything? And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am accepting the Torrens title; I say that it amounts to a long-term lease, that it does not amount to private property in land; that what it says, what it says is that the public will let you occupy this piece of land until we say that you no longer should have it. That is not my thesis; that is the thesis of the Conservative government or free enterprise governments, that pass the concept of Torrens title, and if they ever tried to change it — if they ever tried to legislate genuine private property in land that could not be taken away by the state — they would be defeated on that position. Because on that basis, Mr. Speaker, we would be dispossessing a large majority of the people of this province from ever owning land.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Education and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Public Works.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — PUBLIC WORKS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Committee come to order. We have a quorum. We are on Page 70, Resolution 105, section (d) of that particular resolution, Leased Accommodations (1) Salaries \$65,500—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister explain the increase in salaries. Is that just normal increase, and what about the SMY?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS(Lakeside): We are on (d)(1). Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the SMY situation remains the same at 5.31. There's a slight increase of \$3,900, which is merely a provision for the general salary increase and annual merit increments. I believe we've discussed the other increase. No change in SMY positions here, specifically the answer to the Member on staff.

MR. DOERN: And no vacancies?

MR. ENNS: No vacancies in this appropriation.

MR. DOERN: I would then like to ask the Minister some questions based upon the discussion that he had with the Member for St. Johns when he was here, because the moneys spent in this division of Public Works for leases, of course, are also policywise, related to certain considerations of building as to whether a government when it requires space, should lease that space or build that space.

But, I would like to go back to what the Member for St. Johns asked you, I believe it was yesterday, and that is the Minister seemed to indicate that he would give consideration to proposals of selling existing government assets. For instance, when I was responsible for the department there were many proposals put to me and you mentioned these the other day, people asking for space commitments so that they could construct new buildings. In other words, give them a sizable block commitment and they will put up a building, or they will build an entire building to meet your requirements, or they will go into partnership with you. I had one firm suggest that we would split a

building 50-50, they would build it and sell one half for their purposes, etc. etc., so I'm asking the Minister if he could give us some further comment. The Member for St. Johns indicated that some businessman he knew is prepared to buy any government building or office building and lease it back to the government, and the Minister seemed to indicate that he was somewhat interested in this concept, so, I wonder if he could indicate whether he is serious when he says this or whether he was just sort of thinking out loud.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, without the benefit of Hansard I'm trying to recall or recollect precisely what I did say on the subject matter last night, it's not altogether clear in my own mind, but if I left any impression that there was to be any change of substance with respect to the government's approach in policy in this regard, then let me take this opportunity to correct that impression. There simply is none. I think I was indicating that perhaps even some additional pressure or additional representations have been made to me in the short period of months that I have had the responsibility for Public Works by the private sector with the kind of representation that's already been referred to. But, for two very understandable and very common sense reasons, no real action or change is contemplated.

Firstly, the requirements for government space, understandably, is at this particular time contracting, not expanding. I think what we will find ourselves being able to do is to hopefully consolidate or bring together some of these spaces that we have in the city, but again, these would be done principally on the basis of providing for a better administration that perhaps now is fragmented in different locations throughout the city. But even there I don't see any substantive change occurring. I have for the members of the Committee, information on the overall lease accommodation space which I perhaps should give to the Committee at this time, which covers the unoccupied space as of March 31, 1978, which is as the recent most updating of the actual situation having in mind that some space has just recently in some instances become vacant.

Of the government space. . . I can break this down, or have some of this information available to the honourable member on districts which he is familiar with, but if he will accept for the moment, the grand or the total figures, allow me to give them in that way. Of a total of 39 "owned" units, that is, buildings that the government owns, there is a total of some 197,000 square feet of unoccupied space at the moment. An additional total of 19 leased units, buildings, there is an additional area of 36,000 square feet. Mr. Chairman, I have the metric figures here in metres, but I suppose that for this term around, we'd probably be more comfortable in square footage analysis.

MR. USKIW: Give us the other.

MR. ENNS: Well, it sounds. . . I should quite frankly as a smooth politician, give you the unoccupied space in metric metres because it's considerably less. The 36,000 square feet becomes 3,000 square metres or 197,000 square feet becomes 18,000. . .

MR. DOERN: For the benefit of the rural members, how many hectares is that?

MR. ENNS: Well, perhaps we can convert that further to hectares and we could then indicate that we possibly haven't got much more than one hectare standing empty at the moment.

But in total then, Mr. Chairman, for those members, if we can get down to business again, of the 58 units covered in this area of responsibility there is a total of some 233,000 square feet of unoccupied space at the moment.

MR. DOERN: The Minister, although he gave some inclination of this the other day, he is now making it clear that he does not intend to sell government assets, in terms of government buildings.

MR. ENNS: That is very true, there is no suggestion of that.

MR. DOERN: Is he giving any thought to leasing any government buildings, whole buildings?

MR. ENNS: No, no current building is being considered for leasing. I suppose perhaps we can talk about the Provincial Garage later on on the Estimates.

MR. DOERN: Yes, we certainly will, and can.

So there is no danger then of the Law Courts being, say, sold and rented back by the government from some U-Rent-It firm. I mean you are not desperately looking for capital by selling capital assets, so you can throw it into general revenue on a short-term basis.

MR. ENNS: There is no such thought being given to the operation of the Department of Public Works. While I have the microphone or the floor for a moment, I should just add that the square footage of unoccupied space that I just related includes that of the new and vacant Provincial Garage, which is, of course, of some substance, some 70,000 square feet in itself. It also includes space that is unoccupied and not suitable for occupancy, such as some of the Law Courts, the old buildings. . .

MR. DOERN: Land Titles.

MR. ENNS: The Land Titles building, I believe. 442 William being another example which I am told that if we just took the supports out from the one wall, we wouldn't have a building any longer.

MR. DOERN: I would just like to say to the Minister for the moment, when the time comes for an expansion rather than a contraction I would hope that the Minister would give serious thought to building that space rather than leasing that space, because I believe that the government can build space as cheaply or cheaper than a private developer.

I would cite to the Minister the following advantages. There is no Federal sales tax, no need to build in profit, and if the same architects and engineers can be hired, that the same contractors can be hired, and I believe that it is, in fact, either cheaper or as economical for government to build and operate and maintain as the private sector. Many space requirements cannot be met by the private sector unless the Minister is prepared to go out and say to some developer, "Build me a Law Courts Building or build me a laboratory," because there are just not such buildings available. You cannot lease special purpose buildings, you know, from standard office space. A garage would be another example.

I would like to ask the Minister — going back to this available space, this vacant space, 233,000 square feet — can he indicate what percentage of that, what is the percentage vacancy rate given government space? When we were in office it tended to hover at around 3 percent. I assume this is greater than 3 percent, but I wonder whether staff has a percentage figure of the vacancy rate?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that that figure can be arrived at if staff is given a bit of time. I would offer the opinion that with the inclusion of the 70,000 square feet of the new Provincial Garage in this column, I am advised that it is 50,000. It's nonetheless, and with the contraction of staff and the many thousands and thousands of recorded, you know, civil servants that are no longer in the employ of the government, it still hovers at 3 percent or just in that area.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we will wait for the figure, because I find it difficult to believe that it is 3 percent, I believe it must be higher. I sent in a . . .

MR. ENNS: By way of example, Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to interject. The staffing components of some of the new legislation that is being felt staffwise only this year, for instance, and I cite the particular the one — The Personal Property Act that was passed several years ago, have moved into the 15th Floor of the Woodworth Building and occupied that space, that for admittedly a brief period of time was vacant, but those kind of normal spacing requirements have been met in that manner.

MR. DOERN: I gave you an Order for Return, and I wonder if the Minister has the information now. The answer may be nil, but I submitted an Order for Return a month or so ago requesting information on any new leases that were entered into since our administration left office. Can the Minister indicate whether there have been any new leases or blocks of space taken on since October?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that Order for Return is in the process of being prepared for the Honourable Member. I can indicate to the Honourable Member that there have been the normal flow of lease renewals, notably some lease renewals for MPIC in their current space accommodations. Of any new leases of substance I am not particularly aware, I am waiting for some advice from the staff. I am advised that there have been no changes of substance. There have been some renewal of current leases, there has been some giving up of leases. The Department advises me that on the question of amount of offices or other spaces purchased, rented, or leased by the Province of Manitoba or its agencies since October 24th, 1977, the answer is nil by the Department of Public Works. I wish to pursue and do the usual search with other agencies departments that (a) might have entered into some lease arrangements that the department at this moment is not aware of. We are trying to pursue the similar policy of the previous administration in being the leaser of space, but as the former Minister will know that that isn't always the case.

MR. DOERN: But you know, here is a vital point. I don't know what your figures are; I know roughly what mine are. But since your administration took office about 1,500 jobs have disappeared. I gather about 1,000 by attrition and several hundred layoffs. Now, can the Minister confirm whether those are the figures he accepts.

MR. ENNS: No, I certainly don't accept those figures and I am not in a position as being responsible for the overall government employment situation, nor is my staff in a position to, at this hearing, answer that to committee.

I can, and I have indicated to the members of the committee, what the staff situation is within the Department of Public Works and members will recall it is basically unchanged, that we have operated in the department with roughly the same vacancy rate that has prevailed in the department for the past number of years and we have maintained some of the SMY positions. So, essentially, I think the honourable member will acknowledge that I can and will give him information that the department has with respect to space, occupied or otherwise, but ut I certainly cannot accept the figures by the

Honourable Member for Elmwood as being fact.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, then these are my figures but they seem to be ones that are generally accepted, that there has been approximately 1,000 positions vacated by attrition and some 400 or 500 layoffs. Now, whatever the figures are, they are sizeable. There are hundreds of people fewer working for the province than there were when we were in power, and there are also hundreds and thousands more unemployed than when we were in power.

Now, the Minister, under Leased Accommodations has a slightly improved budget. The amount of money that our government spent on Leased Accommodations, compared to what you are spending, you are spending more money than we spent on Salaries and Other Expenditures, and I would like to know why. If there are fewer civil servants working for the Provincial Government of the order of 10 percent, or whatever the amount is, it would seem that logic would dictate that there be a comparable reduction in the amount of space and in the budget for space.

Now, can the Minister explain why that is not reflected in the Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think before the Minister answers the question, the Member for Elmwood might want to make a correction. He said that there were hundreds of thousands unemployed.

MR. DOERN: Hundreds and thousands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hundreds and thousands, not hundreds of thousands.

MR. DOERN: No, I never said that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps to answer more accurately or correctly — not more accurately but just more specifically — a question that the honourable member asked for a few moments ago, of the 7 million square feet of space that the government either owns or leases, the vacancy, as stated, is some 233,533 square feet. Put that figure over the 7 million and you come pretty well on the three percent figure of vacancy rate. So, I just want to put that on the record to answer the member.

Again, Mr. Chairman, without accepting . . . And I want to be careful about this because I am simply not in a position to accept the kind of figures that the honourable member is quite free to use, whether they are right or accurate is another matter. But I can indicate from just the general experience that in many instances some of the persons — and this by a large measure was the bulk of the people that regrettably employment terminated — were not big space users, in the sense that they often were of a term nature. They were of a seasonal type of a program, where specific office space, as such, was not set aside from. There has been very little, and I think the Minister of Labour indicated that on several occasions in the House, in terms of actual permanent Civil Service staff reductions that would require or have with it a contingent vacant space or reduced expenditures involved in the maintenance of that space. There have been some, and I will certainly not leave the impression with the members of the committee that there has not been some vacancies created by the staff reductions. But in some notable instances they have also been picked up by new programs coming onto stream. The one that I particularly noted was the new staffing requirements and the new spacing requirements of the division up on the 15th floor of the Woodsworth Building taking over the Personal Property, that will respond and administer the Personal Property Act.

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, that space is only a couple of hundred square feet and it certainly doesn't amount to a hill of beans in 233,000. But this is my point. The Minister is telling me that the vacancy rate is the same as it was when I was the Minister. He is saying that, to the best of his knowledge, there is no change in the vacancy rate, but there is a change in the staff. There has been a reduction in the staff. And I say that if the Minister is telling me that we have fewer civil servants by hundreds . . . I say the figure is 1,500; he may have other figures and maybe members of the government would like to give their version of how many fewer civil servants there are. But there are hundreds less than there were and he still has the same amount of space. And I want to know what he is doing — what he has done in the past six months — about consolidating space, about sub-leasing space and about letting leases lapse.

Because surely I cannot believe that what has happened is when people move out, people there just sort of, you know, occupy two desks instead of one, or 200 square feet instead of 100. Because, you know, some people do have that tendency. They will take as much space as they can. You know, it's not necessarily a peculiarity. All I'm saying is what are you doing about the space that is no longer required because of government layoffs? What are you doing with it? You shouldn't be leasing the same amount. You should have a higher vacancy rate, although you say you don't. But you should be spending less money on leases than we were, say, a year ago.

I want to know what the Minister is doing to get rid of some of the space that has been rented from the private sector?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Elmwood ought to be able to realize that, firstly, by far the greater portion of that number if I were to acknowledge or use for a moment his figure of staff reductions, is simply what he himself said, through attrition or through not hiring, you

know, filling vacant positions.

Secondly, the information that I and the staff can give him at this time reflects the situation as of March 31st, 1978, wherein, for instance, another rather substantial group of former government employees that were perhaps users of space, who were under contract and whose contracts have not been renewed — again in most instances those contracts are still in the process of running out at this particular time. But in total, in terms of the year that I am reporting for, in this year, no appreciable change has been reflected. We are certainly doing what he is suggesting, that where indeed space has become vacant as a result of this, leases will be lapsed. The former Minister is well aware that there are, of course, contractual obligations that the government sometimes finds themselves into and we are attempting to rationalize this as best possible. But quite frankly, that question perhaps will have more meaning and the comparison will have more meaning this time next year when the staff reductions have impacted on the department's space requirements for the period of a year. I think the member would accept the fact that in most instances we are dealing — again, I would draw the member's attention to the date, March 31 — in many instances, staff reductions that we received notice of, those staff reductions were and did in fact continue their obligations and their duties to this date, or close to this date and some beyond that date, and therefore the change that the honourable member is looking for really cannot be expected to show up in the data for the year just concluded but rather will, I suspect, show up in a clearer form this time next year.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could do some rapid calculations — I don't know what the average figure was, was it 150 square feet per person is the approximate amount of space we take as a rule of thumb? But if that is the figure, if it's about 150 square feet per person, and you have 1,500 laid off, my calculation is that this would be the equivalent of 225,000 square feet if that's correct multiplication. And that is approximately the size of the Woodsworth Building, and that is approximately the size of the amount of space that should be available in terms of what leasing could be let go, or what could be non-renewed. Now, can the Minister answer these questions? Can he give me any instances of any sub-leases — I assume there have been none — that they're not sub-leasing any space that was leased, and No. 2, can he give me instances again of any leases not renewed, and if so, how many square feet?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'll undertake to find you an answer for the latter part of the question, but let me just in a very short way indicate to the Honourable Member for Elmwood that while he may apply a rough rule of thumb of X number of square feet per employee, that of course varies considerably with the nature of the program that is being conducted. The requirements for square foot space for the operation of the Provincial Garage, for instance, is considerably different to that of an office containing clerical and filing duties. I'm sure the Minister understands that in an office which employed 10 people before and now there are 9, we don't sublet out one corner of the office, or 180 feet. I accept the fact that if there has been a major reduction within a division then consolidation takes place, as in fact it is taking place in a few cases, but the point that I really don't want to leave on the record is that that flat figure that the honourable member uses, 1,500, is not indicative of the number of permanent civil servants who are essentially the people that have space allocations made to them.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister give me his figure?

MR. ENNS: No, I can't; I indicated before I cannot give you that figure because I'm not the Minister — I can give you the figures as they relate to the Department of Public Works and these Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 28, Department of Education. We're on Clause 6. Universities Grants Commission.
Clause 6.—pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could give us a breakdown of the expenditures for the 1977-78 year in comparison to the previous year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes. I would also hope, Mr. Chairman, that in proceeding to deal with this item in the Estimates, that the Honourable Minister would take some time to give us a brief rundown on this particular branch of his department; on the state of affairs in the university community and so forth; a progress report to date and plans for the future: as I believe has been the custom for many many years. —(Interjection)— And we'll get to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this particular section of our Estimates, I would first of all of course remark on the rather unique arrangement that exists between the government and the universities. As honourable members I am sure appreciate, there has been over the years established an arm's-length type of arrangement through the Universities Grants Commission. This has been maintained through statutory legislation that provides for the responsibilities of the particular universities of this province and of that Grants Commission.

The main function of the government of this province is to provide funding to the universities in a block grant, Mr. Chairman. The allocation of those funds to the universities, the way in which those funds are spent is left to the discretion of the Universities Grants Commission and ultimately to the universities involved.

We have found, Mr. Chairman, that certain rather interesting developments have taken place in the university community over the last number of years. In the area of full-time enrollment in 1960 there were some 6,232 students, enrolled full time. In 1970 it had risen to some 16,765, and in 1977 some 17,134. A levelling off seems to have been reached in this area, and I suppose a reflection, Mr. Chairman, on the number of young people in our society and declining enrollments in our public school system, which of course, in turn, supplies the graduates who go on to a university education.

The full-time enrollment estimated for 1978 is 16,750, the full-time enrollment. Part-time enrollment in 1960 was some 4,369; In 1970, some 17,395; and in 1977, Mr. Chairman, some 21,880; and this increase in part-time enrollment — especially in the last few years — shows a new direction, certainly a new thrust, in continuing education in the universities. And of those enrolled part-time in 1977, 11,741 were in the regular winter session and 10,139 in the summer session.

It's interesting that several years ago it had been estimated that part-time enrollment would overtake full-time enrollment in the mid-Seventies and clearly the number enrolled on part-time basis is now greater than the full-time enrollment by a considerable amount, Mr. Chairman.

I might also mention at this time that the projected enrollments for the next decade would indicate a decline in full-time enrollments, Mr. Chairman. Again a direct reflection on the number of young people who are presently in our school systems. This decline in full-time enrollment will certainly create certain challenges for the universities. It is going to necessitate a careful examination of their programming and, in fact, their whole operation. I'm sure it's a challenge that they will be able to meet and one that will easily be overcome with the expertise that they have available to them.

At the same time, the universities are concerned about maintaining quality as well as the question of quantity and this is again a challenge that they have been meeting and will continue to meet, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure in the years ahead.

There are new directions, of course, in community commitment that the universities are taking, much more so than, let us say, some 10 or 15 years ago.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I think the universities of this province are of a high standard, are well respected across this country — and in fact in other countries of the world — and I'm sure will continue to maintain that particular position.

The Member for Churchill had asked for a breakdown of operating expenses for 1977-78, I believe. I'll give him that information at this time.

In 1977-78 the universities operating on first claim, some \$82,466,300; in addition the UGC office grants in lieu of taxes, rentals, support programs, some \$11,967,300 for a total of \$94,433,600.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You will no doubt recall that in dealing with the Estimates of this department in relation to the previous appropriations, that the general position taken by the Minister was that even with the modest reductions but coupled with the more efficient style of operation, that no education program will really suffer. I would like the Minister to dwell for whatever time it takes him to indicate to the people of Manitoba, in what manner and on the basis of what rationale, given the inflation rate that still exists, given all the other factors that must be coped with today, how the universities can possibly be expected to deliver the programs, for which they are charged with the responsibility of delivering, with only the modest increase that the Estimates Book before us appears to show, which is only one and a small fraction of 1 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Burrows. In fact the increase in operating funds to the universities amounted to some \$2,400,000, which on a percentage basis represents some 3 percent. This, of course, is a little different figure to the one the Member for Burrows has been stating.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The fact of the matter still is, Mr. Chairman, if one looks at the figure on the left-hand side of the line, Resolution 46 — and I believe that this is the one which the Minister wants the committee to approve, this particular line — the figure for last year is \$87,925,000.00. The figure for this year, which this Minister wants us to approve, is \$89,108,000; and if one subtracts last year's figure from this year's figure, one arrives at a figure of just a shade better than \$1 million, which amounts I'm sure — applying the same method of arithmetic division as he would — it works out to

just a shade better than 1 percent.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for Burrows is quite correct, if he takes the two figures before him and works his arithmetic on that basis. But what he must understand is that the Grants Commission receives a sum of money and passes it on to the universities; and the amount of money that the Grants Commission has handed on to the universities this year amounts to a 3 percent increase. They, of course, have received this amount. In fact, if you take out the grants in lieu of taxes and other economies that the Grants Commission has seen fit to practise, the universities in fact have received 3 percent — a 3 percent increase, which I am the first to admit, Mr. Chairman, is not certainly a huge increase at all and at a time of inflation is going to cause the universities to certainly do a great deal of belt-tightening. But I can assure the Member for Burrows that I have had the opportunity, along with the Minister of Finance and the Premier, of sitting down and talking to the presidents of the three universities; and have received their assurance, although this is going to present a considerable challenge to them, that they feel that they can continue to provide the quality and the quantity of educational programming that they have been providing in the past; and that they will manage to live within the bounds of the amount of money that is being given to them through the Universities Grants Commission.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would like to ask him one question at this point in time. Did he or his First Minister or anyone from government suggest, advise or recommend to the universities that they increase their tuition fees commencing the forthcoming academic year?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the review that had been completed, that recommendation was made to the Grants Commission.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well then I would like the Minister to answer one further question and I now find it rather difficult to see how that recommendation squares with the existing legislation under which universities operate. It's my distinct recollection that the matter of setting tuition fees is one responsibility of the Boards of Governors of the two universities and the Board of Regents of the University of Winnipeg and not one of government to recommend or indicate or whatever to universities what it should be but that is the prerogative, that is the responsibility of the boards and not of government.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the line of reasoning that the Member for Burrows is following, however, I would suggest to him that the Universities Grants Commission, although receiving a recommendation from government is certainly under no compunction to follow that recommendation if, in their judgment, it would be harmful to the university community as a whole.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Does not the Minister feel that making a suggestion of that kind is really an encroachment upon the autonomy and independence of the universities?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows may interpret that particular recommendation in that light. I would suggest that even among the university community, an increase of fees had been seen as inevitable because, for some reason that is unknown to me, there had been no increase in fees for a considerable number of years and the fees in Manitoba had fallen certainly to the point where they were not only the lowest in Canada but away out of line with other provinces of this country. I'm sure not only the university community but all people in this province certainly saw that as an area where the percentage of university costs being borne by the students without any problem at all should be increased and even with the increase, Mr. Chairman, the university fees in Manitoba are still among the lowest in this country.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That brings me then to this question. What percentage of university costs is borne by the students?

MR. COSENS: In 1975-76, Mr. Chairman, the percentage was some 11.5 percent; in 1976-77, some 11.1 percent; in 1977-78, some 9.56 percent and in 1978-79, in line with the increase in fees, it is expected to be in the neighbourhood of 10.95, roughly 11 percent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would once again like to ask the Minister and at this time he has the opportunity to elaborate at greater length in his answer to a question which I had posed to him some time ago during questions before Orders of the Day Day, and that is this: Does he share the view of his First Minister who appears to make a distinction between taxpayers and students. He refers to taxpayers and students as being two separate and distinct categories or groups within our society because, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that there is a distinction. I am not aware of any tax levied by the Province of Manitoba which a student is exempt from paying by virtue of his being a student. I'm not aware of any. All taxes that the people of Manitoba — there's nothing, no goods, no services that a student buys where he could declare himself as being a student and thus be exempt from paying whatever provincial tax may be imposed upon that good or that service. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, to my mind and I believe in the minds of the people of Manitoba, students are taxpayers in

the same manner as everyone else is.

Now, I think I know what the Honourable Minister might say. He might, as I've heard others, make mention, ah, but income tax. But, Mr. Chairman, whether an individual pays tax on his income earned has nothing to do with his being a student except for the fact that he's eligible for a deduction for tuition fees so that may reduce his taxable income but other than that it has nothing to do with it, absolutely nothing to do with it. There are many people who are not students who are not taxpayers for whatever reason. There might be members, as I mentioned once before, there might be members in this House who do not pay income tax, I don't know, because they may have been able to arrange their financial affairs in such a way as to take maximum benefit of all the provisions within the tax legislation and thus reduce their income below the taxable level or reduce it to an absolute minimum. So whether one pays an income tax or not has nothing to do with whether one is a student or not. If there's any student who has a level of income above the taxable level, he pays tax in the same manner as everyone else.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would say that those families in which there are members attending university, they are being doubly taxed. They are being doubly taxed in the sense that they pay the same sales tax, they pay the same income tax, they pay the same level of all other taxes that are imposed upon them and then on top of that they pay the tuition fee plus the increase that this government has recommended to the universities that they build into their budget for the forthcoming year. So really, I fail to see the distinction between taxpayers and students. To me, students are just as much taxpayers as any other citizen of this province. Now perhaps the Minister makes some distinction between taxpayers and students; his First Minister seems to make the distinction. I would like to hear the Minister's comments whether he shares his First Minister's view or not.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Burrows is begging the question a bit. I'm sure the First Minister in his comments in this particular area was intimating that most of us, and I'm sure the Member for Burrows' university experience was no different than mine, or perhaps it was, but in most cases those who are involved in scholarly pursuits do not at the same time have the opportunity to be working and earning a great deal of money. When the time does come around to fill out their income tax papers, very few find themselves in the position where they have to pay any considerable amount and in most cases I would suggest to the Member for Burrows most find themselves in the position where they do not have to pay anything and in fact receive money back. So when he is suggesting somehow that students are being taxed unduly, I would suggest that if he can produce figures that would prove this to me, I would be very interested in seeing them. It has been my experience with the university students in my own particular family and those that I know that in spite of the fact that they attempt to work during the non-university months, that the amount of income that they can earn in that time certainly does not put them in a tax bracket where they are paying any considerable amount of taxes at all and, in most cases, pay none.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to stress the point that there is no individual exempt from paying any tax by virtue of being a student. The student who needs to buy a pair of shoes this afternoon and goes down to Eaton's or the Bay is going to pay sales tax on that pair of shoes at exactly the same rate as the Minister would if he needs a pair of shoes. The only difference may be that it will create a somewhat larger dent in his pocketbook in relation to the amount of money that he has in it than it would in the Minister's because his income is not at the same level. But this notion that students seem to enjoy some tax benefit is a myth, Mr. Chairman, because no student is exempt from paying any tax by virtue of being a student. As I have indicated a moment ago, I don't know how many members in this House pay income tax or at what level they pay income tax but I do know that they are all governed by the same laws and in accordance with those laws they pay the tax that the law indicates that they must pay. The same applies to all other taxes, on whatever other goods and services that they may purchase. They pay the tax that is prescribed by law. I know of no tax which exempts students from paying.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, of course no one can dispute the fact that students do pay sales tax on items that they purchase with their own particular money. I don't think that's a matter of dispute at all but I believe the Honourable Member for Burrows will — and I would find it very odd if he would not — agree that there are certain exemptions on the income tax that the students pay that favour them in that particular circumstance.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I mentioned this at the outset, that tuition fees are deductible from one's earnings and if a student is living away from home — I'm not a tax expert, I can't recall that exact provision — but I seem to recall there is a further deduction that a student can make for living expenses away from home up to a certain maximum allowable amount. But I think that it should be pointed out at this time, Mr. Chairman, that in this year, in the first year of government of the Conservative Party, that the students are being hit with a number of taxes, with a number of taxes that will make it doubly, or triply, or quadruply more difficult to pay the increase in tuition fees.

The tuition fee tax has been increased. Because of the cutback in transit grants, the increase in transit fares — and the Honourable Minister can do that arithmetic just as well as I can — that just to take that student to and from university during the academic year is going to cost him an additional \$30.00, \$35.00 for the seven or eight months that he spends in university, not to mention the fact that it

will also cost him an additional \$4.00 or \$5.00 a month to take him to and from work if he should be fortunate enough to find work.

There's another burden imposed upon the student — the cutback in summer employment. Now hopefully we'll be able to have a more thorough discussion of that when we get to Item 7.(c) under Youth Services.

Those are just to mention a few, Mr. Chairman, of the additional burdens imposed upon the student of today. I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that the increase in tuition fees is going to be most severely felt by the sons and daughters of the families at the lower end of the socio-economic scale. NT71 Those are the ones that are going to be most hard hit. The son or daughter of the more affluent family, he is not going to be hard hit. It is not going to hit him as hard, and certainly isn't going to hit as hard the student who may be fortunate enough to be on the payroll of his dad's company for the summer, or the daughter can be put on the payroll of her parent's company for the summer, and be paid an income that will put that student within the taxable range, so he deducts an additional \$100 from his earnings, and thus reduces his taxable income. So he is not the one that is going to be hit. But the one at the bottom end of the socio-economic level is going to be hard hit, and his parents are going to be hard hit, because his parents are also contributing toward the costs of his education.

So this notion that it is about time that the students paid more, but in many families it is not just the student that is paying more, it is the entire family that is contributing towards that student's education, not just the student whose name appears on the register of one of our three universities, but the parents also contribute toward that student's education costs, and that additional \$100 or \$140 a year or \$150 or whatever it may be, to the family which is at the minimum wage level or just a shade above, that is equal to a week's wages, a week's earnings of somebody — of the student, if he was fortunate enough in finding a job for the summer, and if not, a week's wages of his dad. So, you know, this notion that this is only an attempt to get the 16,000 or 17,000 students enrolled at university digging down a bit deeper into their own pockets and paying more for their education is really a myth, because the entire society, the entire community will have to dig down that much deeper, and unfortunately that is where the inequity arises, Mr. Chairman, is that it is going to hurt those at the lower end of the socio-economic scale much more so than those at the upper.

So, here again, Mr. Chairman, we have a perfect example, an indication of the general direction, but, you know, when we have been asking the Honourable Minister to define and explain to us this new direction in which the Education program is heading, I think that when we have got to this appropriation, the direction in which this government is heading in its Education program has become very very clear. It is aimed in the direction of making post-secondary education, at any rate, available only to those who can afford to pay for it, who can afford to pay for it with ease and comfort, make it available to those upon whom education costs will not be any form of a hardship.

Then, of course, in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, you were in the House earlier this morning when we were debating the Tax Bill, and you know for the family that is earning \$25, \$30, \$40, \$50 thousand a year, the tax cut that this government has given to them will more than offset the increase in tuition fees. But it will clobber over the head that guy living in my riding. So that is the direction in which this government is moving in its Education program, to bring education back to where it was for many many years, that it was a privilege reserved exclusively for the sons and daughters of the members of the Manitoba Club, and for the sons and daughters of the board members of the Great-West Life Assurance Company.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Well, we don't have too much time left at this time, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to start to address the remarks made by the Member for Burrows, who is making a substantial case, I am sure he feels, against the increase in fees, and I would ask him then how he explains the fact that in our sister province to the west, Saskatchewan, that last bastion of socialism in Canada, perhaps crumbling bastion but nonetheless a province under a government with the same political persuasion as himself, charges their university students who are taking Arts \$625 a year, in Arts, tuition. That is \$85, Mr. Chairman, a year more than our students will be paying even with the increase, and I have not heard these great screams of protest similar to those that are emanating from the Member for Burrows from the people or the students of that province in that regard. They seem to feel that that is not out of the ordinary. But here we are with some \$85 a year less, Mr. Chairman, than that particular province, the one who I would suggest is economically in no better position than this particular province. There are some very basic similarities in the agricultural base.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time being 12:30, I am now leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 o'clock.